

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Good evening, my name is Hope Cahan, and I'm chair of the planning commission. On behalf of the entire planning commission, I'd like to welcome you to the planning commission public hearing of Wednesday, March 7, 2012. Please, remember to turn off your cell phones. The parking ticket validation machine is for the garage under City Hall is located at the rear of the chambers. If you want to address the commission, fill out a speaker card located on the table by the door on the parking validation table at the back, and at the bottom of the stairs near the audio/visual technician. Deposit the completed card in the back. Please, include the agenda item number, not the file number, for reference. For example, put 4-a, not pd-06-023. The procedure for this hearing is as follows, after the staff report, applicants and appellants may make a presentation. The chair will call out names on the submitted speaker cards in the order received. As your name is called, line up in front of the microphone at the front of the chambers. Each speaker will have two minutes. After the public testimony, the applicant and appellant may make closing remarks for an additional five minutes. Response to commissioner's questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance. The public hearing will then be closed, and the planning commission will take action on the item. The commission may ask for a response from the public testimony, ask staff questions, and discuss the item. If you challenge these decisions in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at this public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the city at or prior to this public hearing. The planning commission's actions on zoning, rezoning, general amendments and code amendments is only advisable to City Council. The City Council may hold public hearings on these items. Okay, for roll call, all commissioners are present except commissioner Platten and Kamkar. Deferrals. Heard first on the matter of deferral. A risk of staff-recommended deferrals is available on the press table. Staff will provide an update on the items as to what referral is being requested. If you want to speak to the question of deferring these or any other items, you should say so at this time. Okay, deferral item 1-a, staff?

>> This is a conditional use permit to allow off-sale of alcohol, 24-hour use, and retail use for an existing gas station on a 0.39-gross-acre site in the district located on the Southwest corner of woodard road and union avenue. This project is exempt from CEQA.

>> Okay, thank you. And we have no speakers on this item. So I will entertain a motion from the commission. Motion to approve from commissioner Bit-Badal and the second from commissioner job. Defer.

>> Motion to defer.

>> Thank you. All right, we have a motion and a second to defer the item. All in favor, any opposed? Motion to defer the item 1-a passes. Consent calendar, we have nothing on consent calendar, so we'll move on to item three, public hearing. Staff for 3-a?

>> Thank you, madam chair. This is rezoning from the ip industrial park zoning district to the apd planning development zoning district to allow for the development of a 450 multi-family attached residential project with the density of 55 dwelling units per acre consistent with the goals and politics of the general plan. The general plan growth major strategy as the site is located within the North San José area, identified as a growth area of the general plan. The zoning is also consistent with the North San José area development policy and the North San José urban design guidelines, which both shape and support the identity of North San José as a pedestrian and transit-oriented business center that's connected by neighborhoods that support the job growth. This project would provide high-density residential within that area. Revised development standards were handed out at the beginning of the meeting. Minor revisions were made to the setbacks to further clarify where the setbacks were measured to and from. Additional changes were made to the building height, to also further clarify that, but it was brought to my attention at the beginning of this meeting that more clarification can even be provided than what you have in front of you. The design guidelines provide basically for a one to one ratio or 50-foot setback would be a 50-foot height limit, so we're proposing to change that height limit at the Eastern property line adjacent to the existing residential units to be 50 feet tall at a 50-foot setback, then what the remainder of project going up to 120 feet, per the guidelines. Finally, this project was covered through an addendum to the North San José area development policy's update program environmental impact report. It was prepared by the director of planning, building, and enforcement for rezoning and based on the analysis for the addendum, the city concludes the final program adequately addresses the environmental effects of the proposed project and this project would not result in significant environmental impacts not already identified in that final program, therefore, staff recommends to find the projects in conformance with the environmental quality act and recommend approval of the rezoning with the proposed changes to the development standards. This concludes staff report.

>> Thank you. Okay, I do have a few speaker cards on this, so we will have the applicant first for five minutes. You'll have an additional five-minute opportunity after the speaker cards have gone through for two minutes each. If you'll state your name as you begin.

