

## MINUTES OF MEETING

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting**  
**Monday, June 6, 2012**  
**Olympia City Hall, Council Chambers**  
**601 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue East**  
**Olympia, WA**

### Call to Order

Chair Tousley called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m.

### Attendance

Members Present: Roger Horn, Paul Ingman, Agnieszka Kiswa, Jerome Parker, Larry Leveen, James Reddick, Rob Richards, and Amy Tousley

Excused: Judy Bardin

City of Olympia Staff: Associate Planners Amy Buckler and Stacey Ray, Planning Manager Todd Stamm, Community Planning & Development Director Keith Stahley

Others: Mayor Stephen Buxbaum and Tom Gow, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services

<b>SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:</b>	
<b>Acceptance of Agenda:</b>	Approved as presented.
<b>Draft Charter for Comprehensive Plan Update and Leadership Team Update:</b>	Approved an amended Charter and an Appendix on Roles and Responsibilities of Planning Commission, Leadership Team, CPU Subcommittee, City Council, and City Staff
	Approved establishment of a 4-member CPU Subcommittee

### Acceptance of Agenda

Chair Tousley reported the meeting is a continuation of the Monday, June 4 meeting to consider approval of minutes and receive briefings on the Comprehensive Plan Update and Charter, Leadership Team, and Committee Reports. An additional item is added on urban design and planning materials for the library.

Chair Tousley reported the Commission directed Commissioner Richards to meet with staff and review the schedule for the Comprehensive Plan Update. She asked for an update from Commissioner Richards.

Commissioner Richards shared that he met earlier in the day with Planners Ray and Buckler and reviewed two schedule options. There was a desire to initiate the Comprehensive Plan Update review process by scheduling two meetings with panels of two to three individuals with 10 minutes afforded to each followed by Q&A from the Commission. If the panels include four or more individuals, up to 15 minutes could be allocated. A third meeting could be scheduled, if needed. The format would resemble an open house in the lobby from 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. followed by the panels in Council Chambers. The discussion also addressed the timeline up to the final deliberation phase. Rather than the Commission releasing its draft comprehensive plan and because of staff capacity issues, the Commission's draft could essentially be a list of substantive changes compiled in a spreadsheet format. That document would be shared with the public prior to the final public hearing. The public record could be closed several days following the last public hearing. The Commission at that point would complete the final 25% of its work in deliberations. That process calls for efficiency and decision-making and less discussion to ensure the process is completed on time. In terms of the Commission's work plan, the Urban Agriculture Code Amendment is currently paired with the Comprehensive Plan Update, which he believes is an unsustainable workload for the Commission. He recommends deferring the Urban Agriculture Code Amendment until late November or early December.

Chair Tousley agreed pursuing completion of the Comprehensive Plan Update and then moving on to the Agriculture Code Amendment is logical.

**Draft Charter for Comprehensive Plan Update and Leadership Team Update**

Chair Tousley said the discussion on the charter is a carryover from Monday's meeting. Since then, she has had discussions with Kendra Dahlen, retreat facilitator, Mayor Buxbaum, and Councilmember Langer about the role of the charter, how the Planning Commission will work with the charter during the year, and the role of the Leadership Team. She acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Buxbaum and asked him to share information about the importance of the charter and how the Council views the role of the charter.

Mayor Buxbaum mentioned that Councilmember Langer was traveling and unavailable to attend the meeting. He and Councilmember Langer have had several opportunities to meet with the Leadership Team with the most recent meeting on the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). The Leadership Team has initiated the charter process by framing the charter to support the work plan with acknowledgment of pressures in term of the schedule and workload. To the extent possible, he would prefer the Planning Commission continue following its work plan. The charter will be presented to the Council on June 19.

*Commissioner Leveen arrived.*

Mayor Buxbaum said the charter is a new path for the Commission and it could be a good methodology in moving forward. He agreed it would be helpful to have a conversation with the Leadership Team on how the Council might help charter and frame the agricultural issues to ensure that amendment process is expedited and not delayed. It is hoped that some of the stakeholders involved in the agricultural issue could assist in some of the work to move the amendment forward. He encouraged the Commission to work within the work plan.

