

Planning Commission
August 21, 2013

Item #7 –

Infill Incentive District Revision Sub-Committee Update, Potential Expansion and Procedural Issues

Chair Keith – ...Let's move on to the next item on the agenda, it's the Infill Incentive District Revision Sub-Committee Update, Potential Expansion and Procedural Issues this is an Action Item and is there a staff presentation Jim?

Jim Mazzocco – Mr. Chairman we don't really have a presentation we brought along our slideshow, but I would rather turn it over to the two Commissioners who have been participating and let them give you their viewpoints on all this rather than give you our viewpoints.

Chair Keith – Alright, Commissioner Rex

Comm. Rex – Thank You. I want to express my appreciation of the completeness of the presentation that you've given in the packet to Commissioners because it has really given a good snapshot of what we've been through. In particular, we are wanting to be very clear that the items that we're dealing with in the revision are what the Mayor and Council directive would be, which is to give prominence to neighborhood protection, clarify the role of formal commitments, provide for an improved design review element and ensure the IID infill incentive district stays an incentive, work with the Streetcar Land Use Plan to ensure the consistency which again we just heard about the streetscape that is really one of the elements, obviously and then look not to create redundancy with the other overlays like the Downtown Links, but, again, so we heard that in the first presentation. So some of this is coming along and we're, so far we've done a lot of fact finding, we've heard a lot of presentation and research and we're now ready to move forward with generating some responses to these items that Mayor and Council had us ask the committee to address, as part of that we would like to have more involvement of the community and we were talking at our last meeting of having a citizens participation on the committee, like a contingent from the development community, a contingent from the neighborhood community, a contingent from like Dean Cervelli and the University and my understanding is that if we have the citizens as part of this committee, subcommittee, that we can no longer, they are also under open meeting law? I guess that's a question for Mr. McMahon.

Chair Keith – Tom could you clarify?

Tom McMahon – Sure Mr. Chair, Commissioner Rex and all the rest of the Commissioners, the Open Meetings Law applies to committees, specifically committees which are formed by a legislative body, by the Mayor & Council for the purpose of advising them. Therefore, this subcommittee specifically was created by Mayor & Council for the purpose of advising them on this subject so it applies to that committee. Therefore, it's the opinion in my office that any members are added whether we call them ad-hoc members or ex-officio members or just simply non-voting members would still be subject to the same restrictions that you folks are

Comm. Rex – So with that and that was our understanding. On the last couple of pages of the insert that Jim's provided is we had some information some recommendations of different people that were interested in participating in this. So the reason why we're bringing this update to you, obviously as an update, but also that we need to be able to discuss with the entire commission how it is that we are

going to be including more public participation as we go forward with the draft of what we need to produce which is where we are going to be going from here. So Commissioner Beeker if there is anything to add to that

Comm. Beeker – I’m, I sent an email to Jim earlier this week looking to other alternatives rather than putting the people from the community who come to help us do problem solving and to give us our input to have an opportunity to participate with us without having to be considered a formal part of the infill incentive district. I am the person who shook the trees and said can’t we get community involvement into this whole thing, I do not see these, this community involvement being more than two meetings where we really zero in on ok, what do we have as problems what do we have as solutions with the opportunity for people with a wide interest to have the opportunity to find things that they cooperate on and by the time they’re finished, hey you know, we have the development world and the neighborhoods all being real comfortable saying yep, we’ve come up with what we need to do. Once we move beyond them sitting and talking with us and so on, I do not see, I don’t know, we have to get this finished before December because Cathy’s going to be gone by December, but the writing of the ordinance itself, I do not see this resource that we’re bringing in for the community input being there as voting or non-voting members I don’t see them as members, I see them as guest presenters who come in a panel and have the opportunity to talk to us just like Keri Silvyn and Chris Gans talked to us a couple meetings ago and giving us their point of view and their information, but having the opportunity for exchanges. What we have had thus far, for, with the exception of those two people we have a call to the audience, a call to the audience does not allow anybody, even for us to talk to them and to say ask or answer questions, there, in my mind there simply has to be a way that people who are most impacted by what we come up with being involved in a, in a setting where there can be exchanges and talking and Jim Campbell can say to Chris Gans, well, would this work for you if you were thinking about this and having an exchange and so I came up with two ideas, one that they simply be guests that we bring in, resource people to have this conversation or to say hey, it’s basically a study session and we just had people come and talking to us about something that was nothing that we’re gonna be making decision on at all here. Isn’t there another alternative that we can use for two meetings where people could have the opportunity to talk, discuss, interact without having to be formal members of our subcommittee

