



# City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

## SEATTLE PLANNING COMMISSION

MARCH 9, 2006

### Approved Meeting Minutes

#### **Commissioners in Attendance**

Tom Eanes – Acting Chair\*, George Blomberg, Chris Fiori, Martin Kaplan, Valerie Kinast, Mimi Sheridan, Tony To

#### **Commissioners Absent**

Steve Sheehy – Chair, Jerry Finrow – Vice-Chair, Hilda Blanco, Mahlon Clements, Joe Quintana, Carl See

#### **Commission Staff**

Barbara Wilson – Director, Robin Magonegil – Administrative Assistant

#### **Guests**

John Rahaim, DPD/City Planning; Lish Whitson, DPD; Edward Bryant, Kristie Gordon, Kathy Hendrickson, Sabrina Lee, Svetlana Pavlova, Manuel Salas, Craig Swanson, North Seattle Community College Commercial Real Estate students.

**\* Commissioner Eanes was appointed by Chair Sheehy to fill in chairing the meeting in the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair.**

***Please Note: Seattle Planning Commission meeting minutes are not an exact transcript but instead represent key points and the basis of the discussion.***

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. by Acting Chair Tom Eanes.

#### **COMMISSION BUSINESS**

***Because a quorum was not present at this time, items needing approval were moved down on the agenda until a quorum was present.***

##### ▪ **Chair Report**

###### – **Reschedule Council President Licata**

Acting Chair Eanes reported that because of today's low attendance the meeting with Council President Licata has been rescheduled for our April 13<sup>th</sup> meeting when more Commissioners will be able to attend.

###### – **South Lake Union Urban Center Plan**

Acting Chair Eanes noted that DPD staff will be here later to give us a status report on the plan and to tell us about the upcoming public forum on April 4<sup>th</sup>. They have asked for 4 Planning Commissioners to facilitate small group discussions, Commissioners Valerie Kinast and Jerry Finrow have volunteered

but two more are needed. Commissioners George Blomberg and Chris Fiori volunteered. Commissioner Martin Kaplan added that he might be available as well and would let Barbara know.

– **New Commissioner Update**

Acting Chair Eanes stated that the Mayor has appointed 5 new members to the Planning Commission tomorrow and that the City Council confirmation proceedings and approval by Council will take place in early April. He continued that the new members will be invited to attend the next Full Commission Meeting.

– **Upcoming Events and Meetings**

Acting Chair Eanes called attention to some of the upcoming meetings and events. He called special attention to the upcoming Planning Commission Retreat. It is scheduled for April 27<sup>th</sup> from 3:00 - 7:30 p.m. at the Port of Seattle.

He also noted some of the other upcoming SPC meetings including; the Executive Committee meeting Tuesday, March 14<sup>th</sup> 7:30-9:00 am and the Land Use & Transportation committee meeting on Thursday, March 16, 7:30-9:00am. He noted that at the LUT meeting they will be reviewing the Industrial Lands Roundtable report and will be joined by Mary Jean Ryan from OPM, Laura Lutz from OED and Tom Hauger from DPD to discuss broadening the discussion and mapping out a public involvement plan for industrial lands.

He added that our next full commission meeting will be March 23 from 7:30-9:00 a.m. He noted that at this meeting we will get a briefing on the South Downtown Plan and an update on the 2006 Comp Plan amendments.

Acting Chair Eanes further noted the Livable South Downtown Open House, Wednesday, March 15, 4:30–7:00pm in City Hall Bertha Knight Landes Room.

## **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

▪ **Planning Director Report**

– **John Rahaim, Department of Planning & Development/City Planning**

John Rahaim noted that his briefing will focus on updating the Commissioners on three areas, the Neighborhood Business District Strategy, the area around Dravus, and the Port’s proposal for Interbay.

