

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
June 2, 2009
7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers*
1017 Middlefield Rd
Redwood City, CA
Ph: 650-780-7233
Accessible to Disabled

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioner Borgens, Commissioner Cronin, Commissioner Gee, Commissioner Holt, Commissioner Seybert, Commissioner Smith, and Chair Radcliffe

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Principal Planner Passanisi, Assistant City Attorney Aranda, Planning Manager Ekas, Planning Secretary Mateo

GUESTS: Lisa Brownfield – Hogle-Ireland

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED: For further information not contained in this draft of the written minutes, an audio cassette and DVD recording of the entire meeting is available for listening or purchase at the Planning office, located in City Hall, Redwood City.

AGENDA POSTED: Copies of the Agenda for this meeting are posted at City Hall on the Friday prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

1. ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR: None

5. HISTORIC RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HRAC) INTERVIEWS

6. REVIEW OF DRAFT NEW GENERAL PLAN

Lisa Brownfield of Hogle-Ireland gave a PowerPoint on the following:

Redwood City New General Plan/Draft General Plan: *Introduction, Natural Resources Element and Public Safety Element*

Meeting Objectives

- Update
- Climate Action Plan
- Review Draft Elements
- Respond to Questions
- Receive Comments

- Peek into the Future

Climate Action Plan

Beth Ross, Environmental Initiatives Manager, noted one of her responsibilities was to work together with the community and Staff on the development of a Climate Action Plan. She discussed the Climate Action Advisory Team, the process underway for creating the plan and content of the plan. Some components of the plan discussed by the team included:

- Community education and empowerment, motivation measures for community members to participate in sustainability.
- What can be done to be more energy efficient in the built environment both at home and in the workplace?
- Alternatives for transportation and discussion of how to address the food system by buying locally, supporting community gardens and efforts at schools.

What is a General Plan

-State required, long range planning tool

-Guides:

- What City looks and feel like
- How and where live
- How get around
- What is done for fun, entertainment, enlightenment
- How live with and preserve natural resources
- How improve quality of life

General Plan Elements

-Introduction

- Built Environment
- Housing
- Building Community aka Quality of Life

-Public Safety

-Natural Resources

- Implementation Matrix
- Glossary
-

Elements' Content

-Introduction

-Vision

-Subject

- Technical Summary
- Issues
- Goals, Policies, Programs

Review

- Policy Focus
- Forward test and editing changes to Tom Passanisi
- Review Log

Introduction

- Our Guiding Principles and Vision
- Redwood City's New General Plan
- A Community Effort
- Our Context for Planning
- Realizing Our Vision

Introduction: Guiding Principles

- Plan for **sustainability** within our finite resources including but not limited to open space, water, energy, and air quality
- Ensure that change harmonizes with the existing development to **preserve our historic and neighborhood character**
- **Strengthen economic vitality** to provide jobs, services, revenues and opportunities
- Preserve and generate **awareness of** our cultural, educational, economic, and recreational **diversity** and historic heritage
- Partner with and **embrace our neighborhoods** to improve the health, safety, and well being for all in our community
- Continue to make **community participation** an important part of achieving a greater city.
- Work to develop attractive convenient **transportation alternative** to the automobile, including a unique transportation hub and ferry system.
- Design for **active pedestrian** and **bicycle-friendly** streets and public spaces.

Introduction: Redwood City's New General Plan

- Describes Elements
- Defines Key Terms
- Highlights Sustainability Focus and Symbol
- General Plan Usage

Introduction: Community Effort

- General Plan committee
- Affinity Groups
- Neighborhood Outreach
- Citywide Workshops
- Committees, Commissions
- Website

Introduction: Planning Context

- Geographical Context
- Planning Area
- Reference Documents

Natural Resources

- Introduction
- Vision
- Water Resources
- Energy Conservation
- Natural Habitat and Open Space
- Urban Forest

- Agricultural

Natural Resources: Water Resources

-Issues

- Dependent on limited imported water
- Groundwater not viable: quality, limited quantity
- Desalination not viable: cost, energy intensive, waste
- Maximizing recycled water usage

Natural Resources: Water Resources – with map

-Ensuring adequate, equitably priced, sustainable water supply for RWC users.