>> Jerad cahan and members of the planning commission, I represent the urban company, I don't have many remarks, I'll be available afterwards. We've read the staff report, and we're in agreement with the findings, the conditions, and the changes that have been suggested tonight, we're fine with that. Also, the term sheet with regard of the development agreement, we reviewed that, we're in agreement with that. I want to point out, too, specific components of that, one is the affordable housing fee, we're contributing \$8.8 million for affordable housing fees, that's \$2 million more than what's required, and as some of you know in terms of the previous projects, no fees were paid, we're agreeing to pay the required fees, plus an additional \$2 million for projects within the city. In addition, the term sheet indicates parking fees, adjacent to this project is a project we're working on now, crescent village, we're improving that site with the required amenities, that's very near this site, so staff and I are recommending the fees be paid, which is about \$9.4 million. It would be our urging the city use that for the park site, which is nearby, for the improvement of that site, and also potentially for separation of that site. We believe that would be the best use of the funds and also a constraint for the community that additional park sites be done in the area. The company's made major investments in the North San José area. As I indicated, we're now building a 1,750 residential unit project nearby called crescent village. That's a major investment in terms of our resources, plus, it created about 830 construction jobs. So with the approval of this project, we'll be able to finish that project and begin this project right away. We appreciate your consideration and urge your support and our project team is here if you have anymore specific questions, but we'll be available afterwards, thank you.

>> Thank you. I see no questions, so we'll move on to our speaker cards. If you will line up, Jim Fran, Mike bentrom, and David cooke. Okay, remember to state your name before you begin your presentation. You will have two minutes each.

>> Good evening, planning commissioners. My name is Jim. I represent the parkside home owners association, the direct neighbors to this project. Our board and on behalf of our association, objects to the zoning as written -- zoning change as written on four grounds. One, development standards state the setback from the Eastern property line is 50 feet. Developer's plan developed in cooperation with the neighborhood association, which we commend the developer for, shows 60 feet, and we request that the development standards be amended to call out 60-foot setback, as shown on the plan. And we further request the change in zoning be conditioned on the 60-foot setback and 55-foot height limit, adjacent to our property. Number two, access be provided to the coyote creek trail on the levy on the North side of the site, internal documents showed that staff determined that residents would have existing access to the trail nearby. The only access to the trail nearby is the ramp at the rear of our site. That site is only accessed through private property, it is not open to the general public, and the staff has also stated so in refusing to sign it for other residents. Of the area. So we request the separate access be constructed on this site and would like to see that be a public access so that the residents of the crescent village and other complexes would also be able to access the levy without trespassing through our property. Number three, ask all construction traffic access should be from the West and not passing directly in front of the homes of our residents, which face directly on to river oaks parkway.

>> Thank you, your time is up. Thank you very much.

>> Hi, my name is Mike, good evening. I am a resident along the border in parkside immediately adjacent to the site in question, and I'm also Vice President of the river oaks neighborhood association. I want to thank h&H and working issues with us. Other than the general concern that we have that the developments along river oaks parkway are tremendously overbuilt for the capacity of the road, which we brought up previously, our major concern with this particular site is the height differential along the border between the two properties of the right now we have three story buildings, they are proposing five-story buildings very close to us. We'd like to see a story off along the border or turn some of the alcoves so there's breaks between us and the massive wall we're going to be facing. The second major point is we want to strongly encourage that as part of this project that the -- that moneys be put towards the development and maintenance of the park behind the essex project. It's our understanding Irvine has offered up money for the planning process, which we encourage to happen as soon

as possible, and they also offered up money that could be used for the construction and maintenance of a park -- the park that's currently behind Essex. I'm understanding that park is basically stuck because of city financials. We're losing the park that was originally intended where Cisco was going to convert to residential, so we're losing that park. We lost the park that was originally supposed to be there along River Oaks Parkway. We think we should have a park for the community. There's one planned, but the financials are a problem. This gives a solution to that. I'd also like to state that we back the idea of having public access to the public trail along the Levy. Right now it's -- there's no close access, and we think there should be community access to that public trail.

>> Thank you. Thank you, your time is up. Thank you.

