

GMHB EXHIBIT 246

2024-06-05 Planning Commission Transcript

0:01

and we are live good evening and welcome to the June 5

0:07

2024 special hybrid Planning Commission meeting I'm Mike Murphy the chair

0:13

tonight's hybrid Planning Commission meeting is brought to you courtesy of Zoom
welcome to all and thank you for

0:20

joining us tonight Commissioners please have your mics turned on for the roll

0:26

call Deputy city clerk please call the roll

0:31

thank you chair chair Murphy present Vice chair

0:37

reab present commissioner accuse present commissioner bazo here commissioner

0:44

rashis here and there we

0:50

go and not anymore okay our first item of business

0:57

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

1:04

accept those items scheduled for a public hearing uh if there is one this evening

1:11

is there anyone who has signed up for appearances that wishes to address the

1:17

commission chair there's there was no one that signed up prior to 4m and I do not see anybody in the attendees box

1:26

okay uh so we'll now move to special business the first item of special business is to

1:33

review and consider approving the minutes of the May 15 special meeting

1:39

Commissioners may I have a motion motion second okay the motion has been made and

1:46

seconded to approve the minutes is there any comment or discussion of or

1:51

Corrections needed to the minutes seeing No Hands um Deb would you

1:57

like to do the roll call vote on approving the minutes thank you sir

2:04

chair Murphy I Vice chair riam I commissioner

2:10

q i commissioner vazo I and commissioner RIS I thank

2:17

you minutes are approved uh the second item of business is agenda Bill

2:24

2414 Planning Commission Administration um there are three topics

2:30

in this agenda Bill the first item to discuss is chair and vice chair

2:35

elections uh and we welcome Deputy city clerk Estrada as she leads us through

2:41

the election process Deb thank you chair so tonight the

2:49

the we're changing things up a little bit perhaps from what we've done in the past and that we've Incorporated a

2:55

process that's uh much more similar to what the council does so I'll walk you through this steps and uh after the

3:03

chair is elected if the chair the new chair would like to uh take over this

3:09

process they will refer to the script or if they prefer that I continue and get us through the election of the vice

3:15

chair I can do that so Commissioners there are um excuse

3:21

me under the Planning Commission bylaws commissioner shall elect a chair and vice chair for a term of one year from

3:27

among themselves at the June Planning Commission meeting or as soon as possible thereafter or upon vacancy or

3:33

resignation of the commissioner filling the chair or vice chair position the election process is outlined in section

3:40

3.1 of the Planning Commission bylaws that were adopted last December

3:46

tonight I will call for nominations for the chair if there is only one one

3:51

nominee it is appropriate to make a motion and obtain a second to instruct myself as Deputy city clerk to cast a

3:57

unanimous ballot for that nomination per chair approval is by majority vote of

4:03

the Commissioners present in that case it would be three of you elections will

4:08

continue until the chair is elected by a majority vote of the commission upon the election of the

4:15

chair the chair will then proceed in the same fashion with the election of the vice chair or as I explained earlier I

4:20

can take I can manage that process on their behalf so at this point I'll entertain nominations for commissioner

4:27

to serve as chair for a period of one

4:34

year any um I'd like to nominate chair Murphy

4:39

for the chair position are there any other nominations

4:47

yes I would like to nominate commissioner bazo as

4:56

chair and are there any other nominations

5:03

hearing no other nominations we'll close the nominations Commissioners in the order

5:10

in which uh nominations were

5:16

made although I suppose commissioner uh or chair Murphy you could

5:21

decline um I I will decline yes okay in

5:27

that case that leaves us with a nomination by chair Murphy to nominate

5:33

uh commissioner bazo as chair so seeing that there is only one

5:39

nomination is there a motion for commissioner bazo to be chair mov so

5:47

moved second third okay so we're going to say

5:54

commissioner accuse made the motion and commissioner RI seconded it is that

6:01

correct I think they went before me so I don't know I'm I'm happy to take

6:08

it but commissioner Masis did you make the motion or was it Vice chair rig I

6:14

think it's a I think it was a jump ball between myself and vice chair ragab and

6:19

so I said I seconded I concede to him

6:25

okay you're a gentleman and a scholar

6:31

all right we have a motion and a second on the floor to nominate commissioner bazo as

6:39

chair Deputy clerk estrado were you not gonna ask if I was gonna accept the

6:44

nomination or decline I was just like were you guys just gonna make me take it yeah pretty

6:51

much asking about rules that was that was funny no there isn't actually a rule about this
and I guess uh the only

6:58

reason why I thought of chair Murphy is because he he was the one who nominated you I
suppose in all fairness you could

7:05

choose to decline I could yes you can

7:11

no good are you debating are you debating the motion in the second at this point or would
you like to continue

7:16

with the roll call vote that's fine go to the roll call all

7:22

right commissioner Murphy hi Vice chair RAB I Comm commissioner

7:29

accuse I commissioner bazo I commissioner RIS I'm all right and I

7:39

need to stop saying 70 on these votes it's G to be hard we give you three

7:45

meetings to practice right 23 rotations and three

7:51

meetings okay and with that uh chair bazo you can take over the election of a

7:58

vice chair or if you'd like I can continue in the same manner on your behalf um I would actually prefer either

8:04

you or former chair Murphy to continue for this meeting if we could um you mean

8:11

for the entirety of the meeting or that would be my preference just the election

8:17

process um Can can we have chair Murphy finish the meeting for us this evening I

8:25

think the the the appropriate step would be to have um Deb finish the election process to

8:33

have the vice chair and then you can have the vice chair chair the

8:41

meeting or okay whatever I would like to make a uh nominate chair Mur former

8:47

chair Murphy to be Vice chair Murphy that's a turnab about as fair play huh

8:55

kinda do we have any other nominations for vice chair may may I self

9:03

nominate I don't see why not I've I've it's happened in

9:08

my 25 years before so all right okay so I have a commissioner

9:15

rigga uh nominating himself okay are there any other

9:26

nominations does in the spirit of our last discussion do either one of those

9:31

individuals wish to decline the

9:36

nomination I think I'll stick stick with that okay so unless there's no other

9:43

nominations I'll now close the nominations we have two individuals I'm sorry excuse me
Vice chair if chair

9:50

Murphy's not declining then I'll I'll I'll decline so yeah I'll I'll withdraw

9:57

my self nomination okay in that case uh seeing that there

10:02

is only one official nomination at this point is there a motion is there a motion excuse me
uh for vice or excuse

10:12

me for commissioner Murphy to be Vice chair so moved I got it we had

10:17

duplication so and I was looking one okay was first was first all right and

10:23

do we have a second second thank you

10:29

any discussion okay we'll go to the roll call vote uh commissioner Murphy

10:39

I commissioner RAB I commissioner accuse I chair

10:45

bazo I and commissioner rashis I motion passes 5- Z and that closes the

10:53

elections for this evening and going back to the original

10:59

disc session um chair bazo you had requested

11:04

uh that the vice chair m in this case Vice chair Murphy take over the

11:10

remainder of the meeting please I will do

11:15

so um so having completed that

11:20

congratulations chair bazo on your elevation and I'll congratulate myself

11:27

on my demotion so the second item under agenda Bill

11:34

2414 is a bylaws update deputy director Allison van gorp

11:41

I believe has a

11:46

presentation actually don't have a presentation but I just wanted to say a few words um so typically in years past

11:54

we've updated the bylaws at this June meeting um we're going to hold on that this year because of the recent actions

12:02

by the city council to reconfigure the Planning Commission we need to do we need to draft some updates to the bylaws

12:10

to reflect that um I think there's several areas throughout where we're going to need to make amendments and we

12:15

need a little more time for the city clerk's office and the city attorney's office to review that and prepare the

12:20

Amendments um so we'll be bringing those back to the commission at a later time I'm thinking that will probably be this

12:26

fall um and then at that time if of the Commissioners would like to propose amendments to the bylaws in addition to

12:33

the ones proposed by the staff um you'll have an opportunity to do that at that

12:38

time um and then I can move on to the next item unless there's any

12:46

questions no go ahead okay so the next thing we need to do is appoint a new

12:52

member to the housing workg group um we would like to reconvene the housing workg group uh to start meeting at the

13:00

end of this month um you may recall that

13:05

we need to make some increases in capacity for high higher mid density

13:12

housing um to address the shortfall that was found in the land Capacity Analysis

13:18

so we would like to bring the housing work group back together to help us draft that code amendment that will

13:24

likely add some additional capacity in town center and then also add multif family housing as an allowed use in the

13:30

co zone so um Carolyn Bozman was previously

13:36

on the work group and since she's now her term has expired on the commission um we'll be looking for a new

13:42

representative um and as long as commissioner accuse is interested in continuing on the work group we would