***Neighborhood Business District Strategy (Commercial Code update)***

Mr. Rahaim stated that the legislation regarding NBDS went to Council last May and there has been a fair amount of discussion off and on with Councilmember Steinbrueck and the UDP committee. He added that there have been key issues that are being explored. The two biggest issues that remain are parking and the issue of what happens outside of the core pedestrian areas with first floor residential use. His hope is that they will begin working with Council staff in April, have resolutions by May, and take a vote in Council in late May/early June.

Acting Chair Eanes mentioned that the last time Mr. Rahaim was here he noted that the delay has given them the opportunity to finish mapping the P designation areas. Mr. Rahaim stated that they are done with the field work and have developed preliminary recommendations on where P zones should be. Mr. Rahaim added that they are now scheduling meetings with the respective neighborhoods.

Acting Chair Eanes asked if there would be a set of definitive maps showing the P zones when this legislation gets to Council. Mr. Rahaim answered that the maps will not be ready at that point as staff will need to have more discussions with the neighborhoods. Acting Chair Eanes questioned if the mapping is decoupled from the legislation. Mr. Rahaim responded that it is still decoupled. He noted that what Council staff has discussed is the idea that the current rules along the arterial remain for now until the mapping is completed. He added that what DPD/City Planning proposed was that they would do that only on arterials and that areas along non-arterials would open the door for first floor residential.

Acting Chair Eanes noted that when there are maps of the recommendations the Commission would be interested in looking at those. Mr. Rahaim answered that they are not on the web site yet but it is probably a good time to start having that discussion with the Commission again.

Commissioner Kaplan asked when DPD meets with the neighborhoods if there is some room for flexibility about the boundaries of the P designations. Mr. Rahaim replied that was the intent of the meetings, to get community input. He noted that there are 30 to 40 commercial districts but that the meetings will be clustered to reduce the number of meetings needed. He added that those meetings are being scheduled now.

Acting Chair Eanes questioned if the parking issue will be taken up district by district and, he added, if so he questions such an approach. Mr. Rahaim responded that was not their proposal. He added that Councilmember Steinbrueck is scheduling a city parking forum to get a panel discussion on both sides of the issue to discuss it.

Commissioner Mimi Sheridan noted that if the City directly or indirectly encourages parking to be on the property in any zone there has to be very strict controls on the design and where the parking is located. She added that you don't want what happens in some of the denser neighborhoods where people pave over their yards.

Commissioner Fiori asked if, given all the issues surrounding parking, whether parking would be decoupled from the rest of the legislation. Mr. Rahaim stated that they see parking as integral to the whole legislation but what was initially discussed was to divide the legislation into two parts so that Council could move ahead with just the first part. He added that DPD discouraged that from happening. He continued that what happened was that Council did act on supporting the list of topics within the program but did not finalize the legislation. He noted that the issues will be merged into one when they finally approve the whole thing.

Ms. Wilson asked, besides parking, what other big issues remain outstanding. Mr. Rahaim replied that ground floor residential in pedestrian districts was one of the issues that remain. He added that they had a discussion yesterday about the rezoning criteria and that they are proposing some changes there to make it easier to rezone C1 and C2 to NC. He continued that another thing that is a semi-big issue is the requirement for onsite common recreation area that is commonly called open space. They have proposed reducing that requirement as it is very high right now. He noted that Councilmember Steinbrueck made it very clear that they should not require onsite common space for residents and that should be left up to the developer and that instead he felt that they should be addressing either public space or space that provides some sort of public amenity.

Commissioner Sheridan noted that that is a major change. Mr. Rahaim agreed and noted that this has come up not only in commercial areas but in downtown and in multi-family areas.

Commissioner Sheridan stated that this change may not be a problem in smaller/medium sized buildings but it could be when you get into the larger buildings. Mr. Rahaim stated that they had proposed reducing it to 10% from 20% and to put a cap on it based on the size of the building. He added that the requirement can be met by meeting rooms, rooftop decks, etc. Councilmember Steinbrueck does not feel that this is something that the code should address and his interest is that it has some public purpose. Mr. Rahaim noted that the problem with this is that in the commercial districts they encourage developers to build to the property line.