Chair Keith – Ok. Very quickly to Commissioner Rex and Commissioner Beeker since Commissioner Saylor-Brown who is the third member isn’t here tonight, since it’s only two and this is just kind of a discussion and then Commissioner Lavaty had a question also or a comment, is there any rationale to avoid the open meetings law if this is only two meetings? And I ask the question because if it’s a legal issue then we certainly don’t want to skirt state law would there be any reason not to plan the two meeting in advance and give public notice like we do for our Planning Commission hearings and that in my mind that kind of determines where we go from there

Comm. Rex – Even though it might actually just be two meetings my understanding of open meeting law is that we would basically be prevented from talking with these people about these issues until the Planning Commission as a whole has made some sort of determination is that a fair understanding?

Tom McMahon – I think the problem as it was originally described to me was that it would prohibit communication between the people that you are asking to appear (*Catherine Rex – Right*) and it would prevent communication between you and those people in anything other than an open meeting and the answer to that is yes, it does create those problems. I don’t see, if I can continue, I don’t necessarily see that there is a problem with what Commissioner Beeker suggested in having speakers here I think having Keri Silvyn come in and agendize it as an attorneys view of the IID or something that is sufficiently broad

and descriptive that it would put anybody on notice and they could be there if they wanted to be there I don't see a problem with that. If you bring in a bunch of people at the same time my fear is that at some point if they don't interact with you in the traditional manner whereby they address you and you address them with questions which is perfectly acceptable, if there is cross talk among those people it seems to me that there could be a claim that they've assumed a deliberative function that you perform as a committee or subcommittee than therefore they are in fact members

Comm. Rex - So if they are making a dis (sic) like as Commissioner Beeker was saying if we have a discussion amongst all of the people in the room like you say, the crosstalk between them, between us, at a formal meeting so it's not called a study session, it's not called a call to the public it's, but it would not be as you say, an agenda item where we are having a presentation, we've already had those we now want to have a discussion. So what we are trying to get at is to have a couple meetings where we can have discussions with the community members and then what I wouldn't mind seeing then is in an order to continue the follow up is that they could then be a resource to staff and then we can hear back from them

Chair Keith – Before we go any further, Commissioner Lavaty do you want to put in input?

Comm. Lavaty – No, I think let them go ahead I was trying to develop something on the order of an open forum, but I think that if you do that you're going to have to throw it wide open I don't think you can restrict (Commissioner Rex – that's ok) the attendance (Commissioner Rex – that's ok) but I do think that you could get away with that under the open meeting and the crosstalk as if it was just a wide open forum at the subcommittee

Chair Keith – Tom

Tom McMahon – Mr. Chair and Commissioner Lavaty, Commissioners, to just raise an additional fear I have, when you do throw an open meeting like that there is a reason for the traditional format of the meetings and the way we hold them and it's to control the meetings and to prevent open meetings violations and to prevent other problems, in that people only and it is in our rules, they only address the commissioners and the commissioners only address them. If you have crosstalk it's going to be very hard to assure that you stay on and within the agenda when people are just discussing things among themselves, that's more a practical consideration than it is a legal consideration

