Agenda
Planning Commission
Special Meeting
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Ben Haight, Chairman
November 26, 2019

I. ROLL CALL

Ben Haight, Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 7:03 p.m.

Commissioners present: Ben Haight, Chairman; Paul Voelckers, Vice Chairman; Michael LeVine, Nathaniel Dye, Ken Alper, Shannon Crossley, Dan Hickok, Travis Arndt

Commissioners absent:

Staff present: Alexandra Pierce, Acting CDD Director; Allison Eddins, Planner; Emily Wright, CBJ Legal Counsel

Assembly members: Greg Smith, Loren Jones

II. REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 29, 2019 DRAFT Minutes – Planning Commission Special Meeting

MOTION: *by Mr. LeVine to approve the October 29, 2019, Planning Commission Special Meeting minutes noting any staff corrections or Commissioner comments.*

The motion passed with no objection.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None

V. ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION - None

VI. CONSENT AGENDA - None

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

Applicant: City & Borough of Juneau
Case No.: AME2018 0007
Location: Borough-wide
Activity: Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Recommendations

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends several courses of action to remediate the Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee's issues with holding a quorum. Staff first recommends that they do not replace one of the two recent members of the Steering Committee who stepped down due to availability issues. Staff recommends replacing the second member with Iris Matthews, who has showed considerable interest in the Blueprint Downtown project. Lastly, staff recommends that the youth representative position, to be replaced by Thalia Gerber, be non-voting in order to increase the Steering Committee's ability to hold a quorum.

Discussion
Mr. LeVine stated that he did not support taking away the voting rights of the youth representative, and instead suggested to lower the number needed for a quorum.

Ms. Pierce said that she didn't think of it as taking away the youth representative's voting rights since they still took the youth's perspective into account. She was more concerned with youth's availability for attendance, since historically the youth representatives have been involved in other extracurricular activities which have interfered with attendance at Steering Committee meetings.

Mr. LeVine suggested having the Chair of the Steering Committee not count towards holding a quorum while retaining their ability to vote.

When asked what the official quorum rules are for the Steering Committee, Ms. Wright stated that the Steering Committee is able to manipulate the rules as they see fit.

Mr. Alper agreed with Mr. LeVine about the importance of retaining the voting rights of the youth member. He asked what the current quorum rules are.

Ms. Piece answered that the current rule requires seven members.

Mr. Voelckers stated that he is sympathetic to the issue but that he has served on boards before which have had issues with continuity of its members. He said that he isn't sure that retaining the youth's ability to vote is as important as the issues before the Steering Committee.

Mr. LeVine noted that there seems to be an issue with the process involved in the Steering Committee meetings, since they haven't had a quorum for the two most recent meetings.

Mr. Crossley asked for how long the Steering Committee meetings will continue.

Ms. Pierce answered that they would continue through the spring of 2020. She also stated that the lack of quorum is not due to a flaw in the process but instead due to the availability of three specific members. Those three members, the two previously identified and the previous youth representative, have since stepped down.

Ms. Crossley and Mr. Eiler both agreed that the youth representative should retain their voting rights.

Ms. Pierce stated that, realistically, the process might go on longer than the spring of 2020. She said that she would love to have a youth representative involved in the entirety of the process, and that she is hopeful there will be greater continuity for that position moving forward.

Mr. Dye posited that the Blueprint Downtown plan would be coming before the Planning Commission closer to the fall of 2020, so he did not consider the youth representative's role to be a short-term commitment. He stated that he was indifferent on the issue of retaining the youth representative's voting rights but that he is interested in its effects on the quorum requirements. He suggested reducing the size of the committee rather than lowering the quorum requirements.

Ms. Pierce admitted that the Steering Committee, with thirteen members as opposed to the usual seven to nine, is very large. In order to address the issue, staff recommend not filling one of the current vacant positions. She stressed that she felt it was important that Iris Matthews be able to participate in the process by filling the other vacant position, due to the high level of engagement she has already demonstrated. Ms. Pierce said that, had they not already started the process of accepting a new applicant, she would be more inclined not to replace both of the seats. She further stated that she was indifferent whether they retained the youth representative's ability to vote or whether they changed the quorum requirements, since the root issue is the size of the Steering Committee.

Mr. LeVine supported the Steering Committee in being able to decide their own quorum requirements.