Commissioner Kaplan asked if the developer could pay a fee instead of having this open space. Mr. Rahaim noted that they had actually written that in with up to half of the requirement could be met that way and their feeling at the time is that there should be some open space provided but they were getting pushed back on that. He noted they are looking at many possible options. He added that the problem with the payment in lieu is that it requires a lot of administration.

Acting Chair Eanes mentioned that he agrees with Councilmember Steinbrueck that the provision of on-site open space should be left to the developer and that code-mandated open space should have a public purpose. He added that it typically costs thousands of dollars per linear foot just to deal with the sidewalks when building in Seattle. He feels that if the sidewalks and street frontages are done really well this may fulfill the public purpose.

Commissioner Blomberg stated that, in thinking about common spaces as both a design feature and a public resource, that it is not limited to C zones. Commissioner Kinast noted that these amenities should not be under-estimated. Commissioner Blomberg noted that it is more than an amenity but potentially very important and affects a number of areas. Mr. Rahaim mentioned that some of these can add to the cost of housing and that there needs to be a balance. Commissioner Sheridan stated that it being a requirement does give leverage to design review.

Commissioner Fiori asked if the idea of payment in lieu wouldn't work well with the impact fee program. Mr. Rahaim replied that their sense is that when the impact fee program goes into place they may be able to eliminate the onsite requirement.

### ***Dravus***

Mr. Rahaim gave the background on the Dravus. He noted that some of the property owners had requested a change to the Comp Plan last year to make that area a hub urban village. DPD/City Planning did not support that as they did not think that it met the criteria. He added that Council has asked them to take a look at some zoning changes in that area. The area is about a 7 acre area that is currently zoned commercial so it would not involve rezoning or looking at changing the industrial zoned land to the west but it would involve looking at the commercial area, specifically to allow more density and to change it to a neighborhood commercial category to allow it more mixed use. He continued that the issues involved are creating an expectation that the change would eventually go farther west into the industrial area and how much height would be allowed. This has to be looked at with the idea that there is not going to be a monorail station there now.

Ms. Wilson asked what the height was now. Mr. Rahaim responded that it was C1 and C2 so around 40 feet. Commissioner Sheridan mentioned that the monorail owns property there that is on the market as well as their maintenance base site just down the road. Acting Chair Eanes asked how that property

is zoned. Commissioner Sheridan answered that she thought that the maintenance base site is zoned industrial.

Mr. Rahaim added that they are still in an early scoping mode on this. His asked the Commission to think about how they want to be involved with this.

### *Interbay*

**Disclosure: Commissioner Blomberg disclosed his affiliation with the Port of Seattle and recused himself from any discussion.**

Mr. Rahaim noted that in regard to the Interbay site, their agreement was that this would not involve a Comprehensive Plan change and the Port withdrew its proposal for housing on that site. Mr. Rahaim continued that the current thinking is that they would look at allowing the Port to cluster the office development but the details have not been worked out. He added that there is not much more to add but that there seems to be agreement on the range of land uses and it does not appear to involve a Comprehensive Plan change.

### *Viaduct*

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Rahaim to talk briefly about the Viaduct and the Waterfront and summarize the Executive's current thinking about the ballot measures and the different things that are happening right now. Mr. Rahaim noted that his understanding is that it will be an advisory vote with just Seattle residents and does not know more beyond that. They also approved the action that would give the City until the end of the year to come up with the additional costs of building the tunnel and that would give the Governor the final say on that.

