

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION MINUTES

January 26, 2022
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Virtual Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Malakoutian, Vice Chair Ferris, Commissioners Bhargava, Brown, Goeppele, Moolgavkar, Morisseau

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Thara Johnson, Emil King, Department of Community Development; Matt McFarland, City Attorney's Office; Rebecca Maskin, King County Regional Planning Team

COUNCIL LIAISON: Councilmember Robertson

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER
(6:30 p.m.)

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Malakoutian, who presided.

Deleted: Moolgavkar

Chair Malakoutian stated that the meeting was being held remotely via zoom.

Deleted: Moolgavkar

Chair Malakoutian welcomed Councilmember Robertson as the new Council liaison to the Planning Commission.

Deleted: in order to comply with the Governor's emergency order concerning the Open Public Meetings Act, which prohibits in-person meetings

2. ROLL CALL
(6:32 p.m.)

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
(6:33 p.m.)

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Goeppele. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown and the motion carried unanimously.

4. REPORTS OF CITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS
(6:33 p.m.)

Councilmember Robertson said she was excited to be the new Council liaison to the Commission, noting that she served on the Commission from 2003 to 2009. During her tenure as Chair of the Commission, the Commission worked on the Bel-Red plan and chaired the Light Rail Best Practices Committee. She said in her private life she is an attorney for cities and does a lot of specialty work having to do with land use. She said she also served on the Growth

Management Policy Council for King County from 2010 to 2022.

5. STAFF REPORTS
(6:37 p.m.)

A. Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Comprehensive Planning Manager Thara Johnson took a few minutes to review the Commission's schedule of upcoming meeting dates and agenda items.

Commissioner Morisseau noted that the week of February 3 is winter break for the Bellevue School District and said she would not be able to attend a meeting that week. Commissioner Moolgavkar indicated she also would not be able to attend that week and Commissioner Bhargava said he was not yet sure. Ms. Johnson said if necessary another meeting date would be chosen for the month.

Councilmember Robertson pointed out that the Commission meeting scheduled for April fell during the Bellevue School District's spring break week. Both Commissioner Morisseau and Vice Chair Ferris said they would be out of town that week.

6. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
(6:43 p.m.)

Ms. Johnson noted that the Lochleven Community Association provided a written communication to the City Council, a copy of which was forwarded to the Commissioners earlier in the day.

7. PUBLIC HEARING – None
(6:45 p.m.)

8. STUDY SESSION
(6:45 p.m.)

Rebecca Maskin, demographic planner with the King County Regional Planning Team, said the Countywide Planning Policies were last adopted in 2012. The King County Council adopted the 2021 policies in December and they are currently out for ratification by the King County cities. The purpose of the Countywide Planning Policies is to provide a broad shared vision for comprehensive planning within the county. There are requirements in the Growth Management Act (GMA) that speak directly to the creation of the Countywide Planning Policies in terms of purpose. The GMA also speaks to Multicounty Planning Policies which are created by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) and housed in Vision 2050 for the central Puget Sound region. The GMA and Vision 2050 directly influence the Countywide Planning Policies, which directly influence comprehensive plans.

Deleted: the

The format of the Countywide Planning Policies mimics the general format of a comprehensive plan. There is a chapter for each required element, and there are high-level policies that dictate or guide regional and countywide policy addressing how jurisdictions should prepare their comprehensive plans. The work to update the Countywide Planning Policies in 2021 was to prepare for the upcoming 2024 Comprehensive Plan update. A number of changes have happened since the Countywide Planning Policies were last fully adopted in 2012, including the adoption of Vision 2050 and a revised centers framework from PSRC. Additionally, there were

Deleted: the

some changes made to the GMA that needed to be reflected in the Countywide Planning Policies. One significant item was related to the work of what was formerly called the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force, now called the King County Regional Affordable Housing Committee. The major topics for the Countywide Planning Policies update were related to housing, climate change, equity and centers, as well as the development of new growth targets to guide land use assumptions.

Ms. Maskin said the key policy functions of the Countywide Planning Policies are to provide guidance for comprehensive plans; establishing urban growth area boundaries; criteria for revising urban growth area boundaries; establishing growth targets for each jurisdiction; criteria for defining the different levels of centers in King County; and policies for issues of a countywide nature, such as affordable housing, transit and climate change.

