CALL TO ORDER, AGENDA REVIEW, CONFLICT DISCLOSURE
REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES – November 6, 2019
REVIEW DRAFT ALTERNATIVES
NEXT STEPS, DISCUSS AGENDA FOR POSSIBLE 1/29 OR 2/5 MEETING IF NEEDED
RECAP OF DECISIONS AND CONSENSUS
PUBLIC COMMENT
ADJOURN

CALL TO ORDER, AGENDA REVIEW, CONFLICT DISCLOSURE
Chair Maradel Gale called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM. Steering Committee Members in attendance were Vice-chair Micah Strom, Donna Harui, Scott Anderson, Michael Loverich, Sam Marshall, Mark Tiernan, John Decker, Asaph Glosser, Michael Pollock (City Council), Jon Quitslund (Planning Commission) and Jane Rein (Design Review Board). City Staff present were Engineering Manager Mike Michael, Senior Planner Jennifer Sutton and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes. City Consultants Jeff Arango (Framework) and Charlie Wenzlau (Wenzlau Architects) were also in attendance.

The agenda was reviewed. Steering Committee Member John Decker asked to add an item to the review of draft alternatives agenda item. He asked that there be time allotted to presenting Consensus Plans a subgroup of the Steering Committee had come up with in response to the three draft alternatives presented for review that week by Framework.

The conflict disclosure was read, and each member present stated their interest/ownership in the Island Center area.

After a request from the public in attendance that the group move to the Council Chamber (as a result of a large public attendance), City Councilmember Michael Pollock introduced himself and provided the Steering Committee with copies of a handout entitled “Four Simple Rules of Parliamentary Procedure” for running a meeting while stating that he hoped everyone would take them home and they would be used at the next meeting as he felt the meetings had not thus far been run in the correct manner. After his statement, Chair Gale recessed the committee in order to move to the Council Chamber.

When the meeting returned from recess Chair Maradel Gale asked for a vote of confidence in her ability to continue chairing the Steering Committee saying that if there was not full confidence, she would step down as chair. Each committee member spoke individually with unanimous confidence in Ms. Gale’s leadership.
REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES – November 6, 2019
A request for a change in the public statement by Heide Madden to “she requested there be a pathway from Holly Farm Lane,” not an extension of the road.”

Motion: I’ll make a motion to accept them.
Loverich/Strom: Passed Unanimously

REVIEW DRAFT ALTERNATIVES
Consultant Jeff Arango (Framework) provided an overview of the three draft alternatives brought to the meeting.

Steering Committee Member Michael Loverich presented the “Consensus Plans” compiled by the Steering Committee.

Chair Gale summarized the discussion:
• Use the alternative three “Consensus Plan” from the Committee for the basis of the optimal plan to work from.
• Pedestrian and non-motorized amenities shown in entirety as opposed to bits and pieces.
• Remove extensive discussion of TDRs and sewer expansion as it threw too many unknown elements into it at that point in time and made it really hard to move beyond where they were in terms of how they would re-zone or re-classify those areas.

Committee members brought up the following priorities previously discussed:
• Pedestrian and alternative transportation should be a priority and backbone or theme of what they were doing all the way from the Grand Forest to Gazzam Lake.
• Critical Areas
• Historic Areas
• Farmland
• Addressing issues associated with motorized transportation including both volumes and speed.
• Parking that was not hazardous.
• Access to the water.
Motion: I move that the consultant create three new alternatives largely based on those presented by Michael that are attentive to policy levers and other existing circumstances.
Glosser/Strom: Passed Unanimously

NEXT STEPS, DISCUSS AGENDA FOR POSSIBLE 1/29 OR 2/5 MEETING IF NEEDED
It was decided the Steering Committee would meet on January 29, 2020 and keep the February 10, 2020 public meeting.

RECAP OF DECISIONS AND CONSENSUS
Recapped earlier in meeting before discussion of next steps.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Chris Neal, SavelsIslandCenter.com – Did not understand the rush for a February 10, 2020 public meeting. He liked Michael Loverich’s work and could get behind a version of that.

Therese Charvet, Holly Farm Lane - Thanked everyone for their hard work and Michael for his comprehensive alternative.

Tracy Collier, Miller Road – Felt there was not time to prepare adequately for a February 10, 2020 meeting.

Patti Dusbabek, Holly Farm Lane – Wanted to see the committee resurrect what the Environmental Protection Agency sent to the city a number of times in order to control development as there was limited water on the island that was jeopardized by over-expansion.

Heather Burger, Friends of the Farms – Mentioned the reference to LU4 and LU4.2 from the Comprehensive Plan contained in the Overview of the draft alternatives which focused on the development of housing and small scale commercial and service activity and asked the committee to consider the 59 Goals and Recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan that support local farms and food.