### *Other*

Acting Chair Eanes mentioned that, in the NBDS, DPD rewrote the rezone criteria to reflect the intended outcome of the zoning rather than the static description of what is there now. He asked if that was just done for the commercial zones or was it done across all the zones. Mr. Rahaim responded that in this case it was just done for the commercial zones. Acting Chair Eanes asked if DPD were going to do that for the multi-family. He added that he feels that it would be a good idea especially if you are going to reduce the number of zones to 3 or 2. Mr. Rahaim replied that it is all part of an attempt to tie the zoning code more closely to the Comprehensive plan.

Commissioner Sheridan noted that on our work plan there is SEPA thresholds and asked Mr. Rahaim what the process is at looking at the SEPA thresholds. Mr. Rahaim answered that they are just figuring that out now and that there is a sense that they should look at them and explore different options. He added that if they do propose to raise thresholds it will be controversial.

**QUORUM: At 3:45 pm Commissioner Tony To arrived. With the addition of Commissioner To, a quorum was present.**

- February 23, 2006 Minutes Approval

**ACTION: Commissioner Tony To moves that the February 23, 2006 minutes be approved. Commissioner Chris Fiori seconds the approval. The motion passes unanimously.**

- **ACTION ITEMS: Planning Commission Review and Actions**
  - **Review and approve 2006 Commission work plan**

Director Barbara Wilson asked the Commissioners to look at the 2006 Draft Work plan. She noted that there has been quite a bit of discussion of the work plan in committee meetings and that some of the discussion has been the issue of capacity. She mentioned that one of the big questions is that Commissioners really want to focus on having just two or three major activities for the year and then some focus on additional things that we want to do that are not as big of expenditures of time.

Commissioner Blomberg noted that the work plan is impressive and that there is some sharing of roles within the work plan between the committees. He asked if we have done that before. Ms. Wilson responded that for instance, many of the items listed under Center City Strategy could all be huge independent projects and that it does make sense in how we have assigned work to the committees so that there is more balance.

Commissioner Blomberg asked how we would go about focusing on particular items. Ms. Wilson answered that what they have discussed at committee meetings is the idea of coming up with some priority actions for 2006 and to really spend some time on those. She added for a lot of the items on the work plan that the Commission has the ability to get very involved or to do cursory reviews so for some projects that you have worked on. In the past we have done public involvement, review, implementation, held forums, and workshops and we have the opportunity to do that on a couple of issues this year. An example of one of these issues that has been suggested is industrial lands. She added that it would be good to get an idea of what people's preferences are for other high priority issues but that does not have to be done to approve the draft work plan but should be something that the Commissioners think about and clearly determined at the retreat.

Commissioner Kinast suggested housing affordability, as it plays into so many things. She asked if we would decide geographically what to concentrate on. Commissioner Fiori noted that there are large planning efforts with DADU's being the first one that could go under that category. The long term thinking about rezoning could be another one.

Ms. Wilson added that beyond DADUs in Southeast Seattle there is the potential development at the end of the year of a city-wide DADU policy and, perhaps, cottage housing which the Commission has a long history of involvement in.

Commissioner Sheridan noted that the Commission would support city-wide DADU's but she would question how much more time the Commission would want to spend on cottage housing as she does not feel that it would produce a lot of units. She added that the Commission, historically, has spent a lot of time on these issues.

Commissioner Blomberg noted that we do not have to dig into these matters now but it might be something to do at the retreat. He added that matching important agenda items with the interests and passion of people on the Commission is an important matter.

Commissioner Kinast replied that with the affordable housing issue maybe the Commission could help develop the strategy or perhaps develop our own strategy.

Acting Chair Eanes suggested that we go ahead and vote to approve the 2006 work plan now and then, between now and the retreat, ask everyone to weigh in on this to give an indication of what priority should be placed on items.

Ms. Wilson noted that maybe they could do some sort prioritization exercise at the retreat.

Commissioner Kinast suggested that we give this to the new commissioners ahead of time to review.

Commissioner Kaplan noted that months could be spent on every line item and what are we interested in and what is going to be the hot issues. He asked whether we, especially with some of the issues, should consider that there be more public outreach and try to create some sort of dialog.