Chair Keith – Just really quickly, one other question for Commissioner Rex and Beeker, I heard Dean Cervelli's name tossed out and Keri Silvyn, my, the thinking that I'm going through right now is that they are all very professional and very used to open meetings, you know, I think in my mind at least you could solicit the input that you're looking for from those caliber of participants I think they would be able to get around the discussion aspect, but Commissioner Beeker

Comm. Beeker – I really do not want it limited to those professional people this is something that is a concern among those people who are in the building and development world and the people who live in these areas of the neighborhoods that are there . I do not, I don't have a problem with us limiting who comes and sits around a table in that those are the people who are going to be able to interact and to address the situation. If there are others in the audience who are also interested they would have the opportunity during call to the audience to make whatever response they wanted to, to it, but to, I don't know how you have good problem solving, good public involvement in problem solving where everybody has to be called upon before they can say a word by a Chair who says well you can

acknowledge this and then if somebody who else wants to say something has to be called on and it always has to be coming back and forth through the Chair. Any good functioning committee that I have served on, until I've hit Planning Commission has had the opportunity for people to really have meaningful interactions – at the land use committee that Jim and Adam had, the parking stuff that ended up coming to Planning Commission – Cathy was there, Thomas was there, but they weren't there in this kind of a strait jacket we were able to really talk and work things through, I just, as you can hear I find this so utterly frustrating that we don't have a means in this City because of the fact that Mayor and Council said do it through the Planning Commission to be able to have a good open, productive problem solving coming from our community of the people who really care

Tom McMahon – I don't think it will give you any solace, but I can tell you the reasoning and the reasoning is that I believe the committee that you are talking about which was more of a stakeholders group those people were giving advice and direction to the Director as opposed to Mayor & Council and the open meetings act applies to those committees who are directing legislative bodies as opposed to those who are directing or advising an individual Director. I realize that's a very slim distinction and I suppose it doesn't give you any solace, but that's the reasoning and I suppose that another solution which may or may not be attractive is that I suppose that this group of people who were suggested could actually be an ad-hoc group to advise the Director who then brings the recommendation to the committee I suppose that could then happen

Chair Keith – Commissioner Patten did you have a comment and then Commissioner Rex

Comm. Patten – I'm just going to ask, would it be possible then for the Director to call a stakeholder group and our two commissioners that are on the panel here be, go as concerned citizens?

Tom McMahon – Whenever those two commissioners are in a single place carrying out business you've got a quorum of that - it is a meeting of that subcommittee if you've got

Comm. Rex – So then in those cases where you have a stakeholder meeting only one commissioner could go but the commissioners could go as members of public but not more than one

Tom McMahon - Yes, let me just say there is another provision that people don't often talk about the open meetings act and we usually look at it as there can only be a violation when a quorum is present or there is contact among the quorum, but there is a provision in the open meetings act that says if there is a deliberate attempt to circumvent the open meetings act even with less than a quorum you can violate the open meetings act

Comm. Rex – Right, right

Tom McMahon – And I feel bad that I am only here to present you with non-solutions other than the fact that perhaps if people were advising the director that might be a solution

Chair Keith – Commissioner Lavaty?

Comm. Lavaty - Just for one second Ruth, how much if you were to throw them open how much of a problem would it be how big a crowd would you anticipate getting if it looks like it's a group of people who are already interested and concerned with what you're doing than I think you might be able to get away with an open forum type of notification in that case and call it a meeting of the subcommittee to

hold an open forum of interested parties in a discussion, that one I think you can do as long as you notice it, but it can get out of hand pretty quickly and there is just no way to control it so if you have too big a group then I don't think that you want to consider that

Chair Keith – Commissioner Beeker than Commissioner Rex

Comm. Beeker – From my informal talking to people in the neighborhood and to people from the development community everybody pretty much is on the same page knowing what needs to be done and I don't see it becoming a shouting match, I don't see it becoming angry in the whole thing, but in some way the City of Tucson really does lack means for having people who are most impacted having the opportunity to be those who bring forth solutions and it just strikes me as I have already talked to a couple of Mayor and Council people, don't ever put anything through Planning Commission in the future if you really want a good meaningful discussion of doing problem solving because this does not lend itself to being able to do that.

