

Public Suggestion
electrek

Suggestion to Camden



Europe just got its first solar-covered cycling path



Michelle Lewis | May 1 2023 - 10:04 am PT | 3 Comments



Europe's first solar-covered cycling path has made its debut in the German city of Freiburg, in the Black Forest – here's the lowdown on the pilot project.

German utility service provider [Badenova](#), along with its partners, the City of Freiburg and the Fraunhofer Institute for Solar Energy Systems, installed the cycling path's solar roof at the Freiburg Exhibition Center, near the Freiburg FC football stadium. The 300-meter-long (984-foot-long) installation is made up of 900 translucent solar modules made by German panel maker Solarwatt. Freiburg-based Clickcon provided the mounting structures.

The solar roof will generate 280 MWh per year, and that will primarily be used by the Fraunhofer Institute's laboratories. Badenova [said](#) in its announcement that the cycle path's solar roof will be brought online in the next couple weeks.

Gateway Plan suggestion
to Arcata Plaza - pathway suggestion



Dr. Karolina Baltins at Fraunhofer Institute, who heads up its PV power plants team, said, “We not only use the solar power of the cycle path canopy, but we are using the knowledge gathered from the pilot project and incorporating it into our research in order to answer the diverse questions for PV in urban areas.”

It’s a win-win: The solar-covered cycling path means that cyclists are sheltered from the elements while they pedal with no emissions, and the shelter makes clean energy. This is definitely a pilot that should be emulated everywhere.

Read more: [Six Flags is about to install one of the largest solar carports in the US](#)

Photos: Badenova

To limit power outages and make your home more resilient, consider going solar with a battery storage system. In order to find a trusted, reliable solar installer near you that offers competitive pricing, check out [EnergySage](#). EnergySage is a free service that makes it easy for you to go solar. They have hundreds of pre-vetted solar installers competing for your business, ensuring you get high quality solutions and save 20 to 30% compared to going it alone. Plus, it’s free to use and you won’t get sales calls until you select an installer and you share your phone number with them.

Your personalized solar quotes are easy to compare online and you’ll get access to unbiased Energy Advisors to help you every step of the way. Get started [here](#).

Mads Odom

From: Fred [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2023 9:06 PM
To: Scott Davies; Dan Tangney; Judith Mayer; Christian Figueroa; Matthew Simmons; Peter Lehman; Joel Yodowitz; David Loya; Jennifer Dart; Delo Freitas
Subject: Suggested format to assist you with the Framework that you are currently using
Attachments: Commissioner Input form v1.3-Entry Form.jpg; Commissioner Input form v1.3-Entry Form-Filled H-2d-with arrows.jpg

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Planning Commission Chair Davies, Commissioners Tangney, Mayer, Figueroa, Lehman, Simmons, Yodowitz
Community Development Director David Loya, Jen Dart, Delo Freitas
From: Fred Weis
Date: Monday, May 8, 2023
General Subject: **Suggested format to assist you with the Framework that you are currently using**

Bold and red are used to highlight, so you can skim.
Each point here is written so you can get the basis of it very quickly.

You do not have to go through the contents in order -- You can skip to what interests you and read what you want.

For a one minute review: Look at Item 7 and read the Summary.

There are many ideas presented here. As an individual, you can select what seems best for you. There can be group agreement on which aspects to use, but that's not necessary. Using any bit of what is presented here has the potential to add efficiency to your process.

Contents:

- 1 - Info on the form that was sent earlier
- 2 - Introduction
- 3 - The Bike Rack situation, and level of importance
- 4 - How the form would be used
- 5 - The basis of the form
- 6 - **The form**
- 7 - **The important information that is included and displayed**
- 8 - **Summary**

1 - Prior to your Thursday, April 27, meeting I wrote to you:

A form to help with the Framework: I have mentioned to you and spoken with David Loya and Chair Scott Davies that I have developed **a one-page form** that would work in

conjunction with your current "Framework" process. Its use would not alter or replace any aspect of the Framework -- it would augment it. It would involve just a few minutes of extra work (which either each of you or staff could do, or a combination) and would, I believe, further increase the efficiency at your meetings. It would also help eliminate the "I thought we were talking about what's on Page 56" and "What is that in reference to?" type of discussions, which occur perhaps more frequently than you may realize.

