



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Amy Buckler
(360) 570-5847

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Wednesday, November 28, 2012

6:30 PM

Room 224

Comprehensive Plan Update Subcommittee

1. CALL TO ORDER

6:30 PM

1.A ROLL CALL

Present: 5 - Commissioner Judy Bardin, Commissioner Paul Ingman, Commissioner Jerome Parker, Commissioner Rob Richards, and Chair Amy Tousley
Excused: 4 - Commissioner Roger Horn, Commissioner Agnieszka Kisza, Vice Chair Larry Leveen, and Commissioner James Reddick

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

[12-0766](#)

Final Deliberations Process, Continued

Attachments: [Final Deliberation Process](#)

Sub-Committee confirms a new voting method as simple and straightforward.

The voting on topics will occur at the Dec. 3 OPC meeting, and that CPU will put forward the recommendation on the method at that time to the full Commission.

Commission should be efficient in their use of time, concern expressed for how draft edits may be addressed at the full Commission level. Grammatical and punctuation edits can be dealt with separately from the full Commission (i.e. time is not dedicated to that), but the issue is how to address draft language from Commissioners.

Concern expressed about the existing draft structure. Full Commission can decide if a new, proposed structure is a topic worth deliberating on.

Gus Guethlein: The topics in the Plan are all interrelated, making sorting of topics difficult.

Staff shares the concept the Writing Team had in not repeating goal and policy language in multiple chapters as a tool to streamline the Plan. Staff suggests that cross-referencing was a potential tool to address making connections within the Plan.

There may be goals or policies that can be omitted; receives confirmation that that may be brought up as a topic for deliberation.

Staff confirms the difference being noted by Commissioners as making a change in how the draft is organized and accessible versus a change in policy direction.

Key is understanding Council's expectations for the Commission. Example: Does Council want a new Table of Contents, or a statement that recommends that the Plan have a Table of Contents.

Suggestion made that the Commission produce an entirely separate document for Council that is their own document so that the Commission's suggestions do not get lost in the document. Staff commented that an editor had come in to put the document in one voice prior to release of the April Draft. That method may not fit in providing recommendations on the draft at an appropriate "10,000 ft. level."

Some recommendations should be expanded on with examples for Council.

There are three main objectives noted in the Charter; a Table of Contents and framework aren't a good use of time with limited time available to finish.

Sub-Committee is supportive of a separate report that outlines recommendations to Council for elements that should be incorporated, staff should be directed to incorporate. For example, a Table of Contents.

Staff confirms that Council will have for their review the Commission's recommended updates, but also an in-depth staff report with staff's comments on what staff can and can't support.

Topics for discussion should be those that have been brought forward as a substantive change or brought forward by members of the public.

Staff confirms that the challenge is addressing draft language efficiently and with potentially nine members bringing forward text language.

Staff confirms that a change in language, example "encourage" vs. "shall," does equal a substantive change in policy.

Commission could benefit from clear direction from Council on how the Commission's recommendation will be incorporated into their review process. Perhaps the onus is on the Commission to decide who the primary audience is for their recommendation.

Wait to address text edits until the topics for discussion are identified.

Some Commissioners have areas of expertise or knowledge in a particular area, could form small groups that bring forward proposed text language to the full Commission.

Staff notes that sub-groups will take more time and that the full group will need to be willing to accept the sub-group language, and that the Writing Team worked with two professional editors to ensure the document had one consistent voice.

Sub-groups can adopt chapters and can return to the Commission with high-level policy revisions and recommendations. Staff will make edits in the language with direction from Commissioners.

Commissioners Parker and Richards have drafted a letter that expresses to Council a desire to know more or receive clarification on Council's expectations for the Commission's recommendation; letter is based on not seeing their recommendation necessarily incorporated into the review and discussion process for the Shoreline Master Program.

Staff notes it needs to be clear who is signing the letter, the full Commission or a select number of Commissioners.

Agreement that there are some good concepts and ideas on the table for how to address text edits; will address more after identifying topics.

Sub-Committee to be sunseted. Any additional work can be discussed at the full Commission. There is no need to put forward a nomination for a Sub-Committee Chair.

The work session topic was discussed and closed.

6. OTHER TOPICS

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

Accommodations