- Contractual Water Supply Assurance
- Expanding recycled water use
- New water sources

Natural Resources: Water Resources

-Reducing water consumption

- Low usage appliances/fixtures
- Landscaping
- Other conservation

-Land use/water supply planning

- Adequate water for new development
- New development funding
- Water supply/usage studies and monitoring
- Public participation

Natural Resources: Energy Conservation

-Issues:

- Most energy consumed generated from non-renewable sources
- Limited passive solar design usage
- Light pollution – over illumination

Natural Resources: Habitat & Open Space

-Protect, restore, maintain creeks and streams

- Limit construction activities near creeks/streams to protect water quality
- Daylighting of culverted creeks
- Promote natural stream function
- Preserve riparian vegetation that shades creeks and provides habitat

Natural Resources: Habitat & Open Space

-Preserve and enhance baylands, natural wetlands, and ecosystems

- New development doesn't encroach into bayland habitat, minimized environmental damage, nor create wildlife access barriers
- Restore tidal flats, marshes and salt marshes
- Work w/others to restore Bair Island and Area H Bayfront lands
- Allow public access to bayfront open space for recreation activities while protecting ecosystems and minimizing damage
- Reduce urban runoff into Bay

Natural Resources: Habitat & Open Space

-Identify, protect, restore open space, resources, habitat that support wildlife communities

- Protect sensitive biological resources
- Preserve and create contiguous wildlife habitat and movement corridors
- Replace/control non-native vegetation and animals in parks and open space areas
- Enhance fisheries habitat and restore access for native fishes in creeks

Natural Resources: Urban Forest

-Issues:

- Need for improved public awareness about urban forest benefits
- Inappropriate tree selection
- Poor tree care practice by untrained trimmers and residents

Natural Resources: Urban Forest

-Enhance number and health of trees in public and private lands

- Tree planting programs & ordinance
- Appropriate trees – native and landmark
- Education, outreach for planting and maintenance

Natural Resources: Agriculture – Salt Harvesting

-Salt harvesting provides a regional natural resource

- Recognized salt harvesting as viable long-term use
- Use tax incentives to maintain harvesting operations

Commissioner Borgens asked for clarifications on the Goals and Policies since it was her understanding that they were going to remove the Cargill property from the General Plan discussion with the understanding that it was part of the existing land use. She noted that giving this a goal and program implementation, the general public may misunderstand this as the Planning Commission is making decisions.

Mrs. Ekas stated what was discussed with the consulting team, and in keeping with the City Council's direction, the parcel was noted but no land use designations have been changed on the Cargill property. It has two designations at this time: 1) Open Reserve, 2) Open Space Preservation. Staff was directed by the Council not to change these designations for the sake of the General Plan but to acknowledge their location and what occurs there at the present time as far as land use. Acknowledgement was also made of an application which was coming down the pike, with more on that will come to light at a future date after the General Plan. She reiterated this was not new policy or policy decision-making on the Cargill site. They would, however, be interested in hearing comments.

Commissioner Borgens stated her issue was in the fact that they are recognizing that salt harvesting is already done on this property. However, she did not want it to be misinterpreted as an establishment of long-range policies for the site.

Chair Radcliffe asked if this section indeed spelled out what is already in place.

Mrs. Ekas stated they would double-check and compare this to the policies they have in the documentation at present. She noted the land use element, which was part of the

Built Environment chapter, had the definition for an Urban Reserve which was taken word-for-word from the 1990 General Plan. The other portion marked as Open Space Preservation.

Ms. Brownfield stated in the Land Use chapters they combined the two. She reiterated these two sections in the wording were brought for untouched. She stated, with the salt harvesting language, they had been instructed to describe what was happening today. She stated they ultimately could change some of this language to make it more transparent.

Commissioner Cronin stated he was pleased to see the information on Urban Forestry and its developments. He asked that more focus be placed on Urban Forestry in private land use as well.

Commissioner Seybert stated, since the current General Plan was adopted in 1990, there had been a number of significant Amendments made to it. He noted Land Use needed consideration as they moved forward with the new General Plan. The Cargill lands are part of that land. He stated the information coming forward described things in their present state but did not preclude the fact that after the adoption of the New General Plan, Amendments could be considered for the new General Plan by due process.

Mr. Passanisi stated when a project is proposed for the Cargill land sites, the project will be examined, and the possibility of a General Plan Amendment approval existed. Until then, the uses remained the same as they did in 1990.

