

**Lemon Creek Area Plan
Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes
Gruening Park Rec Room**

March 30, 2017 at 6pm

Steering Committee Members:

Stephen Johnson, Chair
Michael Lukshin, Vice-Chair
Daniel Collison
Wayne Coogan (via phone)
Susan Erben
Dave Hanna
Patrick Quigley
Michael Short

Not Present

Paul Voelckers, Planning Commission Liaison
Tom Chard
Sandra Coon
Mark Pusich

Staff:

Jill Maclean, Senior Planner, Community
Development
Allison Eddins, Planner I, Community Development

Beth McKibben, Planning Manager, Community
Development
Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant,
Community Development

Agenda:

I. Roll Call (6:00pm)

Completed at 6:06

Mr. Hanna moved to enact the following rules:

Members wishing to speak on a subject or to a motion will restrict their speaking time to two minutes.

Time will be kept by a person appointed by the chair.

Unless they are out of order, speakers will not be interrupted.

All members will be given a chance to speak at which point members will then be given one minute for rebuttal or additional comments.

Speaking time is not bankable. You may not speak to one minute at first and have two minutes for follow up. If you choose not to speak on the first round you will have a minute at the follow up period.

Chair will appoint a monitor to track on paper who speaks on a subject. Whose turn to speak first will rotate with each new subject.

The chair will use the agenda to determine discussion topics.

Mr. Coogan seconded.

Mr. Johnson opened discussion.

Mr. Hanna spoke to his motion regarding efficiency and courtesy. Would like to ensure that every member has the opportunity to speak.

Ms. Erben is opposed – need to be courteous and think this would change our ability to problem solve because of heavy constraints; makes the situation adversarial.

Mr. Collison – not terribly familiar with Roberts Rules of Order. Likes the suggestion of a timeframe for comments. Wonder if something that is less formal would work.

Mr. Hanna – this set-up works well for the city, helps stay on topic. Doesn't see this committee working without any constraints.

Mr. Coogan – we all agree on the intent, but we disagree on how to get there. We all want to be productive, the intent is to get things accomplished and be able to hear everyone. I would be OK with one minute for a comment and two 30 second follow-ups.

Mr. Hanna – 2 minutes is a lot of time. One thing I did not address is if someone asks a question there should be an allowance for responding to questions. We do not have time to finish this document at the rate we are going. I think that some people have not been speaking because they don't want to drag it on.

Ms. Erben – proposed a friendly motion – that it would not start tonight, but at the following meeting.

Mr. Hanna – friendly motion accepted.

Mr. Coogan – excellent point, but it shows the strength of the point; Being prepared, rather than allowing ourselves to ramble on is important.

Ms. Erben – this restriction is going to create a lot of stress. Just bringing it up is a good warning, but I think if we constrict ourselves it takes away from us as community members.

Mr. Collison – is the proposal just Robert's Rules of Order?

Mr. Hanna – Mr. Coogan and I came up with this together.

Mr. Collison – is there an allowance for continuing this discussion at a later date?

Mr. Johnson - my interpretation is everything is up to motions. I think we should give it a try, if it works then good, if it doesn't then we deal with it then. This amendment was an effort to get something in writing ahead of time so people were able to read it – it only has to do with administering this group. I am in favor.

Ms. McKibben – I'm willing to monitor this in a friendly way to see how long two minutes are and could reconsider the motion at the end or at a later meeting.

Mr. Lukshin – I think the idea of moving us along is good, but the way we have gone about it I don't like. I'm ready and willing to meet more frequently etc. to get the work done so that we can meet the deadlines.

Mr. Collison – I like Ms. McKibben's suggestion for friendly time keeping and deferring this until the next meeting.

Mr. Hanna – I'd still like to vote on it

Mr. Coogan – the underlying motivation for this motion is only to move the meetings along.

Mr. Hanna – Withdraw motion with the notice that it will be addressed at the beginning of the next meeting.

Mr. Coogan – asked that we informally attempt to monitor our time in this way so we can have a better idea of how it would affect us.

Mr. Hanna – we have an informal agreement for this - Ms. McKibben will be a time indicator.

II. Approve Neighborhoods & Housing (10 minutes)

a. Discuss the chapter (45 minutes)

Ms. Maclean – Presented the revised boundary map and gave an overview of changes that were made to chapters between meetings.

Mr. Coogan – would like to strike last sentence in the second paragraph on p1.

Ms. Erben – doesn't like "tension", too strong of a word.