>> Good evening, Planning Commission. My name is David Cooke. I'm a resident of Naglee Park, resident of San José, and also volunteer for the Audubon Society. We're concerned about the repair, which you can see clearly on the map, it's a major corridor for animals to move, to nest, it's the last place for them to live in a city area, so we're very, very concerned about the implementation of the repair corridor policy the city of San José has, and this is a very important wildlife area, and so that would call for certain limitations on the types of use near the creek and would allow the animals to exist with the people, so we're asking that the city implement this river corridor policy as part of their plan, including the setbacks and use limitations in the area near the creek, and we'd also like maybe for some of you to visit the Blue Heron Rookery, a nest site for the blue herons, which is in that very area. Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you. Okay, Mr. Miller?

>> Thank you. Just a couple of comments on some of the issues that the community brought up. The access to the Levy, we have no problem allowing public access, the problem is the water district has prohibited accessing it from that Levy, so if that can be worked out, we're okay with that, so we'll cooperate with city staff and water district in any way on that. Again, we'll work with the community on the height issue. Clearly, we're trying to deal with achieving the density acquired by the city and the buffering of the area between the existing community that's there now and what we're trying to do, but we have different alternatives that we can work with in the

final architectural, work with the community, work with the city staff, trying to achieve both goals, and I think we've come a long way in our meetings with the home owner's association and will continue to work with them on that. With that, I have no other comments other than any questions you may have.

>> Commissioner bit-badal does have a question for you, Mr. Miller.

>> Hi, how are you going to be addressing the corridor question? Would you please address that?

>> Again, we'll meet city requirements on that. Tom, can you come up and maybe address that?

>> Tom Armstrong with the engineer entitlement. The city policy is very clear of what the definition is and isn't of a repairing corridor, also, the policy has never been approved by the City Council. The director of planning can comment on that or the attorney's office, but there is no approved policy, but in spite of that, the staff report is very clear on the way that is interpreted, which we're consistent with, which is when there's manmade engineer filled, which is the levy, which is compacted to 98%, a piece of concrete, that doesn't qualify as a corridor. Also, we did provide information and did look and measure to the true corridor that is on the far side of the levy, that Green there that's shown, that's a lot of scrub and flatland that's cleaned out by the water district periodically to maintain the high flow. There's a low-flow channel on the far side, against the other bank on the Eastern side, which is the corridor in that area. The rest of it is the floodplain bypass, and the city policy, that's not adopted, recognizes that is not a corridor, so I would defer to the planning director to maybe infill that from the city's perspective, but the staff report's very clear that we're consistent with what's interpreted as the policy.

>> Okay, we'll get clarification on that right now.

>> Tom is correct, there is no policy, but the strategy, which was adopted by the council, which does have the 100-foot, and Tom is correct when you go through and look at 100 feet as measured from the project site, you end up into the river side of the levy, but it is the levy and not the floor of the floodplain, so the repairing setback is essentially the levy and the fire lane that is running on the back side of the project. We do look at the permit stage

about the landscaping that goes along those edges to use repairing-Type planting, using sycamores as opposed to redwoods and stuff like that, California sycamores as opposed to the London plain tree, the type of shrubs and ground cover, so it's repairing friendly, but the levy itself functions as a concrete structure, so it is one of those quirky areas about the strategy itself.

>> Commissioner Abelite?

>> Maybe I can ask him quick, on the new street, which is off on the left side, you know, normally you would see like a -- like a bulb at the end for a cul-de-sac turn around, but that's just a straight dead end one. Can you give me background as to why that is like that?

>> We worked with public works and public transportation, but the mutual agreement between the staff, applicant, and D.O.T. Folks is we were going to provide the zoning for our public right away, which is half the street, the rest immediately West of us, so there would be a street, a minor street because of the home owners associations around us were concerned that would turn into a major thoroughfare, so we will build the first segment of it that will wrap around, essentially, and go West over towards cisco street or boulevard -- cisco way, I should know that. That would be a minor connection around the back there, and it does not connect to where river oaks tees into the other street. The idea was to discourage cut-through traffic or anything else, so the portion that's shown to us is more or less a holding spot on our property, and it will function as essentially our drive aisle for now. That's why it's odd looking towards the back, but there's been layouts done where that will curve over to cisco way potentially.

