



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Amy Buckler
(360) 570-5847

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Wednesday, October 17, 2012

6:30 PM

Room 207

Comprehensive Plan Update Subcommittee

1. CALL TO ORDER

6:35 PM

1.A ROLL CALL

Judy Bardin attended the meeting by phone.

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

Carole Richmond: What is the role or purpose of this sub-committee?

Can the sub-committee address the vision in the July Draft--doesn't feel the draft Vision paints the picture of where we need to go in 20 years. Requests that the sub-committee produce a clearer vision

Commissioner Richards confirms that the role of the sub-committee is to craft process--not discuss policy or content of the plan. The vision has been discussed at the full Commission level, anticipate the Commission drafting revisions to the vision.

Commissioner Parker notes that staff made available a handout that includes Commissioners having raised issues with the vision during initial deliberations.

Staff notes that the comment period is currently closed, but will reopen for additional written comments for the October 29 public hearing.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None noted.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

12-0644

Final Deliberations

Attachments:[1. Final Deliberations](#)[2. July Draft Substantive Change List](#)

Commissioner Richards introduces the topics for the meeting and directs subcommittee attention to the attachment labeled: Final Deliberations.

Commissioner Richards notes a desire for the Sub-Committee to focus on sections "Establishing Priorities" and "Consent Agenda."

Commissioner Richards provides an overview of the attachment per Commissioner Ingman's request.

Commissioner Bardin notes that Clark County has chapters in their Comprehensive Plan for Climate Change, Food Systems, and Public Spaces (Third Places).

Commissioner Richards notes that is why a part of the process includes time to address such issues as additional policies or focus areas that may be missing from the July Draft. Confirms that Commissioners can recommend adding a new chapter. Commissioner Parker adds that the additional chapters may also be an element of the discussion to be had per #2 Priority: Trends or Highlights from the Public Comments.

Commissioner Richards requests feedback on the five elements of the priorities list and the ranking of the list. Expresses a desire to have something approved to take forward to the full Commission.

Commissioner Parker notes that #1-5 are fine, but has concerns regarding #2. Richards notes in response that #2 simply lists examples of potential topics, not a final list of topics derived from public comment.

Sub-committee confirms that they'd like to determine this list at the full Commission level on Nov. 5.

Commissioner Ingman notes that the list should stay dynamic, and that Commissioners be able to modify it throughout final deliberations.

Commissioner Richards confirms that the list of priorities is ranked in order of importance.

Commissioner Ingman suggests that the first priority for review should be determining if the Plan meets the requirements of the GMA. Commissioner Richards replies that that is not the responsibility of the Commission, but instead to make a recommendation to Council to consider.

Commissioner Ingman notes the importance of understanding where anticipated population growth of 20,000 people will be distributed. Believes it imperative to the final deliberations.

Commissioner Richards notes that the job of OPC is to evaluate goals and policies. Exploring population figures is more appropriate for the implementation strategy. Concerned about having the time to go that far into data.

Staff notes that Commissioners will have information requests responded to prior to final deliberations, or as soon as staff is able to provide the data or analysis requested.

Commissioner Parker notes that he heard from the public a desire for the Plan to articulate better urban corridors and/or nodes. Notes there can be policies that call for things like population densities to be established. Richards and Ingman agree.

Commissioner Tousley notes that Sub-committee should return to a discussion of the process. Expresses support for the list of priorities noted in the attachment on pages 4-5. Agrees that the vision can be addressed during the "Scope" priority (#3), and that #5 is the least important to address. Population will be integrated into the discussion.

*Commissioner Richards recommends that #5 not be part of the process-
-Commissioners can send typos, etc., to staff separately by email. Notes that there are only four meetings available; time is limited.*

*Commissioner Parker asks how the possible extension may affect the schedule?
Commissioner Richards notes that the Commission should operate under the existing schedule until we know differently.*

Tousley confirms for Commissioner Bardin that the Commission will not be able to return to the environment topics that weren't addressed during the initial deliberations. Notes that the briefing papers are still available for review, and can be resources for the final deliberations.

Commissioner Bardin notes that there is content in the July Draft regarding air pollution that is just wrong.

Commissioner Parker expresses hesitancy to move forward with any type of process without hearing from Langer about the extension. Notes that the Commission is not waiting for the completion of Sustainable Thurston or other planning processes. Would like to have a full Commission meeting with Langer. Notes that he's never heard from the Council why speed is of the essence.