The format is very similar to what Commissioners Simmons and Lehman are already doing -- just formalizes things a bit, and adds some missing info that will help the process. The idea is to make your comments easier to read by the other Commissioners (and the public) and easier to process and to understand -- and at same time have the discussion be complete, accurate, and faster. I developed the form and have been adjusting it, based on what you have actually been submitting as your comments. As per the current style, I'll present it as a 45-second "elevator pitch" and then a couple of pages of examples and backup material. If you can be more efficient on the smaller areas, then you will have more time to discuss the more visionary or crucial material.

2 - Introduction

What I am suggesting here adds to your existing Framework. **It augments it -- makes it faster and easier.** This saves time.

It does not replace anything you are already doing.

Using this form will take a few minutes of time. You can enter the form, or Staff can do it. Or you can do part and Staff can do part. It could be that you enter all your comments directly onto the forms -- and it won't take any more time at all. The result will be that what you want to express will be more effective.

The Framework has evolved as you've used it. For example, at your last meeting (April 27), you recognized that your comments related to editorial matters -- typographical errors -- are in a different category than "substantial" matters.

As an observer, I'm in a different position than the Commission. You are involved with the in-the-moment discussions and decisions. I get to see more of the overall picture. I respect the work that you are asked to do. If I can make your work easier -- with maps, research, this form, ideas for efficiency, etc. -- I am happy to do so.

3 - The Bike Rack situation, and level of importance.

It seems to be the case that comments go into the bike rack for one of four reasons:

1. **Ran out of time:** A topic (i.e. General Plan Chapter) is scheduled. There is a list of comments to discuss. The Commission goes through the list in the order that they've been presented. Items that were displayed toward the end of the list go onto the bike rack.
2. **More info needed:** The Commission recognizes that more information is needed before a decision or recommendation can be made.
3. **A larger discussion** than is wanted at that time: If the comment involves what is acknowledged as a big discussion, then it might be put off until later.
4. **There is a neutral vote**, or the Commission otherwise agrees that further discussion is needed.

In every case, **what is missing is: What is the priority of this item? What is its level of importance?**

This new form addresses that.

4 - How the form would be used

The form could be used as a PDF that you'd fill in; as an MS Word document form that would be filled in; as an e-mail form; or **simply as a checklist of info pieces that you'd put into your own writing**. (It could be easily made into a data-entry form, which greatly assists the organization, but the Commission has strongly stated that you do not want another program or place to go for entering material, and I support you on that.)

As mentioned above, this form is very similar to what Commissioners Simmons and Lehman (and perhaps others of you) are already doing -- it just formalizes things a bit, **and adds some missing info that will help the process**.

Later here I will give a real-life example of a comment from this week (May 9), as your comment would be displayed in this form.

5 - The basis of the form

1. If there were a bit **more information** in your comments, the discussion and decisions **could be completed more efficiently**.
2. **Certain critical information is absent**: Specifically a summary, a chapter reference (mostly there, sometimes not), and a level of priority.
3. There can **be a one-sentence summary** -- not more than 120 characters and preferably shorter.
As an example, that previous sentence here has 16 words and 96 characters (with spaces). You should be able to state the title of your comment briefly -- and not as a narrative (i.e. paragraph) but as a true title.
4. **The summary is descriptive and non-ambiguous**. You can recall the discussion around the Vision Statement, where it was not clear which of the two Vision Statements was being discussed. This confusion has occurred other times too.
5. **Level of priority is a critical factor**. We need to know **how important this matter is to you**. Just the change of one word can be a huge alteration in scope or intent -- "shall / should / can / may / will" being the well-known examples, and there are plenty of others. **Even if level of priority were the only concept from this form that was utilized**, that in itself would be helpful to your process.
The Commission discussed making the distinction between regular comments and minor typographical errors, so that is now incorporated.

6 - The form. Here is a blank form. Again, we are looking at the information that it contains. The nature of the form, and whether you use a form at all can be discussed. We are looking at the content that is here, and how that would help you.