Commissioner Horn asked whether there is an expectation that the charter is a final draft for the Council to endorse and adopt. Mayor Buxbaum said he is hopeful the Leadership Team and the Commission can present a solid charter for adoption. Both bodies can work together to refine and clarify the charter prior to adoption. He cited the engagement process with the Coalition of Neighborhood Associations as an example of how the memorandum of understanding was developed. The memorandum was essentially final when the two groups met. The Commission should also bear in mind that the Comprehensive Plan Update review shouldn't become bogged down in details. The Commission has a good draft Comprehensive Plan from which to work from.

Planner Buckler asked whether the Council discussed whether the June 19 meeting includes the entire Commission or only the Leadership Team. Mayor Buxbaum advised that he would follow up with Councilmember Langer. If the path forward has been clearly defined, it likely would be a good opportunity for the entire Commission and Council to confirm the process.

Commissioner Ingman asked Mayor Buxbaum if he was aware the majority of the Commission did not receive the charter until June 4. It appears the intent is to have a document that includes the Commission's perspective. However, the Commission hasn't been afforded sufficient time for review and comment. Mayor Buxbaum noted the continuation of the meeting from Monday night affords time for the Commission to review the charter. He recognized that the schedule is aggressive and is hopeful that the outcome of the retreat is for the Commission to work deliberately together with the Leadership Team in moving the process forward.

Chair Tousley noted the charter was forwarded electronically to the Commission on Friday, June 1. Commissioner Ingman replied that there were some members who received the charter on Monday night. As he understands it, the Leadership Team has worked on the charter for months. His contention is ensuring the Commission has a voice in framing the charter. Commissioner Leveen added that the charter process should have been undertaken better, which is why this meeting was scheduled.

Mayor Buxbaum said he is looking forward to meeting with the Finance Committee on June 7 on a process reinvention and working towards some new methods of receiving the Commission's perspective within the

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**June 6, 2012 Page 3 of 10**

deliberations on the CFP. Rather than waiting until the end of the year when the CFP is essentially completed, the Leadership Team and Council are reconsidering the calendar for the CFP review process. The meeting will include a conversation on CFP scheduling in terms of the Commission's input. The meeting will also afford an opportunity to revisit the Commission's CFP comments from 2011.

Commissioner Leveen said the Commission's CFP letter is a product of the Commission's deliberation following its public hearing on the CFP, which will need to be considered in terms of any changes in the CFP process. He asked for consideration of that issue as he may be unable to attend the meeting.

Chair Tousley invited comments on the draft charter.

Commissioner Horn agreed with the previous comments of Commissioner Ingman on changes to the public involvement process. Commissioner Leveen agreed and added that he believes the Commission's work plan is too full. It's indicative of underestimating how much time it will take to complete the necessary work. Perhaps after the joint meeting with the Council, the Commission can discuss consideration of clearing all nonessential items from the work plan.

Commissioner Reddick agreed that the workload is too heavy. He cited the example of last year's work plan and the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) process, which should be avoided this year.

Commissioner Parker shared that he met with Commissioner Ingman to gain a better understanding about his concerns and together they developed a scaled-down version of the charter (proposed draft).

Commissioner Kiswa acknowledged that there may be a need to revisit the schedule but her intent is focusing on substance and she would like to ensure that all elements of the RCW requiring innovative techniques and incentives for environmental and sustainable planning are incorporated.

Commissioner Ingman expressed appreciation for the support of his previous comments during the Monday meeting. However, he is concerned with a line-by-line affirmation of the charter. In his meeting with Commissioner Parker, there were insights that he did not consider, and together, they developed an alternative charter by providing clarity of language, meaning, and understanding. The alternative clearly represents the intent of the draft charter reducing the draft from five to two pages. He suggested an open discussion on the document rather than affirming the proposed charter.