Mr. Hanna – move that we modify the sentence to read:

Sufficient buffers between incompatible uses have not always been established between the residential and commercial/industrial areas today.

Mr. Johnson – second

Passed – All in favor

Mr. Collison – this is the 4th meeting we are discussing this chapter. If there is nothing factually wrong let's move on and talk about the goals and actions.

Ms. Erben – lets go to the goals and actions and come back to this if we have to. I'd like to talk about River's Edge condos that are not included – think they belong in Pinewood.

Mr. Johnson – in favor of going to the goals and actions. Think they look a lot better tonight than they have previously.

Mr. Collison – was there anything in particular in the chapter that you wanted to show us before we move on?

Mr. Lukshin – on p 5 there are areas with “more info to come”.

Ms. Maclean – will filling in state info before finalizing, this would just be facts.

Continued an overview of changes that had been made in the chapter.

Some confusion about how goals and actions get accomplished and who would be the driver

Ms. Maclean – more likely the CBJ would start these, but they would need public support to be successful.

Mr. Johnson – wonders the force of law behind this document.

Ms. Maclean – once the plan is complete hopefully it will be approved by the Steering Committee; it will then be taken to the Planning Commission who could approve it or send it back to the committee; if they approve it it would go to the Assembly for final approval before becoming a guiding document for the city.

Mr. Hanna – I would highly encourage the neighborhood association to get behind this and rally so that it goes through those channels.

b. Discuss the goals and actions (45 minutes)

Ms. Maclean – gave an overview of the Goals and Actions.

Mr. Coogan – Took offence at a recent article that called the Lemon Creek area Juneau's “Industrial Zone” would like to refute that in this document. Would like to discourage encroachment of other uses into the legacy residential areas.

Mr. Lukshin – what do you mean by “legacy residential areas”?

Mr. Coogan – Pinewood Park was in Lemon Creek before most other uses here.

Mr. Lukshin – I would support that

Mr. Coogan – moved to add a new sentence to action item 3: “prevent the encroachment of other activities into preexisting gentrified, legacy residential areas such as Pinewood Park.”

Mr. Lukshin – seconded

Mr. Hanna – proposed a friendly amendment to remove gentrified.

Mr. Collison – proposed a friendly amendment to change “preexisting” to “existing”

Mr. Coogan – accepted both friendly amendments

Amended motion reads: add a new sentence to action item 3 “prevent the encroachment of other activities into existing legacy residential areas such as Pinewood Park.”

Ms. Erben – would this put people with existing uses in any trouble?

Ms. Eddins – those uses sound like home occupation so they are allowed in homes.

Mr. Johnson – called the question.

Passed – all in favor.

Mr. Lukshin – moved to approve Goal One with amendments.

Mr. Hanna – seconded.

Mr. Johnson – calls the question.

Passed – all in favor.

Mr. Collison – clarify that if it is passed it is not up for discussion at the next meeting.

Correct.

Ms. Maclean introduced Goal 2.

Mr. Hanna – moved to add “investigate” before introducing D10 zoning in the actions 4 and 5.

Mr. Johnson – seconded.

Mr. Coogan – proposed a friendly amendment – use “consider” instead of “investigate”.

Mr. Hanna – accepted.

Mr. Lukshin – proposed a friendly amendment – add “and D5” to action item 4.

Ms. Maclean and Ms. McKibben – D5 would not be in compliance with the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Lukshin – withdrew his friendly motion.

Mr. Johnson – called the question.

Passed – Mr. Hanna, Mr. Lukshin, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Collison, Mr. Johnson in favor.

Mr. Short – who designates the Transit Designated Corridor?

Ms. Maclean – Capital transit determines this. Gave more clarification of transit information.

Mr. Collison – basically what you’re saying is that someone could buy a parcel of land in Pinewood Park and if this Overlay existed they could build it out to D15?

Ms. Maclean – I wouldn’t foresee that becoming an overlay – could go to grant’s plaza, Walmart, but not to an existing low density neighborhood

Ms. McKibben – this goal says “designate suitable land” so the Planners and subcommittees, PC etc. would look at the maps and help process what would make sense and how that would fit into neighborhoods – not arbitrary.

Mr. Lukshin – thank you for the clarifications, this thing is borough wide, correct?

Ms. Maclean – yes

Mr. Collison – do you envision a scenario where a neighborhood such as Pinewood would have an overlay from this transit overlay?

Ms. Maclean – I don’t see that happening in the next 20 years.

Mr. Johnson – didn’t we address this in goal one?