Reference: [] i.e. GA-7a	Date: []
Reference Document: []	For meeting date: []
[]	Your Name / []
	Initials (3)
Page: (if known) []	
<input type="checkbox"/> Gateway Plan <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Form-Based Code <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Measure <input type="checkbox"/> General City Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Other []	
	Your importance: 1-10 [] Consent okay? Yes/No [] Typo correction? [] Staff assigned priority: [] Staff use only []

FJW v1.3 - 5-07-2023

6 - How the form would be used -- an example from the May 9 compiled comments.

Planning Commissioners' Input Form
for Gateway Area Plan / General Plan Consideration

Reference: [H-2d] i.e. GA-7a	Date: [5/4/23]
Reference Document:	For meeting date: [5/9/23]
[Design & Historical Preservation]	Your Name / [AMX]
Page: (if known) [5-27]	Initials (3)
<input type="checkbox"/> Gateway Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	Your importance: 1-10 [8]
<input type="checkbox"/> Form-Based Code	Consent okay? Yes/No [No]
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Measure	Typo correction? []
<input type="checkbox"/> General City Policy	Staff assigned priority: []
<input type="checkbox"/> Other []	Staff use only []

Summary:

[**A "noteworthy" structure is not defined - Add language how to determine.**]
One sentence. 120 characters maximum.

Existing wording or reference:

[**See page 5-27 - page 25 in the May 9 packet**]
Copy-and-paste original section. Or Staff can supply.

What you are proposing for the wording:

[**Actual language to be determined.**]
Enter how you want to see this policy/section worded.

Your explanation:

[**"Noteworthy is not defined. I suggest changing the term to make it consistent. More significantly, the City may or may not be able to keep current its listing of potentially historic buildings. In order to prevent a building that is historic but not on the list from falling through the cracks, I propose adding language that requires some level of review to determine whether an unlisted property is or is not a potentially historic resource.**]

FJW v1.3 - 5-07-2023

7 - The important information is included and displayed

- Important Information -

Planning Commissioners' Input Form
for Gateway Area Plan / General Plan Consideration

Page in the document **Your level of importance**

Reference: [**H-2d**] i.e. GA-7a Date: [**5/4/23**]
 Reference Document: [**Design & Historical Preservation**] For meeting date: [**5/9/23**]
 [**Design & Historical Preservation**] Your Name / [**AMX**]
 Page: (if known) [**5-27**] Initials (3)

Your ID

☐ Gateway Plan ☒ General Plan Your importance: 1-10 [**8**]
☐ Form-Based Code Consent okay? Yes/No [**No**]
☐ Implementation Measure Typo correction? []
☐ General City Policy Staff assigned priority: []
☐ Other [] Staff use only []

Summary:
 [**A "noteworthy" structure is not defined - Add language how to determine.**]
 One sentence. 120 characters maximum.

Existing wording or reference:
 [**See page 5-27 - page 25 in the May 9 packet**]
 Copy-and-paste original section. Or Staff can supply.

What you are proposing for the wording:
 [**Actual language to be determined.**]
 Enter how you want to see this policy/section worded.

Your explanation:
 [**"Noteworthy" is not defined. I suggest changing the term to make it consistent. More significantly, the City may or may not be able to keep current its listing of potentially historic buildings. In order to prevent a building that is historic but not on the list from falling through the cracks, I propose adding language that requires some level of review to determine whether an unlisted property is or is not a potentially historic resource.**]

FWJ v1.3 - 5-07-2023

8 - Summary

1. I see only the compiled comments -- I have no idea how you are submitting your comments now.
2. The form can be used as a fill-in-the-blanks PDF, a fill-in-the-blanks MS Word doc, a free-form Word doc, a free-form e-mail template, or just as a suggestion as to what info could be included in your comments. ("Free-form" meaning you can type wherever you want.
3. I am presenting this as a form, because a standard form potentially makes it easier for staff to compile, and maybe makes it easier for you too. The form itself is not the main point here -- it's the info that the form requires. Your comment input should include:
 1. Priority: Your evaluation of how important this is. **This is the key point.**
 2. Consent: Your evaluation - Can this be a consent item.
 3. Document / Page Number: Make it easier for others to find what you are referencing.
 4. Your name / initials.
4. If this basic information is included in your comment, then going through this material will be more efficient and will more accurately reflect what the Commission wants.