>> Got it, okay. Quick question on the term sheet, I'm just curious, the term sheet talks about the second \$2 million payment, and it's triggered by the certificate of occupancy. That's a large project, is it the first C.O., the last one, I'm just curious.

>> First, usually when we do these things it's a big chunk at one time, it's the first C. Of O., that's how we interpret it.

>> Just curious, okay. That's good, I'm clear.

>> Okay, appears we have no further questions, thank you. Commissioner Kline? Looked like maybe you were going to do a motion there.

>> You said question of staff, any information on access of levy for a public, what kind of limitations are there and what does this provide?

>> Commissioner Kline, I would love to entertain the motion to close public hearing before we --

>> Motion to close the hearing.

>> All in favor? Great, and now commissioner Kline, your question.

>> Ditto.

>> So the water district does control what goes on the levy itself, it's their facility. In the past they have not allowed us to go build physical improvements on it, so as you heard from the applicant, that's one of the things we'd have to work out. There are places where there's access ramps that move up and down, so if they are able to bring vehicles up the side of the levy and then back down into the floodplain area, so there's not one planned right in this -- at least this side of the levy that you can see on the site plan in the grading plan on the river side, there actually is those ramps that go down, so that's one of the things we'd have to work with the water district, would they allow some Earth work to essentially build a ramp up on the levy itself, which means we also have to deal with the Army corps of engineers as one of their regulatory facilities, so the goal is there, and I think it's going to be a matter of working through what the water district and core approves --

>> Anything to prevent that in the future?

>> No, that's one of the reasons the staff wanted the access road on the property line and the applicant was willing to add that into their plans, as it provides an opportunity and is one of the things as we go through the development permit to see how we could preserve access rights across on that land, including the ability to put some fill in.

>> Thanks.

>> Staff, do you have further comments?

>> Thank you, madam chair. Staff has no additional comments, we concur with what the director said and applicant in response to the public's comments.

>> One little bit of housekeeping, I think we called the zoning item but not the development agreement item, though we did take testimony and had discussion around it. We should first vote on the zoning and formally introduce the development agreement and take a separate vote on that.

>> Thank you. Commissioner Abelite.

>> I still have one more question and that is to do with the zoning requirements, they talk about the bicycle parking policy as amended. I'm just curious what that means.

>> Thank you, madam chair. We're specifically calling out the current code requirements for bicycle parking. We add the "As amended" so if this were changed in the future to require more and come back, they'd be under the current code at all times.

>> Okay, I would like the record to show the commissioner platten is with us now. Okay, I will entertain a motion on this item. Commissioner Abelite?

>> We do separate motions for each piece, right? Okay, I'd like to go ahead and make a motion to consider the addendum to the North San José development policy's update and accordance with ceqa from ip, industrial park zoning district, to the apd district to allow for the development of up to 450 multi-family attached residential units, as recommended by staff, and as recommended by staff. Thanks.

>> Okay, we have a comment -- oh, I just wanted a quick clarification on the rezoning. It's to the ippd, not the apd, so I believe there's a typo on some of the materials that were submitted to you, but I heard in the verbal staff report that the recommended rezoning is to the ippd zoning district.

>> I'll amend my motion to reflect those comments. Also, I'd like to do a clarification to the motion, I'd like to fold into the motion the proposed development standards that were revised on March 7th that were just handed out to the commission, and with also the setback verbal comments that I heard that for 50 feet back from the adjoining property, residential equals to a 50-foot vertical height limitation. It was a clarification we heard in the staff report. Thank you.

>> That's acceptable.

>> Okay, great. We have a motion and a second. And I see no further discussion on the item, and certainly I feel more comfortable now that I know the company is willing to work with the neighborhood, with the height and architecture, and that the access is going to be worked on as well with staff. So we will now take a vote. Okay, motion passes with all commissioners present voting in favor of. And now we'll move on to 3-2 -- 3-a2. Okay, we will open public hearing. I don't have speaker cards for that specifically, but just in case, it was a little confusing. Would anyone like to speak on that? Okay, I see no one coming forward. I have a motion to close public hearing and a second, all in favor? Any opposed or abstaining? Okay, so we will close public hearing. Staff, do you have any further comment?