Lisa Neal, Fletcher Bay Rd – Thanked the committee for the plans they had created and felt they were doing good work.

ADJOURN
The meeting adjourned at 8:34 PM.
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ALTERNATIVE 2
ALTERNATIVE 3

- **TRAILS**
- **ISLAND CENTER MAIN STREET**
- **ISLAND CENTER MIXED USE STREET**
- **STUDY AREA**
- **PARKS**
- **R - 0.4 (1 UNIT PER 2.5 ACRES)**
- **R - 1 (1 UNIT PER ACRE)**
- **ISLAND CENTER MIXED USE (HIGHER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY)**

PARKS

STUDY AREA

R - 0.4 (1 UNIT PER 2.5 ACRES)

R - 1 (1 UNIT PER ACRE)

ISLAND CENTER MIXED USE (HIGHER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY)

ALTERNATIVE 3

Miller Rd NE

Springridge Rd NE

Fletcher Bay Rd NE

Holly Farm Ln NE

Battle Point Dr NE

NE New Brooklyn Rd

NE Berganio Rd

NE Fletcher Bay Rd
Island Center Alternatives
Generated from committee consensus maps

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

- **Current use:** Nursery/retail
- **Parcel A:** Size: 3.7 acres
- **Parcel B:** Size: 4 acres
- **Current use:** Undeveloped
- **Current zoning:** NC
- **Future zoning:** R-0.6

**GOALS**

- Expandability of use, meaning that it could be used for any future use as ownership of the property changes.
- Infrastructure improvements to limit noise, possibly pervious etc.
- Potential use of upland portion for playground, parking, community space, etc.

**ISSUES**

- **Current access points:** all on Fletcher Bay Street
- **3rd access point:** just outside access points along Fletcher Bay Street
- **Nisqually/Springridge Corridor Improvement:** Previously proposed for public use

**DATE CONSENSUS REACHED:** 08/21/2019

**DATE CONSENSUS REACHED:** 07/17/2019

**CHANGE FROM 'CONTRACT' ZONING TO REGULAR OR 'ISLAND CENTER ZONING'**

- **Current use:** Vacant
- **Current zoning:** R-0.4
- **Potential zoning:** R-0.6
- **Possible new traffic calming:** if development occurs near intersections
- **Potential expansion of Island Center zoning:** from the corner while considering current and future infrastructure and the need for a staging area for large trucks and materials.

**EXISTING BUSINESSES**

- All existing businesses are accessed from this road.
- 'The Grand Forest' and 'Gazzam Forest to Sky Trail' are proposed.
- Issues for Bainbridge Gardens are proposed.
- No crosswalks available.

**PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS**

- Awkward visibility for eastbound traffic.
- Limited space between roads.
- Steep downward slope for area feel like a strip.
- Non-motorized infrastructure is important water features in the neighborhood.

**CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS**

- **New Brooklyn and Miller Road intersection:** places where it makes sense.
- **Date consensuses reached:** 07/17/2019.
- **Create a transportation environment that addresses all users.**
- **Expandability of use:** meaning it could be used for any future use as ownership of the property changes.
- **Infrastructure improvements to limit noise, possibly pervious etc.**
- **Potential use of upland portion for playground, parking, community space, etc.**

**PUBLIC ACCESS TO FLETCHER BAY**

- **Additional viewing or access points**
- **Committee approval:** Not approved yet.
What do we value?
All the existing businesses and the services offered
What do we value?
The natural features and rural atmosphere of the area
Where do we see improvements?
Less congested streetscape
Better access to our natural resources
Support for local businesses, the economy of Island Center
Some additional small scale business expansion.
Alternate 1
Existing Zoning with public amenities

Current NC Zoning = 7.8 acres

Current NC zoning allows for:
- 35% lot coverage
- 35’ building height
- Maximum 5 housing units per acre
  - 2 Units base
  - +1 unit if affordable
  - +1 unit if from a TDR
  - or
  - +3 units if sewer is available

Max build out in regards to housing:
- 40 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16 Units Base</th>
<th>+16 Bonus Units</th>
<th>+8 Community Septic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Map showing study area boundary, trails, existing open space, and new open space]
Alternate 2
Slight Modifications

IC Zoning = 14.6 acres

IC Zone 1 allows for:
65% lot coverage
25’ building height
Maximum 5 housing units per acre
  2 Units base
  +3 unit if affordable
  or
  +3 unit if from a TDR
  or
  +3 units if project incorporates agricultural uses
*Potential reduction of parking requirements with further study.