The growth targets are a policy statement that express the number of housing units and jurisdiction jobs that the jurisdictions will plan for in their comprehensive plan updates. The growth targets developed through a collaborative effort involving King County and all the jurisdictions. The growth targets look out 20 years to 2044. Development of the growth targets start at an aggregate regional level and move from there to the county level and then to the regional geographies. Once the regional geography totals are in hand, the focus turns to creating individual growth targets for cities. Jurisdictions are convened by regional geographies to determine what the ultimate recommended growth targets should be. The recommendations are presented as part of the Countywide Planning Policies, approved by the Growth Management Policy Council, and then are approved by the King County Council and ratified by the cities.

At the regional level, the population and job growth numbers are drawn from the PSRC regional 2019-2044 forecast. The four counties in their deliberations chose to use the forecast that underlies Vision 2050 as the starting point. The forecast for population growth is 1,321,700, and the forecast for jobs growth is 884,450 over the next 25 years. The next step involves applying the regional growth strategy in Vision 2050 to apportion the regional growth down to the county levels. About 50 percent of the population growth and 60 percent of the jobs are projected to be accommodated in King County. The countywide totals are then apportioned to the regional geographies, which are groups of cities and jurisdictions that share like characteristics. Bellevue, as a metro city shares the regional geography group with Seattle and no other cities. The shares for each regional geography are broken down by population and job growth. The conversion of population to housing is made using a variety of assumptions attuned to each regional geography. The original control total for the metro cities was 135,000 housing units between Seattle and Bellevue, and about 225,000 jobs between the two cities.

The next part of the process involves the creation of some hypothetical growth target scenarios using known data sources that relate to growth targets, including capacity, recent growth, and overall existing housing units and jobs. The scenarios kick start the deliberations for the deliberative step of bringing all the jurisdictions within the regional geographies together to talk about things deemed important within each jurisdiction for the next 20 years. The final step for creating the targets is the convening process where the different range scenarios are discussed for apportioning the control total targets to the individual cities. Ultimately, the recommended growth targets are taken to the Growth Management Policy Council. The key themes raised during the convening of the metro cities were the jobs/housing balance, the Vision 2050 policies, major developments, and the capacity for new development.

One of the key policy themes specifically for the Eastside was the jobs/housing balance. As of 2019, about a quarter of the housing in King County and about a third of the jobs were located on

Deleted: a

the Eastside. For the 2019-2044 growth period, the share of housing is targeted to increase to 30 percent, and the number of jobs to 32 percent.

Ms. Maskin said a number of amendments were proposed to the Countywide Planning Policies which were not ultimately adopted by the Growth Management Policy Council. The Growth Management Policy Council set up a work program item for 2022 under which the Affordable Housing Committee would return with recommendations for potential additional policies to be added to the Countywide Planning Policies in the areas of strengthening monitoring and accountability, and exploring the notion of creating subarea or jurisdictional or countywide need totals for affordable housing. At the King County Council level, an additional work program item was added exploring the Urban Growth Area expansion policies, and another to look at the Sammamish growth targets that reflect updated capacity estimates.

(7:06 p.m.)

Commissioner Morisseau asked what the difference is between a metro city and a core city. Ms. Maskin said the designations are determined by the PSRC. Generally the difference is in terms of scale. The metro cities tend to have multiple regional designated growth centers and multiple transit connections, whereas the core cities, with the exception of Redmond, have only a single regional growth center and fewer transit connections. She further explained that the high-capacity transit communities do not have designated growth centers.

Commissioner Brown pointed out that there has been a major shift in jobs and housing in the cities over the last two years owing to the pandemic. She asked what kind of changes in the planning work have been made because so many are working remotely. Ms. Maskin said the targets and the planning policies were being developing while Covid was going on. She said the forecasts do not give consideration to remote work beyond the traditional levels. It is too soon to know how long the effects of remote work at current scales will last, though data to that point is coming in. The demand for transit remain high and some workers are returning to their worksites and that remains an important underpinning of the overall growth strategy. Commissioner Brown asked if a big shift is observed to occur from high-priced housing markets to lower-priced housing market would be addressed by any adjustments to the targets in between the major planning opportunities. Ms. Maskin said she did not believe any adjustments would be made before the 2024 plan updates. New wholesales targets are set in advance of every periodic update, and there is a process to make small amendments.