Ms. Wright confirmed that this is within the ability of the Steering Committee.

<u>MOTION:</u> *by Mr. LeVine to confirm the Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee recommendations to appoint Ms. Matthews and Ms. Gerber, and to allow the Steering Committee to decide their own quorum requirements.*

The motion passed with no objection.

AME2019 0012:	A Text Amendment to adopt Juneau's Historic and Cultural Preservation Plan as part of the CBJ Comprehensive Plan.
Applicant:	City & Borough of Juneau
Location:	Borough-wide

<u>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</u>

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review and consider the draft *Historic and Cultural Preservation Plan* and recommend to the Assembly its adoption as an addendum to the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Presentation
Ms. Eddins first thanked the Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) for their input. She explained that, since the Historic and Cultural Preservation Plan was funded through a grant, the process is taking longer than it normally would if it had been funded through the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ).

Ms. Eddins said that she decided to organize the Preservation Plan into five components, taking into consideration the public's opinions. Each of these five components was prioritized for short-term and long-term. Her justification for where she placed each component was the logical order of operations in terms of which components must occur before the others can take place. The plan is intended to have a 20-year life span, with a check-in every two years to assess progress, and a reassessment of the plan at the ten year mark.

Ms. Eddins confirmed that the Preservation Plan, as drafted, does comply with the Comprehensive Plan. She recommends that it be adopted as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Eddins addressed the most recent edits to the Preservation Plan, which are as follows:

1. (Page 17) Staff added a fourth bullet point due to the critique that the Plan should include more financial incentives.
2. (Page 17) Staff did not add the suggested steps and tasks under the already present bullet points because they are already present in the plan.
3. (Page 20) Staff added a sentence to the right-hand column regarding design standards and guidelines. This was updated to include Native traditions and forms, including Native artwork in general, in order to be more honest about Juneau's past.

4. (Page 25) Staff did not move an action item from Goal Five to Goal Four as suggested because the subject matter of the action item more closely aligned with Goal Five.
5. (Page 25) Staff did not add suggested provisions for more technical and financial incentives under Goal Five, since those are outlined on page 38 under the Incentives and Benefits chapter.
6. (Page 34) Staff did not make a revision regarding the Title 69 tax, as there are no restrictions on the types of local properties to which it applies. Ms. Eddins noted that relevant information can be found online, but that the information is outdated.
7. (Page 38) Staff agreed with a critique that the Title 69 property tax should be more ambitious but didn't want to propose an arbitrary number. Staff intends to wait for more research on the subject before making a recommendation. Staff acknowledged Mr. Arndt's critique that this would make a better short-term goal than long-term. Staff noted that the ordinance, which was written in the 1990s, does not specify whether the tax rebate through Title 69 applies to any work done on properties to which it applies or whether the work must adhere to historic standards.
8. (Page 41) Staff added the Friends of the Juneau City Museum under the Education and Interpretation section.

Questions from Commissioners

Mr. Arndt asked if it would be possible to move the goal of making the Title 69 property tax more ambitious from long-term to short-term. All agree to this edit.

Mr. Eiler asked about the use of the phrase "provide checks and balances" under the section explaining the purpose of the Preservation Plan. He wondered what these "checks and balances" were intended to mean.

Ms. Eddins explained that this phrase was a direct quote from a public comment. She said that they were tempted to rephrase some public comments but ultimately decided against it. The phrase "checks and balances" refers to the plan's recommendation to update survey data, and to the internal tracking system which notifies the Community Development Department (CDD) whenever a building over 50 years old sits on a parcel being reviewed. This internal tracking system would insure against the demolition of a building with potentially historic value. This system also helps enforce the expectation that the CDD be given five days prior to the demolition of a historically significant building to photographically document it.

Mr. Arndt asked if someone wishing to demolish such a building would need a permit. He further asked how the public would know that they needed to notify the CDD five days prior.

Ms. Eddins stated that any significant demolition requires a demolition permit, and that therefore anyone following these requirements would inherently be notifying the CDD. She admitted that there are people who do not follow these requirements and that there is no way to enforce the documentation rules for demolition work under those conditions.

Mr. Dye suggested that it be made more obvious that the suggestions made on page 7 are at the request of the public.