Chair Keith – Commissioner Rex

Comm. Rex – So what I think might be possible then, with Mr. McMahon's blessing is to go ahead and have a stakeholder's group that does report to staff and is able to review the documentation as we process it at the same time if we could have the next two meetings specifically called out as forum meetings and if you could be present to make certain we stay on track and those meetings would then, we have what 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 items the Mayor & Council has asked us to review and if we were to stay only on these items as were on the forum the people that have been attending the meetings are as Commissioner Lavaty has pointed out responsible people they have been very good about sticking to the point so I agree I don't think we're going to have a problem there in terms of significant cross talk if we make it very clear that these are the only things that we are going to be talking about is that in your opinion?

Tom McMahon – I think that may be workable to do it precisely as you and Commissioner Lavaty have suggested I don't mean to imply that if that will satisfy your needs that you have to do the additional advisory group to advise staff or the Director as some sort of artifice to make that legal if that will suffice for your needs than you can do that

Comm. Rex – I don't want to limit the public or the community to just those two meetings I want them to continue to be participants in a more active way than simply as a call to the audience which that means that they would then need to report to staff but that's how any community member would process the information correct without actually having a stakeholder's group

Chair Keith – Jim

Jim Mazzocco – Mr. Chair members of the Commission just a little history when the IID was first being devised back in 2009 we had formed the Land Use Code Committee and they worked on the draft at the same time we had a commission subcommittee and we would bring that document that had been worked on to the commission's subcommittee so there was this balancing act of going to the land use code committee working on the draft and bringing back to the commission's subcommittee. The Commission's subcommittee then would finalize and refine whatever they got and then take it on to the Planning Commission all I'm saying is that's what we did without a lot of thought and discussion back in 2009.

Chair Keith – Ok Jim just to clarify, since this is an action item, are you looking for a motion out of this or just some kind of determination from the Commission

Jim Mazzocco – Well I'm kind of at a dead end as a staff person here, I don't know what to do about September 9th as far as what you want on the agenda because, you know, I've offered and sometimes I've gotten some throw back and I just want to make sure that whatever is on that agenda that the subcommittee is happy with and if you have items you tell me and I will put them on if you want me to suggest items I will, but I won't force anything on you – I want to make that really clear and then this issue of the subcommittee what do you want to do is my question. I'm fine with any answer on that

Chair Keith – Ok one more question for you, if the not subcommittee extra members but it's the director's committee, stakeholders group, who would go about appointing and deciding who is on that stakeholder's group – I ask because it's clearly there's some members

Jim Mazzocco – There's two routes to go either you the Planning Commission do that and then you have a subcommittee under open meeting law or you just request that the Director do something, we know who is on the list, we know who spoke at the hearing, we know generally what size that was talked about at the subcommittee that could be formed, but they, so that there is a space between you the Commission and this subcommittee, you know, we'll bring our recommendations, we'll tell you what they said, but we may disagree with them and we'll show you what that is, but there has to be, that has to be put on the table because you can't say and do what we're saying through that subcommittee you have to give a little bit of freedom to the staff to work with the subcommittee, or this ad-hoc committee whatever you want to call them, but then they would not be an open meeting law group they can talk to each other, they can call each other they can serve on other committees with Mayor and Council and not be affected and they can show up at the subcommittee and talk to the subcommittee because they are not part of your group they are not advising you, directly, they are advising us and then they can act as citizens and talk to you so it allows more options

Chair Keith – Thank You I just wanted to clarify that distinction and the separation between the two