Commissioner Goepple referred to the historic underproduction of housing and the need to consider that in the process of setting targets and noted that the jobs/housing ratio in Seattle is lower than for Bellevue. He asked why a higher ratio had been established for Bellevue. Ms. Maskin said the ratios are determined by the jobs and housing numbers. The ratios are not set independently for any jurisdiction. The difference in the ratios for Seattle and Bellevue reflect where things currently stand. Commissioner Goepple asked if the approach tends to perpetuate the issue of underproduction. Ms. Maskin said the opportunity to address past out-of-balances exist at the point where policies are drafted both at the local and geographic levels.

Assistant Director Emil King said the process of setting targets starts at the staff level for both the county and the city. They percolate upward from there to Councilmember Robertson and ultimately the King County Council. The question of context relative to the jobs/housing balance and the notion of looking at cities or larger areas, on the Eastside it is good to think about Bellevue as being the job center for the Eastside. That means the jurisdictions surrounding Bellevue do not have the same level of job growth compared to their residential growth. In some

ways, areas like Sammamish and Newcastle function along with Bellevue as the Eastside subregion. Considering the total Eastside jobs/housing balance were collectively addressed during the planning meetings. With regard to the job/housing balance policy, he said the 2006-2031 target was 53,000 jobs and 17,000 housing units for Bellevue, a 3.1:1 ratio, which is much higher than the new 2:1 ratio which is a reflection of the number of jobs known to be coming to the city and the need for more housing units.

Commissioner Bhargava said the jobs/housing ratio at the county level is very important in determining the regional mix. He asked if the splits established at the county level are based on current data or historical trends, and if all plans for investing in infrastructure is taken into account. Ms. Maskin said the splits are established in Vision 2050. The development of the regional growth strategy does consider how employment and housing are current distributed throughout the four-county region. Guided by policy, the percentage are reallocated among the four counties to account for spreading the economic wealth. Consideration was also given to improving the share of housing in King County. Commissioner Bhargava said he had hoped for a different answer, one outlining a bottoms up view to what is happening on the ground and in terms of trends and infrastructure investments all leading to a change in the baseline. The current trends do not always represent what is happening on the ground or what is projected to happen.

Commissioner Bhargava said it appears that the splits for the metro areas have a little more rationalization in terms of input from the cities and where the numbers need to be set. There has been a densification and a change in the jobs/housing ratio specific to Bellevue, and changes have been occurring to the housing stock in terms of townhomes and multifamily development, all of which is changing the density of the housing stock. The kinds of jobs being created and the kind of housing units desired in the city are also evolving. What is unclear is whether or not the changes will be adequate. Mr. King explained that Bellevue staff spent a fair amount of time working with Seattle and King County representatives, as well representatives of the core and other Eastside cities, focused on how to split up the control total and determining what that might mean for the Eastside as a whole. Permit activity was reviewed to adequately get a handle on the development that is coming in. A careful review of the housing numbers was made and the determination was made to increase them substantially. Bellevue advocated for adding another 8000 housing units to the initial number of 27,000. The metro cities ultimately exceeded the control totals for both jobs and housing.

Ms. Maskin added that one of the key inputs the jurisdictions considered in thinking about their growth targets was capacity. The King County Buildable Lands Report contains a lot of detail about capacity at different density levels.

Commissioner Bhargava asked if Bellevue's capacity is in line with the target of 35,000 housing units. Mr. King said the city's housing capacity is actually about 10,000 less than the target. Part of the work of the Commission will be to provide capacity for at least an additional 10,000 housing units.

Vice Chair Ferris referred to the statement made about the cities being required to take an inventory of housing, particularly around affordable housing and asked if that will only be required during the comprehensive plan update or on an annual basis. She also asked what kind of details will be associated with the inventory. Ms. Maskin said there is a stream of reporting outlined in the Countywide Planning Policies that have been updated. From time to time King County and the PSRC survey all jurisdictions for quantifying issues on the policy side, including an inventory of affordable housing units and the affordability level of the units. She said she could see the approach lining up against affordable housing need and goals.

Commissioner Moolgavkar noted that everyone is clearly concerned that the targets will meet the needs. She asked how good the various planning exercises have been in the past in terms of targets being met or exceeded. Ms. Maskin said PSRC has done a number of analyses in the past of forecasts and outcomes. She said the results have been generally been pretty good at the regional and county levels. The results vary greatest at the jurisdictional level but aggregately the mark has been hit.