Commissioner Sheridan suggested that we look at the criteria to weigh the items on the work plan and see if it meets our role in facilitating in some way outreach. This could be done by taking the lead role or assist other departments. She suggested sending the criteria out to the Commissioners.

**ACTION: Commissioner George Blomberg moves that the 2006 Draft Work Plan be approved. Commissioner Martin Kaplan seconds the approval. The motion passes unanimously.**

- **Review & Approve the 2006 Commission Retreat Draft Agenda**

Ms. Wilson noted that she worked with the Executive Committee with this and, because there are 5 new members coming onto the Commission, they wanted to put the emphasis on the history of the Commission and how we do things. She added that they have also talked about the fact that SPC is coming up on its 100 year anniversary so we might take a look at that.

Commissioner Blomberg added that they have also talked about having some former Commissioners present to talk about the role of the Planning Commission and to assist the new Commissioners to be able to hit the ground running. Commissioner Kaplan suggested that we make sure we have enough time for the 2006 major initiatives in the work plan. Acting Chair Eanes suggested adjusting the agenda to make more time for work plan prioritization.

**ACTION: Commissioner Tony To moves that the 2006 Commissioner Retreat Draft Agenda be approved. Commissioner Valerie Kinast seconds the approval. The motion passes unanimously.**

- **Briefing – South Lake Union Urban Center Plan**
  - Lish Whitson, Department of Planning & Development

Lish Whitson gave some of the background of South Lake Union (SLU) noting that in 2004 it was designated as Seattle's 6<sup>th</sup> Urban Center. They are going back and looking at the neighborhood plan that was developed for SLU and adopted in 1998 and making sure that it meets county-wide

requirements for Urban Center plans and that it reflects the amount of growth we are expecting to see in the neighborhood now. This is significantly different than what was expected just 8 years ago.

Mr. Whitson stated that they started out about a year ago working with a University of Washington class. The class looked at SLU and came up with a bunch of ideas for different topics for how to update the neighborhood plan and then held an open house in May of last year. Through the summer and fall he worked with the community to develop goals and policies for a new neighborhood plan. There was an open house in November 2005 to get input from the community. He added that goals and policies for a new SLU Urban Center plan were submitted as part of this year's Comprehensive Plan update. He continued that along with that there was an amendment that would change the future land use map.

Mr. Whitson went over the agenda and the report that was contained in the Commissioner's meeting folders. He noted that since the November meeting DPD staff has been working to identify specific strategies for meeting those goals and policies. He added that there was a policy to support education in the neighborhood and they developed a draft set of strategies for how they can do that. He continued that the report reflects a lot of work that has happened in the neighborhoods in the last couple of years around transportation, housing, parks, utilities and a number of components from the community and the University of Washington class.

Mr. Whitson noted that the next step is to get public input on these strategies. They will be holding a workshop on April 4th with the goal being to have community members grapple with difficult issues. Most of those issues being related to land use and zoning incentives. He added that in this set of strategies there are about seven or eight things where we indicate that we intend to provide incentives. We need to ensure that we provide incentives to achieve things that the community actually cares about. He noted that these incentives need to be used wisely and prioritized. He noted that the only incentives they really have are related to allowing property owners and developers more height and density.

Mr. Whitson mentioned that after the meeting in April they will be flushing out the strategies and will have another document that will make it understandable 5 to 10 years down the road. Then, in early June, there will be a final meeting to get public input and to make sure what was decided in April and what is reflected in these strategies is actually what the neighborhood really cares about. After that meeting the Mayor's office will forward a document to City Council and proceeding with a Comp Plan amendment process.

Acting Chair Eanes asked if, by the end of the year, they hoped to have a new plan in place adopted by the City Council and the necessary Comp Plan amendments also adopted. Mr. Whitson stated yes and that if they change the future land use map to change the industrial area to mixed use they would also have to have a rezone to accompany that.