The Commission was provided with a copy of the two-page draft proposal.

Commissioner Ingman described changes between the two documents in a crosswalk review. When he and Commissioner Parker reviewed the charter, they considered the body of the document to be the roles and responsibilities of the Planning Commission, Leadership Team, CPU Subcommittee, Council, and staff. The intent was identifying a verb, an action, and the object to provide direction. Identifying the principal objectives of the roles for each of the five bodies is critical. As an example, he cited the Council's role in relationship to the CPU Subcommittee and the Planning Commission. The body of the document describes the roles and responsibilities of each body with the scope outlining the process for the Comprehensive Plan Update. The Leadership Team's draft charter doesn't describe the actions of each respective body, which should be the focus of the document. The proposal is direct, revises the format, and provides clarity and certainty in terms of the Commission's mission. In addition to the difference in the format, there are critical issues that are substantive that the Commission should discuss.

Chair Tousley asked Commissioner Ingman about his dissatisfaction with the charter and what he believes meets the test for a charter based on the outcome of the retreat. Commissioner Ingman said he's unsure whether all the information in the draft charter was the result of the retreat discussion. If the Leadership Team is working with staff, the real thrust is where is the majority of the Planning Commission and its role in the process. It's important to ensure that there is a relationship between the Leadership Team and the majority of the Commission. The direction of the Leadership Team should be a function of the entire Commission's direction. The draft charter lacks that connection. He cited an example as the bullet within

the draft stating, "Determine what is needed for CPU process/coordinate with full Commission." Additionally, the charter includes text indicating the work plan, schedule, and milestones will be developed by Chair Tousley and staff. The work plan should be developed and adopted by the Planning Commission and not by the Leadership Team. If there's a theme to identify within the draft charter that is troublesome, it's that concern. That concern is prevalent throughout the document.

Chair Tousley questioned whether there should be a Leadership Team or a CPU Subcommittee. That's an important question as some members endured the Shoreline Master Program and the subcommittee and what did and did not unfold over the two years.

Commissioner Parker said the change that Commissioner Ingman speaks to occurs in section 1.3 in the draft proposal.

Commissioner Leveen commented that the two-page draft proposal by the Commissioners is an easier document to comprehend. However, there's no reason the Commission couldn't utilize the proposed charter in sections where it might be appropriate, such as the public involvement process pertaining to objectives and outcomes that could apply to the CPU Subcommittee to provide leadership to the Commission on the public process during the Comprehensive Plan Update. He suggested including the public process in section 3.1.

Chair Tousley invited feedback on proceeding with the review of the two documents.

Commissioner Leveen asked staff to comment on any fatal flaws within the proposed draft. Planner Buckler said the draft submitted by Commissioners Ingman and Parker does a good job capturing roles and responsibilities. However, there are some other elements the Council is seeking in the charter. One is the public process and a broad outline of a schedule. The Council also wants to know what the Commission's scope of the Comprehensive Plan Update review will entail. The point of the study session and the charter is for the Commission to provide a proposal for discussion. More detail is needed around the scope of the Commission's review. She agreed that perhaps the objectives and outcomes could be repetitive. The intent is to provide an overall story of what the Commission wants to accomplish. The proposed delivery date should be included in the charter, as well as clear direction, which hasn't been received from the Council on the timing of the Commission's recommendation. It could be assumed that the Council would like the Commission's work completed in January because of interest in pursuing development regulations and subarea planning.

Director Stahley said the most important element is the completion date. The Commission must establish a completion date as it pertains to the previous night's presentation to the City Council on the budget, which is likely not going to increase next year. It likely will be smaller and that will impact staff and the ability to continue supporting the process at the level as the same level of the last three years. It's the reality of today's environment. More accomplished this year will benefit the work plan in 2013 when work begins on implementation of the comprehensive plan.