Mr. Haight noted that, on page 8, there were originally six components. He wondered when it was reduced to five.

Ms. Eddins responded that the edit was made during an HRAC meeting, and that she would note this fact in the Preservation Plan.

Mr. Eiler asked about the rationale behind the inclusion of the history of the Douglas fire on page 14.

Mr. Eddins answered that the original intention was to include a complete history of Juneau in the Preservation Plan. Staff met with various stakeholders and discovered that there is not widespread agreement on what happened to the Douglas Indian Village. Staff and HRAC felt that both sides of the story should be mentioned in the Plan but that the Plan should not promote one version over the other. Staff pointed out that the Plan does recommend that the City pursue grant funding which would allow the history of the Douglas Indian Village to be further studied through written and oral accounts, interviews, and public listening sessions.

Ms. Crossley stated that this section of the Plan had been discussed at length during at least two HRAC meetings. Even internally, the HRAC members could not agree on what really happened to the Village, and whether the fire was accidental or intentional. The language that is in the Plan is what was agreed to and Ms. Crossley stated that she could recommend the Commission not change the language.

Mr. Voelckers agreed with Ms. Crossley and Ms. Eddins about the fact that the Juneau History section has gone through a process. He stated that he felt it important to honor the compromises and that he was comfortable with the language that had come out of those compromises.

Ms. Crossley reiterated that almost all of the sentences they have been discussing had been talked about for a very long time. She stressed that any changes at this point would be detrimental to the long process that they have gone through.

Mr. Haight recommended to leave the section as it is for the time being.

Ms. Crossley commented on the Array of Locally Funded and Managed Preservation Incentives on page 17, stating that she understood it had been recently added. She wondered if there was any discussion on concrete action towards the bullet point items. She suggested sub-grant programs as an example of possible action. She asked if there was a way to ensure that there are an array of incentives, as the section title states.

Ms. Eddins referred Ms. Crossley to the Incentives and Benefits chapter. She explained that the language of the section title refers to not only financial incentives, but also technical assistance incentives, and the plaque program to provide recognition, for example. She recognized, however, the desire for more financial incentives.

In reference to the Downtown Historic Design Review Process section on page 21, Mr. Eiler referenced the second box in the diagram which states "meeting is less than a week away," and asked Ms. Eddins what the timeline or goal that staff had for completion as outlined in the chart.

Ms. Eddins replied that there wasn't anything currently written in code but that the CDD's standard process is less than two weeks. She stated that the department's goal is to generally keep from slowing down the process more than that.

Mr. LeVine stated that he appreciate the staff's comments regarding the need for efficiency and cited his past experience working with the State Historic Preservation Office and the difficulties with efficiencies with that office. He praised the self-awareness regarding timeliness of the process and expressed his interest in planning out targeted timelines and goals.

Mr. Voelckers asked staff if there have been any cases of HRAC rejecting a project, or disagreeing with a project's goals, within the past year or two. He stated he knew of some similar issues in HRAC's past.

Ms. Eddins stated that things had been running fairly smoothly within HRAC recently. She provided a few examples of cases where HRAC had made recommendations for projects that ended in the projects ultimately being approved after the recommendations had been implemented.

Mr. Voelckers referenced the language near the bottom of the right column regarding amendments, and commented that he believed the language was too vague. He recommended being more straight-forward about HRAC's role.

Mr. Eiler expressed approval for the two middle bullet points on the right side of page 22 recognizing that current downtown historic design standards can be vague and it's not always easy to distinguish a standard from a guideline. He asked if it was possible to strengthen action items to address these issues.

Ms. Eddins agreed with Mr. Eiler that the difference between standards and guidelines could be clearer. She posited that staff could insert a section which would differentiate between them.

Mr. Voelckers agreed with Mr. Eiler about greater specificity. He noted that there wasn't a section that specifically talked about updating the current design standards.

Ms. Eddins agreed, but stated that separating the administration and management tools could become confusing. She did think that there was a place to add language to make it clearer that they are recommending updating the design standards. She noted that sometimes the quality of the language of a project that HRAC is asked to review creates difficulty. She stated that this section was attempting to establish some minimum standards in terms of what projects HRAC will accept for review. She referenced the difficulty inherent in asking HRAC for design recommendations on hand-drawn plans.