There are many ideas presented here. **As an individual, you can select what seems best for you.** There can be group agreement on which aspects to use, but that's not necessary. Using any bit of what is presented here has the potential to add efficiency to your process.

Thank you.

-- Fred Weis



Mads Odom

From: Fred [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2023 7:40 AM
To: Scott Davies; Dan Tangney; Judith Mayer; Christian Figueroa; Matthew Simmons; Peter Lehman; Joel Yodowitz; David Loya; Jennifer Dart; Delo Freitas
Subject: Fwd: Suggested format to assist you with the Framework that you are currently using
Attachments: Commissioner Input form v1.3-Entry Form.jpg; Commissioner Input form v1.3-Entry Form-Filled H-2d-with arrows.jpg

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioners and Staff:

My apologies for any confusion. To be clear:

It is not the form that I am suggesting you use.

It is **the information on the form** that I am suggesting that you include in your pitches / comments.

There is very little extra work required on your part. See the example below.

Specifically, at a minimum:

1. A one-sentence synopsis
2. A level of importance to you.
3. Can this be a consent item
4. The date and your name or initials
5. The Reference (i.e. "LU-2c")
6. The page of the document (i.e. "5-27")

You have the Framework, and it's working. When you discussed it, you agreed that it would require some discipline. If you look in the Bike Rack, you will see a wide variety of styles of your submissions.

To use Commissioner Yodowitz's H-2d example again, and to show it with this added information. **This is a good example:** Clear and well-written.

Here's the original, with the new suggested information added (shown in **red** here). What is in red is the only change from what was originally submitted.

(1) Policy 2d – Page 5-27 Joel Yodowitz 5-2-2023 for 5-9 meeting

Importance: 8 Consent: No

Summary: A “noteworthy” structure is not defined. Add language how to determine.

Edit/add to this policy as follows:

Design review approval. Design Review and approval shall be required from the appropriate review authority for all exterior alterations to noteworthy structures potentially historic structures, when or if alterations require a building permit, including changes in types of materials and additions. The review authority may request a recommendation from the Historic Landmarks Committee prior to its decision on the project. In the event that the City reasonably believes that a structure may be potentially historic but said structure is not on the potentially historic buildings list, the National Register or listed as a local, state or national landmark, the City shall initiate the process of listing the structure on the potentially historic buildings list. If the City decides to initiate such listing process, the permit shall not issue pending completion of that process.

Policy pitch/explanation for the addition:

Not sure what a “noteworthy” structure is – it is not defined - so I suggest changing the term to make it consistent. More significantly, the City may or may not be able to keep current its listing of potentially historic buildings. In order to prevent a building that is historic but not on the list from falling through the cracks, I propose adding language that requires some level of review to determine whether an unlisted property is or is not a potentially historic resource.

And here's how it would look, as compiled:

1) Make the following change:

(1) Policy 2d – Page 5-27 Joel Yodowitz 5-2-2023 for 5-9 meeting

Importance: 8 Consent: No

Summary: A “noteworthy” structure is not defined. Add language how to determine.

- a) **H-2d Design review approval.** Design Review and approval shall be required from the appropriate review authority for all exterior alterations to ~~noteworthy structures~~ potentially historic structures, when or if alterations require a building permit, including changes in types of materials and additions. The review authority may request a recommendation from the Historic Landmarks Committee prior to its decision on the project. In the event that the City reasonably believes that a structure may be potentially historic but said structure is not on the potentially historic buildings list, the National Register or listed as a local, state or national landmark, the City shall initiate the process of listing the structure on the potentially historic buildings list. If the City decides to initiate such listing process, the permit shall not issue pending completion of that process.
- b) Not sure what a “noteworthy” structure is – it is not defined - so I suggest changing the term to make it consistent. More significantly, the City may or may not be able to keep current its listing of potentially historic buildings. In order to prevent a building that is historic but not on the list from falling through the cracks, I propose adding language that requires some level of review to determine whether an unlisted property is or is not a potentially historic resource.