13:49

welcome her to just continue and then just add a new

13:54

member yeah I would like to continue and I would like to nominate chair

13:59

bazo to take Carolyn Batman's Place commissioner bman

14:06

Place do we need a second yeah it's uh in in a way it's

14:13

kind of a volunteer thing so the question is more is Cher bazo willing to

14:19

volunteer for that duty this a volunteer

14:24

thing all right I I volunteer to participate on the housing work group

14:32

okay um so we have um she's volunteered uh we have made a I guess a motion by

14:42

commissioner accuse do we have a second for the motion to appoint chair bazo to

14:49

the housing work group I will second it if no one else

14:58

will so it moved and seconded

15:03

um Deb do you want to call a role on pointing chair bazo

15:13

certainly Vice chair Murphy uh I commissioner q i

15:20

commissioner Rashid hi commissioner reab hi and Sher

15:28

B I thank you thank you okay the final

15:35

item of special business is agenda Bill 2415 comp plan periodic review

15:42

deliberations and I believe Adam Zach is supposed to

15:48

U talk to us now all right thank you uh welcome back

15:55

um feels like we were just here yeah um let me uh let me share my screen here

16:00

I've got a couple of slides to get to um and then we'll uh continue the

16:07

discussion from last week um

16:14

okay um so tonight we'll be continuing the deliberations um from that began at

16:20

last week's um meeting on the 29th um and our purpose tonight is to um work on

16:28

your recommendation for the transportation Capital facilities utilities and parks and open space

16:35

elements um we're kind of taking these in chunks um with planning on uh

16:42

addressing the other elements at the next week next week's meeting um so that

16:47

we can we can get to a recommendation on the whole plan um and so that's that's kind of the

16:53

overarching goal is to arrive at your recommendation to the city council on the the overall

16:59

um comprehensive Plan update in terms of the the amended

17:05

elements um just as a refresher we're updating the comprehensive plan um because it's required that we update it

17:12

by the end of this year um under the Washington State growth management act and and the update is really to extend

17:19

the um the planning Horizon for the comprehensive plan um for the next 20

17:24

years um this update also addresses some of those up the new GMA requirements

17:30

that were established by um the Washington State Legislature in recent sessions

17:37

um I won't go into as much detail on the time the project timeline um if you're

17:43

if members of the public watching this are interested in seeing kind of an in-depth look at this timeline I would

17:49

recommend uh watching last week's meeting um I kind of went through this point by point the main the main thing

17:55

to know here is that we've been working on this comprehensive plan update since the spring of 2022 when the city council adopted the

18:03

scope of work public participation plan and master schedule for the um for the project and throughout the the

18:10

intervening two years the Planning Commission has been reviewing the elements of the comprehensive plan and

18:16

and working on um updates um to respond to those uh Statewide requirements and

18:21

then other changes in Regional and countywide policies so that brings us up

18:27

to today uh here um I didn't move my we are here box

18:33

but we are in the tail end of the planning commission's legislative process for reviewing the comprehensive

18:40

Plan update um we held a or the Planning Commission held a public hearing last Wednesday May

18:46

29th um and began considering their recommendation and then tonight and then

18:52

on June 12th we plan to continue those deliberations and work towards that recommendation to the city council

18:59

um and that would conclude the planning commission's legislative review of the comprehensive Plan update the the

19:05

elements themselves the goals and policies of the plan um from there the process would then be handed off to the

19:12

city council um for their review um so even when the when the Planning Commission wraps up their review of The

19:18

Elements that's not the final um action the city council ultimately will will

19:24

decide whether to adopt the comprehensive plan um as recommended or with amendments um and that'll kick off

19:30

in the summer um we're we're planning to give the city council their initial briefing in July and then from there

19:38

they'll continue their review um into the fall um as Alison mentioned we're

19:45

reconvening the housing work group um soon uh to begin looking at those

19:50

implementing code amendments um specifically the code amendments to increase the multifam and mixed use uh

19:59

development capacity um focusing on um looking at the development regulations

20:05

in town center um and reviewing a potential height increase there and then the commercial adding um multif family

20:14

housing and mixed use housing as an allowed use in the commercial office Zone and both of those amendments um or

20:21

the the general idea for those amendments was directed by the city council earlier this year so the housing

20:26

work group will pick that up in um over the summer and that work will then come

20:31

to the Planning Commission we're expecting um to to have that uh to bring forward in September um so then the

20:38

Planning Commission will conduct an additional review of those code amendments make a recommendation to the

20:43

city council and then the city council will consider um adoption of those so so we still have some work ahead of us even

20:50

when we get to um your recommendation next week as a recap of the public hearing

20:58

last week um we received public or the Planning Commission received public testimony on

21:04

the um proposed comprehensive Plan update and began its deliberations um

21:11

last week you appro approved six motions um you can see the full text in those um

21:16

in the 529 meeting minutes um which should be available um next week um but

21:23

essentially uh you decided to close the policy gaps and and resolve the internal con consistency topics as recommended by

21:31

staff um and then there were a couple of amendments that were made to the

21:36

transportation land use and housing element text um in response to some

21:41

comments from uh former commissioner Bozman and then the final motion uh was

21:48

to um accept the the staff recommended findings um that were provided um as a

21:55

working document and begin kind of working on um on the planning commission's findings

22:01

in addition to um the uh updated comprehensive plan

22:08

elements um at that meeting too the Planning Commission requested some additional information um and these were

22:15

provided in uh agenda Bill 2415 um so the first thing that you

22:21

requested was a a public comment tracking um mechanism and so there was a

22:27

table provid Ed in that Planning Commission bill um to track those

22:32

comments and track um the resolution for those comments um and before I keep

22:39

going I I see a hand up I just had a quick question on that

22:45

table when I looked at that table in the packet um aside from names that table

22:51

was blank um are we going to do we have a timeline for when we're going to fill

22:58

that out or what's what's the plan on that so

23:03

those additional comments and um actually I can I can show you here so this is essentially what the what the

23:09

table is in the in the Planning Commission bill in the interest of saving some

23:15

space in the agenda Bill I just referenced the names um and and assigned

23:20

them a log number you you can find the full comment was provided in the exhibit

23:26

um to the Planning Commission bill and then these empty columns here as we go through um if there are Amendment

23:34

amendments made um in response to one of these comments we can track it there um

23:40

I provided this as a tool for you to um keep track of this for us to keep track

23:45

of it as we go through it um we're not necessarily obligated to make a change

23:51

one way or the other on on any of these this is just a tracking tool

24:00

did that answer your question okay

24:06

great um so one of the other um pieces of information that the commission

24:12

requested on the 29th was some information about the scope of work um

24:17

and so the Planning Commission Bill includes included a link to um the

24:23

adopted or approved scope of work um which was resolution 1621 and then also

24:29

the addendum to the scope of work that was adopted or approved in 2023 with

24:35

resolution 1645 so those are that's where you can find that information and

24:41

then the final uh thing that was requested was uh information on where

24:46

the housing element um the minimum requirements for the housing element were provided um and so I provided a

24:54

link to uh Planning Commission Bill 2405 which that was the the version of the

25:01

that's the housing workg group drafts of the housing element and it includes the

25:07

um references to those minimum requirements so that's where you can you can find that if you're um if you're

25:13

looking for it so there are some comments that we've

25:19

received um and we're I'm we're now keeping track of where those those

25:24

Amendments have been made um the first table that you'll see in PCB 2415 is tracking the planning

25:32

Commissioners comments the comments that have been submitted by U members of this body um so the table in the um in the

25:43

Planning Commission Bill stops at pc5 which was received by Chris from Chris gells the the subsequent um what is that

25:52

eight um eight comments came in from Adam reab yesterday um and so those were forwarded

25:59

um or sorry was it Monday they they came in after the Planning Commission bill was uh was published so um that's why

26:07

they're underlined here we can we can come back and and revisit those if needed they'll also be included in the

26:13

next uh Planning Commission bill but this is just a track where we've responded to planning commissioner

26:20

comments um and then we just talked about the public comment uh tracker um

26:25

there were three public comments that were received after the Planning Commission bill was published um those

26:32

came from uh now private citizen Chris GS um Meg Lippert and Sarah Fletcher um

26:40

those will again be included in the next uh the next draft and as we work through

26:45

um as we work through updating or um your recommendation we can we can track

26:53

um any actions that the uh Planning Commission may take um in response to

26:59

these comments using this table um and that'll get updated as we

27:06

go so the the other part of this that I wanted to touch on again we we talked

27:12

quite a bit last week about findings and I just wanted to touch on this again um because I think this will be a big part

27:18

of our discussion moving forward so the draft findings are um are your way of

27:26

kind of memorializing why you're doing a certain thing or provide some information about your expectations for

27:33

implementation and and we're planning on having those in section four of the

27:38

draft findings sections one through three are really just kind of some technical documentation about how the um

27:46

proposed update satisfies the procedural requirements in the city code and how it

27:52

includes the content that's required by the growth management act so the the real the the point where we can kind of

27:59

focus uh your attention for making Planning Commission findings would be in section

28:05

four we looked at that a little bit last week but I just kind of wanted to put that out there um again um staff has

28:13

recommended seven findings um that are directed at some of the public input and some of the um identified policy gaps

28:21

and those were provided with last week's Planning Commission Bill 2413 in table two and there's a recomend

28:28

amended Motion in that Planning Commission bill and I'll I'll bring it up here in a moment that would