Mr. Collison – wondering if there would be a higher level of housing along old glacier highway over time because of this.

Ms. McKibben – I don’t see this happening, but there are opportunities and things in code that make a few of these things available currently.

Mr. Coogan – If we want to preserve specific subdivisions let’s put that wording in.

Mr. Johnson – I think we already did that in goal number 1 with the amendment made above.

Mr. Hanna – like to reinforce that, at first I was not comfortable with this, but I’m not nervous anymore because it says “suitable land” and we have already addressed this in goal number one. If we want to put another statement that would be fine too.

Ms. Erben – would like to make it stronger – so that these aren’t competing actions.

Mr. Johnson – If this is already in the comprehensive plan can we eliminate this action item?

Ms. Maclean – the comprehensive plan is overarching, so it will still apply to the area.

Ms. McKibben – I don't recall exactly how it's phrased in the comprehensive plan. I think this suits the area well because it says you're going to look at it, and consider it.

Mr. Collison – I think it's appropriate for us to say that we don't want Pinewood Park to have high density housing – maybe we should add that language. I hear that there is a well-developed process, but we're going on record for people who will be interpreting this document 10 years from now and if we want to preserve Pinewood Park we should.

Mr. Hanna – moved that the following be added to action item 6 under Goal 2

“Any future zoning or development proposals shall preserve the current zoning and character of the Pinewood Park subdivision”.

Mr. Lukshin – second.

Mr. Coogan – proposed a friendly amendment – strike “future”.

Would like to go further and consider striking the ability to subdivide Pinewood Park further.

Mr. Hanna – did not accept the friendly motions.

Ms. McKibben – we cannot do the second idea, it's against the law.

Mr. Hanna – against the amendment because there are ways to do slight changes that will not disturb the neighborhood but could be very helpful to property owners.

Mr. Johnson – calls question.

Carries – all in favor.

Ms. Maclean – gave an overview of action item 7.

Mr. Collison – passed out a handout and outlines its contents (see attached).

Ms. Maclean – this information was sent to us earlier and we tried to incorporate this to our presented goals and actions.

Pause for everyone to read document.

Mr. Collison – it's difficult for us to come up with housing targets independent from the rest of the borough, the first action is laid out in the appendix to the Housing Action Plan (HAP).

Only after the city does certain things, can we determine what Lemon Creeks contribution will be.

The second item would allow the neighborhood to reprioritize once more information is available.

The third addresses a recent concern about senior housing among others.

The fourth allows us to use this to have a report card and adjust year to year.

Ms. Maclean – Lands division has a study that they put out every year, and CDD puts out a buildable land study. Addressing CBJ owned lands is identified and addressed in previous studies. It may look like we skipped ahead, but the areas addressed in the plan have been identified through those processes, the action items as they stand address these with all of the previous information informing it. These actions are for *both* CBJ and private land – not CBJ land only. Proposed action 3 is covered in Goal 3; we could add senior housing to goal 3.

Mr. Hanna – that's similar to what I'd like to say – I feel that these proposed changes are not in our purview – and they're already doing many of those things. We should add senior housing along with workforce housing.

Mr. Coogan – not in favor.

Ms. McKibben – shared information about The Housing Action Plan, not about only putting more housing on CBJ property; Part of the goal is to find incentives to have private developers develop on their land.

Mr. Collison – wondering what other steering committee members think at this time.

Mr. Lukshin – Move to replace “Lemon Creek” with “the City and Borough of Juneau” in action 1 (Goal 2).

Mr. Hanna – seconded.

Mr. Coogan – would like to add a goal in goal 1 that housing of any kind will be added to Lemon Creek only in a pro rata share of how it goes into the borough as a whole.

Mr. Collison – the heart of my concern is that there are three CBJ parcels with development potential in Lemon Creek – we don’t know what proportion of that housing is going to be in Lemon Creek – we want to develop housing targets in Lemon Creek, we don’t know how those targets will be created in Lemon Creek or in other areas. Concerned that Lemon Creek is first without a larger borough wide context. The proposal he brought is consistent with the plans on the books.

Mr. Coogan – if we just change it to pro-rata the rest of the city will say balanced with Lemon Creek.

Ms. Erben – proposed a friendly amendment – table this motion to deal with the wider question that has been discussed without a motion.

Mr. Lukshin – not accepted. This motion solves a lot of the issues presented.

Mr. Collison – problematic – no indication on how the housing targets will be created.

Mr. Lukshin – I don’t think staff knows either.