Councilmember Robertson said she as a ~~King County GMPC~~ member, and Mayor Robinson as a member of the Affordable Housing Committee, ~~have~~ been very involved. The original growth targets were 54,000 jobs and 27,000 housing units. Bellevue looked at the jobs figures and concluded the city would blow through them by 2030 or so. The conclusion reached was that the target should be increased. In line with the increased number of jobs, the conclusion reached was that the housing target should be increased as well. The 2:1 balance is in line with the city's average of 2.4 persons per household. The delta of 10,000 housing units between what the city has capacity for currently and what is expected to be achieved by 2044 will have to be addressed by the Commission. Zoning changes in Wilburton and Bel-Red will cover about two-thirds to three-quarters of the total, but other strategies will need to be called into play. The Affordable Housing Committee will be reporting to the Growth Management Policy Council by the end of 2022 which likely will result in some new Countywide Planning Policies. Bellevue will be very engaged in the process. She said she expects Bellevue to ratify the Countywide Planning Policies. All four of the amendments proposed by Bellevue to the policies were ultimately adopted, and all of the amendments were in regard to housing, affordable housing and connection to jobs.

Deleted: PSRC

Deleted: Deputy

Deleted: has

With regard to the core cities, metro centers and regional centers, Councilmember Robertson said cities want the designation because it reflects the growth they see due to the investments they are making, and because it can drive investment from outside sources.

B. Discussion of Planning Commission Survey Results

Ms. Johnson stated that a survey was sent out to the Commissioners in advance of the retreat in December. The survey was filled out by most Commissioners, and support staff provided input relative to one question on the survey. The results were discussed at the retreat and intent was for staff to evaluate the feedback and report back to the Commission both on things that can be implemented easily and things that will take some additional discussion at the City Clerk and City Manager levels.

The survey questions focused on four primary areas: where the Commission is functioning well; improving Commission interaction; more effective staff support for the Commission; and improving interaction with the community.

The early wins identified by the Commission included implementing a consent calendar on the agenda, and utilizing the raise hand function rather than having the chair ask each Commissioner for comments and questions. The Commission also indicated a desire to have an improved resource guide, and the draft provided to the Commission generated some good feedback and comments. There were also requests to provide more context relative to complex issues, and to identify alternative viewpoints as staff brings forward their recommendations and analysis. Ms. Johnson explained that adding a consent calendar to the Commission's agenda would require making an amendment to the bylaws.

One suggestion made by the person who provided training on Roberts Rules of Order during the retreat was to not use detailed meeting minutes. There was good discussion of the pros and cons at the retreat. Ms. Johnson stressed that the city utilizes a consistent approach for all of its boards and commissions. Accordingly, all bodies, including the City Council, utilize detailed meeting minutes. Staff finds the detailed minutes helpful in following the Commission's discussions, and they provide additional information for the Chair when making presentations to the Council.

With regard to improving opportunities for public comment during the legislative review process, Ms. Johnson said there were comments made about ensuring opportunity for the public to offer feedback prior to the Commission making a formal recommendation. One option would be for the Commission to not make a recommendation during the same meeting at which a public hearing occurs. Deferring a recommendation to a future meeting is always an option for the Commission.

On the topic of how staff can better support the Commission, Ms. Johnson noted that the feedback was about providing background resources, training materials, background information on state law and planning mandates, and the decision criteria for legislative processes. The suggestion was also made to provide the Commission with the packet five days in advance of a meeting to allow more time for review.

Ms. Johnson stated that several items could easily be addressed, including the creation of a consent calendar for approval of meeting minutes, except where there are revisions to the minutes, and use of the raise hand function on Zoom to save time. She said the fairly extensive resource guide prepared by staff can be refined and simplified in response to a Commission suggestion. Staff will work to provide additional background information and briefings on complex topics. She said the staff will also work to identify alternate points of view for staff recommendations and analyses, but stressed that the staff recommendations must be based on the decision criteria spelled out in the code.

A fair amount of feedback was received about how to better engage with the public. Ms. Johnson said having an extended calendar will identify topics and additional meetings. Ensuring that the website is up to date will also further engagement opportunities. Staff tries to make sure new comments received from the public are forwarded to the Commissioners in a timely manner as they come in, and outlines the content during each meeting. Staff also seeks to respond to all public comments in a localized manner. There are multiple opportunities for public comment during the legislative and land use processes as required by code.

Commissioner Moolgavkar asked what the process is for updating the Commission's bylaws. Assistant City Attorney Matt McFarland said the last time the bylaws were amended it was at the direction of the city and it was done for all boards and commissions at the same time. The Commission was given some discretion, but many of the items were set in stone based on the Council's structure and procedure. The most efficient way to amend the Commission's bylaws in order to include a consent calendar would be to direct staff to bring it back as an agenda item. The Commission could then take action on that amendment. The issue is that the bylaws dictate following a certain order of business, thus the need to amend the bylaws in order to add a consent calendar to the order of business. He said staff could at the same time review the bylaws to determine if there are any additional improvements that could be made and bring any suggestions back at the same time.