Commissioner Tousley notes that she is working with Langer on the schedule; Langer was clear that the three months come with conditions for completion. He noted the need to continue to move forward.

Commissioner Tousley notes that 4-6 additional meetings may allow the Commission to review more issues.

Commissioner Richards notes that we will not have in reality three more months, so the meeting time will still be limited. Commissioner Tousley agrees, noting the need to respect staff resources and that Commissioners are tiring from holding so many meetings. The Leadership Team will work with staff to develop a meeting framework.

Commissioner Richards notes a desire that part of the Commission's recommendation to Council should include what Commissioners were able to accomplish and what they were not able to accomplish; include in the recommendation that we did not have enough time. Provide constructive feedback in a clear manner.

Commissioner Tousley confirms she will have the discussion about the extended schedule with Langer at LUEC. Topics will be determined at the full Commission. Commissioner Tousley confirms she will work from the existing bylaws in setting a meeting schedule.

Staff confirms that time will be needed to prepare the Commission's recommendations, which will impact the schedule; some Commissioners are also up for reappointment in March.

Commissioner Richards suggests that "parking lot" items identified during initial deliberations can be considered under the #2 priority.

Commissioner Ingman expresses a desire to determine a draft schedule; Commissioner Richards notes in response that OPC will need to approve a recommendation from this sub-committee. Perhaps CPU can recommend time allotments expected for each priority.

Commissioner Richards reiterates that the priorities are intended to have the Commission focus on the most important items first. Each priority may take one or multiple meetings. This framework provides an order of how to address priorities.

Commissioner Ingman suggests starting with #2.

Commissioner Richards responds that the Commission needs to provide Council with a recommendation on the changes that staff made.

Staff confirms for Commissioner Ingman that the Commissions' "Substantive Changes" are their final recommendations for Council.

Commissioner Richards confirms for Commissioner Bardin that accepting the priorities means that if Commissioners don't complete priority #1, they won't address #2. Commissioner Bardin also recommends that #2 be first.

Public Comment: Rachel Newman: Still concerned that there is not a clear vision. The values, as written, are not a vision. The vision should be a priority #1.

Commissioners approve moving a review and discussion of the vision to priority #1. Noted that the vision will function as guiding principles, a good 'departure point' for the final deliberations, and create more efficiency for subsequent review of goals and policies.

Staff offers to provide an original draft vision narrative created early in the process by the Commission. Confirms for the public that an earlier exercise around evaluating goals and policies wouldn't be a helpful tool for this purpose.

Commissioner Richards suggests that all items start on a Consent Agenda, and

Commissioners can put forward a motion to pull items from the Agenda. Notes that the Commission has rarely heard public comment regarding the Substantive Change List; compares to the SMP process, and how more time than was necessary was likely spent discussing items the Commissioners agreed on.

Richards: The consent tool could be used for each priority (#1-5).

Commissioners confirm use of the Consent Agenda for priority #1, the Substantive Change List.

Commissioner Richards notes that there are likely not that many items to be brought forward for priority #2, and that some items may not take as much time to come to a decision on as others.

Staff notes that there will be situations where one Commissioner may wish to discuss something, and no others agree. Commissioners will need a method for sorting what issues meet a threshold for discussion by the entire Commissioner.

Commissioner Bardin expresses concerned about not having an opportunity to discuss certain topics that weren't addressed during the initial deliberations. Commissioner Richards responds that Bardin as an example could bring forward Climate Change as a topic of discussion, and if a majority of Commissioners wish to take it up, it will be added to the agenda.

The Commission will use an hour of Nov. 5 meeting to determine the list of issues identified by the public and Commissioners.

Public Comment: Rachel Newman: In light of limited time, focus on what is important and do that extremely well, and explain to the Council what you were unable to get to and why. If Council believes it is important, OPC will be given the time needed to readdress it.

Commissioner Richards notes that any topic that doesn't make it into the deliberation process needs to be added to a list for Council; important element of the recommendation and can guide Council in what to focus on during their review. Notes that they aren't unimportant, but there was not enough time.

Commissioner Ingman and Parker recommend that #2 also include highlights from

Commissioners. Expresses concern about limiting the discussion of the topic list to just the Nov. 5 meeting.

