

**Planning Commission Comments  
General Plan Update  
Preliminary Hearing Draft  
Planning Commission Hearing 3/15/07  
Chapters 1 - 3 (1<sup>st</sup> half of the meeting)  
Chapters 16 – 19 (2<sup>nd</sup> half of the meeting)**

<b>Planning Commissioner:</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Comments on Process</b>	
<b>Smith –</b>	Let’s move away from detailed analysis, and move toward accepting public comments on the draft, and make sure staff isn’t going over a cliff. And then at the end we can look at this as a whole. I’m concerned we will never finish, get fixated on the details. We have a transparent process where we are getting guidance from the public as we go along. I recommend we not do the straw votes until the end.
<b>Kelly -</b>	I was frustrated after the last meeting. I’m concerned we won’t be able to come to consensus. If we agree to not wordsmith, we can all get what we want. Supports straw votes at the end
<b>Hansis -</b>	Agrees with Kelly
<b>Murguia -</b>	It sounds like with staff’s recommendation ignores all the work that has gone into the update. I share C Smith’s concern that it will take too long. I’d like to move more quickly, and clearer. What are the anticipated outcomes? Where do the communities want to go?
<b>Emad -</b>	Agrees with C. Smith – we could get stuck on the details. We can just say what we think, then take a vote at the end of the process.
<b>Gearhart -</b>	Agree with C. Smith. I didn’t hear that we should take a vote now, but rather provide comments, then vote at the end.
<b>Herman -</b>	Where I was coming from, I was expressing my thoughts, and we generated some lively discussion, then we got the staff report back, I didn’t see my comments reflected. That was frustrating. Why put all the work into it. I respect C. Smith’s comments and support them.
<b>Herman -</b>	If we need to step in to provide guidance, we’ll do that.
<b>Chapters 1, 2 &amp; 3</b>	
<b>Smith -</b>	Metaphors are used throughout instead of precise language. I’d recommend more clear language.
<b>Kelly -</b>	Where do we go from here? Do we take more comments? Questions about closure and how long do we take public comment? For a year?
<b>Herman -</b>	I think we should take public testimony.
<b>Smith -</b>	Take testimony, give staff direction, then move on.
<b>Emad -</b>	Let’s not take any straw votes, we’re just saying we’re comfortable with how the document is worded.
<b>Herman -</b>	Example: Give comments on Chapters 1 – 3, staff brings it back next time, take more comments, until we’re comfortable with it.
<b>Smith -</b>	Just because we’re putting it aside, doesn’t mean we like it, or are going to vote for it. I was focused on wordsmithing the goals, but what I’m suggesting now is that we get comfortable with a set of alternatives and take a vote in the end. Question to staff: Are we going to run into problems with wordsmithing at the end? <b>Staff response:</b> As long as the wordsmithing is within the parameters considered in the EIR, it isn’t a problem. Just don’t go beyond the range in the EIR.

<b>Smith -</b>	We received a lot of public comment, and while there's less of it in the staff report than I would have expected, you are being heard. If it doesn't make it in the staff report now, it will when we review it in the end. Don't regulate what other agencies are already regulating. That's a valuable comment. Regulations lead to higher housing prices. Purpose of these hearings is to capture public comments & Planning Commission comments.