On the topic of public process, Commissioner Moolgavkar said she was the one who raised the notion of simply having another meeting after a public hearing before making a

recommendation. She said it has not always been clear what the Commission was going to do in that regard. The process should be defined both for the Commission and for the public, and the best approach would be to always schedule a meeting to follow a public hearing at which to make the final recommendation, unless the additional meeting is determined to not be needed. Ms. Johnson said that can certainly be made clear in the staff reports and in the staff presentations.

Commissioner Goepple noted that there was a planned training session on the Open Public Meetings Act last year that did not occur. He said he would be very interested in having the training. The session focused on parliamentary procedure was very good and helpful. Ms. Johnson said she would look into scheduling a training session on the Open Public Meetings Act.

Commissioner Goepple supported going ahead with an action to revise the Commission's bylaws as suggested.

Commissioner Goepple said he was grappling with the issue of state mandates. He noted that over the past several months the Commission has been dealing with a number of mandates that were handed down by the state and trying to implement them through amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. A new state mandate is being considered as HB-1782 that deals with what should be included in single family areas. There are very thoughtful processes undertaken in regard to planning to reach various substantive goals, but the state mandates are curve balls that get thrown in, and they often upend planning processes and introduce uncertainty. Mr. King allowed that the Commission could benefit from an education session focused on the city's process for dealing with legislative agendas. He said there are a lot of staff tasked with reviewing bills as they come along. He agreed that bills do not always mesh with the Council-determined state legislative agenda. Pragmatically, the staff and legal team carefully review the state legislation that makes it through with an eye on how it can be implemented at the city level.

Councilmember Robertson said the Council has been following HB-1782. She said the Council annually adopts a legislative agenda that has is largely general, except for requests for certain funding. Local control is always an issue. The Council works with the city's government affairs director, the lobbyist, and the Association of Washington Cities in weighing in on legislation. Additionally, Councilmembers are often tasked with testifying in Olympia. When a new mandate comes down that requires local action, it typically comes first to the Council which imposes a short-term Interim Official Control. The Planning Commission is then called upon to develop the policy framework and documentation to implement the mandate. While it is always preferable to be proactive, it is often necessary to be reactive, and when the state hands down something that must be done, it must be done. She stressed that the Commission is never asked by the Council to weigh in on the legislative agenda, and Commissioners are never tasked with testifying at the state level.

Commissioner Bhargava commented that it is always a challenge for all Commissioners to be able to express their points of view with equal voices. He allowed that while it has not been much of an issue for the Commission, there is need to ensure that the process is fair. Having the Chair invite each Commissioner in turn to offer comments seems like a more equitable process than relying on the raise hand function. Ms. Johnson said the intent behind the suggestion to use the raise hand function was to more efficiently use the Commission's time by having the Chair call on each Commissioner individually.

Chair Malakoutian added that the raise hand function is a good approach to take, particularly with less complex topics, and especially in the second round of questions. The intent solely is to

bring efficiency to the process.

Vice Chair Ferris voiced support for the notion of reviewing the bylaws to see if any changes are warranted. She said if a consent calendar is added, it should include the meeting minutes as well as the approval of the agenda. If the Commission continues to use Zoom, even if it is a hybrid version at some point in the future, it would be good for the Commissioners to be able to see people's faces as they testify.

Commissioner Brown agreed with the comments made by Vice Chair Ferris.

Commissioner Morisseau said she would happily go along with the majority of the Commissioners, so long as any changes will make the Commission process more effective and equitable. She agreed with Commissioner Moolgavkar that there have been times when the Commission has been rushed into a process, and the result has been a disservice to the community. With regard to the meeting minutes, she commented that too often her comments have been taken out of context when summarizing them for the minutes. That is also a disservice to the public. If the minutes contained only the action items, someone wanting more information could go to the recording and listen to the entire conversation. Summary minutes do not necessarily convey the full concept of what was discussed. The current meeting minutes are several pages long and because they appear to be very thorough, many from the public might conclude that everything they need to know about what happened during the meeting is in the minutes. That is not always the case, which is why the recording is there. She agreed that the bylaws should be reviewed on a regular basis to determine if changes are needed.