Ms. Crossley stated that she believed that the Preservation Program Administration Management Tools portion of the Preservation Plan is the most important. She recommended that both of Goal Six's actions be put in a near-term timeframe.

Mr. Eiler asked if the action item regarding adding historic neighborhoods to the national register was ready to move forward. He wondered if now was an appropriate time to progress with this action item while the Comprehensive Plan and the neighborhood plans were still being updated.

Ms. Pierce stated, regarding the Comprehensive Plan and the neighborhood plans, that the updates will elevate the new Comprehensive plan to a much higher level. The current Comprehensive Plan defers to the neighborhood area plans for topics like this. She stated that the intention behind the current rezoning project downtown is to preserve the integrity of the historic neighborhoods, rather than attempt to apply suburban zoning to historic houses as they did in the 1980s. She said she thought the CDD was supporting those processes by encouraging historic preservation. She also noted that adding historic neighborhoods to the national register did not necessarily entail design standards and guidelines being applied to those neighborhoods.

Regarding historic registered neighborhoods, Ms. Crossley noted that the downtown core is the only one that has design guidelines. She further noted that having your building on the national register allows you to qualify for grants and tax credits, as examples of some of the incentives. Buildings within the district may be changed in a way that takes away their historic features, but if enough buildings within a historic neighborhood become non-contributing to the historic character then the neighborhood is taken off the national register.

Ms. Eddins clarified that the Preservation Plan does not make any specific recommendations about which neighborhoods should be added to the national register. She said that, through the Blueprint Downtown process, staff realized that there was motivation within the community to preserve the historic character of the built environment. Recognizing that, the Preservation Plan recommends that the property owners and the public be engaged in a discussion about pursuing listing on the national register. This discussion would allow the community within the historic neighborhoods to decide if they would like to establish design standards to better ensure that the neighborhoods remain on the national register.

Ms. Crossley reiterated that she would like to make both of Goal Six's action items short-term rather than long-term.

Mr. Haight asked if Goal Four would be reworked and if it would have an action item added to it.

Ms. Eddins affirmed that she would add an action item under the second action item where she would specifically spell out the standards versus the guidelines based on the type of work being proposed for a building.

Ms. Alper noted a small typo on page 27: Silverbow Basin contained a "v" in place of a "b."

In reference to the first paragraph on page 28, Mr. Alper commented that the list of 24 historic properties only contains 23.

Ms. Eddins explains that the list had previously contained a lighthouse which was removed. She had accidentally interpreted the lighthouse as being within CBJ's boundaries. She stated that she would correct the list title.

Ms. Eiler asked if the Church of the Holy Trinity was still on the national register, despite having burned.

Ms. Eddins explained that the national register was unaware that the church burned. She admitted that staff should contact the national register and let them know.

Mr. Voelckers noted, regarding the color graph on page 30, that he didn't see any slides for 1870-1889. He asked if there were any or if it should be removed from the key.

Ms. Eddins replied that she believed it was the 1.48%.

Mr. Voelckers disagreed with this assessment.

Ms. Crossley remarked that, to her knowledge, it is correct that there are no buildings which have any vestige before 1890. She pointed out an old tenement house as the oldest-documented building.

Ms. Eddins said that she would double-check her information and make sure the chart was correct.

Mr. Arndt asked if, on page 34, they were working on that outer value as a later page item.

Ms. Crossley replied that if it was in 1997, with inflation, it would be $32 thousand.

Mr. Voelckers asked if that paragraph might have some language that tied it to ongoing analysis of potential additional CBJ incentive grants.

Ms. Eddins affirmed that it did.

Referencing Preservation Incentives and Benefits on page 38, Mr. Eiler reiterated his earlier comment that he isn't sure the Preservation Plan goes far enough making reforms and addressing the issues regarding renovating historic buildings.

Ms. Crossley asked if CBJ has looked at federal funding and a sub-grant program as a potential preservation incentive.

Ms. Eddins replied that she has not, beyond researching the subjects.

Mr. Voelckers tied the Planning Commission's comments and questions regarding greater action and funding on these topics back to the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) discussed earlier in the evening during the Committee of the Whole meeting. He stated that one of their action items was to encourage the assembly develop a process to incentivize development downtown. He suggested adding the term "per historic district standards and guidelines" or something similar to the CIP narrative to create a dynamic process.