Commissioner Leveen suggested it would be important for the Commission or the Leadership Team to describe to the Council that it's an area of tension. He appreciates that the budget and resource limitations are motivating factors in terms of staff's perspective. However, his motivating factor is different and it's the Commission's responsibility to represent that to the Council. The overriding message during the SMP process was the relentless message of completing the process on time resulting in a frequency and schedule of meetings that will cause him to resign if the Commission is faced with a similar situation during the Comprehensive Plan Update. It's incumbent upon the Commission to complete the update well. Part of the Commission's job is to ensure the Council is making an informed decision regardless of the decision.

Chair Tousley pointed out that pages 1 and 2 of the draft charter are not addressed in the draft proposal. Pages 1 and 2 address the level of the review of the Comprehensive Plan Update, the scope of the review, and the public involvement process. Commissioner Ingman replied that because of the time constraints, he and Commissioner Parker focused on roles and responsibilities. There is some summarization under some

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**June 6, 2012 Page 5 of 10**

sections but not at the same level of detail that should be included. He asked whether that type of specificity in the first two pages or other sections of the draft charter could be included as a footnote or an appendix. The language could likely be simplified to eliminate some redundancy. He suggested that Commissioner Richards could refine and combine the two documents.

Commissioner Leveen said there was some information that was considered for inclusion for the Council but the Leadership Team preferred to include it as background information. Chair Tousley said the information is characterized as the roles and responsibilities on pages 3, 4 and 5, which is an appendix. Pages 1 and 2 comprise the charter. Planner Buckler added that part of the purpose for the charter was creating common expectations among the City Council, staff, and the Planning Commission on the review process.

Commissioner Ingman said he doesn't believe the scope or the goals are a process. The goals and the scope are not methods. If time is the issue, it will control the quantity of the work completed by the Commission. If that is the design determinate then it will affect pages 1 and 2 because it's tied to the work plan.

Commissioner Richards said the draft proposal does a good job of encompassing the roles and responsibilities. However, as mentioned by Chair Tousley, there is more information not represented in the proposal. He understands the format, the structure, and the idea of referring to specific sections; however, the first three paragraphs in the proposal do not encompass the first two pages of the draft charter.

Commissioner Horn said he is trying to grasp how the two proposals work together. The proposal only includes four responsibilities of the Commission while he envisions more, such as establishing an effective public process. He suggested more time is required before the Commission adopts a charter. Some goals should be included because the Commission's work should tie to goals. It's also likely the sixth goal in the draft charter is not a goal and could be restated and located elsewhere in the document. It's possible to refine the proposal whereby both could work together.

Commissioner Richards said the draft proposal lacks a mission statement. He agreed the top five goals are the better overarching goals and the sixth goal could be rephrased. It's important to retain the paragraph and the goals as well as the mission statement. The draft proposal is procedural and includes action words and tasks, but it's missing a mission statement. Commissioner Ingman affirmed the comments confirm his concern as the document is not a process as it is titled to be. A mission statement should be included.

Commissioner Horn pointed out that roles and responsibilities could be termed as a process as well. Commissioner Ingman said his proposal is driven by what was included within the draft charter and that he's alluded several times that his draft could be integrated into the activities. Goal 6 is already repeated in the draft proposal.

Commissioner Parker suggested tightening up the draft charter and improving its readability. He questioned the definition of public process in terms of the steps or something more inclusive such as outreach or response documents. Chair Tousley described the different methods of public process.

Commissioner Parker questioned the existence of a work plan. Chair Tousley advised that the Commission has an adopted work plan for the calendar year.

Planner Buckler offered to review the work plan and how the public process conforms to the schedule with an assumed delivery date of January. That information could be included in the charter. The Commission could review the two proposals and make suggested changes for inclusion in the Council's staff report, which must be completed by the next day.

Commissioner Richards said he views both tasks as two different conversations. He suggested finalizing the charter prior to discussing the schedule. Chair Tousley agreed as that process will be the role of the CPU Subcommittee.