28:33

essentially just make these uh these seven findings with a single action and if you do that that isn't necessarily

28:39

closing the findings it would just be saying these these seven we're going to put in there and then if you have

28:45

additional findings you can make those throughout the remainder of the deliberations process so um nothing's

28:51

really fixed in stone until you make your final recommendation to the city council um

28:59

and again throughout throughout this process as we come across um public comments or other things where you want

29:06

to include some direction about what you're expecting in terms of implementation or um if you want to

29:14

provide additional context the the findings are the place to do that um and we can um additional um findings or

29:22

amendments to the findings could be made by motion just as we would with anything else

29:32

I I see another hand yeah just going back on the

29:37

previous slide so when uh when at the bottom bullet where you talk

29:43

about uh adopting those seven findings um and that they can still be changed

29:50

and edited and um all that how's that different from what we did last

29:55

week I have the same question Adam well I think um if that was the intention I think the

30:03

the discussion was uh unclear at that point but if that's if that's what the

30:11

understanding was we can we can move forward with that as a um I think I

30:17

think I proposed the motion and that was my understanding when we said working uh I think we said working

30:23

document my understanding was that and I think I even articulated this in the meeting with have to go back and look at

30:28

the video I think I said yeah we're going to continue to make changes to this edit it add to it um and so on and

30:37

that was my understanding of a working document okay um well that that

30:44

clarifies that sorry for the misunderstanding

30:49

okay J Baza

30:56

um we might want to make it clear in this meeting if we are accepting the

31:02

findings provided by the city because I have a feeling I don't think we actually did I I see what commissioner Rish is

31:10

pointing to and I remember that conversation I also remember I was the one who was kind of putting up a stink about it so I'll readily admit that I

31:17

was the one causing trouble um I'm going to set that aside for a minute we'll clean that up in a

31:23

second I do want to go back to public comments um so I think it's a great

31:29

start thank you it's a great start um that we have them up there's no

31:35

resolution um I don't want to play like ask the

31:41

wrong question and get the wrong answer so I think what maybe might be best is

31:47

me just being very transparent with you guys about with my friends Adam and

31:52

Allison about I think what I was requesting and and asking for um this is

31:58

a good start but I think I was actually asking for the city to make recommendations on what to do about

32:04

comments um and I've sat with this for a couple of days thinking about it like

32:10

maybe they're waiting for us to make recommendations

32:15

um and I'll be honest I'm not sure if the roles are clear in my mind and in my

32:23

experience and I'll just be hon like this is just in my mind and in my experience

32:28

usually it's the agency or usually it's the agency whether it's a city

32:34

or a government authority of some some kind who takes a crack at making a

32:40

recommendation based on public feedback and then governing or advising bodies

32:46

make comments relative to that I've rarely seen the government or advising

32:52

body make the initial comment I don't see boards I don't see boards I don't

32:58

see um commissions I don't see people taking the first crack at making comments or responding to public comment

33:05

I see the agency who's received it has receiving the comments making a initial

33:11

draft and then advising boards make responses and so that is in my mind what

33:16

I was waiting for I'm willing to be wrong I'm willing for us to have a misunderstanding I'm willing for this to

33:22

be different on Mercer Island but in the Myriad of places that I've had this EXP

33:27

experience this was not I I'm waiting for you guys to tell me what you think much like you pre-wrote my findings for

33:35

me like I feel like you pre-rt the commission's findings for them uh I'm

33:40

waiting for the pre-written here's what we recommend based on our consistency our policy approach and and what we've

33:48

been doing so um in my mind I'm like this is a good

33:53

start but I can't take action on this because I'm not going to fill in this table

33:58

um bare minimum if I'm really honest I'm like if you guys don't want to do it then give it to city council because I

34:04

feel like it's their it's their responsibility to respond to Sarah Fletcher's many emails about these

34:09

issues it's not entirely mine I just advise now if we need to have a

34:15

conversation about what direction advisement needs to be then let's flush that up now but I'm uh I feel like it's

34:25

incomplete and I'm trying to figure out who's respons possibility is to complete it and I wasn't thinking it was

34:32

mine from the staff side what we could use from you from the commission is some

34:38

direction on whether you would like to make an amendment or adopt a finding

34:45

or take some other action related to each of these comments if you do want an amendment you can request that staff

34:52

draft something or propose something you know give us some general direction of

34:58

what you would like we could draft it I think Adam and I talked about this extensively and we were

35:05

struggling a bit because these comments range all over the place right some of them quite

35:12

lengthy some of them are very detailed and touch on multiple areas of the plan

35:18

um it's not easy to delineate exactly what should be done

35:25

with each of them or whether something should be done with each of them so I think it would be useful for the

35:30

commission to perhaps go through each of the comments or the comments that you

35:35

believe um Merit some kind of response in terms of

35:40

an amendment or a finding well this is where I feel like we're getting into a little bit of that

35:46

debate of well whose responsibility is it to make that first pass um because I

35:52

agree with you any any comments that say what on Earth do you mean by this it's

35:57

kind of hard to kind of hard to address and I'm not going to be making an amendment based on a comment like that

36:04

but I eventually at some point in time when someone's looking for something to do I think responding to that comment or

36:11

at least pointing to here's where you might find more information about what we mean by that

36:17

is public responsibility um in those places where

36:23

someone might say uh and retain trees

36:28

um where I would expect the city to take a first pass and respond however it makes sense or make a recommendation on

36:36

an edit or revision similar to what you did in the findings um I'm just not

36:44

sure it it does seem like I would have expected the city to do this first pass

36:50

and take your first best professional guess at you know these six of

36:58

15 comments within this actually warrant um maybe looking at this

37:04

revision or we addressed it by this particular finding for example like

37:09

crosswalking your findings to comments that have been given that's like we

37:14

think that our finding actually addresses these six comments like I think that would have also been useful

37:20

at this point I feel like you're requesting that we do it and I just am not sure that that's actually

37:26

appropriate as an advisory role I'm just not as sure that that's appropriate for us to be doing it rather than you make a

37:34

recommendation and we not our heads or Shake our heads or make some sort of

37:41

um comment I'm just not sure doing that work is actually that it's where I

37:48

actually pose the question is it really our job to do that work or do I feel like you guys received the comments you

37:53

do the work and we say yes or no around it it sounds like we have a disconnect

38:00

around that I mean I can say the way we've typically done it has been that

38:06

the commission makes a decision about whether or not to make a change based on public

38:14

comment okay say that one more time please sorry like our past practice the way

38:20

we've typically done it is that the commission makes a decision about whether or not to make a change based on

38:27

public

38:34

comment chair Murphy have you been on this are you the last remaining um commissioner that's been on

38:41

this the longest or commissioner

38:46

you who's been on this commission the longest I think it's a tie actually oh I

38:53

love ties yeah um the problem is that we've never

38:59

you know the comp plan full comp plan amendments don't come up every year for

39:06

good reason yeah it's a 10year cycle so neither one of us um have been through

39:13

this um so trying to equate this with

39:19

you know say the annual docket or something of that nature um you know

39:24

where there might be some specific things um Allison might be referring to that

39:31

but um I don't think either Victor or I have lived experience dealing with this

39:39

and especially with the type of comments that we're we're seeing um and frankly I

39:46

share I share your concern and while

39:51

Allison is saying that we have the final say um the question becomes

39:58

who does the leg work of pouring through that material and determining if there

40:04

are some nuggets in there that are worthy either in their own right because

40:10

they've stated them or because they can be teased out as amendments um and I think that if you

40:18

asked the five Commissioners to do that we would have various very different

40:24

views of that and it would be wildly time consuming process I know Adam ragab

40:31

has has gone through at least some of those and teased out um some proposed

40:38

amendments and you know I applaud him for that effort um but that's a heavy

40:44

lift with the list that we're looking at here so I I share chair bazo's concerns about the

40:53

process of how to do that Adam I think your hand was next uh yeah thank you um yeah I I

41:02

thought you know we when we had the meeting last week we were said oh you know
deadline for comments June 3 I

41:09

thought our job was to read through those comments and

41:15

propose comments of Our Own in response to select you know whatever you know we

41:21

filter through it and put things in front of the commission to discuss I mean I think

41:28

you know when people send that email it's addressed to Planning Commission that's us
seven and now five it's not

41:35

CPD At Mercer Island um that being said I I think if you guys you know you saw the emails I

41:42

sent one Adam Zack forwarded my initial one Monday and then he said he you know

41:47

recommends in the interest of expediency and Clarity proposing them as motions

41:53

and um a point that chair bazo made um

41:58

about give it to city council I agree with her on that um and that's why if you've you know taken the

42:06

time to read what Adam forwarded on Monday and what he forwarded for me on Tuesday um you know the the ones where

42:13

there's actual content change I said let's add those as findings to help make City council's Job earlier I'm not I

42:20

don't I kind of thought about it like I don't want to make a big change um goalwise after the the public hearing um

42:28

and then and that I think I'm looking at my eight proposed motions and yeah three

42:33

of them are let's add to the findings it's kind of a boiling down of those public comments and then the other five