>> No, but I would just add that we did include the term sheet, the city attorney and city staff are continuing to work on the formal development agreement itself, but it is based on what you saw in the term sheet, those are the structure in the agreement with Irvine, and as you did hear from Mr. Miller, the reason we are doing a development agreement is that this project has offered to make a substantial contribution for affordable housing that other apartment communities have not been subject to in the city of San José, related to court case about two years ago called the plumber case, they are willing to meet the normal requirement that existed previously, as well as the \$2 million you heard also mentioned, that is what fits with the council action to amend the North San José area development policy to consider trading or reallocating affordable units in North San José to market rate in exchange for substantial contribution to the affordable housing fund, which will allow the city to build affordable housing in other projects. It is one that's a little different than we've done in the past, but it is one of the purposes of development agreement, to reflect those types of contributions.

>> Commissioner Abelite?

>> Yes, I'd like to make a motion to consider the addendum to the North San José development policy's updated eir in accordance with ceqa and a consideration of an ordinance to approve a development agreement with river oaks -- with river oaks San José, llc, known as the Irvine company, to reallocate 150 units from affordable rate to market rate unites in the development policy area subject to performance by iac for payment of contributions, commencement of construction, and subsequent occupancy for deadlines of performance, as recommended by staff.

>> Okay, we have a motion and a second. I see no further discussions, so we will take a vote on the matter. Okay, and that passes with all commissioners present voting in favor of it. All right, now we'll move on to 3-b. Staff?

>> Thank you. This is an ordinance that -- I have to make sure I get the right one in front of me. All right, so the proposed ordinance is the long-awaited streamlining of the off-sale Capitol process, the commission has asked for us to be able to do this for quite some time. The council has pleaded with staff to be able to bring this forward,

so this is now finally coming forward. We apologize for the delay with it, but the focus on this, or the real structure, is to treat off-sale alcohol like a rezoning. The position to force a denial, even where it was a logical reason to support the off-sale license, so in this case, now the planning commission will be able to go and consider the full merits of the off-sale request and be able to make a recommendation to the City Council for their decision on it, which allows the commission to consider it straight-up rather than in an appeal circumstance. It eliminates the applicant from having to appeal their own permit, so we think it's a much more business-friendly streamlined process, so looking for the planning commission's support.

>> Okay, and we have no speaker cards on the item. Motion to close public hearing? With a second. All in favor? Okay, motion passes. Staff, any followup to that? Okay. Yes, we do --

>> I would note there is a small envelope of determinations of public convenience and necessity that the planning commission currently can make and that was not removed from the commission jurisdiction, so to the extent these four factual findings could be made, your current jurisdiction hasn't changed, so it's only where you couldn't make the required findings rather than go through the additional process of an appeal that it automatically you become a recommending body and it moves to the City Council without having an appeal, but your current jurisdiction was not taken away.

>> Great, thank you for that clarification. Okay, commissioner bit-badal.

>> Thank you, chair. I would like to put a motion to approve as recommended by staff.

>> Second.

>> Okay, we have a motion to approve, and a second. I see no further discussions, so we will vote by light. Okay, and that motion passes with all commissioners present voting in favor of. Moving on to 3-c. Staff?

>> Thank you. This ordinance revises the downtown zoning district to eliminate the ground floor retail in most locations in the downtown. The current regulations, there are just designated streets that require active retail uses be allowed. This was the result of the dot-com boom when everything available was filled with office space. With the current downturn in the economy, the city is really interested in having active retail still, but the council really wants to make sure that having the lights on with people in the spaces are more important than having nobody waiting for the perfect tenant, so we are bringing forward this ordinance that would relax the standards for downtown, allow office uses in, and as the markets warm up, we antiCIPate those pressures will push office uses back down and retail will move back into those spaces.

>> Okay, and I have no speaker cards on that either. Motion to close public hearing, and a second. All in favor? Okay, commissioner bit-badal.