Commissioner Seybert noted, throughout the General Plan process, there was always the difficulty in reading it in bite-size pieces without getting confused by the overall bigger picture.

Commissioner Gee agreed they needed to focus, but not over-focus, on each element of the General Plan as it came forth. If they spent too much time on each piece, word-smithing and the like, the discussions will go in circles.

Mrs. Ekas directed the Commission to a section of the current General Plan regarding open space elements, Chapter 9, Policy 5, in that the City should maintain existing tidal plane Zoning in those Bayfront areas which are/or can be used for salt harvesting, shell dredging or other types of mineral extraction.

Chair Radcliffe noted the Tree Board was not mentioned along with the City Trees group in the Urban Forest section of the draft General Plan.

Commissioner Seybert suggested the addition of more language on what can be done in conserving energy, such as policies or goals that may relate to the reduction of automobile use.

Commissioner Smith suggested the addition of quantifiable goals or benchmarks in defining sustainability, which becomes difficult when talking about vehicles and emissions. He noted the importance of finding a way to track the City's reduction in greenhouse gas admissions as more and more developments become sustainable. He

asked if there were any planned strategies for promoting the reduction of water and energy from the existing housing stocks.

Ms. Brownfield stated the way it was currently written, all the tools exist for quantification in outside documentation such as the Climate Action Plan and others. She noted intensive studies go along with these measures and tracking which take place outside the General Plan process.

Commissioner Smith was not looking for specifics; however, he noted there were some elements they should look at and consider as their base initiatives.

Ms. Brownfield asked if there were additional items in this regard that he might suggest, specifically. If so, she asked him to forward these to Mr. Passanisi.

Commissioner Smith noted items such as water conservation, decibel levels, and some additional items which he will forward to Mr. Passanisi.

Commissioner Holt spoke to the energy conservations as well. Specifically, with regard to the Energy Conservation Ordinance, she noted the timeframe for this was immediate. She asked for clarification on this, and where the timeline for this would be set forth and who follows up to be sure these measures are underway.

Ms. Brownfield clarified there were three to four (3-4) different classifications for the term immediate, with regard to when something is scheduled to begin.

- Immediate – within a 2- to 30-year time period.
- Short-term – within a 3- 5-year time period
- Mid-range – within a 5- to 10-year time period
- Long-range – within 10 years or beyond

Ongoing items were occurring at the present and were to continue. This made the energy conservation items scheduled to occur within the next two to three (2-3) years. She stated yearly reports from Staff would verify how things were comparing to the General Plan goals. She noted the implementation matrix within the General Plan would include a table and would also go to City Staff as a spreadsheet file in order that the implementation matrix can begin department-by-department.

Commissioner Cronin asked for clarification of the Urban Water Management Plan which he felt was out of synch since it current measures dating back to 2005 with new numbers not expected until 2010.

Ms. Brownfield stated when Staff looked at the build-out numbers for the new General Plan, these were theoretical numbers. She noted these theoretical numbers were set high, with also market fluctuations taken into account as the plan is implemented. She stressed that General Plans never build out to what they initially state since these theoretical numbers are set quite high. Discrepancies may exist as the plan is worked through, but it was unlikely that the City would attain the high build-out numbers during the period of time prior to the New Water Management Plan taking place in 2110.

Mrs. Ekas stated in the existing General Plan the water supply did not support the build-out of the 1990 General Plan. She stated there was no significant change in the City's situation, which is that the City needs to monitor their water supply and usage on an

annual basis, and adhere to the five-year updates of the Urban Water Management Plan. She noted this next Urban Water Management Plan update was due in 2010. An implementation program would be included in the Land Use and Urban Form element of the New General Plan in order to do high-level monitoring of the water supply and usage rates for the City.

Commissioner Gee noted the importance of tying the General Plan elements together as well as noting any implementation plans that will be necessary to meet the plan goals. He also noted there were no policy statements for the Privately-owned creek. He looked for consistency in the creek banks as per the Ordinance.

Ms. Brownfield policies dictated to the Ordinance and not the reverse.

Commissioner Smith stated any components or a checklist would be helpful in monitoring sustainability which could include progress, timelines and enforcement possibilities for continued progress.