42:40

are just um I mean those are facts really that the that are that the public

42:48

commented on and found that are incorrect In The Narrative of the transportation element and I think I

42:54

have no problem correcting you know small editorial facts like that um but

43:00

anything content wise that that's why I you know one two and five are hey let I

43:06

I'll propose we add this to our findings um additionally I only looked at the

43:12

three element you know I looked I only looked at public comments related to the three elements that we're talking about

43:19

today I was my expected plan of action was to you know come up with some

43:24

proposed motions based on the other three elements that we'll be discussing next week I'm assuming by the deadline

43:31

of Monday unless that is not how the commission wants to act so

43:41

yeah yeah thanks uh Victor I think you were next actually I think Kate's

43:50

next thanks Victor um I'm

43:57

I'm inclined to kind of agree with everyone here um my expectation for the

44:02

table was also not met and I think what I was expecting after last time was you

44:09

know just my experience with government is before something goes to council or a

44:14

board um there's an analysis that's done

44:20

to bring together comments from different people that are on the same

44:25

theme and that way

44:31

the we're not picking and choosing the ones that we we think Merit attention we're giving attention to all of them

44:38

and and with equal you know with equal weight because each one is a comment from a person that matters in the

44:44

community um so I was expecting this table to

44:49

have uh theme and then comments under that theme and then what the source of

44:56

that comment was was um for the record and then I was also expecting there to

45:01

be a column from staff as part of the analysis something that said is this

45:06

consistent with guidance from Commerce and and from there I

45:13

think that we could make some uh educated suggestions to council

45:21

you know because anything we do we're not like declaring what is or isn't we're making we're always making a recommendation to council and they do

45:27

what they want with it um but I think it is the job of this body

45:33

to make recommendations to council and and not leave it to them to

45:41

um analiz uh whether or not something's consistent with code or consistent with

45:47

um Department of Commerce guidelines so um i' I'd like to propose and whether

45:53

it's staff or commission that does it um you know I think I'd like to propose

45:59

that we modify the table so that it's broken out thematically so that we can

46:05

ensure I think that the idea in the first place was to make sure that we were addressing all comments with the

46:11

same um with the same process um and and that each one had a

46:20

review for consistency I think that would be extremely helpful and if if we want to

46:25

if you want uh Planning Commission to build that table we can talk about who can do that I'd be I'd be happy to

46:33

work with another commissioner to put that table together but I feel like um we need that before um and and many of

46:40

the items that Adam RB pulled out commissioner Riad pulled out I agree with need to be responded to but there

46:47

are also other ones and I just I was expecting to do that through a table that had is this consistent or not based

46:55

on based on staff exper and I was I was kind of expecting to see comments that address the same thing

47:01

but we're from different centers kind of grouped so that we could weigh all the comments together

47:08

um but I would just ask the the the staff and the commission um you know I

47:15

would rather you know look at Adam uh commissioner rickb's suggestion in the light of a table that's really complete

47:22

um that has themed comments and I don't know if that would be helpful to others

47:29

um and if staff need a commissioner to volunteer to help produce that I'd be

47:34

happy to help because that's I have to do this for my job all the time and it has to be objective when you put

47:40

together the table of comments you're just taking out kind of rebate in what people said but you're grouping it so

47:46

you can see what different people said on the same thing

47:52

together so on that if if that would be well I had two days to put together this

47:59

table um so if if it would be helpful to have them grouped in that way um we can

48:06

do that in advance of the next meeting I think where there's a challenge though with a

48:13

lot of these comments in doing in making a statement as to whether or not even a

48:19

recommendation as to whether or not to make these changes because they're not necessarily inconsistent with guidance

48:25

or they're a difference of approach a lot a lot of the comments are presenting a difference of approach um and so it

48:33

makes it really difficult to fill in that from a staff perspective and say Yes make this change no don't make that

48:40

change kind of recommendation and so that's maybe I don't think I'm saying make it or don't make it what I'm saying

48:46

and and maybe what I'm saying is it's a simple not a not a concurrence but rather just this is

48:52

inconsistent like maybe there's just a checkbox that and if it is inconsistent what is it in what MPP what CPP is it

48:59

inconsistent with um yeah so not not the burden of proof that that something

49:05

could be true because that is you know like you said you're getting into policy decision-making and and I understand

49:11

why staff want to avoid that because that's our job to make that recommendation to council um but the

49:17

analysis though I think I think that is a staff job I agree with Andie on that but I understand that that may have been

49:22

done differently um for some time between the commission and staff that's why I offering to help if it's

49:32

useful um so what I'm hearing is and I I would pose this to the group then is

49:39

that there for the next iteration of the comment tracking table like them grouped

49:44

by topic with uh an with

49:50

some additional information I can't necessarily say that like I I can't

49:55

analyze every one of these comments because like I said some of them are uh more approach than they are um

50:04

objective and so uh but I do think we can fill out the table a bit more and

50:10

and group some comments together um by by topic if that's

50:20

helpful Victor so um I don't want cell paaths to

50:26

close it's sounds like um we have a resolution here but um just for the record want to say uh plus one to chair

50:34

bazo's comments um you know sounds like she has a lot of expertise in this area

50:42

regarding how other cities and other surrounding areas do that I defer to I defer to that expertise um it also

50:49

happens to align with my understanding of kind of the relationship of this

50:55

commission and the work that we do and and we react to things and proposals

51:01

that are put in front of us um we advise we do not create or

51:06

legislate so so U Adam let me make a couple of

51:15

additional comments here um you know looking at the list of public

51:22

comments um the task may not be as daunting

51:27

as it appears um you know for example numbers

51:33

9 and 10 really are short and rail about the process which is something that we

51:41

really talked about at some length last week 11 and 12 simply repeat Dan

51:47

Thompson's list um and you know the ones to really focus

51:55

on which which have both amendments and specific comments are are two and three

52:03

and three is simply uh almost a repeat of two um and then number eight which is

52:12

Dan Thomson and there there are a few actual recommendations in there so um

52:21

that are worthy of discussion um so I don't think the task is quite as

52:27

daunting as the list and the length of some of the emails would make it

52:36

appear yeah I think uh I I do think with uh a little more time in advance of the

52:42

next meeting we can get those kind of grouped together and then I I would

52:48

think I I I intend I think to just pull them out by element where they you know

52:55

this one these comments relate to Transportation the and and so on um I I

53:01

think that'll make it a lot more clear um and then I think I I I can also Mark

53:09

where um it if you wanted to make a change we

53:14

may need to draft some different language um I think that might be the political way to put it you

53:20

know uh chair I I think I I want to acknowledge

53:27

that I have not had access to my email so commissioner regab has provided probably substantive comments that

53:33

address a number of things that I have not reviewed apologies I'll take responsibility of that and Wing that as

53:39

we address it tonight if the city's looking for direction uh I think commissioner accuse

53:47

and commissioner Murphy have provided some good direction I think I would just emphasize for those comments that are

53:53

substantive recommending specific change and I will give um people credit that most folks

54:00

have literally listed by goal or page or line so yes Adam like you said List It

54:06

by element and then group things together where there's substantive pieces that can just be addressed as

54:13

consistent with current Direction but no change recommended for example some

54:18

people are just word smithing and we do not have to address all word smithing some of it makes some subtle changes and

54:25

we can decide or not and some of it is a change in Direction um I I do think an initial pass at looking at here are the

54:32

elements here's the recommendations from the public these things change the direction that we're headed these things

54:39

are consistent and their wordsmithing if you need like a matrix or some examples that I could provide like here's how

54:45

we've done it in other jurisdictions or other places before so that we are

54:51

responsive to the public because I think that's what we're all trying to get to um Within in our particular

54:57

roles um then if you want very specific direction from commission that I would I

55:04

would recommend that and maybe take Kate who's right here on me up on helping

55:10

with that Kate tag Kate first and then I'll help if you need it yeah no I I

55:15

think I have Direction and I I know I I can get this together I think it's

55:21

just yeah it was it was two days to get this it's a lot of work together for everyone I will acknowledge that it's a

55:28

lot of work and thank

55:37

you okay um I have a couple more slides um

55:43

so let's let me keep rolling with that

55:49

um so tonight um we will be looking at four of

55:55

the elements of the comprehensive plan Transportation Capital facilities

56:02

utilities and the parks and open space element of the transportation element

56:08

the bulk of the changes there were an update to the level of service analysis for our different

56:14

Transportation infrastructure to make sure that it can keep grow keep Pace with our projected growth and then

56:21

also some amendments to align with the multi-county planning policies and the countywide planning policies so there

56:28

were updates to the goals and policies there similar in the capital facilities

56:34

element again there was we updated the level of service analysis in there to

56:39

make sure that our facilities keep Pace with our growth and then also to

56:45

amended the policies to square with the multicounty planning policies and

56:50

the cpps of the utilities element we got

56:56

some some minor updates to align with those Regional planning policies and

57:02

then the parks and open space element is a new element of the comprehensive plan um it primarily functions to adopt the

57:09

parks recreation and open space plan by reference and then also to direct the

57:15

creation of two new zones uh the first of which is the open space Zone that the

57:20

Planning Commission um took a look at earlier this month and then there will

57:25

um it also directs the creation of a park zone following the comp plan update so it won't be happening this year it