Ms. Wilson clarified that it would potentially be in next year's Comp Plan amendment. She asked if the City Council ratifies the neighborhood plan or whether it is done by community ratification. Mr. Whitson replied that they will talk to the Council members to see what they want to do. Commissioner Sheridan noted that what they have done before is to adopt the matrices. She asked if they are going to have the neighborhood validation process. Mr. Whitson replied that was what the June meeting was for.



Acting Chair Eanes noted that Mr. Whitson had said that the incentives are likely to be a contentious issue. He asked if Mr. Whitson could be a little more specific. Mr. Whitson responded by sharing what he has heard people say that they want. Among these are housing (especially low income housing), spaces for the homeless, and mixed income housing. Another key idea is housing for families with the idea that SLU become more of a place for families. This could include a new school and definitely new daycare facilities. Mr. Whitson has also heard mentioned the need for spaces for non-profit arts organizations, human services providers and historic preservation issues. He continued that the tools they are using include a bonus program in which somebody provides something onsite and then is allowed to build a bigger building in exchange for providing that onsite amenity, and transfer of development rights where the owner takes an existing building that is not filling out the amount of development that could occur on the site and transfers the unused development potential to another site so that that receiving site would be allowed to have a larger development.

Ms. Wilson asked if the transfer development right would stay in the neighborhood. Mr. Whitson replied that that was probable and is what they were assuming at this point.

Mr. Whitson indicated that there is also a disincentive that basically prohibits an owner's use of other incentives if they do something that the City does not want them to do, such as tear down a landmark structure. Another tool that DPD staff is looking at is one that was used at Union Station and that is looking at Planned Area Development and agreements for planning across a number of blocks or multiple projects. He continued that the first question is whether the idea of bulk and height increases are actually something we want to entertain when matching tools to the outcomes of what we ultimately want to see in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Blomberg asked if they introduced the incentive system as a means of establishing currency and, if not, will you be preparing materials that will help introduce that soon. Mr. Whitson answered that they have been talking about it with community groups when discussing these strategies. He agreed that information materials would be good.

Ms. Wilson asked if there were any way to meet the housing and jobs targets from the Comp Plan without increasing height and bulk. Mr. Whitson replied that they can be met under current zoning.

Acting Chair Eanes commented that the neighborhood plan envisioned that alleys would be developed as small-scale funky places. In addition, he noted that there is an upper story setback on a lot of the alleys which is troublesome to deal with when you are attempting to do an affordable housing project. He added that he does not know whether the people in the neighborhood know how difficult those are to work with. He continued that there are also upper story setbacks on all or many of the P-designated streets, some of which are appropriate and have been successfully dealt with but not very easy to accomplish. He suggested that the alley set back issue be put on the table for discussion.

Acting Chair Eanes stated that the way the height limits were set was that there was a deliberate stepping down of heights from south to north, but the height limits right now are around 75 or 85 feet. He added that in the building code when you go above 75 feet you become a high-rise and get hit with a lot of additional costs that make you want to build to 240 feet. Because of those issues, he does not know whether modest increases will actually be effective.

Commissioner Fiori noted that there are a lot of projects that are coming online right now that are in that 8 to 12 story range in SLU and Belltown.

Commissioner Sheridan asked about the maritime industrial character of the neighborhood. She stated that it did not seem to her that there was much maritime industrial character left in the area. Mr. Whitson stated that there are still some older industrial buildings in the neighborhood but that concept of maritime industrial character is one that community members hold very dear and want to make sure that it is infused in the plan.

Commissioner Sheridan stated that there is a difference between maritime character and maritime industrial character. She noted that the industrial uses are farther south and are not necessarily maritime. Mr. Whitson clarified that he tends to think of maritime/industrial as having a slash between them, so maritime and industrial. Commissioner Sheridan suggested then that they be two separate items as they are quite different.