Ms. Brownfield stated it had been drafted thus far as a table with a list of programs with columns listing the different implementation agencies and a list or columns for time periods. This was the current draft as a checklist. She stated an additional column could be added for those items that were completed.

Mr. Passanisi noted the Fire Department and Police Department had representatives in attendance as they moved on to discuss the Public Safety aspects of the New General Plan.

Ms. Brownfield gave a PowerPoint on the following:

Public Safety

- Introduction
- Vision
- Atmosphere and Climate
- Hazards Management
- Noise

Public Safety: Atmosphere and Climate

-Issues:

- Good air quality contributes to good health
- Per AB 32, need to establish an emissions baseline conditions, and develop policies to reduce carbon emissions
- Low-level coastal lands may be prone to flooding as sea levels rise

Public Safety: Atmosphere & Climate

-Maintain good local air quality & minimize impacts to sensitive receptors

- Minimize vehicle emissions: rideshare, streetcar, alternative transportation, compact urban form
- Integrate air quality, sea-level rise, land use, economic, and transportation planning
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions: green building ordinances, green energy generation projects, urban forestation

- Avoid sensitive uses near Port, industrial uses, and high volume roads
- Sensitive receptor location criteria & construction features

Public Safety: Hazards Management – with map

-Issues:

- Lowland areas, former tidal flats potential for liquefaction
- Hillsides risk of slope failure and fire hazard
- Industrial activity potential for contaminated sites and HAZMAT release
- Potential for high lead levels along US101, El Camino, and Woodside
- Airport – Influence Zones in RWC

Public Safety: Hazards Management – with map

-Minimize damage and potential from earthquakes, geological hazards, flood

- Abatement districts
- Geotechnical analysis
- Codes/Mapping/Planning
- Public Education

Public Safety: Hazards Management

-Maintain high levels of emergency response

- Inter-jurisdictional cooperation
- Alternative water for fire fighting
- Public education

Public Safety: Noise – with map

-Issues:

- City can use land use planning to minimize most significant noise source – traffic
- Mixed use districts and neighborhoods have distinctly different noise conditions and expectations
- Industrial uses and port uses have noise levels that are generally incompatible with residentially related uses

Public Safety: Noise

-Minimize point source noise & ambient noise

- Noise standards specific to land use type and urban form
- Site design standards: parking locations, ingrees/egress
- Building design
- Inter-jurisdictional cooperation – PUC, San Carlos Airport
- Monitoring

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Seybert asked for consistent language regarding the distance ranges for sensitive receptor areas. He suggested a goal or policy for Public Safety in that the City will continue to maintain the highest level of equipment, technology and resources for the City's Police and Fire Departments. He noted this included affordable and accessible housing for the Public Safety employees.

Commissioner Smith suggested inclusion of building designs and mixed uses in order to keep some of City's interior decibel levels down. In addition to monitoring gang activity, he noted the highlighting of youth programs was also important. He noted the importance of hearing from both the Police and Fire Departments for further input.

Ms. Brownfield stated both the Police and Fire Departments had reviewed the draft.

Commissioner Gee asked if there was consideration of doing an updated soil profile of the entire City, since pockets of serpentine exist, and he did not see that in the draft of the New General Plan.

Ms. Brownfield stated this was, and was not, beyond the scope of the General Plan. She stated Staff would take a look at how to include this with regards to the Safety elements of the General Plan. She noted usually a soil map is included.

Commissioner Gee he noted there was language with regard to updating the levies, but he did not see that this was to occur in a timely fashion to avoid or mitigate Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) initiative to label Redwood Shores as a Flood Zone.

Commissioner Cronin asked for clarification on the mention of the establishment of buffer zones in addition to creek setback requirements for storm water and creek protection.

Commissioner Seybert asked if there was a way to have someone read through the draft and find terms with which to build a glossary to the document.

Ms. Brownfield stated a list develops over a course of time. She stated they also go through and do a technical term highlighting.

Commissioner Seybert stressed how confusing the terminology and/or jargon can be when reading any official paperwork.