>> Thank you, madam chair. I do have a question to ask, how often will we review this process, what do you antiCIPate?

>> There was some discussion about making this only a two-year type ordinance, but in the end the council said to just make it a change, and it's one that just like the original ordinance came as a result of there being a perceived problem, I think that's how it will end up getting handled. It's not something that staff will be putting on a list to come look at on a yearly basis, I think it will be when the downtown community say we're having challenges of getting retail and restaurants into spaces, and let's go revisit the question.

>> I do have concerns with that, because when we do not review the process, we let it go, and what happens is we have to come back and change the policy several years later, and by that time it's a little too late because the damage has been done. I know in other smaller cities they are having the same issues, they relaxed the ordinance -- I don't have the issue with the ordinance, by the way, or the proposal. My only issue is if we're not really reviewing it on a yearly or every two-year process, seeing how it's affected our downtown, because I do not want to see our downtown turn into just first floor all office spaces where people have their windows shut and blacked out the area, as bad as having empty storefronts, so with that, I would put a motion forward to

approve as recommended with staff with an addition amendment of requesting staff to review the policy every two years or to see how it's affecting the downtown. I don't know if that can happen.

>> So I don't know if it would provide you additional comfort, but it's not, in terms of the scope, it's not a wide opening of the flood gates, and it's not in the corner spaces, but rather the interior spots. So I just wanted to note that it's not a -- if -- I'm sure you did look at the ordinance, it's an incremental step to try and provide a little bit more flexibility in this economy, but to your point, I think persons at the city share that concern, which is why it's not a grand wide opening of those flood gates.

>> Absolutely, and I wouldn't want the staff to come to the planning commission meeting to let us know. I think it would be sufficient if they went back to the economic development committee to the city to give them a report every two years as to how the progress of this is progressing. Director?

>> The commission can certainly recommend to the City Council as part of the ordinance of the concern, and that's what we would share, and that there should be some review of it, and then the council would decide how they would like to do monitoring or if they wanted to have monitoring on it. That would be my recommendation how to proceed.

>> Thank you, that is my motion with requesting City Council to review the process. In two years.

>> Commissioner Abelite?

>> To be clear, the motion isn't really modifying the zoning ordinance that's before us, just an additional recommendation that's not embedded in the ordinance. If that's true, I'll go ahead and second the motion.

>> That's correct.

>> Okay, we have a motion and a second. And I see no further discussions, so we will vote by light. And that motion passes with all commissioners present in favor. Petitions and communications. Public comments to the planning commission on non-agenda items. Please, fill out a speaker's card and give it to the technician. Each member of the public may address the commission up to three minutes. The commission cannot take any formal action without the item properly placed on the agenda. At this point, we don't have anyone in the public, so I'm not worried about that. Referrals from City Council, boards, commissions, or other agencies.

>> None that I'm aware of.

>> Okay.

>> It's been quiet.

>> Good and welfare, report from City Council.

>> Let's see, next week, on the 20th, is when most of the land-use items are coming forward for council consideration. I will note that the almaden ranch project, we received an E.I.R. appeal, and the council would look to be scheduling that appeal -- yeah, the appeal hearing on the 20th of March. And then -- sorry. The Morris road -- Morris street residential project was approved by council last week, and units approved by the planning commission, dealt with a little bit of street issues, and in a council yesterday, the council did approve the fraternity house. No comments on the project as the commission reviewed it. We did have the applicant note the same comments he made here at the planning commission related to suburban parking standards in our zoning code, and that's something that needs to be looked at. The council did not do anything with the project or those comments, but it is one of the things that we continue to look at and we'll be bringing forward to the commission. More zoning changes related to parking, just as we've done previously to kind of keep moving ourselves into kind of the new world. I think that is it from actions at the council. That's right, the off-sale alcohol was approved yesterday by the City Council. There was another one -- the last of the denials going through under the old process with the council, so the council was very supportive of the request for off-sale at that

market. There was one question about what is a full-service market, is it the scale or the product that's actually available there, and the council also improved the industrial ordinance you saw at your last meeting, so that's been now approved by the council.

