

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee

November 17, 2009

City Hall, Bertha Knight Landes Room

600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98124

MEETING SUMMARY

Prepared by Triangle Associates, Inc.

ATTENDANCE

✓ In attendance, □ Not in attendance, X Excused absence

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee Members			
Last	First	Affiliation/Neighborhood	In Attendance?
Ashkenazy	Boaz	At Large/Wedgewood	✓
Bailey	Adrienne	Central Area District Council/Central Area	✓
Coney	John	Magnolia-Queen Anne District Council/Queen Anne, Magnolia	✓
Coxley	Christie	Southeast District Council/Rainier Beach	✓
Edwards	Judith	Greater Duwamish District Council/North Beacon Hill	✓
Hale	Jeannie	Northeast District Council/ Laurelhurst	✓
Harris	Ashley	Ballard District Council/Ballard	✓
Knapton	Kay	Seattle Planning Commission	X
Leighton	Amalia	Seattle Planning Commission	✓
Meeks	Sharonn	Southwest District Council/West Seattle	✓
Oien	Heidi	At Large/Capitol Hill	✓
Ramirez	Maria	Delridge District Council/Delridge	□
Saxman	Dennis	East District Council/Capitol Hill	✓
Stanford	Catherine	Downtown District Council	X
Miller	David	North District Council/Pinehurst	□
Stineback	Kate	At Large	✓
Thaler	Toby	Lake Union District Council/Fremont	✓
Vergis Vinh	Diana	At Large	□
Wall	Irene	City Neighborhood Council Neighborhood Planning Committee/Phinney Ridge	✓

Alternates			
Last	First	Alternate for	In Attendance?
Barker	Cindi	City Neighborhood Council Neighborhood Planning Committee/Phinney Ridge	✓
Benjamin	Craig	Ballard District Council/Ballard	□
Brower	Josh	Seattle Planning Commission	□
Counts	George	Magnolia-Queen Anne District Council/Queen Anne, Magnolia	□
Hinrix	Robert	Greater Duwamish District Council/North Beacon Hill	□
Joncas	Kate	Downtown District Council	□
Lathromp	Denise	Council Alternate/Morgan Junction	✓
Lee	Mona	Southeast District Council/Rainier Beach	□
McAftertey	Blayne	Northwest District Council	□
Melo	Sandra	Delridge District Council/Delridge	□
Ramey	Brian	Lake Union District Council/Eastlake	□
Wainwright	Mark	Southwest District Council/West Seattle	□

Project Team/Other City of Seattle			
Last	First	Organization	In Attendance?
Bicknell	Lyle	Department of Planning and Development	✓
Kern	Michael	Triangle Associates	✓
Nolte	Dan	Councilmember Clark's Office	✓
Tenna	Sebhat	Department of Neighborhoods	✓
Trask	Blake	Triangle Associates	✓
Whittemore	Thomas	Department of Neighborhoods	✓

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee (NPAC) Co-Chairs opened the meeting, welcomed members and led a round of introductions. The facilitator reviewed the agenda and meeting materials (available from the Committee's website). A Co-Chair asked for consensus approval of the October 20 and 27, 2009 meeting summaries (available from the website).

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee
November 17, 2009
MEETING SUMMARY

Because the Committee was not in consensus, it was moved and seconded to approve the October 20 and 27, 2009 meeting summaries. The motion carried with 10 members in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstaining. The Co-Chairs then reviewed the revised strategy and schedule they developed in response to a November 5, 2009 letter from the City Council Planning, Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee (PLUNC) Chair indicating that NPAC will not meet after December 31, 2009 (available from the website). That strategy includes adding an NPAC meeting on December 1, the date on which a poll of members indicated NPAC was most likely to achieve a quorum. Draft agendas for both December meetings were provided (see website).

ROUND-ROBIN DISCUSSION

Noting the news about 2010 and that NPAC had just completed its co-hosting of the second round of Status Report Open Houses, a Co-Chair asked NPAC members to go around the table and offer any quick observations and/or comments they had to share about these or other topics. Several Committee members noted that the public outreach and advertising for the Open Houses appeared inadequate, given the generally low neighborhood turnout rates. In several cases (Greenwood/Phinney, Wallingford, Belltown) no neighborhood residents attended the Open Houses. In many other neighborhood breakout sessions, attendance was considerably lower than the first round of Open Houses. Other reasons offered by Committee members for the low turnout included the poor weather, that the venues were difficult to access (e.g., construction and difficult driveway access), and that the Open Houses were scheduled on days that competed with other community meetings.

Many Committee members offered observations on the content of the Open Houses and subsequent breakout sessions. Some noted that because of participants' relative inexperience with Neighborhood Planning, much of the facilitated sessions focused more on education about the process, and less about review of the neighborhood Status Reports. One Committee member noted that the objectives of the Open Houses felt unclear. Another observed that the Open Houses did not make a strong enough connection to the Neighborhood Plans. Some members noted that they facilitated substantive conversations about neighborhood planning. One NPAC member noted that participants were pleased that comments submitted to DPD in the previous open house had been placed verbatim in the Status Reports. Another member said that Central Area participants felt that their comments were not adequately represented.