Commissioner Kinast asked what neighborhood groups have been involved. Mr. Whitson replied that the two main groups have been South Lake Union Friends and Neighbors (SLUFAN) and the Cascade Neighborhood Council.

Commissioner Kaplan asked where the density is now compared to the build out addressed in the Comp Plan and that when there is a meeting to what extent is the neighborhood represented. Mr. Whitson responded that they have about half the jobs that they are planning for in 20 years and about 1200 housing units today and are planning for an additional 8000.

Acting Chair Eanes asked of the 1200 housing units how many are in new developments. Mr. Whitson replied that about half are in buildings that were built in the last few years.

Commissioner Blomberg asked when the last time community members had seen this. Mr. Whitson replied that he was at the SLUFAN meeting on Tuesday and he will be at the Cascade meeting next week. He mentioned that this was emailed out to their mailing list at the end of February.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Whitson to discuss some of the developments that are in the pipeline right now or have recently been done in the area. Mr. Whitson pointed out several projects on the map that are in the development stage or are already developed.

Commissioner Kinast asked about the public improvements including the public right-of-way and utilities and how this is dealt with. She asked if it is done on a project by project basis. Mr. Whitson replied that there is a fairly innovative design effort that tries to maintain the industrial character. He added that there would not be any new sidewalks but there would basically be cars, trucks and the street car all overlapping in the same space.

Ms. Wilson noted that there has been a lot of discussion about the IC zone and that there has been a lot of back and forth about whether the whole thing or part of it should change to Seattle Mixed. She asked what the City's latest thinking is. Mr. Whitson replied that they will be talking about that with the community.

Commissioner Kinast asked if there were other projects with utilities going on. Commissioner Sheridan asked if the new substation was still being talked about. Mr. Whitson noted that it was still being talked about but he did not know the current status. He added that there are discussions about how to use the right-of-way to deal with storm water. Commissioner Sheridan noted that Cascade has really been involved with that issue for a number of years.

Commissioner Blomberg asked if, in terms of open space, the neighborhood center was going to become a neighborhood center. Mr. Whitson stated that he was not entirely sure about who owns the property but it is a non-profit service agency.

Commissioner Blomberg noted that some of the new development is some of the most interesting and forward-looking. He added that the design and some of the things implemented are of interest for many reasons. He asked if people in the neighborhood recognized that as well. Mr. Whitson responded that the efforts have been welcomed. He continued that with regard the bio tech industries, people are concerned about living near bio tech facilities.

Ms. Wilson asked that in addition to the open house what are the other things can the Planning Commission do to assist him. She asked if the Commission should help review the goals before they are ratified. Mr. Whitson replied that the goals and policies are already a part of the Comp Plan process, but if the Commission was interested in delving down into the specific strategies that would be helpful.

Commissioner Sheridan asked questions specific to the upcoming meeting. She shared that the Commission is a bit concerned about the agenda and what the presentations would be, how long they would last, and pointed out that there seems to be very high expectations of the group discussion. She suggested that a lot of thought be put into the questions and that it would be a good idea to have a meeting with the facilitators before the event. Mr. Whitson answered that he had talked to SLUFAN and they expressed that they have a lot of background in these issues and wanted to make sure that some of that got relayed to others in the community. He added that he thought they were thinking about 3 people total presenting on all of the issues and that a pre-meeting with the Planning Commission facilitators would be helpful.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

A question was asked about how many Commissioners would be moving on and how many would be staying.

Ms. Wilson responded that every year we have anywhere from 3-5 vacancies. She added that Commissioners serve 3-year terms that are renewable - so they can potentially stay on for 6 years. This year we have 5 new members coming on next month. She continued that there are a total of 15 Commissioners and one Get Engaged Commissioner.

There was no other public comment or questions.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Acting Chair Eanes adjourned the meeting at 5:04 pm.