Agreement from Staff.

Mr. Lukshin – forcing them to focus on it borough wide instead of only on Lemon Creek and allows them to come up with a plan that looks at the whole borough. I’m comfortable with the rest of it with this change.

Mr. Johnson – calls question.

Carries – Mr. Coogan opposed, Mr. Collison abstained

Mr. Collison – moves to replace actions 1-5 of goal 2 with the attached proposal.

Ms. Erben – seconded.

Ms. Maclean – We have the lands management study and the buildable lands study to address a lot of these issues and take that into consideration while creating these actions.

Ms. Erben – I feel ok with area 2 – area 1 is important too, but area 3 is a big concern for me. Concerned that Lemon Creek shoulders a burden that other areas should shoulder some of that. It’s our turn to have more single family development.

Mr. Collison – I’ve lived in Lemon Creek for 15 years, my experience is that Lemon Creek gets the short end of the stick as far as development goes. There’s nothing that stops the CBJ from continuing to throw undesirable development at Lemon Creek – if we make this study borough wide the effect will be more balanced. We have no way of determining if our suggestion is reasonable in comparison with the future of the rest of the borough.

Ms. McKibben – we are doing this plan because Lemon Creek has this image of being treated unfairly. We want Lemon Creek to be heard and have a plan. A borough wide action for the Lemon Creek plan is not the right place for it. Could add to the amended above “Lemon Creek goals will be determined with input from Lemon Creek stakeholders”.

Mr. Collison – Concerned about how zoning, housing, and development will affect Lemon Creek in comparison to the rest of the borough.

Mr. Lukshin – I like Ms. McKibben’s idea above. I appreciate the work you all have done. I find the motion hard to support.

Mr. Coogan – Ms. McKibben articulated this well – she has a more gentle demeanor.

Mr. Collison – I'm wondering, after listening to Ms. McKibben, if we can make a better proposal. I could withdraw this and suggest alternate language as well.

Withdraws motion.

Moves to add to action 1"

Cbj will develop area wide neighborhood housing targets, zoning recommendations, and prioritization of public lands for housing development with input from Lemon Creek residents, and other community members.

Mr. Lukshin- seconded.

Mr. Collison – proposed a friendly amendment – and also take out items 2-4

Ms. McKibben – removing those is taking away some of your power as a committee. The borough wide comp plan speak to increasing density throughout the borough.

Mr. Collison – withdraws the above friendly amendment.

Mr. Lukshin – proposed a friendly amendment to add "including the Lemon Creek Neighborhood Association" before "and other community members".

Mr. Collison – friendly amendment accepted.

Mr. Coogan – opposed – this says that Lemon Creek members will have to be involved in all CBJ housing targets.

Mr. Johnson – if this is in the Lemon Creek plan it only applies to Lemon Creek so we're not stepping on other areas – that's not in our purview.

Mr. Hanna – Mr. Coogan is correct – it is necessary to change this to any development in the Lemon Creek area.

Ms. McKibben – the Housing Action Plan talks about all housing types, from large homes on large lots to workforce and affordable housing. I'm hearing a fear of having more subsidized or low income housing here. If it's zoned that way we cannot change that. Developers can build however they want within zoning. If you have input from the community that would be good.

Ms. Maclean – Under Goal 1 the 6th action speaks to Lemon Creek people having input to these issues.

Mr. Collison – seems like we're all nearing a consensus on action item 1, could we work further between meetings, and come back to this goal at a later meeting?

Mr. Lukshin – think we should finalize the other five items.

Mr. Collison – withdraws motion understanding that we will revisit this at the next meeting.

Mr. Hanna – move to approve goal 2 with the exception that action item 1 will be discussed at the next meeting.

Mr. Lukshin seconded the motion. Seven in favor, one opposed. Motion carries.

Ms. Erben – Action item 2, could it be D10 SF (Single Family)?

Ms. Maclean – would have to look at the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Hanna – I see no reason to change this.

Mr. Johnson – it's not really developable so what's the point?

Ms. Maclean – like Mr. Hanna said, the site is hard to build on so D15 will probably not be achieved.

Mr. Johnson invited the public to participate

Rick Edwards – there are things I don't understand; I share the desire that Lemon Creek not be a dumping ground for things the rest of the borough doesn't want. I don't see that problem here. I don't know how you would calculate housing proportions; all of Juneau will have to

become more dense – this doesn't seem undesirable. If the goal is not to devalue our property, I don't think any of this will devalue property. I don't see the negative impact that higher density would cause on my property value or quality of life. I worry about how roads will be built and impacts on water quality etc., but density of housing doesn't bother me.