57:32

would be happening after the comp plan update is adopted those are the four

57:37

elements that we're looking at um I I see Deb has her hand up Adam I

57:44

just noticed that the the slide that you have up is very it looks like we're looking at

57:50

the backdrop on your computer screen instead of the full slice your presenter mode oh you just see big mountain is

57:57

that I see a beautiful mountain yeah that's the Mont Blanc yeah um sorry let

58:04

me uh that's okay I just want to make sure that anybody watching this lat yeah good good catch

58:15

thanks um let's see okay um and so those were the the four elements that we'll be

58:21

taking a look at um so so there were three staff

58:27

recommended motions that were included with Planning Commission Bill 2413 um we provided these as kind of the

58:35

road map to get from A to B to get to your recommendation over the course of

58:40

these meetings um the first motion the first recommended motion was made last

58:45

week it took care of those uh the policy gaps the internal consistency topics um

58:51

as we talked about earlier I can change motion two to a check mark um as clarify today um that that was more or less

58:58

resolved um at the end of last meeting and that's just relating to those findings again we'll we'll we can

59:05

continue to change or update the findings um as we go and then finally

59:11

once we've gone through tonight and the review of the other elements next Wednesday um we can uh the the motion

59:19

the third recommended motion will make the overall recommendation to the city council for the total comp Plan update

59:27

so that's kind of how we get from from here to our recommendation um as a reminder um we're

59:35

targeting a con uh the conclusion of the deliberations for next uh next Wednesday

59:41

the 12th um if we find that we need more time um we have kind of an emergency uh

59:48

meeting we can we can have on the 28th um the 19th is the juneth holiday um so

59:55

we will be the city is closed next that Wednesday so that's looking ahead at the

1:00:02

next um couple of meetings um so from that

1:00:07

concludes my presentation um and so if you have I can

1:00:13

entertain those now um and we can get started on the

1:00:21

discussion thanks Adam um so we do have

1:00:27

some suggested proposed amendments uh from uh commissioner RB and uh former

1:00:35

commissioner Gils and um so we could deal with those that

1:00:41

deal to address the transportation element primarily

1:00:46

um I don't know if we could can adopt the any of the elements at this

1:00:54

point without having finalized review of the public comments and addressed any of

1:01:01

the uh proposed amendments that are clean from those comments um so I think

1:01:09

anything that we do tonight would be provisional and subject to to change based on

1:01:20

that so with that I would suggest that we perhaps start with

1:01:28

the Amendments that Adam commissioner RAB uh provided to

1:01:37

us um and and deal with the

1:01:43

transportation elements of those unless there is

1:01:52

objection okay Adam you want to speak to your post amendments or let's take a one

1:01:57

at a time I guess yeah um Adam Zach would it be possible to please put that list of eight up for everyone to read

1:02:07

yes um and you know in the absence of a mediator in the absence of provided

1:02:14

definitions I tried to avoid third rails um and as I said you know in line with

1:02:20

what chair bazo said you know my I I agree with her like let's let's give any Poli changes to

1:02:27

council um so that's why number one motion one two and five are phrased as

1:02:34

add to our findings the others are just simple text Corrections that it just

1:02:41

well no actually Four is not anyway let me let me talk one at a time so I'll make the first motion um I move that we

1:02:47

add to our findings Transportation element policy goal 4.9 received two

1:02:52

strong public comments one comment mentioned the word socioeconomic as a possible alternative during a brief

1:02:58

discussion it was brought up that key definitions related to this goal are not currently contained within the

1:03:03

comprehensive plan document and to tie it to that Matrix um that addresses

1:03:10

comments that came out of pubs number two and

1:03:15

three I guess I would look for a second on

1:03:22

this second okay the motion has been made and

1:03:29

seconded is there any discussion or

1:03:34

questions uh commissioner accuse yeah I just have a consistency

1:03:40

question for staff and kind of why I was hoping to I'm gonna interrupt for just a moment I'm sorry somebody has an a

1:03:49

second speaker on so we're getting feedback it could be a phone could I

1:03:57

think Adam just handled it with a mute okay fantastic thank you thank you um so for something like this I

1:04:06

think because it is fraught um I think our best reference is the

1:04:11

mpps are they cpps and mpps um the recommendations from those and the

1:04:17

recommended language from those um my opinion is that that should rule the day and so I wanted to um ask staff if that

1:04:26

proposed language was consistent with mpps and cpps that we've already reviewed or is it inconsistent with it

1:04:33

in my review I found it to be inconsistent with um the language provided to us by um by the agencies so

1:04:41

I would like staff opinion on whether or not changing and removing those words and changing to the word socio economic

1:04:48

is consistent or inconsistent with the documents provided to us so that specific policy in the

1:04:56

transportation element is nearly verbatim What the multi-county planning

1:05:02

policies um the the language about um black indigenous people of color is is

1:05:08

taken specifically from those those documents so if we were to change that

1:05:15

and remove that language then we be departing from the documentation we were

1:05:20

provided correct yeah it would be it would be a larger a more significant

1:05:26

from that language thank you that's

1:05:32

all Adam I just want to in response to that question I just want to be clear I'm not

1:05:39

proposing a change to goals I'm just proposing that we kind of boil down uh

1:05:44

public comment and I I I believe this is a state of statement of fact from

1:05:50

reviewing public comment and yeah it's not proposing changes to any goals it's

1:05:55

just saying hey city council um this is one of many public

1:06:04

comments pazo um I I do actually appreciate the amount of

1:06:11

work that commissioner regb put into trying to make motions and adding to

1:06:18

findings I I'm not inclined to recommend all these findings one by one because I

1:06:23

think I want to discuss them but or excuse me all at once I think I'd rather just discuss and make some modifications

1:06:30

um but I I'm happy to be able to move findings forward as we modify and

1:06:36

address them but I'm appreciative of the

1:06:44

consolidation uh commissioner accuse yeah my concern is that when we

1:06:51

put something down as findings like the the other findings that I'm reading are I'm reading those

1:06:57

as recommendations for what to do next and restating a public comment is not a

1:07:03

recommendation so I'm maybe we could get some clarification because the public comment is available to council and as

1:07:11

we develop this Matrix that shows that public comment and groups it by theme I

1:07:17

think that summarizes public comment um my understanding is the findings are

1:07:23

what public comments we are recommending that the council consider to take action

1:07:29

on and again agree with uh commissioner RB and chair bazo

1:07:35

that we are not making those policy decisions um but we are making recommendations so to me something that

1:07:42

um is inconsistent with the MPP and CPP language is not something that I feel

1:07:47

comfortable with putting in Planning Commission findings I think it belongs in a summarized document of public

1:07:54

comment and we say what we did with a comment which in this case to me would

1:07:59

be we found it's inconsistent but they it's still presented to the council so that they

1:08:04

can see it J sorry old hand okay

1:08:12

uh commissioner rum and this is the last I'll comment on it I don't want to belabor waste everyone's time but I'm

1:08:19

just the way I saw this also is like if we look at from staff recommended findings table 2 F2 2 3 five six and

1:08:27

seven are essentially based on Direct public comment so it's it's from the

1:08:32

survey so that that's where I was coming from um I'm I'll I'll be quiet now on

1:08:38

this one the

1:08:44

um I as I already have done is commended Adam for for taking the time to go

1:08:51

through these things and I agree that there were strong public comments on that um but what concerned me is the the

1:09:00

notion of including the change to socioeconomic as a possible

1:09:06

alternative uh whether I agree or disagree that that would be appropriate it's clear that it is

1:09:14

inconsistent with CPP T8 the County Planning policy uh T8 which uses the

1:09:21

very language that the staff used and so for my part I'm

1:09:26

uncomfortable presenting has even a possible alternative something that is

1:09:32

contrary to the documents that that we are supposed to be complying with and

1:09:39

frankly to me I think it sends a Troublesome message um and could

1:09:46

potentially put us and Council in the city in in a bit of a bad light um by

1:09:53

avoiding the language that is is mandated frankly by the the

1:09:59

multicounty and the uh County Planning policies Adam is that new hand or old

1:10:06

hand I I know I said i'd be quiet um I'm happy to um accept a friendly

1:10:11

amendment to remove that second sentence I think it is very important to have those key definitions that were referred

1:10:18

to I think it was commissioner asish asked about those definitions and then I think Websters and commerce were thrown

1:10:24

out as sources I think it's very important to get those definitions in

1:10:30

the comp plan document so that it's very clear so someone wants to put forth a friendly amendment to remove that second

1:10:36

Troublesome sentence as I hear from commission um I'm I'm happy to do that

1:10:41

and now I'll be quiet on this one uh

1:10:50

okay I think I might be a little bit confused about what's happening at this point I guess the one comment I wanted

1:10:56

to make is that I believe we are going to put some comment forward in our

1:11:03

findings um and staff has interpreted ways to do that for some of these items

1:11:09

um but they're ones that we agree with and so there's a distinction there for me um but yeah I'm I'm happy to hear