>> Thank you. Commissioners' report from committees, the Norman Y. Mineta San José international airport noise advisory committee has not met. Review and approve synopses from February 8th, we'll do that first, then February 22, 2012. Okay, commissioner platten, did you have an opportunity to review that meeting?

>> I did not. I will be abstaining.

>> Okay, great, thank you. So commissioner bit-badal?

>> Move to approve synopsis for February 8th.

>> Okay, motion and a second for the February 8th synopsis. All in favor -- opposed, and we have one abstention from commissioner platten. Moving on to the February 22, 2012 synopsis, and I will be abstaining from that one. Motion to approve and a second. Commissioner platten, did you have any -- okay, thank you. Okay. All in favor, okay, any opposed? And I'm abstaining. Okay, subcommittee formation, reports, and outstanding business. Seeing none, commission calendar and study sessions.

>> Staff was wondering if the planning commission was interested in additional follow-up on capital improvement program. We did the one session in January that several of the planning commissioners were able to attend, but in getting ready for the may 2nd study session on the capital improvement program, we're working to go through and help kind of demystify that document and better connect it to the general plan itself and the public works director and the other departments are willing to walk through the individual pieces of the CIP and how it's put together, what data they use to assess where the needs are and where the future improvements should be, if that is of interest to the planning commission, we could schedule that. It's one that I do want to make sure that we have attendance at, just kind of the logistics of pulling that together in fairness to the other departments.

>> Did you have a date in mind?

>> Did not have a specific date in mind with that, so it's really if there was a date that worked for -- to have a quorum of the commission, I'd work to schedule it on that date.

>> My suggestion would be to go with an April date if we were going to move forward with that. Commissioner Kline?

>> I recall last year we were talking that any type of study session would actually be incorporated into the actual meeting itself and the study session would not be as useful as expanding the normal meetings and having it here in this hall and doing the study session while we do a normal meeting. I think that's what we decided actually, didn't we? We just -- I think we should book it as part of the normal meeting and if it goes late, it goes late.

>> Okay.

>> That's what we discussed. I'm not saying that's a motion or anything.

>> Commissioner Abelite?

>> I think there was concern about holding staff over, you know, into the late night, not necessarily planning staff, but, you know, D.O.T. people or public transportation, all those guys, which aren't used to maybe working this late. I think that was part of the conversation as well.

>> Just a little bit of a comment, sorry, chair, when we did have the meeting on the 25th, that was one of the things we were talking about is that is it beneficial to move it into the regular 6:30 session and put it as the first item on the agenda versus the last item on the agenda, I think that allows us to go and bring the community in too that may be interested on a given area, members from other commissions that are interested in participating too,

and it allows it to be more time-specific, time-certain, so we can go through and look at the April 11th date and see if there's a chunk of that that we could put on that's maybe an hour-long chunk for the commission.

>> So looking at the 11th or the 25th to see which one is the lighter agenda load so that we don't hold over the general public. I think it's a good idea to do it at the beginning so that we can have our other staff members aren't having to sit through the entire agenda and that also we have public that's able to come and hear that first. Commissioner Kline?

>> How much in advance will we get the CIP before that meeting, and will we have an opportunity to send questions to staff before the meeting itself, not to have responses, but have staff prepared so we don't blind side them with a question that would be easy to look up if not done in a meeting like this?

>> I do not know the distribution date for the budget document coming out. I know it's published through the budget process, so I'll have Laurel shoot a meeting out to the commission with that information, and we do appreciate if there's a question you have to shoot it in, so we can make sure it gets to the right department so that they are prepared to answer that question at the meeting, that all the commission has the benefit of that answer.

>> That's great. It's just not too useful to get a CIP document two, three days before the meeting.

>> That is part of the rationale of staff to make the discussion a year-round discussion rather than a one-hour discussion, that way it allows it to be better.

>> Thank you.

>> Okay, so I don't see any further discussion on that, but it does sound like we'll continue to having that on one of our April agenda meetings, shooting for April 11th first, if that's an appropriate meeting for that. Okay. Okay, so with that, I'll take a motion to adjourn. Motion and a second, all in favor. Okay, we are adjourned.