Mr. Hanna – move to adopt goal three as presented with the addition of senior housing in the third action item.

Mr. Lukshin – seconded.

Ms. Erben – I was hoping to add things to Goal 3: the housing trust, and asking the city to beef it up more, get grant writers to increase this fund.

Mr. Hanna – that's in action item 1.

Ms. Erben – not specific enough – proposed a friendly amendment to add “housing trust” to end of action 1.

Mr. Hanna – accepted the friendly amendment.

Mr. Coogan – seems borough wide, action item 3 doesn't pertain to Goal 3.

Mr. Lukshin – are you suggesting that we reword to Lemon Creek not the City & Borough of Juneau for Goal 3?

Mr. Coogan – I think so.

Mr. Lukshin – proposed a friendly amendment to change the City & Borough of Juneau to “Lemon Creek” in Goal 3.

Mr. Hanna – accepted.

Ms. Erben – would like to address specific lots that seem abandoned and would like to see something different with them.

Ms. Maclean – Actions 1 & 2 speak to those points.

Mr. Hanna – wouldn't be appropriate to make that more specific.

Mr. Collison – Lemon Creek has a number of properties that are in problematic condition and it would be a huge oversight if we have nothing in this document that says we're concerned and want CBJ to do something about it. In favor of the motion.

Mr. Coogan – proposed a friendly amendment – strike items 3 and 4.

Mr. Hanna – amend motion, the last two items don't belong in this goal – they belong to goal one. **Withdraws motion.**

Moves to pass Goal 3 and change “City & Borough of Juneau” to “Lemon Creek” in the title, add “and housing trust” to item 1, and move items 3 & 4 to Goal one with the addition of senior housing.

Mr. Coogan – seconded.

Mr. Johnson – proposed a friendly amendment to add Lemon Creek after “expand”

Mr. Hanna – accepted the friendly amendment.

The motion passed – unanimous

III. Review Order of Upcoming Chapters (3 minutes)

Ms. Maclean – April 6th is cancelled the next meetings are April 20th and April 27th.

Finishing housing and then recreation

We may have to change the meeting nights that will be forthcoming.

Mr. Edwards (member of the public) – chapter as a whole is better but it's more about housing than neighborhoods, the intro says what makes a good neighborhood will be answered – didn't see an

answer. Suggest that the parts that point to other chapters (at end of chapter) move earlier. A road map to guide people.

Mr. Collison – requests that any changes be highlighted when sent out – with a reminder that those highlighted changes be what we discuss.

Mr. Lukshin – I think we had a rocky start but we got a lot done tonight and thank you all for your decorum and working together.

IV. Adjournment

Next Meeting Date: April 6, 2017

GOAL 2: Designate buildable land, particularly along transit corridors, for residential use at densities that can produce housing affordable to all economic groups.

Action: Consistent with the **Housing Action Plan** (Appendix 2 Implementation Actions) create a *Neighborhood Housing Development Opportunities Listing* which assigns all City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) land parcels suitable for housing development within the Urban Service Area to neighborhoods in which the parcels are situated. The *Listing* will:

- Identify zoning options for each CBJ land parcel, and
- Establish housing targets for each neighborhood. A combined total of all neighborhood housing targets will equal the 30-year **Housing Action Plan** goal of 1,980 new housing units, less a borough-wide 30-year estimate of housing units to be constructed on non-CBJ lands.

CBJ will solicit public comment and input on zoning options and housing targets prior to finalizing the *Neighborhood Housing Development Opportunities Listing*.

Action: On finalization of a *Neighborhood Housing Development Opportunities Listing*, review CBJ parcels specific to Lemon Creek and their zoning options with neighborhood members and prioritize Lemon Creek public land parcels for potential housing development.

Action: Promote new housing development in Lemon Creek consisting of 1) Senior Housing and 2) single-family Workforce Owner Housing to better align Lemon Creek's housing types with the Juneau community as a whole.

Action: Make updates as needed to neighborhood housing targets on *the Neighborhood Housing Development Opportunities Listing*. On an annual basis, update the *Listing* by neighborhood with the number and type of housing units constructed on public and private lands.

Goal X: Ensure that Juneau's housing stock is safe and available for occupancy.

Action: CBJ will work with the State of Alaska Mental Health Trust to consolidate approximately 30 acres of undeveloped land into larger tracts for ease of future housing development.