1:11:17

what the revision would be without that second sentence thank you for that offer

1:11:28

so is there a second for including or retaining that finding without the

1:11:36

second sentence I'll

1:11:43

second point of order chair or excuse me Vice chair um I didn't hear a motion to amend

1:11:50

the first motion was there someone I know that I know

1:11:57

that commissioner RAB offered to accept a friendly amendment to change it but I

1:12:04

didn't hear a motion from somebody doing that yeah you're correct on that so the question is whether Adam wants to revise

1:12:12

his proposal um to take out the second

1:12:21

sentence be to move that or I I thought

1:12:26

someone else had to friendly friendly amend it but I'm happy to repr propose

1:12:31

it minus the sentence beginning with one and ending with

1:12:38

alternative if the seconder of my motion is also amenable to that yeah I was yeah

1:12:44

I was gonna ask Deb how yes so how's this handled I'm

1:12:49

the second okay so if the two of you agree to withdraw

1:12:55

your motion your second you can restate it otherwise we need an we need a motion to amend this the city tries to steer

1:13:03

clear friendly amendments I know it's a term that a lot of us have used but we really try to steer clear friendly amendments it's not it's not good

1:13:09

Robert's Rules so well we actually Adam you actually proposed to move three

1:13:15

items forward and you're amending one of them just one but wasn't it uh one

1:13:28

uh f one two and five you proposed to one two and five def findings wasn't

1:13:33

that I was no no the Move Motion was purely on number one okay that was it I

1:13:39

just want make sure I'm happy to motion on I'm I'm happy to withdraw the original motion and remove minus the

1:13:46

second sentence if that's the cleanest and most Roberts rules way to do it de what do you need me to do I just

1:13:55

need you to agree to that at least to okay okay so if you'll so that's been

1:14:00

stricken from the record if you'll restate what you would like your motion to

1:14:06

State C can I make a request I've had my hand up for a while here can we please put the language up I love looking at

1:14:12

your faces but it would be really helpful to be able to consider the language as opposed to looking at your

1:14:18

lovely faces thank you just to make sure we're all talking about the same thing

1:14:34

do I read it or what what happens now

1:14:40

Deb I can read it if you'd like as long as you agree with Adam what Adam has

1:14:45

done uh okay yeah I I agree with what Adam has done and take it away okay so

1:14:51

commissioner RAB has made a motion that the um to add to planning commission findings
Transportation element policy

1:14:57

goal 4.9 received two strong public comments during a brief discussion it was brought up
that key definitions

1:15:03

related to this goal are not currently contained within the comprehensive plan document is
there a

1:15:09

second

1:15:15

second okay are definitions for those terms

1:15:21

provided in the cpps and mpps and if they are I won't be able support

1:15:26

this because my thought is that we would be able to just that will show up the MPP

1:15:34

CPP definitions will show up in the table as we didn't respond to this because here are those

1:15:44

definitions J Baza sorry that was a question for staff

1:15:51

are those definitions in the mpps and cpps oh okay sorry uh un unfortunately I don't recall off

1:15:58

the top of my head if they if those definitions are in there I know that the

1:16:03

terms are used throughout but I don't know if there's an

1:16:09

definition um I think I would just like to point out that uh we're we're adding to our

1:16:16

findings a statement but we're not making a request so there is no request to add it there's

1:16:22

no request to do anything different there's just a statement it was brought up that key

1:16:28

definitions are not currently contained within the comprehensive plan document are we making a recommendation to do

1:16:34

anything about it or we just pointing to something I just want to make that I just want to be clear about what that

1:16:52

is Adam the in is yeah not recommend doing anything just a hey heads up when

1:16:59

we talked about it um yeah it just a it's just a little a

1:17:04

pointer I guess yeah I'm not one two and four or sorry one two and five are

1:17:12

not H I'm happy to remove number five but one and two are not um recommending

1:17:20

action it's just a essentially a summary of public comment and in this case our

1:17:25

discussion about it last

1:17:34

week any further Kate

1:17:40

um just a process thing here again this is a question for staff uh are our

1:17:46

findings supposed to be recommending things um again my understanding is that

1:17:51

it's staff job to summarize public comment my concern is that if we

1:17:57

cherry-pick one or two public comments and put them up to point to the council we're treating public comment

1:18:02

unevenly um I want each public comment and commenter to be treated with the same level of uh importance and

1:18:10

respect so two questions there one are we supposed to be putting things

1:18:17

in findings if they aren't recommendations and two um I guess this

1:18:22

is more of a discussion topic um do any other Commissioners see it as potentially problematic to highlight one

1:18:30

or two comments but not other public comment I I find it problematic

1:18:35

personally I wouldn't be able to support this even amend even as amended or

1:18:42

revised um so I'll I'll answer the first question um or I can't answer the first

1:18:48

question so the the findings are your statement to go along

1:18:55

with the your recommendation on the draft um they don't necessarily have to

1:19:01

be making requests or like proposing Direction they can provide additional

1:19:06

context so it it can it's appropriate to have them summarize discussion if there's if

1:19:14

if the commission wants to memorialize that and forward that onto the council

1:19:25

Cher pazo

1:19:32

um I think just in response to commissioner acc's concerns I think the

1:19:38

way I'm treating this is that we have a very inprocess system going on including

1:19:44

we have a lot of public comments uh we have a matrix with no

1:19:50

commentary in it um and that there's only one commissioner currently who's

1:19:55

taken a crack at adding things in and so I was considering this particular first

1:20:01

run as the first of several with an expectation that we were going to

1:20:06

address everybody's in some form or another except for those comments that say what were you thinking I don't plan

1:20:12

to address those in this round of work um but the ones that are substantive

1:20:19

pointing to goals and the comprehensive review um between this meeting and next

1:20:25

um I was addressing commissioner RB's work because it's come up and we're

1:20:32

trying to work through it um and considering that as we consider consider things moving forward um in case that

1:20:39

helps for context um I don't believe we're just singling out certain people I think we're just addressing some of

1:20:45

these comments and I'll consider that as we consider the rest of them what we haven't addressed yet does that make

1:20:50

sense am I making any sense that makes sense to me me I'm just I'm not prepared to deal with this

1:20:57

particular one out of the context of other other public comments and out of the context of the mpps and cpps the

1:21:04

other ones that uh um commissioner Reb suggested I I'm assuming we can come to

1:21:11

consensus on most of those pretty darn quickly so we started with a a challenging one and um my preference is

1:21:17

to table that until we have the full table of public comment and so that we can decide as a group which comments do

1:21:24

we want Elevate in a summary to council and not is that a motion to table number

1:21:31

one that's a motion to table number one

1:21:38

second any dis further discussion and

1:21:44

and from my perspective we're tabling it to be considered with the

1:21:49

others okay yes that's that's the idea to be considered with the revised table

1:21:54

that has all of the public comment because I I want to know that we are

1:22:00

fairly treating all the public comment and elevating all of the comment that we

1:22:05

think merits elevation okay motions and move seconded

1:22:11

any further discussion about tabling number one seeing none uh Deb would you like to

1:22:19

call the role point point of order we have another motion right is this a

1:22:24

friendly amend or an nested motion I know I'm I'm being annoying I think all

1:22:30

the others are going to move quickly but we had a motion that was presented and

1:22:37

seconded right I believe a motion to table can be

1:22:42

done at any time unless I'm that I I'm not

1:22:49

knowledgeable I believe you're correct I'm about 90% certain that you're correct Vice

1:22:55

chair Murphy uh but I would need to check if you want me to but I believe

1:23:01

once a motion has been made to table it that kind of puts a I'm Gap I'm amendable to that
no worries okay all

1:23:08

right so we do we do need to address I I have the motion recorded as a motion was

1:23:14

made by commissioner cuse seconded by Vice chair Murphy to table the motion to be
considered with the revised table

1:23:20

that includes all of the public comments all right and with

1:23:27

that uh chair Baza I commissioner RAB

1:23:35

nay commissioner RIS n I'm sorry nay

1:23:40

n Vice chair Murphy I and commissioner accuse

1:23:48

I okay three eyes the motion is approved okay let's move on to number two

1:23:57

Adam all right Adam Zach could we put that one up and in light of the revised

1:24:04

Matrix that was shown um I would like to correct three to now

1:24:10

six um for reference that's so the the motion is I move that we add to our

1:24:15

findings Transportation element policy goal 4.10 received six public comments

1:24:21

asking that we note that off street parking is important to families and those who are
handicapped um that comes

1:24:29

from Pub 238 11 12 and 14 from my

1:24:38

reading

1:24:45

second any discussion

1:24:51

okay Deb you want to call the rooll

1:24:58

just one moment I want to catch up with all of

1:25:13

the okay Sher

1:25:18

bazo I commissioner qes I

1:25:26

Vice chair Murphy hi commissioner rashes

1:25:34

hi and commissioner RAB hi thank

1:25:45

you number three number three okay I'll move I'll move quickly I know we a roll

1:25:51

now yeah now we're moving um number three uh this is in response to comment

1:25:56

uh from Pub one I believe let me just double check I want to be sure yes Pub

1:26:01

one um and this is just correcting the terminology referring to the regional mountains to sound Trail it was called

