

**MINUTES, PLANNING & ZONING PLAN OF CONSERVATION & DESIGN SUBCOMMITTEE, THURSDAY, SEPT. 15, 2022,
7:00 P.M.**

A. Call to Order was at 7:00 pm.

B. Attendees: J. Castignoli, J. Kader, J. Mortimer, J. Quish/GUEST: A. Tecza/STAFF: D. Sulkis

C. Topic for discussion:

1. Discussion and POCD draft update with consultant Adam Tecza.

Chairman Quish opened the meeting. He said the main goal of the meeting was to put a project plan together to share the document with the public. He thanked Mr. Tecza for attending the meeting and invited subcommittee members to ask questions. **Mr. Mortimer** asked where the revision work had been concentrated. **Mr. Sulkis** said he had broken the document into 4 parts and begun preliminary edits based on comments from the board during its deliberations, then passing them to Mr. Tecza to reformat and suggest changes. He said Mr. Tecza has also been working with John Hagen, the city's GIS analyst, to update maps. He said the group had gotten a draft of the document for comment. He said the 2012(2022) document was fundamentally sound with areas that required updates and revisions. **Chairman Quish** reviewed the activities that the subcommittee had conducted over the past several years. He said he felt it was not too late to incorporate ideas or schedule meetings prior to the 2032 POCD due date. He commended FHI Studio for studying the history of the subcommittee's meetings, saying it was pivotal to FHI winning the consulting contract.

Adam Tecza, FHI Studio, said he agreed with Mr. Sulkis' assessment of the workflow, namely, that Mr. Sulkis is layering in the findings of the subcommittee and Mr. Tecza is providing document organizational and editorial feedback. He welcomed suggestions regarding the formatted draft document he had submitted to the group. He said that a big revision was to standardize map formats throughout the document, allowing people receiving electronic copies of the document to easily print them. He also said that they had been made easier to read. He referred to Mr. Sulkis' description of dividing the document into 4 parts with expert input from both Mr. Sulkis and FHI potentially varying by section. He said he would share the first of these sections with the subcommittee. He said Mr. Sulkis would direct FHI as the revision progresses but subcommittee members were encouraged to make contributions.

Chairman Quish and **Mr. Sulkis** discussed the deadline for publishing the document and how the state manages them. He said he thought that a completed draft could be ready by December, but still available for a public hearing. **Chairman Quish** asked how many public sessions were required; **Mr. Sulkis** said that during the review period for the previous document, a couple public hearings were conducted on topics that were of strong interest at the time, resulting in some revision. The acceptance process then moves from subcommittee to full board approval to approval by the Board of Alders and simultaneous state review. **Mr. Tecza** distinguished between the formal adoption process set out by the state and local public outreach that can take many forms, both formal and informal. He said that frequently the public finds the documents overwhelmingly, so he added a summarized list of changes. He said he recommends that there be at least one public hearing prior to the adoption process of the document because momentum to adopt tends to build as more boards become involved. He said there can also be entities who know they will be applying for grants or trying to build support for other long-term projects that would benefit from a small addition of language to the POCD and it gives those groups that opportunity. **Chairman Quish** suggested at this point that the draft document be reviewed and said that a public forum held via ZOOM could be productive as a similar session had recently been held in the Regulations Subcommittee. It was noted that comments could also be emailed to Mr. Sulkis after subcommittee members have reviewed new sections of the draft document.

Mr. Tecza began to review the draft, saying all illustrations and other figures would be updated as the document progressed. He displayed the introduction, which pointed out statutory requirements and a "Summary of Changes" section to help readers focus on new or revised material. He pointed out placeholders reserved for data points that will be provided by the city's GIS analyst and other demographic data. He showed new tables with breakdowns of land uses and other statistical details. He reviewed a section highlighting future land use trends and recommendations. **Chairman Quish** suggested maintaining a list of recommendations. **Mr. Tecza** said if there are

pending regulatory changes, they could be noted, such as height changes in a particular zone. **Chairman Quish** said an example was anticipated changes in Accessory Dwelling Units now under consideration by the Regulations Subcommittee. **Mr. Tecza** said the document could feature such topics in support of community goals. **Chairman Quish** listed a set of concerns surrounding sustainability and topics related to climate change. **Mr. Sulkis** said that he and **Mr. Tecza** had just discussed this; the group supported the idea of incorporating best practices into use of public lands. The review moved to sections dealing with Existing Conditions, Open Space, and Active Recreation. He noted 9 designated Greenbelts and Greenways that have been consolidated in to 7 (without loss of actual space), featuring recommendations for conservation and protection. Discussion ensued on whether and how FHI is editing content. **Mr. Tecza** described a dialog with Mr. Sulkis to enhance clarity and detail and to provide specific expertise where FHI has it. **Chairman Quish** expressed concern that a broader, high-level vision for the city may not have been extracted from past sessions. **Mr. Tecza** suggested that an opportunity to discern “big ideas” may organically emerge from the review exercise, adding that sustainability and resiliency might be prominent themes. **Mr. Mortimer** said he would love to put out a comprehensive vision for the city’s future, whatever the path toward that goal might turn out to be. **Mr. Tecza** suggested that his and Mr. Sulkis’ approach be to continue revising the document while a dialog with the subcommittee be added to capture more “blue sky.” **Chairman Quish** said that there are budgetary considerations, but he would like to do some visioning in addition to the general appearance and clarity upgrade of the document. He contrasted the opportunity to shape and contribute to the document of the previous group of subcommittee members to those who had recently joined. **Mr. Tecza** said it sounds like a structured conversation was needed and that FHI is very good at that type of activity. **Chairman Quish** said he would like to see a parallel activity of straight revision and inclusion of high-level input from current board members and the public. **Mr. Tecza** said he could work with that strategy. They moved to Coastal Resources section. Mr. Tecza noted that Mr. Sulkis had added information about the latest flood projections and potential for a resiliency response to a section called Coastal Management Act Consistency. **Mr. Sulkis** provided context for how that information was gathered during earlier in the POCD subcommittee’s work.

At this point, **Mr. Tecza** stopped the screen-sharing review and invited the group to send email to Mr. Sulkis with comments or to mark up the document itself to express ideas. **Chairman Quish** asked about a consolidated group of comments. **Mr. Tecza** shared a new document that would allow the group to leave and view the collective comments and instructed them on how to use it. All agreed that feedback could be incorporated in the next draft. **Chairman Quish** asked for comment from the group. **Mr. Sulkis** cautioned that continued momentum was required to push toward publication. **Chairman Quish** and **Mr. Sulkis** discussed the best use of Mr. Tecza’s time regarding discussion and meeting attendance. **Mr. Tecza** asked that comments be collected so he and Mr. Sulkis could assess their impact on the document, while also offering to design a visioning exercise for the group to help discern the newer subcommittee members’ thoughts. Mr. Quish asked Mr. Sulkis to draw up a schedule-to-completion with public comment for the 4 sections of the document. **Mr. Sulkis** asked the group to submit comments over the next 2 weeks while he was away. **Mr. Mortimer** said he approved of the old document and approved of the 2-track plan for completion. **Mr. Castignoli** confirmed the comments assignment for section 1. **Mr. Kader** also agreed with the approach. **Chairman Quish** praised the effort to envision the best future for the city.

Topics not discussed:

2. Committee member suggestions/comments

D. Minutes from 8/24/22 were approved unanimously.

E. Adjournment was at 8:13.