65% lot coverage
25’ building height
Maximum 11 housing units within designated Bainbridge Gardens growth boundary, which is the current allowable units on property. No bonus.
*Potential reduction of parking requirements with further study.

Max build out in regards to housing:
51 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alt 1 Max</th>
<th>Bainbridge Gardens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 Units</td>
<td>11 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternate 3
Consensus Plan

IC Zoning = 20.3 acres

**IC zoning allows for:**
- 65% lot coverage
- 25’ building height
- Maximum 5 housing units per acre
  - 2 Units base
  - +3 unit if affordable
    - or
  - +3 unit if from a TDR
    - or
  - +3 units if project incorporates agricultural uses

**IC Zone 2 allows for:**
- 65% lot coverage
- 25’ building height
- Maximum 11 housing units within designated Bainbridge Gardens growth boundary.

**Max build out in regards to housing:**
- 63 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alt 1 Max</th>
<th>Bainbridge Gardens</th>
<th>Alt 3 expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 Units</td>
<td>11 Units</td>
<td>12 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The southern 5 acres of the 10 acre ‘Parcel D’ should be allowed to develop under the provisions of ‘IC’ Zoning if development on ‘Parcel A’ is reduced and a public structure for farmers market or other is built on the property to enhance the 4 corners. Currently ‘Parcel A’ has 5 allowable housing units, those units can be transferred to ‘Parcel D’.

New ingress and egress locations for the four corners will be implemented.

New trail system will link New Brooklyn to Miller Road.

Drawing is an example of one possible strategy.

Parcel A: 1.15 Acres
Currently NC Zoning
5 units allowable

Parcel B: 0.9 Acres
Currently NC Zoning
5 units currently allowed

Parcel C: 4.0 Acres
Currently NC zoning
20 units allowable

Parcel D: 10 Acres
Currently R0.4 Zoning
4 units allowable
1. Parcel ‘A’ will be allowed to develop as a commercial property as long as access to Fletcher Bay is granted.

2. Parcel ‘B’ will be allowed to develop as IC zoning as long as parking is provided for Parcel ‘A’ and Parcel ‘C’ and easement for access road is allowed.

New ingress and egress locations will be implemented.

New trail system will link New Brooklyn to Miller Road.

Request a trail easement on Parcel ‘E’ and possible public farm.

Drawing is an example of one possible strategy.

Parcel A: .56 Acres
Currently R-1
1 unit allowable

Parcel B: 1.27 Acres
Currently R-2
2 units currently allowable
5 units proposed allowable

Parcel C: .26 Acres
Currently NC zoning
1 unit allowable

Parcel D: 1.66 Acres
Currently NC Zoning
8 units allowable
- Community/public farm
- Visual connection to Fletcher Bay
- Affordable housing
- Commercial
- Use existing structures where possible
- New crosswalks
1. Parcel ‘A’ and ‘B’ will be changed from R-1 to commercial zoning to reflect the long running business operating on the property. Parcel ‘C’ will remain as an R-0.4 parcel.

If agricultural activities are maintained on the property the same number of allowable units for Parcel ‘A’ and ‘B’ can be built on Parcel ‘B’ which totals 7 units.

To maintain the quality of the Grand Forest, development rights from Parcel ‘C’ can be transferred to another property.

New off-road trail will link Battle Point Drive to the Grand Forest.