1:26:08

the regional mountains -2- sound Trail and um you I went to the website because

1:26:14

our commenter said hey this is wrong or something and I just I just said let put let's match the website the verbiage I

1:26:21

saw on the website was the regional mountains to sound Greenway Trail um so

1:26:27

that's yeah that's I move that we correct the phrase on page 23d paragraph

1:26:33

um per the text presented by Adam Zack i' second

1:26:39

that okay do we have a second second okay moved and

1:26:45

seconded any discussion seeing none let's call the

1:26:52

role commiss

1:26:59

Ries hi commissioner cuse

1:27:04

I chair vazo fine I but I hate editorial

1:27:12

crap commissioner Ram I and vice chair Murphy I thank

1:27:20

you um I move that we amend and transportation element policy 3.3 on

1:27:27

page now I guess before I even make the motion I mean this is a little policy change um

1:27:34

could we do a consensus if we even want to talk policy here about adding and retain trees if not I don't want to

1:27:42

waste time going through the formalities um I don't think it's a major policy issue okay then I'll I'll I

1:27:49

move that we amend Transportation element policy 3.3 on page four to add and retain trees per public comment Pub

1:27:57

one it currently reads constru construct Transportation well the text is correct do I need to

1:28:03

read everything Deb no I'm fine I have the same text

1:28:09

that you all have all right we have a second

1:28:25

I'll second it any

1:28:34

discussion okay I have two concerns about this one

1:28:40

um one is that we have a pending um Capital

1:28:46

project action um that this would impact pretty

1:28:51

severely and it is connecting the um Missing Link in the middle of the

1:28:57

island um I don't know whether this comment was made to specifically uh prevent tree removal from happening

1:29:05

there um it's a very very controversial Capital project um there's a variety of

1:29:12

very strong public opinion on it I don't want I think this I think this is

1:29:17

potentially um intentionally or not it's a wolfin sheeps clothing um and I think

1:29:23

this might Merit more discussion um the other comment I had and I'm not saying

1:29:29

what I would put one way or the other I just think it um I think it merits some

1:29:34

review of our existing uh CIP program and and and how this would impact that

1:29:41

um the other the other I think we need some staff analysis of that is I guess what I'm trying to say um and then the

1:29:48

other comment I would have is what do we mean by unused portions of public rights of way

1:29:55

because I think if this that that's kind of um

1:30:01

unclear maybe there's a definition for that that staff can offer

1:30:30

Adam any thoughts on that Adam no Adam

1:30:40

Zach yeah I'm just taking a quick look to see if we have a definition I can if

1:30:46

if there's discussion I can I can chime in in a minute here okay sounds good J

1:30:52

bazo in the interest of

1:31:00

transparency um I will I will tell you that if I were a

1:31:05

practitioner responsible for implementing this goal I would consider the words

1:31:11

encourage and sensitivity to strongly encourage me to retain as much as possible but I can still cut a tree down

1:31:18

if I need to to do my job and

1:31:25

so um I'm sensitive to making sure that

1:31:30

if we need to remove trees to maintain infrastructure that seems to be failing Us in some places I don't know if any of

1:31:36

you have noticed but we have some problems on the island that need fixing they might need some trees cut down um

1:31:43

among other things uh I want to make sure we're prioritizing maintaining what we need to

1:31:50

prioritize and we keep trees where we can cuz it makes things cooler and it's getting hot outside um and I I don't I

1:31:57

don't see this is one of those places where I'm like we're just we're adding edits to something that doesn't make it

1:32:03

stronger and if I were on the opposite side of the table that edit doesn't make it stronger for me to retain trees but

1:32:10

it also doesn't make it weaker for me to cut it down so I'm just saying the thing out loud it's also the world according

1:32:17

to AGB and comment okay

1:32:25

any further

1:32:32

discussion seeing none let's call the role and deal with

1:32:39

number four Vice chair Murphy

1:32:46

I commissioner rashis I commissioner qes n

1:32:56

commissioner regab I and commission chair

1:33:01

bazo I motion approved

1:33:07

41 number five uh I will I will pass on five because it it I think reading it it

1:33:14

does kind of go in terms of a suggestion as opposed to a report out so I'm I I I

1:33:20

won't even move five um I'm happy to just suggest moving six seven and eight

1:33:26

all as one um in response to Comm uh chair but taso's concern about

1:33:33

editorials I think this is not word smithing um but this is

1:33:38

correcting incorrect information presented I know as a commission we we

1:33:44

we looked at this a year a year and a half ago and we said yeah let's go with these forward-looking comments um but you know it has it's

1:33:53

still isn't running through um in for number seven I mean we what it used the

1:34:00

the document used to say data from 2017 said the parking lot ride is full

1:34:07

well now we have a public commenter who states they live you know across the street and they've given us two sets of

1:34:13

photos showing that that has changed I mean I looked at I tried to Anchor how

1:34:18

far back is 2017 gas was under \$3 a gallon and and

1:34:24

um housing median housing price in King County was 67% lower so I'm just saying

1:34:31

for seven I'm I want to reinstitute the source of those data and then also

1:34:37

articulate the public comment as proven with the photographs that things have changed in seven years and then once

1:34:44

again eight is also just correcting incorrect information it's not you know

1:34:50

or sorry um an assumption in an anal is was removed and I think it's very

1:34:56

important as someone who has you know done a lot of science uh you know when

1:35:02

when you when you make an analysis it's very important to document your assumptions and this

1:35:09

you know this is an assumption that now we can look back on that and it was an incorrect assumption so I I understand

1:35:15

the concern with word smithing but I think these comments raised by by one member of the public uh pub1

1:35:24

um I I think these are very important ones to get factually correct for the

1:35:30

public to read for the next eight years um so I'll I I guess I'm I'll just move

1:35:36

six seven and eight all together as presented um on the

1:35:42

screen so Adam I have a question Adam Zach I have a question for you

1:35:48

um and I don't recall if it was discussed previously but

1:35:54

why was the reference to the 2017 data uh removed from

1:36:02

the the section you know I don't recall this was

1:36:09

one of the elements that we had Consultants work on and I don't remember their exact reasoning for that

1:36:16

edit and do we have actual more current data that we

1:36:23

could be looking at instead of anecdotal photographs from a

1:36:29

neighbor um I'm I'm sure that there are dat there's a data set that probably

1:36:35

exists it's not incorporated into this draft but

1:36:41

um I think the parking study may have looked at this and I'm not sure that's

1:36:46

something we could check on yeah I would like a little more

1:36:52

information before we start carving this one

1:36:58

up Ken yeah I was gonna um I don't know if

1:37:04

there needs to be a point of order because there is a motion on the table and it hasn't been seconded and we're

1:37:10

discussing you're right correct but I do have a comment as well okay do we have a

1:37:15

second for the motion to consider six seven and

1:37:21

eight second okay back to you Kate for comment thank

1:37:28

you um I I'm concerned about the anecdotal of this information and I

1:37:34

believe the parking study does address some of this topic so um rather

1:37:39

than deliberating and voting on it now I would ask that staff

1:37:45

um look at these three and do a quick analysis of whether or not they're they're covered by a formal study um I

1:37:52

think they're interested comments and the other thing I'm concerned about is

1:37:58

um things are also changing and very rapidly because the parking lot emptied during

1:38:05

the pandemic but businesses are starting to move into some offices again but what's gonna you know how's that going

1:38:12

to work out how is changes in interest you know I I think this is a moving Target so I think it'd be very difficult

1:38:18

to pinpoint pinpoint what exactly is

1:38:23

happening right now because I feel like this particular issue is in flux so I guess my ask is that we oh I

1:38:32

don't want to table another thing I don't want to be that guy so I'll just express my concern I think staff should Analyze

1:38:38

This jasa I appreciate the sentiment of

1:38:43

accuracy which is what I think that many of these elements are proposed under um

1:38:50

and uh I would also note that they were these existed to some

1:38:57

degree similar language during the construction of these

1:39:03

pieces um I'm not I'm just not inclined to vote for them I do think because we

1:39:09

are still recovering with from the pandemic and we're seeing Trends changing in parking lots and I'll be I

1:39:16

will tell you guys that I because I'm still a regular Transit user and I use it often and sometimes I drive down

1:39:23

there and sometimes I don't it's very hit or miss it used to be very predictable about if you weren't in the

1:39:29

parking lot by 7: a.m. you weren't getting a spot and now it's unpredictable because I don't know whose

1:39:35

offices are requiring who to be back in the office by what day and so it's hit

1:39:40

or miss and oh hashtag Mariners stuff at Lumen people do use that park and ride

1:39:47

because they can so I I'm just disinclined to change things right now I

1:39:53

don't think it adds any more strength to people's arguments uh for or against things um a

1:40:01

and all of these statements as originally written are mostly true in terms of what that link will eventually

1:40:08

provide when Sound Transit gets it open after not building it right the first time

1:40:14

um so I I'm just I I'm just letting you know I'm disinclined to approve them in

1:40:19

any capacity whether we table them or not

1:40:25

uh commissioner reer I'm happy to pull seven I think the point about if we have better data than