Ms. Pierce reiterated that staff haven't done any work on the sub-grant piece beyond initial research. She stated that the Plans are living documents and can be updated, and that when they look at new programs or initiatives, they look at their plans to see if anything supports or conflicts. Everything in this plan supports finding new opportunities for funding and new programs that can help finance historic preservation. She said that even though it's not spelled out specifically because staff haven't had the time to research it, it's consistent with the spirit of the plan and the plan would be used as a justification to pursue such projects.

Ms. Crossley spoke up on behalf of local funding rather than federal funding. She stated that the local historic guidelines and historic districts are more lenient than the Secretary of Rehabilitation's standards. Federal funding is available but the funds must be matched by the community. She encouraged CBJ and the Planning Commission to work together to create a local sub-grant program that would adhere to the local standards which have already been set regarding building materials and proportions, for example. She expressed concern regarding potential difficulties adhering to federal design standards and the bureaucratic processes inherently involved.

Public Testimony
Doreen Lorenz - 2823 Marsha Avenue, Member of HRAC

Ms. Lorenz stated she wished to speak on behalf of the Preservation Plan being adopted, focusing on the economic benefits of cultural heritage tourism. She informed the Planning Commission that the National Trust for Historic Preservation finds that 80% of domestic tourists travel to have an “authentic experience,” part of which is the aesthetics and culture of place. She claimed that cultural tourists spend 60% more than the average traveler and stay longer. She argued that it economically benefits Juneau to maintain its historic buildings.

Ms. Lorenz argued that it is difficult for a cultural tourist to find information regarding Juneau’s historically significant sites online. She stated that she has worked in historic preservation across the country, and cited her experience regarding attaining historic preservation tax credit grant. She stated that it’s 20% and the minimum buy-in is $5 thousand. She said that once one person in a neighborhood receives the grant, it tends to encourage others in the neighborhood to do the same; the end result is a neighborhood which is well-maintained.

Ms. Lorenz stated that she strongly supports adopting the Preservation Plan as a part of the Comprehensive Plan. She emphasized the importance of its role in retaining historic buildings in Juneau. She also thanked staff for their efforts during a difficult, and oftentimes contentious, process.

Discussion

Mr. LeVine asked about how to best address the comments and suggestions made, since the Planning Commission did not have a list of them. He said he would support a broad motion referencing the suggestions made by the Commission.

Ms. Pierce stated that all staff present had been keeping notes regarding the suggestions.

Ms. Crossley asked, for clarification, if Mr. LeVine meant that the Planning Commission should vote to adopt the Preservation Plan and bring it before the Assembly pending the small changes already mentioned.

Mr. LeVine clarified that his question was whether, if the Planning Commission was going to make a motion to recommend adoption, they needed to list all of the changes in that motion. He said it sounded as though staff did not think that was necessary, with which he agreed.

Mr. Eiler commended staff for an ambitious and substantial plan. He commented, regarding the time frames within the plan, that he encouraged staff to revisit the action items which will require more difficult work. He referenced the interior of Gross Alaska and the Bergman as examples of current buildings which are in danger, as well as the Gastineau Apartments as an example of a historic building which has already been lost. He encouraged staff to look internally to ensure maximum efficiency regarding reviewing and clarifying standards or enhancing tax credits which could assist in maintaining the more problematic historic buildings. He stated that he was hoping that, by looking internally before reaching out for new projects, the plan would help preserve Juneau's assets.

Ms. Crossley pointed out that there was a previous Preservation Plan from 1996 which wasn't adopted. She reiterated that having a Preservation Plan in place has been the will of Juneau for a long time.

MOTION: *by Mr. LeVine to recommend to the Assembly to adopt* AME2019 0012 and approve it with Directors analysis and findings.

The motion passed with no objection.

IX. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

X. OTHER BUSINESS

XI. STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Pierce reported that Jack Scholz joined the Community Development Department several weeks prior to the meeting, after having previously worked for the State of Alaska Department of Law. He has an English degree and is well-versed in the administrative duties involved in the job; Ms. Pierce expressed that the CDD is happy to have him and looks forward to working with him in the future. She noted that it was gracious of him to step in to take minutes while sick, for the period he was able.