Chair Malakoutian noted that a majority of the Commissioners had indicated support for reviewing the Commission's bylaws. Mr. McFarland said staff would conduct an internal audit of the bylaws. He also encouraged the Commissioners to look at the minutes and think about improvements that could be made. He stressed the need to check with the City Clerk's Office before making any changes. He said if the Commission wants to explore going to action minutes, the process will not be a bylaws amendment, rather it will require direction from the Commission to explore the approach and staff going to the City Clerk's Office and the City Manager's Office for their okay.

Mr. McFarland asked if the majority of Commissioners wanted to explore going to action minutes.

Chair Malakoutian said his preference was for the summary meeting minutes rather than action minutes. He said he has never gotten anything from the action minutes for the non-profit he is associated with.

Vice Chair Ferris concurred. She said the summary minutes give a lot of nuance that action minutes do not give.

Chair Malakoutian allowed that on more than one occasion the comments made by Commissioner Morisseau have been misquoted and had to be corrected in the meeting minutes. He said mistakes will be made as staff writes the summary minutes, but that is why the Commission has the opportunity to review and correct the minutes before approving them.

Commissioner Goepple said he was somewhat conflicted on the topic. He said he has in the past served as the secretary for a company board and with non-profits, none of which had detailed minutes like the committee has. He said one of the things he likes about the detailed minutes is

that reading them helps to refresh his memory of the previous discussions. The organizations that utilize action minutes often do so to avoid the chilling effect of people's willingness to engage in open dialog in the course of a meeting. Commission discussions will invariably involve differing views and having detailed minutes can discourage a more open dialog.

Commissioner Moolgavkar said she did not have a strong opinion either way. She said she was not sure reducing the meeting minutes would increase the Commission's efficiency in any way. The recommendation to utilize action minutes came from the expert presenter at the retreat. While it is something to think about, it may not be something that makes sense for the Commission. Having a consent calendar makes a lot of sense, and if there are issues with the meeting minutes, they can be removed from the consent calendar and addressed separately. At the same time, errors in the minutes could be flagged ahead of time, allowing for the minutes to be approved as part of the consent calendar. Unless there is a real need, the meeting minutes should be kept as they are. She added that she fully agreed with reviewing the bylaws generally.

Commissioner Brown said she also did not feel strongly either way. She stated that the Commissioners represent and act on behalf of the community and as such should be clear and transparent about what is discussed at Commission meetings. The minutes should reflect who said what so going forward it will be clear how decisions were reached. She said she did not know what risks might be associated with having detailed minutes.

Commissioner Bhargava said he also was all for transparency and for having detailed minutes. He said absent a best practice or a clear risk, the meeting minutes should be kept as they are.

Commissioner Morisseau said she had no issue with transparency. She said her point was that sometimes the minutes do not fully reflect what was discussed in the meeting, and someone reading the minutes could assume they are reading the gist of the conversation, when in reality it is not. She said that has happened to her several times. Someone who reads the detailed meeting minutes is not likely to take the time to go back and listen to the recording. Sometimes the meeting minutes do not reflect the facts and clarity. She reiterated that she would go along with the majority.

Mr. McFarland said by his count the majority of Commissioners were not interested in taking the step of shortening the meeting minutes to action minutes. He said he was not clear on what the presenter at the retreat was referring to when she raised the issue of risk. If the city were to be sued based on an action taken by the city, and if the Planning Commission meetings and actions taken by the Commission are part of the record, there would be a transcript prepared from the recording. That would be the most accurate possible reflection of what happened at the meeting. He said both detailed minutes and action minutes are okay from a legal standpoint so the Commission should not make decisions based on any worry about liability.

Commissioner Morisseau said she would continue doing what she has been doing, which is reading the packet materials carefully, including the meeting minutes, and making sure to call out where something needs to be changed to reflect what was discussed.

Chair Malakoutian suggested it should be made clear to the public that audio recordings of all Commission meetings are available and anyone wanting to know exactly what was said should listen to the recordings.

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (8:34 p.m.)

A. January 12, 2021

A motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Vice Chair Ferris. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Goeppele and the motion carried without dissent; Commissioner Moolgavkar abstained because she was not present at the meeting.

11. CONTINUED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None
(8:36 p.m.)

12. EXECUTIVE SESSION – None
(8:38 p.m.)

A motion adjourn was made by Commissioner Brown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Morisseau and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Malakoutian adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m.