Comm. Rex – So then what and again Commissioner Beeker if you could, say whether this is acceptable, again have open forum on the agenda for September 9th and 23rd and that would be a specific discussion points on those 6 items and that would be between the committee members and the public and it would be noticed as such and we would encourage the community to come as they have been both the infill and the neighborhood community with that information then staff would go back and prepare a draft because we would have given our input, we would have heard our input with the community and that draft would then start down the process like your land use code committee had done which then those drafts come back to the committee is that

Comm. Beeker – That's not what I heard, what I heard Jim saying is we're not going to be there that the staff is going to have a forum with the people who want to be there and I find that totally unacceptable

Jim Mazzocco – I'm only telling you from history, I'm not telling you what to do

Comm. Beeker – and I'm just saying that strikes me as totally unacceptable that if we can't be in the room with the people who are the participants who are most directly involved with it and we are the ones that are supposed to bring back the recommendations I think that sucks

Chair Keith – Ok. Commissioner Rex

Comm. Rex – and I wasn't understanding it that way. What I was understanding was that we have two steps one is we do as your saying, which is to have that open communication for the next two meetings but after that when the actual drafting of the text occurs that happens with the stakeholders because our input has already been talked over with the community with the staff understanding what the direction would be and then it comes into the reiterative process that you don't like, but that's what we're faced with I guess, but I'm hoping to have both

Comm. Beeker – But what I thought I heard was that if there is going to be a community forum it would be conducted by staff and we would not be able to be there, is that correct?

Jim Mazzocco – No, I didn't even talk about a community forum what you're hearing from Commissioner Rex is completely her idea I was just talking about what tradition what we had historically done in the past and that's all I was talking about I wasn't even making a recommendation what Commissioner Rex I understand is saying that September 9th and September 23rd you would have us put on the agenda the six items that are the key pieces and that we would call those general discussion or community forum whatever you want to call that and the community would be invited to speak on that on each item in even in a crosstalk manner that you would be listening to and then after those two meetings you would have us, staff work with a ad-hoc committee that we would put together to come up with a draft and then we would come back to you with a preliminary draft that we had worked on with the ad-hoc committee after those two meetings is that correct? And I'm just asking what I heard not what I'm recommending

(Comm. Rex – in the background agreeing with Jim's summary of what she said)

Chair Keith – Just really briefly since you are the subcommittee of the Planning Commission do any of the other Planning Commissioners because I see some heads nodding in one way or the other do any of the other Planning Commissioners have any thoughts on this? Does this sound like a fair process? Because I would like to move forward with the Agenda. Commissioner Maher

Comm. Maher – Well Mr. Chair, fellow Commissioners it sounds like a fair process, but I'm extremely curious, I have to ask, is that, I was under the impression that the IID needed some tweaking but are we throwing it out and starting over I mean it sounds like we want to add more committee members get tremendous input from stakeholders or from the community but I was under the impression this was meant for a couple of Design Review Committee perhaps ensuring that historic is protected what have you, but I'm under the impression that we are completely starting over is that what's happening? And if that is what's happening fine but I'm just very curious that is what I'm curious about otherwise what has been suggested sounds like a way to get there under our government rules and Robert's Rules of Order and all that stuff

Chair Keith – Ernie?

Ernie Duarte – Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, Commissioner Maher, I don't think that is the intent here, the direction from the council was fairly clear, look at the infill incentive district look at specific areas that need adjustments the message that I took back from the council's direction of the 19th of March this year was keep it an incentive, make sure that the infill incentive district does stay as

an incentive but take the necessary steps to look at it and make the adjustments necessary and bring back some recommendations and I will go on to read to you the motion from the Council Member specific to work with the Planning Commission and a subcommittee of the Planning Commission to do this work

Comm. Maher – It's just that I'm reading between the lines and it just sounds like its being blown up