Parcel A: 0.95 Acres
Currently R-1
1 unit allowable

Parcel B: 5.92 Acres
Currently R-1
6 units allowable

Parcel C: 9.6 Acres
Currently R-0.4
4 units allowable

Max number of units in Bainbridge Gardens growth boundary = 11 units.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE VARIABLES</th>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th>ALT 1 EXISTING</th>
<th>ALT 2 SLIGHT MODIFICATIONS</th>
<th>ALT 3 CONSENSUS PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC AMENITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS</strong></td>
<td>Public improvements such as pedestrian and bicycle facilities, public space expansion and improvement, trails, public art, waterfront access, and other improvements may differ between alternatives (see Consensus Maps in Attachment A). Alternatives with greater development potential may require more investments in public amenities and improvements.</td>
<td>Prioritize working with Core-40 to develop safe bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Provide traffic calming, trail network and waterfront access. Conversion of City lot to public park.</td>
<td>Same as Alt 1 with additional requirements written into design guidelines and code to create better non-motorized connectivity. Potential TDR to create new open space without downzoning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL ZONING</strong></td>
<td>The extent and location of neighborhood commercial zoning may differ between alternatives and may include a proposal to create a neighborhood commercial zone that is specific to Island Center.</td>
<td>Existing NC Zoning</td>
<td>Modified NC zoning and potential new Island Center Zoning.</td>
<td>Same as Alt 2 with specific requirements on properties whose zoning has changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING DENSITY + ZONING</strong></td>
<td>The extent and type of residential zoning will differ between alternatives. In addition, the Island Center Subarea Plan is an opportunity to better define appropriate residential zoning within designated centers to ensure consistency with Comprehensive Plan policies.</td>
<td>Existing Zoning: Undelying density is 2 per acre. 5 units per acre max. 1 of which is affordable or 1 of which is through TDR’s or 3 of which is because of sewer 40 units total</td>
<td>Island Center Specific Zoning: 5 units per acre max (existing) 3 of which have to be from: -Affordable housing -TDR’s -Creating agricultural uses on property. 51 units total</td>
<td>Island Center Specific Zoning: 5 units per acre max (existing) 3 of which have to be from: -Affordable housing -TDR’s -Creating agricultural uses on property. 63 units total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE VARIABLES</td>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
<td>ALT 1 EXISTING</td>
<td>ALT 2 SLIGHT MODIFICATIONS</td>
<td>ALT 3 CONSENSUS PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLAND CENTER DESIGNATED BOUNDARY</td>
<td>Island Center does not currently have an official mapped boundary. While the current study area will remain the same during the planning period the final designated boundary will need to be modified to reflect adopted alternative.</td>
<td>Focused on existing Neighborhood Center Zoning</td>
<td>Same as Alt 1 with the partial addition of Bainbridge Garden’s Property.</td>
<td>Expanded boundary but smaller than current planning area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>Island Center does not have sewer service and the alternatives may differ in whether sewer service is expanded and in what manner.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four Simple Rules of Parliamentary Procedure

By A. Gregory Wonderwheel, M.A., J.D.

Many people are intimidated by the words "parliamentary procedure" and by Robert's Rules of Order, both by the book's imposing number of pages and its complex cross referenced rules. Human beings are very complex too, but that doesn't prevent them from being our friends. Similarly, parliamentary rules should be the member's friend, and all the complexity of the rules should be made friendly by an understanding of their common sense relationships to each other.

The purpose of parliamentary rules of order are to help people make group decisions after a full, fair, and free discussion. All the rules of parliamentary procedure may be traced to four fundamental principles of common sense, which I liken to the four legs holding up of the parliamentary table. If the member of the board, committee, or assembly holds these four basic rules in mind, all the other rules will fall into place and easily be put into perspective.

1. One Speaker Speaks at a Time

2. One Question Is Decided at a Time.

3. The Speaker Must Be Respectful.

4. Everyone's Rights Are Protected by Balancing Them with Each Other.

---

1. One Speaker Speaks at a Time. The rules of order about who may get the floor to speak and when a speaker may be interrupted all derive from the simple rule that if any of the members are to be heard then only one member should speak at a time. If someone is speaking then others should be quiet. If another feels it is important enough to interrupt, hopefully that person will know the rule that allows him or her to interrupt. But if the person feels the need to interrupt is important and doesn't know the rule, then the member may always make a parliamentary inquiry to ask the chair if there is a rule that allows for interruption for that purpose. It is the chair's duty to assist members with understanding the rules and finding the appropriate rule to assist the member's participation.

2. One Question Is Decided at a Time. A question is a motion. People need to know what issue is being discussed and when and how it will be decided. All the rules about considering motions and their rank in order are made to avoid confusion about which
a minority larger than one-third when certain significant questions are considered. The
rules requiring or not requiring a second protect the rights of the individual or the
minority to consider or prevent consideration of certain questions. The rules of
quorum and notice protect the absentee members. By having the common sense
understanding of whose rights are being protected by any particular rule, both the
member and the group will appreciate the rule and how the rule operates within the
greater’s scheme of applying the rules to particular circumstances. Knowing that the
rules are balanced to protect everyone’s rights, not just the majority or just a minority,
helps members appreciate why the rules are elaborate.

All the rules of parliamentary procedure relate directly to one or more of these four
simple rules. If these four primary rules are held in mind when conducting meetings,
the members should be able to have their say while the questions needing to be
decided are decided in the most fair and efficient manner possible. Even if a member
isn’t familiar with all the rules of procedure, these four rules will provide enough of a
basis to know by common sense whether the rules of parliamentary procedure
generally are being followed or not. If a member thinks that one of these four rules is
being violated, or not appropriately applied, that is a warning sign. It is always in
order for the member to ask the chair if the member is correct. Then the chair should
assist the member in clarifying the point or question and, if necessary, assist the
member in formulating the proper particular motion to make the point or question
appropriate to consider.