NPAC members also commented on the online surveys that the Seattle Planning Commission used to supplement input from the first round of open houses and that DPD is using to supplement input from the second round. Several members questioned whether the online surveys offered an adequate replacement for in-person participation, noting that it is not possible to verify if online respondents are filling out more than one survey or if they actually live or own businesses in the neighborhoods they are commenting on. They also said that online participation could disadvantage residents who face technology or language barriers. DPD reported that 790 online surveys have been filled out to date for the second round of open houses.

Several members reported that some Open House participants were confused by the Adoption and Approval (A&A) matrix exercise, and upset that they had such a short time to review such large and detailed spreadsheets. One member noted that the formatting of the A&A matrices was a problem for printing out, making the document inaccessible to many. A Co-Chair clarified that the matrices provided at the open houses were not in fact the original A&A matrices, but were print outs from a database created by DPD to track activity on subtasks and projects in the original A&A matrices. That implementation database was removed for the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) website in 2008. The 11" x 17" reports, created for the Open Houses, were only modified to show the "No Status" projects up front. No content was modified by the

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee
November 17, 2009
MEETING SUMMARY

Co-Chair or her alternate. The original A&A matrices are still available via PDF, but are difficult to sort and evaluate. Other Committee members noted that some participants took the matrices home for further review.

A Co-Chair requested that NPAC members who had hosted tables at the open houses send their notes to her, so that NPAC can develop a record of the second round of Open Houses beyond the dot exercise the City conducted. These notes may help inform the letter that will accompany NPAC's recommendations to the City Council.

Several members expressed disappointment in the letter from the PLUNC Chair regarding a lack of funding for the Committee in 2010. These members said NPAC will not be able to accomplish its work successfully by the end of 2009. They also said ending NPAC this year is not consistent with the resolution and ordinance that created NPAC, nor with living up to the obligation NPAC members have to their communities to provide recommendations that inform neighborhood plan updates. One NPAC member said that the letter provided an inadequate explanation of the decision.

A staff member from the PLUNC Chair's office indicated that the Chair was not able to restore funding for NPAC that was left out of the Executive's proposed budget during a very difficult budget year, but has discussed with DPD the idea of finding discretionary funding to allow NPAC to hold two additional meetings in early 2010. While the Councilmember works to acquire this funding, she still requests that NPAC retain its current timeline to provide work products by the end of 2009. The two 2010 meetings could be used to refine these documents. A Co-Chair noted that the Co-Chairs have been asked to provide an update on NPAC at the December 9 PLUNC meeting.

Neighborhood Plan Update Subcommittee Report

The Subcommittee Leads provided an overview of the Neighborhood Plan Update Subcommittee's activities and its revised November 14 report (available from the website). He outlined the three sections of the report: (1) General Philosophies, (2) Recommendations, and (3) a Checklist of Topics for Stakeholders Involved in Neighborhood Plan Review and Revisions to Consider. The Subcommittee Lead explained that he recently solicited comments from NPAC members. While the Subcommittee did not have a chance to meet before this meeting, it revised its draft report with input from Subcommittee members, and distributed the draft to the entire Committee last week.

The Subcommittee Leads moved and seconded that the Subcommittee report be adopted by NPAC. The Co-Chairs called for discussion on the report and the motion. Several NPAC members said that the report needed further refinement before adoption. Several members raised specific concerns. Other members expressed frustration that these concerns had not been raised when the Subcommittee requested comments and edits. They noted that NPAC faces a tight timeline and that members need to respond to the subcommittees prior to full Committee meetings to effectively use meeting time for discussion and approval of Subcommittee reports. One NPAC member expressed concern that an over-reliance on email could cause problems for those with unreliable computer access.

The Subcommittee Leads noted that they were amenable to comments about the report, and to considering friendly amendments to their motion. Committee members then raised a number of concerns about the content of the Subcommittee report, and proposed a series of revisions, most of which were accepted as friendly amendments to the motion. During the discussion, it was moved and seconded to amend the original motion to separate out for a vote Section I (General

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee
November 17, 2009
MEETING SUMMARY

Philosophy) of the Subcommittee's report, as amended at the meeting. The motion failed with 3 members in favor, 11 against and 1 abstention.

After further discussion and friendly amendments, the Subcommittee Leads revised their motion, moving and seconding that NPAC adopt Sections I (General Philosophy) and II (Recommendations) of the Neighborhood Plan Update Subcommittee's Report, as revised at the meeting by a series of friendly amendments, with the understanding that language referring to design review and incentive zoning in Section II needs to be rewritten by the Subcommittee and provided to NPAC for review. The motion carried with 9 members in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstaining.

The Subcommittee noted that it would meet on Tuesday, November 24 to revise paragraph #7 of Section II and to revise Section III for future consideration by NPAC. All NPAC members were invited to attend that Subcommittee meeting.

Public comment

No public comments were provided at the meeting.

Next Steps/Final Thoughts

The facilitator reviewed topics identified for the December 1 agenda and asked members to forward any additional items. The Co-Chairs explained (at the meeting and in an email sent out prior to it) that a Subcommittee will draft recommended general selection criteria for neighborhoods to receive neighborhood plan updates. These criteria will be used to inform NPAC's discussion on December 1 regarding recommendations for the two neighborhoods to receive updates in 2010, and on December 15 regarding recommendations for neighborhoods beyond 2010. The Co-Chair thanked the members for their participation and adjourned the meeting. The Committee's next meeting will be Tuesday, December 1, 2009 at 6:15 pm in the Bertha Knight Landes Room at City Hall.