Chair Keith – Commissioner Beeker

Ruth Beeker - What is being blown up in my mind Joe, is how you are able to get the people who are most involved in doing the tweaking we have made this into a really, really difficult kind of process because of the open meeting law that says that people who are most involved cannot sit down together and try to find a solution and I think probably in my talking with individual people we have maybe four or five major points that will come out of this whole thing, I simply would like buy in before it comes back to here and have people come back and say but you didn't address something that we thought was really important and the reason we haven't addressed it is because those individuals never got a chance to interact and to say if you do this would this work, do you think that this would be a solution and somebody from the neighborhood can say to somebody from the development world, ya, if you did that that would work real fine. I would like that by the time it comes back to this group that we don't have people coming to that mike who are saying why didn't we ever have a chance to really interact with other people who had different points of view or maybe had different ways of presenting solutions to this. I do not see this starting from scratch at all I do think there are a very limited kind of things when you look at what's up there that people are pretty much on the same page of how to go about doing it I would like them to have a chance to talk and realize that they are all on the same page

Chair Keith – Ok. And I think we all understand the frustration with the laws that govern us as a body, an appointed body but we have to find a solution tonight so that you can move forward and make a recommendation to Mayor and Council as you were tasked to do. Commissioner Rex

Comm. Rex – So does the Commission need to make a motion or action based upon the idea of having the next two meetings as forum meetings on those topics and then having the stakeholders advise staff, is any of that actionable by the Commission?

Tom McMahon – I think we have it agendized as an action item so it would probably be appropriate to have a motion

Chair Keith – Would you like to (illegible) as a motion Commissioner?

Comm. Patten – I'd like to motion that we move forward with Commissioner Rex's plan and that the next two meetings of the subcommittee be open meetings and staff have a stakeholder engagement group

Comm. Maher – I'll second that

Chair Keith – So we have a motion by Commissioner Patten and a Second by Commissioner Maher is there any discussion, any further discussion. Ok seeing none all in favor, I (various I's) all opposed? (nothing heard). Ernie?

Ernie Duarte – Mr. Chair members of the Commission not to add to the complexity, something the Commission may want to discuss and it may have been mentioned earlier is that the subcommittee's chair Commissioner Rex's term expires on the 14th - September 14th, I'm sorry, which is less than 30 days and so the commission may want to discuss filling that void upon expiration of her term

Chair Keith – You said September right,

Comm. Rex – I thought it was December, see you guys, I'll be public then

Chair Keith – You have made things more complex – Jim do you have any recommendation?

Jim Mazzocco – We will double check on that, but Belinda just made me aware of that I was under the impression it was December

Tom McMahon – I'm sorry I just began talking there impolitely – Mr. Chair my sheet from the City Clerk's office says that Commissioner Rex was appointed on September 16, 2005 and expiration is December 7th of 2009 so I don't know

Ernie Duarte – We received an email notice today from the City Clerk's office notifying us of the September 14th expiration of the term

Chair Keith - So is it your recommendation that we discuss appointing another subcommittee member tonight?

Tom McMahon – Can we get, before we resolve that, can we get a roll call on that last vote because I wasn't sure and you didn't announce that it was unanimous – can we get a roll call on that

Chair Keith – I believe it was unanimous but Belinda can you do a roll call just to make sure

Belinda – Roll Call

Chair Keith – I

Comm. Lavaty – I

Comm. Maher – I

Comm. Podolsky – I

Comm. Rex – I

Comm. Rogers – I

Comm. Beeker – PASS

Comm. Patten – I

Comm. Wissler – I

Comm. Yee – I

Chair Keith - So we have 9 votes for and 1 abstain so the motion passes. Commissioner Lavaty.