Appendix 2 Implementation Actions

IMPLEMENTATION STEPS										
ACTION	Adopt Housing Action Plan	Prioritize Affordable Housing Fund	Hire Housing Director	Create housing for workforce, seniors, and young families	Preserve Existing Affordable Housing	Develop policies for CBJ owned land and assets	Amend Zoning Code to promote housing	Develop Neighborhood Plans	Develop Downtown Strategy	Timeline
	Hold public meetings to gather community feedback on the Plan	Raise revenue for fund through taxes, grants, donations, sale of CBJ land, permit surcharges	Draft project list with Affordable Housing Commission	Set annual unit goal established in Plan	Reinstate Code Enforcement Officer	Finalize update to CBJ Land Management Plan to include inventory of buildable land	Develop Inclusionary zoning ordinance	Identify and prioritize areas for neighborhood plans	Set goal for number of downtown housing units	
	Development of report card to measure progress	Broaden scope of eligible projects	Develop benchmarks	Maximize/leverage employer provided housing	Impose prohibitive fines for code enforcement violations	Apply appropriate zoning for CBJ buildable lands	Use UD financing for new roads and utility service to facilitate development	Use plans to identify housing development opportunities	Create downtown improvement district with a revenue stream	
		Prioritize funding of workforce and senior housing	Conduct annual needs assessment	Create tax abatement program	Develop blighted property ordinance	Adopt criteria for determining how plan goals are achieved through development of specific CBJ parcels	Create inability to vary transition zone designation	Develop housing targets for each subarea	Inventory vacant/abandoned/blighted housing units	
		Develop operating plan	Create work plan	Evaluate potential to replace obsolete mobile homes	Support energy efficiency upgrades to existing units	Consider disposing of unbuildable sites to Army Corps land bank	Re-zone D-18 lands to Mixed Use	Encourage mixed income housing	Market development opportunities to outside developers and financiers	
		Hire fund manager to grow housing fund when it isn't being used to promote housing		Evaluate use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF)		Create strategy for CBJ land disposal aimed at meeting housing goals	Evaluate areas to be up-zoned	Review parking ordinance to ensure policies promote development	Implement blighted areas ordinance	
				Make CBJ land available for projects		Identify land for workforce and senior housing to be developed through national	Require residential and commercial uses in mixed-use zoning			
				Ensure assisted living facilities are connected to affordable workforce housing		Reduce setbacks and minimum lot sizes for duplex units			Develop incentives and provide assistance to upgrade and permit existing vacant residential units	
				Coordinate and support training for CNA's, LPN's		Infrastructure development automatically triggers upzoning				
				Create tax abatement program for first-time home buyers		Update T49 as envisioned by 2013 Comp. Plan Update				
				Down payment assistance and property upgrade assistance						

Motion for rules of speaking at Lemon Creek Steering Committee Meetings

Members wishing to speak on a subject or to a motion will restrict their speaking time to two minutes. Time will be kept by a person appointed by the chair.

Unless they are out of order, speakers will not be interrupted.

All members will be given a chance to speak at which point members will then be given one minute for rebuttal or additional comments.

Speaking time is not bankable. You may not speak to one minute at first and have two minutes for follow up. If you choose not to speak on the first round you still have a minute at the follow up period.

Chair will appoint a monitor to track on paper who speaks on a subject. Who's turn to speak first will rotate with each new subject.

The chair will use the agenda to determine discussion topics.

Speaking to the motion.

While we have agreed to basically operate by Roberts Rules similar to the assembly, we do not have the time for our meetings to extend to 11 o'clock like theirs do. If we are to get our work done on time we have to become more efficient.

Last meeting we had a steering committee member interrupt almost every other speaker, sometimes more than once as the other person tried to speak. This same member gave a lengthy, shouting at times tirade that was accusatory, and in no way constructive, and appeared to embarrass most of the rest of us. This same member has made denigrating comments to other committee members and our liaison.

I and others feel that we need to enact rules that ensure that everyone gets a chance to speak, uninterrupted, and ensure that we do not spend too much time hashing things out that could have been understood and quickly vetted had everyone done their homework. Not being prepared is no excuse for making all the other members go over things two, three or four times. Questions on the materials can be submitted to Jill ahead of the meetings

I feel that we need to enact the proposed rules tonight, and that anyone who cannot abide by these rules, resign from the committee so that the others can finish this endeavor in this lifetime. If one continues to violate these rules they should be removed from the committee and their participation be as a public member observing our work.