The Commission discussed and provided recommendations to bridge the two documents into one charter for presentation to the Council on June 19:

- Add a description to the charter stating, “The purpose of this charter is to make clear to the City Council, the Planning Commission, and the public the goals to be met by the Comprehensive Plan Update review process and the process by which review is to be conducted.”
- Delete the first paragraph in the draft charter. Chair Tousley disagreed but conceded with the suggestion because no one else opposed the recommendation.
- Rename *Goals* to *Goals for OPC’s review process* and move to follow the description statement. Goal #6 was deleted because it’s stated elsewhere in the document.
- Revise goal #5 to state, “Conduct OPC process in timely manner consistent with charter and a work plan.”
- Re-title *OPC Review Process* to reflect *Scope of OPC’s Review* and move that section language to follow the goal section. Revise the existing first paragraph under old *Scope* to state, “The following items shall be included in the recommendations transmitted to City Council:” and add it to the end of the existing paragraph under *OPC Review Process* to *Scope*.
- Within the old *Scope*, combine the sub-bullets under the second bullet to reflect, “Recommendations on the proposed goal and policy updates, consistent with the community’s long-term vision, sustainability and practicality.” Delete the third sub-bullet and renumber the bullets as 1-3 under the new paragraph in *Scope of OPC’s review*. Revise the first sentence in #3 to state, “Identification of issues not addressed in the Scope of the Update or the July Draft that have been raised by the public and the Planning Commission.” Revise the last two sentences to state, “The Commission will make a recommendation on such issues if time and resources allow. The Commission will identify issues that cannot be resolved within the Commission’s timeframe for review, so that the City Council may consider whether an extension of time or a future annual update is needed.”
- Within the proposed draft move sections 1-3 to *Planning Commission* within the draft charter in the section pertaining to *Roles and Responsibilities*.
- Within the description statement, add “and staff” after “the public.”
- On page 2 of the draft charter, delete the first four bullets.
- Commissioners agreed to delete the following on page 2: “The following is not within the scope of OPC’s review, however individual Commissioners may submit suggestions to staff outside of a meeting:
  - Line-by-line grammar and proofreading
  - Format, sequence of chapters, headings, background text (unless it is incomprehensible)”
- Revise the first goal under *Goals for OPC’s review process* to state: “Review draft Comprehensive Plan Update vision, values, goals and policies.”
- On page 2, revise the italicized statement to read, “Deliver the OPC recommendation to City Council in January 2013,” and add it as goal #6 on page 1.

Commissioners discussed the section on *Public Involvement Process* (page 2 of charter). The Commission agreed to re-title the section as *Goals for OPC’s public process*. The Commission reviewed the 9 bullets, agreed to delete several of the bullets, and revised the list of goals to state:

1. Involve general public, special interests and subject matter experts in the review process
2. Host public hearing(s) that are fair, open and accessible to a broad range of public
3. Provide multiple formats and opportunities to comment
4. Provide an opportunity for interactive dialogue between the Commission and public
5. Educate the public about the purpose and value of the Comprehensive Plan
6. Use time and resources efficiently to achieve desired outcomes
7. Use public comments to help derive priorities for OPC review

Commissioners agreed to delete the bulleted list of Outcomes on page 2.

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**June 6, 2012 Page 7 of 10**

Planner Buckler noted that staff will insert a table of the schedule reflecting the public process as determined by the Commission. Commissioner Ingman stressed the importance of the Planning Commission driving the work plan.

The Commission reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the Planning Commission, Leadership Team, CPU Subcommittee, and the City Council, which will become an appendix to the charter. The Commission provided recommendations on bridging the draft charter with the draft proposal.

Commissioner Richards supported replacing the chart draft's roles and responsibilities for the Planning Commission with the roles and responsibilities in the draft proposal. He suggested replacing 1 through 3 with 1.1., 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4. Commissioner Parker recommended including the timeline of January 13 within 1.3 to ensure that the work plan is consistent with the timeline. Commissioner Leveen suggested replacing "Adopt" in 1.3 with "Propose."