Ms. Brownfield gave a PowerPoint on the following:

New General Plan - Next Steps: BCCs and Agencies

- TBD – Building Community
- TBD – Other BCCs
- Aug 27 ALUC
- Sept 10 C/CAG

Planning Commission Study Sessions

- June 16: Built Environment (Historic Resources, Economic Development, Infrastructure)
- June 23: Joint Session w/HHCC
- July 7: Built Environment (Land Use/Urban Form, Circulation)
- July 21: Building Community

Public Hearings

- Planning Commission – Anticipated August 4, August 11 or 18, October 13
- City Council – Anticipated September (Study Session), October

Mrs. Ekas stated there may be a Joint Session with Council over the summer. She noted the Quality Life chapter would undergo some name changes for some items. The Environmental Impact Report is currently being prepared and there were discussions on the alternatives being studied. One of them was No Project, and also a Reduced Build-out Alternative, along with the offering of a new name for the Sustainable Streetcar Alternative which will now be called something like “Increased Build-out” on the Corridors Alternative and/or something of that nature.

Mr. Passanisi noted additional colors would be added to the mapping to depict trends.

Commissioner Gee asked when the Commission could expect to see the Environmental Impact Report elements.

Ms. Brownfield stated this most likely would come through in June or July of 2009.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Alan Carson, Redwood City resident, stated he believed the implementation matrix would explain a great deal in the coming weeks. He also suggested inclusion of wording regarding elected officials’ efforts to keep the cost of implementation down for programs and mandatory implementations. He also suggested some fiscal impact information along with any environmental impact reporting.

Karen Davis, Redwood City resident, spoke on her long-term living status in the Bay Area and more specifically now in Redwood City. She noted her review and reading of the 2009 General Plan as well as various committee meetings and minutes. She noted the Council’s two-step process involved public input and also setting the vision. She was disappointed in the visioning and maps in the Natural Resources portion of the new plan.

Peggy Bruggman, Redwood City resident, spoke on the vision statements in the Natural Resource sections and whether or not the City indeed has ample parks and trails, as well as ratio of open space to residents. She recommended the word “ample” be removed. She also suggested better wording on wetlands being an important tool in combating global warming. She spoke on the creek setback wording and suggested the word “where feasible be deleted” with a setback limit implemented to protect the waterway resources. She disagreed with any language that lent to the Cargill property developments without the public’s opportunity to comment.

Ms. Brownfield noted when an item is listed as a vision it lends to a 15-year time period out in scope, and then looks back. A notation that there is ample parkland means that in 15 years ample parkland will exist.

Lynne Trulio, Friends of Redwood City, spoke on the new chapter in the Draft Natural Resources Element regarding Agriculture and Salt Harvesting. She noted this was devoted to the discussion of salt harvesting on the Cargill site. There was also discussion of the California Land Conservation Act, or the Williamson Act Contract which restricted conversion of the property to urban usage in exchange for a significant

reduction in their property taxes. She recommended changing the wording for this section of the drafted plan.

Matt Leddy, Redwood City resident, with three (3) minutes ceded by G.J. Scove, gave the following PowerPoint:

General Plan Draft, Natural Resources Element – Map of Water Surfaces and Open Spaces

Open Spaces – Map

- “Future Development Expanding Limits of Urbanization,” also known as “Urban Reserve” is currently listed under “Open Spaces.”
- *All* of the Cargill salt ponds are currently included under “Open Spaces.”
- This is consistent with the State of California definition of “open space uses” which allows the ponds to be under Williamson Act contract in the City’s Agricultural Preserve.

Natural Resources – Map of Water Surfaces and Open Space

Map

- In contrast to the current General Plan Land Use map *no longer considers Urban Reserve as open Spaces*.
- This represents a proposed change for the Cargill site within the General Plan update, since all of the Cargill site is currently considered “Open Spaces,” and *all agricultural lands* are included in the current 1990 General Plan Open Space Element.

Summary:

- The current (1990) Land Use Map includes *all* of the Cargill site under “Open Spaces.” It is included within the General Plan Open Space Element under because it is *all* agricultural land.
- The new (2009) Natural Resources Element Open Spaces and Surface Water Map, and the 2009 draft General Plan Map *remove a significant portion of the Cargill site from the Open Space designation*, constituting a proposed change for the Cargill site.
- As a result of this change, Cargill is now part of the new General Plan update. This action is inconsistent with the Redwood City Council’s order to exclude the Cargill site from the new General Plan update.
- Removing the site from the “open spaces” designation on the Land Use Map is inconsistent with the actual current status of this *agricultural property* under the Williamson Act “open space use” contract. This change is significant and should require an analysis of the General Plan Environmental Impact Report currently in preparation.