Comm. Lavaty – Ernie in the past as the term expired the commissioner was asked to stay on until the ward office appointed a replacement does anyone know whether there is an imminent replacement or whether that is likely to stretch to some period of time

Tom McMahon – Chairman Keith and Commissioner Lavaty, Commissioners, in fact, I think at an early stage in my career I advised you that you could do that and I was reprimanded by the City Clerk's office who told me that that limitation is a strict limitation and you cannot serve beyond that point

Comm. Lavaty – I did kind of remember that advice actually

Chair Keith – So Ernie is your recommendation that we appoint or discuss a new subcommittee member

Ernie Duarte – Chair Keith in as much as the second subcommittee is scheduled for a date subsequent to the 14th of September I think it would be prudent for the Commission to consider making an appointment to replace Commissioner Rex who is Chair of the subcommittee

Chair Keith – tonight? Pause. Commissioner Beeker.

Ruth Beeker – Does that mean that the three members of the subcommittee then re-elect a chair or does it mean that whoever replaces her automatically becomes the chair

Chair Keith - Ernie

Ernie Duarte – Council advises me that the subcommittee would vote on the chair of that subcommittee

Chair Keith – Do we have any volunteers for the subcommittee or else I may appoint you

LONG SILENCE

Chair Keith – So does staff have any recommendation on how to proceed? PAUSE. Jim?

Jim Mazzocco – I guess my recommendation is that you have to pick one of you and it's as simple as that and if the person wants to try it out they can try it out and if they don't like it they can come back and you pick somebody else, but hopefully that person sticks with it

Chair Keith – Would anyone like to try it out? Commissioner Beeker

Comm. Beeker – It really isn't nearly as involved as it has sounded like it is tonight. It is not going to be rocket science in order to come up with these tweaking's and they actually are tweaking's it does require somebody becoming familiar enough with the infill incentive district to understand what it is that is being tweaked and so from that point of view having an understanding of the ordinance would require some background but it makes it sound like we're going to be working on this for three years, there isn't any way in the world that we should be working on this for three years when I said that we should finish by December when Cathy is there I think that we should be finished by November if we get some good discussion going on with these are the problems here are our recommendations I see maybe there are six recommendations that will be coming back that will do the tweaking that will leave everybody satisfied that we have addressed the things that have been troublesome this far and so while I am probably the reason nobody wants to ever think about doing this because of what I have been complaining about this evening I haven't been complaining about the task the task is not a difficult task I have been complaining about the process that we are the strait jacket that we have been put in getting good community input to be able to give our community both from the citizens the residents who live there and from the development community and from professional people who have been dealing with

this sitting down together and saying ya, here is a tweak there is a tweak ya we all agree this will work this is not this isn't anything that is an overwhelming kind of thing to get involved with it has been made very difficult in my mind by the rules and regulations of how open meeting laws have to occur

Chair Keith – Jim could you remind me of the schedule the subcommittee meeting schedule

Jim Mazzocco – Right now there are two meetings that we have scheduled one is September 9th the other is September 23rd the meetings start at 6 o'clock

Chair Keith – And what day of the week are those

Jim Mazzocco – Monday and we do not have a room right now for September 9th Belinda you were going to update us on that if we ever go to that, the room we had was I thought insufficient but it was the only room we could find and I think Belinda found two places more in the midtown rather than in the downtown, could you mention those rooms

Belinda – sure, one was the Woods Memorial Library on 1st Ave and the Second was the Himmel Park Library at 1035 N Treat

Jim Mazzocco – right, they were large enough we felt, Himmel was kind of small, 40 some people we have been getting around 20 to 30 people in the last few meetings at the first one we had two but they have grown since then so those are the parameters

Chair Keith – I believe that Commissioner Patten may volunteer on the condition that she may be out for one of the dates, Commissioner Patten

Comm. Patten – Yes I will volunteer but I unfortunately am out of town on the 9th so I cannot attend that meeting so if there is somebody

Jim Mazzocco – Well Commissioner Rex is still there

Comm. Patten – Oh Cathy is still there, ok, alright

Chair Keith – I'm seeing lots of nods and no one else volunteered so Commissioner Patten is appointed to the Infill Incentive District Subcommittee so thank you Commissioner Patten for stepping up to that.