Commissioner Horn said a missing role and responsibility under Planning Commission is developing a public process, which could be added before 1.1 requiring a renumbering of the section. The Commission discussed the language in new section 1.1, such as "Adopt a public involvement and process that meets the goals of the charter but is developed further by CPU."

Commissioners reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the Leadership Team. Manager Stamm pointed out that the Commission has never formed a subcommittee of the leadership. He recommended retaining "Leadership Team" rather than "Leadership Committee" as referenced in the draft proposal.

Working from the draft proposal, Commissioner Leveen suggested revising section 2.3 to state, "Attend LUEC and City Council briefings."

Commissioner Horn recommended replacing "press" in section 2.2 to reflect "media."

Commissioner Richards recommended changing the reference of "1.3" in section 2.2 to reflect "1.4." to coincide with the renumbering of the first section.

Chair Tousley asked for feedback on sections 4, 5, 6 & 7 under the Leadership Team within the draft charter. Commissioner Leveen suggested deleting #7. Commissioners agreed to take #5 in the draft charter and renumber it to 2.4. The Commission agreed to also strike #6.

Commissioners discussed and compared the roles and responsibilities of the CPU Subcommittee in both drafts.

Commissioner Leveen suggested section 3.2 should likely reflect, Analyze and summarize comments.. He asked Commissioner Richards for feedback on the responsibility in terms of receiving a summary of public comments on the July draft. Section 3.2 would be helpful because it's not about deliberating on the comments but rather reviewing and analyzing for trends. Commissioner Richards said the section affords too much leeway on deciding what may be important or not important. There likely is a need for a summary of the feedback with the CPU Subcommittee determining the most efficient format for the Commission. Commissioner Ingman expressed concerns about the lack of resources for summarization of comments. Planner Buckler referred to the difficulty staff is encountering in summarizing and categorizing comments because the comments pertain to the entire draft versus comments received during focus meetings where many comments were focused on one particular issue.

Discussion ensued on whether to include the item. Planner Buckler commented that during that the initial deliberation phase during the public hearing, it may be possible for the CPU Subcommittee to review the comments to determine if the issues should be forwarded to staff for follow-up or referred to the Council because resources are not available.

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
June 6, 2012 Page 8 of 10**

Chair Tousley supported retaining and integrating sections 1 and 4 from the draft charter into the new draft. Commissioner Ingman suggested the inclusion of the Leadership Team within section 1.

Commissioner Horn recommended revising section 3.1 in the proposed draft to reflect, "Provide leadership to OPC on the public process and deliberation process to be followed for the Comprehensive Plan Update." Commissioners agreed with the recommendation.

Commissioners discussed and compared the roles and responsibilities of the City Council in both drafts.

Correct "1.3" to reflect "1.4" in section 4.1 of the draft proposal. Commissioners supported language in section 4.1.

The Commission discussed at length the remaining sections in both drafts. Commissioners Kizza and Reddick supported retaining the entire four statements as outlined in the draft proposal. Commissioner Reddick said it's important to include them based on the historical lack of clarity from the City Council.

Section 4.2 was clarified to state, "Provide clear direction and expectations for OPC's review and analysis of the Comprehensive Plan Update, and on additional work or issues referred to the Commission."

Section 4.3 was approved stating, "City Council liaison will meet with OPC on a regular basis."

Section 4.4 was approved stating, "City Council will convene meetings as needed with City Council or LUEC regarding OPC's review process, as well as involve OPC in study session(s) to discuss OPC's recommendation transmittal."

Commissioners discussed and compared the roles and responsibilities of City staff in both drafts.

The reference in section 5.5 of "1.3" was changed to reflect "1.4."

Section 5.3 was clarified to state, "Maintain public records, keep information in one place electronically (e.g., shared file folders, city email address), catalogue and synthesis comments."

Sections 5.1 and 5.6 were combined to reflect, "Provide information and support to OPC and the CPU Subcommittee to help achieve OPC's work plan."

Add new section stating, "Assist with overall public outreach strategy to achieve OPC work plan."