Ms. Pierce reminded the Commissioners that the APA Conference is occurring on the second weekend in February in Anchorage. She stated that she knew Ms. Crossley had expressed interested in attending and requested that anyone else interested in attending contact staff.

Commissioner training will be held at one of the January meetings, most likely the 28th. The date is not, however, finalized. The December 17th meeting has been canceled.

Ms. Voelckers commented on the training opportunity in Anchorage, stating that all of the Commissioners who have participated in the past have felt that the training was informative and a good use of time and energy.

XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ms. Crossley reported that she sat in on a Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee work session where they were unable to reach a quorum. Despite the presentation from staff, since it was not technically a meeting of the Committee she had nothing to report.

Mr. Dye reported that he similarly attended a Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee work session where they were unable to hold a meeting due to not having a quorum.

Mr. Haight reported that the results of the CIP Committee meeting he attended had already been discussed.

XIII. LIAISON REPORTS

Mr. Smith reported that the Assembly had its first regular meeting the day prior, on November 25th, since the Planning Commission last met. The biggest issue which arose was that the Assembly did not allow the Manager to negotiate the sale of a few pieces of land related to the Mendenhall Loop construction project. The project would have put a few roundabouts on the Mendenhall Loop, one of which would be at Stephen Richards Drive in front of Floyd Dryden Middle School, some medians, and some work on the multi-use paths. Mr. Smith states that the Manager is actively looking for a way to progress the project.

Ms. Crossley stated that, in a past Planning Commission meeting, there had been some contention from some of the Commissioners regarding one of the roundabouts proposed in the construction project plans, since the intersection involved had been remodeled recently. Ms. Crossley asked if similar critiques had been discussed during the Assembly meeting the previous night.

Mr. Smith remarked that he understood that the Stephen Richards roundabout had been the one to cause contention among the Planning Commissioners and that the intersection had been remodeled within the past five years. He admitted that this was a point raised at the Assembly meeting, and for this and other reasons the Assembly voted not to allow the Manager to move forward with the negotiation of the transfer of land to the State for this project.

Mr. Voelckers asked if anyone from the Department of Transportation (DOT) was present at the deliberations, and if they offered any comment or input on the process.

Ms. Smith said that no, there was no one present from DOT. He stated that there was also no one from Lands & Resources. He said that he thought the general public understanding was that this would not be a contentious issue.

Mr. Alper stated that there was a decent board turnout at the Municipal League Conference last week and asked if there was anything Mr. Smith could report from that.

Mr. Smith stated that a number of the Assembly members were at the Municipal League Conference, as well as Alaska Municipal League (AML) officials from municipal government across the state, elected officials, clerks, attorneys, managers, and finance officials. He reported Assembly members Jones and Hale were on the AML board, and that a packet of 35 resolutions were moved forward. The resolution topics included emergency preparedness, ferry service funding, school bond net reimbursement, etc. He stated that there were discussions regarding how the municipality should cope with, and plan for, the uncertainty of the State budget and the vetoes that have come from Governor Dunleavy. Regarding the online remote sales tax commission, Mr. Smith reported that Mr. Rogers, CBJ's Finance Director, is the chair, and that Ketchikan had also signed onto the commission.

Mr. Smith stated that he had heard from CBJ's clerks that the non-conforming ordinance is planned for the December 9th Assembly Committee of the Whole meeting. In the Human Resources Committee, they set a date to review the five candidates to the Planning Commission, set for December 18th at 5:30 p.m. The Assembly reviewed the questions that will be sent to the Planning Commission candidates, which had been sent to Mr. LeVine. Mr. Smith asked if the rest of the Planning Commission had any interest in seeing those questions.

Mr. LeVine affirmed that Mr. Smith sent him the interview questions for the Planning Commission candidates. He stated that the questions had remained unchanged since Mr. Voelckers submitted his application but was not sure whether they were the same questions Mr. Haight had answered during his application to the Planning Commission. He expressed confidence in the majority of the questions, but suggested that next year's Planning Commission discuss the questions. He noted that he thought the list of questions lacked a question asking about applicants views on diversity and its value in the decision making process. He suggested replacing one of the nine current questions with a new diversity-focused question rather than simply adding it.

XIV. <u>CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS</u>

XV. <u>PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS</u>

XVI. <u>EXECUTIVE SESSION</u>

XVII. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.