The problem ... The Draft General Plan Land Use Project Map and the Natural Resources Element Open Spaces and Surface Waters Map *remove Urban Reserve from the Open Spaces category*. This proposes a change for the Cargill site, bringing Cargill into the new General Plan process.

The solution ... A Draft General Plan Land Use Map and a Natural Resources Element Open Spaces and Surface Waters Map which *do not remove Urban Reserve from the Open Spaces category*. This keeps the Cargill site out of the General Plan process as per the Redwood City Council's order.

Open Space Element. Chapter 9

“Open space land” is any parcel or area of land or water which is essentially unimproved and devoted to an open-space use as defined in this section, and which is designated in the Redwood City General Plan as any of the following:

- (1) Open space for the preservation of natural resources including, but not limited to, areas required for the preservation of plant and animal life, including habitat for fish and wildlife species; areas required for ecologic coastal beaches, lakeshores, banks of rivers and streams, and watershed lands.
- (2) Open space used for the managed production of resources, including but not limited to, forest lands, rangeland, agricultural lands and areas of economic importance for the production of food or fiber; areas required for recharge of ground water basins; bays, estuaries, marshes, rivers and streams which are important for the management of commercial fisheries; and areas containing major mineral deposits, including those in short supply.

Commissioner Gee asked for clarification on the points and maps that Mr. Leddy presented.

Ms. Brownfield noted Mr. Leddy used two different maps; however, he did show the draft Land Use Map which was correct in the sense that the Urban Reserve was not under the Open Space category. She stated, given the wording of the text for the 1990 General Plan, the Urban Reserve was being held in reserve at the same time. She stated this was not as an Open Space designation. She stressed that the 1990 General Plan talks against itself and contains some conflicting wording which they are trying to more clearly delineate this in the new plan.

Mrs. Ekas clarified Mr. Leddy had compared the Open Space and Surface Water Maps. She added that more study would be done on this. Staff was aware of the concern and had heard this comment previously. Staff has the 1990 General Plan Land Use map, and Mr. Leddy did show how things were depicted on this map with a category for Open Space and four color codes and descriptions of these areas. She noted the challenge is that there is no specific one-to-one relationship between the names of the categories and how they are grouped within the text of the document. Open Reserves are not called out as Open Space components in the 1990 text. She reiterated the new General Plan will have a one-to-one relationship with the textual categories with the map legend in order to make this more transparent.

Judy Serebrin, Redwood City resident, was pleased that Redwood City held their commitment to remain Green, sustainability and conservation. She asked how the City will meet these commitments if some of the elements of the new General Plan are not in keeping with these goals.

Joel Jenson, Redwood City resident, noted his comments had already been mentioned by other members of the community and passed on any further comments.

Marcia Cohen, Redwood City resident, North Fair Oaks which is the sphere of influence of the new General Plan. She noted it was critical that the new General Plan mesh with the plans of San Mateo County and the North Fair Oaks community area. She spoke on natural resources and water supply issues.

James Jonas, Redwood City resident, handed out his comments and highlighted several issues within the Public Safety Draft.

Nita Spangler, Redwood City resident, agreed with the proposal to include a glossary in the General Plan documentation. She made suggestions on decreasing the verbiage in the plan and also made suggestions where to find additional maps. She spoke on groundwater and well water issue.

Maritza Longland, Redwood City resident, spoke on the changing of some of the wording in the new General Plan. She suggested some ideas with regard to reforestation of the City and rewarding residents for planting redwood trees. She also spoke as an advocate for the voiceless and homeless in the City. She noted Nature was one of these voiceless entities which were vulnerable and deserved care and regard in the new General Plan.

M/S (Seybert/Cronin) to close the Public Hearing

Motion Passed

7. UPDATE ON GENERAL PLAN

Mr. Passanisi noted the next Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for June 16, 2009 for discussion of the Historic, Economic and Infrastructure elements of the new General Plan. The new Planning commissioner has also been through his orientation and will be sworn in at an early July meeting.

Commissioner Seybert asked if they could get some clarification at the June 16th meeting on putting someone on emeritus status.

M/S (Seybert/Borgens) to adjourn at 10:05 p.m.