1:40:31

the anecdotal public testimony I think that's fine um I think eight I mean the

1:40:37

six and eight I see no reason for the city to analyze them I mean these are these are facts right this

1:40:44

is articulating an assumption made in eight and six is just saying hey this is

1:40:50

what it's planned to do instead of this is what it is doing so I'll I'll Stand Fast on six and8 um if the second or the

1:40:58

motion is happy to remove seven I'm happy to withdraw the motion and remake it for six and

1:41:13

eight okay any further discussion on six and eight seeing none let's call the roll

1:41:30

okay commissioner accuse nay Vice chair Murphy

1:41:39

nay commissioner RAB I I'm sorry

1:41:46

I commissioner wishes hi and chair vazo nay

1:41:53

okay motion fails 32

1:42:05

yeah so we have an email

1:42:13

which chair bazo probably hasn't seen from former commissioner GS that

1:42:20

had a few other um proposed changes some of which are

1:42:28

relevant to this discussion tonight transportation and uh Economic

1:42:34

Development um I suggest that we move to those since

1:42:42

those are relatively

1:42:50

concrete and Zach can you put that up

1:42:58

Victor just a question we have other emails and and

1:43:03

this is a little bit along the lines of Kate's or commissioner accuses earlier

1:43:10

comments we had other um emails that were actually

1:43:15

also equally specific uh and I'm thinking of the one

1:43:21

that I highlighted last week [Music] from hang on for a

1:43:28

sec I'll uh an apologies for the mispronunciation elsu Spencer Perez

1:43:37

Jr um are we going to treat that one in the same

1:43:43

way uh well that one is is very similar to

1:43:50

the Jeffrey Weissman y uh email almost

1:43:56

identical um and what I understood is that we were going to try

1:44:04

to put those deal with those in The Matrix but we can put these

1:44:10

others in The Matrix if that's the preferred approach I guess I you know

1:44:15

certainly um Mr gills is a former commissioner um I just want to make sure

1:44:22

that we're not um providing the appearance

1:44:30

of Prof preferential treatment because of his service here on the commission

1:44:36

and that we're treating um these proposals that are

1:44:42

coming in from the public equally if they're if they're specific and they're requesting specific

1:44:50

changes I don't have a problem either way I was treating commissioner gs's

1:44:57

input pretty much the same as commissioner rabs but if you think or if

1:45:03

the sense of the commission is to put this in The Matrix then I'm happy with that well the the the difference the

1:45:10

difference is we have commissioner ragb and we have former commissioner

1:45:19

Gils yeah I think I think his submission was before he was

1:45:28

before his term ended was the concept but I I agree with you that it

1:45:35

does suggest that he's giving he's given preferential treatment which is

1:45:40

certainly not the point I I don't want to belabor it but

1:45:46

I only got the email this weekend and so I I think his if I'm correct

1:45:53

uh I think his his term ended last Wednesday uh I assumed it ended with

1:46:00

this meeting but I I I could I could very very well

1:46:05

be wrong I I just went off of our goodbye yeah understanding his term expired on

1:46:14

May 31st oh okay then then we should treat him the same as the rest correct

1:46:21

Okay so so let's put him in the Matrix as it

1:46:29

were uh Adam um yeah I I think so I I

1:46:34

yeah I saw his longer email and yes I would agree with seems like everyone

1:46:39

else that that was a ought to be treated equally with all our other public comments um but on table one of our um

1:46:48

document for today I'm looking through the email and he did propose was

1:46:54

pc4 and pc5 while still a commissioner so I I figure we ought to give him that

1:47:01

um that being said I think pc5 if I recall correctly was brought

1:47:07

up immediately prior to commotion batsman's motions and he just mentioned

1:47:13

it and then kind of waved it off we never even breach the topic of pc4 and I

1:47:19

I will support pc4 but I thought pc5 was waved off you know I I saw it

1:47:26

reappear in the the public comment one but I think as a commissioner my my interpretation is it was just waved

1:47:33

off yeah I was not looking at PC four and five I was looking at his longer

1:47:39

email with the proposal so to chair bazo's point pc4 is

1:47:50

really Corrections which I think that staff can

1:47:58

incorporate if pc5 is waved off then it's mot and then we put the rest of his

1:48:04

comments his email comments into the Matrix

1:48:16

okay any other proposed amend or chair paza well I just have a question along

1:48:22

the lines of my constant muing Adam Zach are you guys GNA do a

1:48:28

copy edit on the stuff before you refer it no offense I need a copy edit on my

1:48:33

stuff everyone needs a copy edit you know one that fixes words and punctuation or whatever else so that

1:48:39

Adam doesn't have to keep doing it for you and we have to vote on motions to add a period right and as we go through

1:48:46

the process to you know things that are um just minor grammatical errors or

1:48:53

punctuation those are things that we can we can fix as scrivener errors and don't require action from the Planning

1:49:00

Commission so um as we go through I mean obviously if you find a

1:49:06

missing semicolon or something let me know but um we can correct those without

1:49:12

an action from the Planning Commission well yeah except for so there have been times where like for examples someone

1:49:18

pointed out commutes should change to commuters which I think is accurate it's a scrivener's there that's not something

1:49:23

we should vote on as a motion and yet it lands in The Matrix as something that needs to be addressed and I'm like we

1:49:30

should not have to address that nor should we forward that to a matrix for discussion so I it is why I'm asking the

1:49:36

question because it's actually not clear to me how this gets addressed so I I want to just kind of press on that a

1:49:42

little bit like hey that scriber stuff I don't want to vote on it as a motion I don't think it's I don't think it's a

1:49:48

good use of our time or yours and I want to make sure I know hey are you guys doing the copy edit or do you need us to

1:49:55

do that too yeah we will be having a consultant an editor do a copy edit before the

1:50:02

final version goes to city council okay that's helpful to know thank you and

1:50:08

then if I see it go to city council I'm gonna tell

1:50:17

you okay Adam uh so there being no other

1:50:22

amendments to consider at this point it seems like we could turn to the

1:50:28

actual um documents elements to see if

1:50:34

we want to we have any further discussion of

1:50:39

those at this point subject to the uh the future amendments um based on the

1:50:49

Matrix is that a wise use of time or

1:50:55

not um that is where we were planning on this going so if there's other

1:51:01

amendments to those those four elements now would be the time to bring them up but obviously that's pending the um

1:51:08

updated comment Matrix um next time

1:51:17

okay so what's the pleasure of the commission does anybody have any thoughts on whether any of the elements

1:51:23

that are teed up for tonight need further discussion in the absence of amendments

1:51:32

okay um my thinking is that we have already discussed them extensively and that our our job of making revisions is

1:51:39

to do it in the context of public survey and public comment which I don't think we're prepared to do this

1:51:47

evening okay Adam H Kate took the words out of my mouth yeah I completely agree

1:51:54

okay well I tend to agree with that too does anyone have any contrary

1:52:01

views okay

1:52:08

um so there's no reason to have a further motion on any of oh uh chair

1:52:15

bazo no I think I was just going to say to that extent it is the expectation

1:52:21

that at our next meeting meeting we're supposed to make any other additional changes and then refer something to

1:52:27

council which Adam Zack means you guys have a lot of Matrix making between now

1:52:32

and Friday um I'm just acknowledging that because I recognize that now what we're

1:52:38

asking you to do is make a lot of recommendations and

1:52:44

things to the extent that you can use us and and I will just say feel free to

1:52:50

reach out to me too if you need some support because I want to play team as opposed to
play chase the Rocks but um I

1:52:59

think just in the effort of trying to get everything done by next week like we were planning
um it does mean this

1:53:04

commission needs to be responding to a completed M Matrix and set of recommendations
and approximate analysis

1:53:11

for some of those questions um in order for us to be able to do that

1:53:32

okay does staff have any further comments at this

1:53:37

point uh no I think I've got the um got

1:53:43

my uh marching orders for the next couple of days and I would uh I would

1:53:49

ask or just reiterate you know um if if you do have qu or if you do have

1:53:55

proposed amendments um ahead of next meeting try to get those in as early as

1:54:01

possible so I can distribute those to the rest of the commission I think um commissioner Rab's uh example this

1:54:09

meeting was really helpful it it really we efficiently got through a lot of material so um I think we can mirror

1:54:16

that next week and keep on rolling yeah thanks

1:54:23

yeah because you know in the absence of amendments based on public input I don't

1:54:29

see us spending hours of time discussing the

1:54:34

um the elements that we've gone over many times for and

1:54:41

approved that's the plan yeah okay so we're all clear okay uh Now we move on

1:54:49

to other business uh is there Allison the deputy director report

1:54:54

tonight I don't have anything new to report at this time okay um if there's

1:55:00

any planned absences please um convey those to chair and to staff um and uh

1:55:10

the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday June 12 at 6 PM there being no

1:55:17

other business to come before the Planning Commission the time is now 7:55 p.m. and the meeting is adjourned please

1:55:25

stay seated until the city staff has terminated the broadcast good evening and thank you all for joining us