Commissioner Richards notes that Commissioners need to be prepared for not being able to complete everything, and at the same time needs performance measures for success.

Sub-Committee confirms a compromise: note those topics that come up during Final Deliberations that the Commission was unable to address; highlight those in the recommendation to Council.

Commissioner Ingman recommends that the Commission shouldn't need a majority of Commissioners to determine if something is worthy of discussion.

Sub-Committee confirms that it is reasonable to need at least three members in favor of bringing an item forward for discussion.

Commissioner Richards notes that the lengthier in time #2 is, the less time that is available for #3. #3 may be a placeholder for an in-depth discussion around what items the Commission didn't get to that are important, or are outside the existing scope.

Commissioner Richards recommends that if Commissioners are going to draft their own language, they need to empower a Commissioner to draft that language, and either draft it as a final draft OR draft and return to the Commission for one final review.

Commissioner Ingman recaps the discussion: Everyone will have an opportunity to bring forward lists of items for discussion (per #2 priority). Then the full Commission will prioritize the list.

Commissioners Richards and Ingman agree that there is a need to prioritize the items under priority #2.

Commissioner Parker suggests and the Sub-Committee confirms the process: Start with #1 on the list. Vote on each item, and rank each issue by the number of votes received for each. Any items with less than three votes are not brought forward for discussion.

Staff is requested to ask for topic lists from Commissioners on Oct. 29 (Final Public

Hearing). Commissioners submit their lists at the Nov. 5 meeting. Staff will compile and organize the list; voting will take place later in the meeting on Nov. 5. Start the list as soon as the vision and priority #1 are completed. (Likely on Nov. 19.)

Sub-Committee confirms for Commissioner Bardin that she can bring forward an additional topic for consideration to be added to the list at after the list is finalized.

Commissioner Bardin leaves the meeting at 8:25 PM.

Commissioner Richards request that CPU tentatively leave the Nov. 28 CPU meeting on the calendar; determine later if there is a need to refine the process at that time.

Commissioners discuss how the topics will be addressed; discuss a voting procedure. Note that Commissioners can be assigned to draft language based on discussion had at final deliberations.

Commissioner Tousley notes that any draft language will need to adhere to the timeline, preferable to have draft language in meeting packets for review prior to meetings.

Commissioner Ingman expresses a desire to see Commissioner positions on issues, or proposals, laid out in advance and clearly and precisely articulated. And that Commissioners respond clearly in favor or not.

Sub-Committee confirms not needing to use "motion" language, but will ask Commissioners to share clear proposals, and request clear responses or votes in response. One all-encompassing motion can be made toward the end of the process to adopt all recommendations confirmed throughout final deliberations.

Sub-Committee confirms Option A as noted in the attachment: Priorities #1-5 are addressed in order over the course of the four (or more) meetings.

Commissioner Ingman and Parker note that Commissioners need to be aware of Plan elements interact and relate to one another,

and confirm through the Commission's deliberations that revisions/changes to one goal or policy may have an implication/affect on other goals and policies.

Commissioner Ingman expresses concern that Commissioners won't have access to or knowledge of the zoning ordinance or other documents that are needed to truly understand the depth necessary to make recommendations.

Commissioner Parker notes that the vision statement exercise will be helpful in establishing consistency among goals. Some goals may be perceived as being in conflict; there has to be demonstrated some logical connection among goals. A vision helps align goals.

Staff notes that a Commission discussion around the addition of an index may fall under priority #5.

Commissioner Richards reconfirms that the Sub-Committee determined needing 3 votes to pull an item from the Consent Agenda, and that for an item to pass, it requires a majority in support.

Sub-Committee determines yes, that items for discussion need to be of a substantive nature.

Sub-Committee confirms that is there is a vote in which there is no majority reached, the staff recommendation stands.

Sub-Committee confirms and requests that the revised process description reflects that Commissioners can write minority statements.

Sub-committee confirms the need for 6 votes (a super-majority) for a reconsideration of a topic to be granted.

Staff confirms for Commissioners that Council would need to direct staff to add analysis of new issues to the SEIS. Staff also confirms that the Draft SEIS is a valuable tool for preparing for discussion on the Substantive Change List.

Staff notes that according to the priority framework, edits that are not substantive for goals or policies will be a low priority (#5).

6. REPORTS

None noted.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment at 9:04 PM.

Accommodations