Commissioner Leveen recommended deleting the bullet in the charter draft stating, "Be objective and constructive" because it doesn't coincide with the tone of the entire document.

**Commissioner Leveen moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to approve the Charter as amended.**

Planner Buckler advised that she will revise the draft Charter for review by Director Stahley on June 11. She plans to forward the table on the public process to Commissioner Richards to ensure all elements were captured. Commissioner Horn recommended Chair Tousley should review the draft charter prior to submission to the Director. The Commission agreed with the suggestion.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Tousley reminded the Commission to review the minutes of the SMP meetings for approval at the June 18 meeting.

Chair Tousley provided clarification on the process for Commissioners to add items to the agenda.



**Committee Reports and Liaison Assignments**

**Finance Subcommittee** – Commissioner Horn reported the subcommittee's next meeting is on June 14 at 6:30 p.m. in Room 112. Commissioners Horn, Kiswa, Reddick, and Bardin are members of the subcommittee. At the next meeting, the subcommittee is planning to review the 2011 CFP letter and comments from the Finance Committee meeting scheduled on June 7.

**CPU Subcommittee** – Commissioner Richards emphasized the need to have a conversation about formally asking the Council to allow amendment of the Commission's work plan to defer the urban agriculture amendments until after the Comprehensive Plan Update is completed.

**Commissioner Richards moved, seconded by Commissioner Tousley, to approve formation of a four-member Comprehensive Plan Update Subcommittee to replace the existing Committee of the Whole and that this subcommittee be comprised of the existing CPU Chair (Commissioner Richards) and three additional Commissioners to meet as needed and be empowered by the Commission to make decisions in coordination with staff on the update process. Such decisions may include methods of public outreach, public participation implementation, and the determination of a deliberation process, or other tasks as determined by the full Commission.**

Commissioner Horn said his only concern with the motion is the terminology of "make decisions" as opposed to recommendations. Decisions should be made by the entire Commission.

Manager Stamm said the issue is delegating such authority to the subcommittee because it's a timing issue if there is a need for a decision.

Commissioner Richards offered that the motion could be modified to reflect a "limitation" rather than "may include."

Commissioner Horn commented that it's likely there are some matters where a decision is appropriate. However, there are some issues requiring the entire Commission's review and decision. Commissioner Parker pointed out that the Commission just determined the role and responsibilities of the CPU Subcommittee in the Appendix to the Charter. The motion appears to include additional responsibilities. Commissioner Richards explained that the existing committee and the proposed committee is the make-up of the committee comprised of four members of the Planning Commission as opposed to a Committee of the Whole, as most Commissioners currently attend CPU Subcommittee meetings. The proposed committee make-up is inherent in the Commission's recent adoption of the roles and responsibilities.

Planner Buckler added that the CPU Subcommittee would be empowered to make decisions about the public process and the outreach.

*Commissioner Leveen asked whether the previous offer was a friendly amendment to strike "deliberation process." Commissioner Richards affirmed it was a friendly amendment.*

**Motion carried unanimously.**

The Commission discussed membership of the CPU Subcommittee. Commissioners Ingman, Parker, Richards, and Tousley expressed interest in serving on the CPU Subcommittee. Chair Tousley offered to follow up with Commissioner Bardin to determine her interest in serving.

Chair Tousley announced the meeting of the Olympia Planning Committee Finance Subcommittee on June 14 and the meeting of the Olympia Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan Subcommittee on June 20. Formulation of the CPU Subcommittee will occur at the June 18 meeting.

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
June 6, 2012 Page 10 of 10**

**Announcements**

Commissioner Richards reported on the loss of a long-time community volunteer who was recently hit by a car as he ended his shift at the Olympia Food Co-op. The area lacks lighting and a crosswalk and the loss speaks to the need for improvements at that particular intersection.

Commissioner Horn spoke to the hope of addressing the issue broadly within the Comprehensive Plan Update.

**Adjournment**

**With there being no further business, Chair Tousley adjourned the meeting at 9:54 p.m.**

---

Amy Tousley, Chair

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President  
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net