As one example, the first "Policy Pitch Proposal" (page 9 on the 5/9/2023 compiled comments) is 2/3rd of a page long. To me, it begs for a one-sentence synopsis. **There's no synopsis, no level of importance, no date, no name, no reference and page.** If the six items of information shown above were on this Policy Pitch, then **it will be a whole lot easier to understand when you return to it.**

(I don't mean to pick this one out particularly -- there are plenty of examples.)

Thank you.

-- Fred Weis

=====

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Fred** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, May 8, 2023 at 9:06 PM
Subject: Suggested format to assist you with the Framework that you are currently using
To: <sdavies@cityofarcata.org>, <dtangney@cityofarcata.org>, Judith Mayer <jmayer@cityofarcata.org>, <cfigueroa@cityofarcata.org>, <msimmons@cityofarcata.org>, <plehman@cityofarcata.org>, <jyodowitz@cityofarcata.org>, David Loya <dloya@cityofarcata.org>, Jennifer Dart <jdart@cityofarcata.org>, Delo Freitas <dfreitas@cityofarcata.org>

To: Planning Commission Chair Davies, Commissioners Tangney, Mayer, Figueroa, Lehman, Simmons, Yodowitz

Community Development Director David Loya, Jen Dart, Delo Freitas

From: Fred Weis

Date: Monday, May 8, 2023

General Subject: **Suggested format to assist you with the Framework that you are currently using**

Bold and red are used to highlight, so you can skim.

Each point here is written so you can get the basis of it very quickly.

You do not have to go through the contents in order -- You can skip to what interests you and read what you want.

For a one minute review: Look at Item 7 and read the Summary.

There are many ideas presented here. As an individual, you can select what seems best for you. There can be group agreement on which aspects to use, but that's not necessary. Using any bit of what is presented here has the potential to add efficiency to your process.

Contents:

- 1 - Info on the form that was sent earlier
- 2 - Introduction
- 3 - The Bike Rack situation, and level of importance
- 4 - How the form would be used
- 5 - The basis of the form
- 6 - **The form**
- 7 - **The important information that is included and displayed**
- 8 - **Summary**

1 - Prior to your Thursday, April 27, meeting I wrote to you:

A form to help with the Framework: I have mentioned to you and spoken with David Loya and Chair Scott Davies that I have developed **a one-page form** that would work in conjunction with your current "Framework" process. Its use would not alter or replace any aspect of the Framework -- it would augment it. It would involve just a few minutes of extra work (which either each of you or staff could do, or a combination) and would, I believe, further increase the efficiency at your meetings. It would also help eliminate the "I thought we were talking about what's on Page 56" and "What is that in reference to?" type of discussions, which occur perhaps more frequently than you may realize.

The format is very similar to what Commissioners Simmons and Lehman are already doing -- just formalizes things a bit, and adds some missing info that will help the process. The idea is to make your comments easier to read by the other Commissioners (and the public) and easier to process and to understand -- and at same time have the discussion be complete, accurate, and faster. I developed the form and have been adjusting it, based on what you have actually been submitting as your comments. As per the current style, I'll present it as a 45-second "elevator pitch" and then a couple of pages of examples and backup material. If you can be more efficient on the smaller areas, then you will have more time to discuss the more visionary or crucial material.

2 - Introduction

What I am suggesting here adds to your existing Framework. **It augments it -- makes it faster and easier.** This saves time.

It does not replace anything you are already doing.

Using this form will take a few minutes of time. You can enter the form, or Staff can do it. Or you can do part and Staff can do part. It could be that you enter all your comments directly onto the forms -- and it won't take any more time at all. The result will be that what you want to express will be more effective.

The Framework has evolved as you've used it. For example, at your last meeting (April 27), you recognized that your comments related to editorial matters -- typographical errors -- are in a different category than "substantial" matters.

As an observer, I'm in a different position than the Commission. You are involved with the in-the-moment discussions and decisions. I get to see more of the overall picture. I respect the work that you are asked to do. If I can make your work easier -- with maps, research, this form, ideas for efficiency, etc. -- I am happy to do so.

3 - The Bike Rack situation, and level of importance.

It seems to be the case that comments go into the bike rack for one of four reasons:

1. **Ran out of time:** A topic (i.e. General Plan Chapter) is scheduled. There is a list of comments to discuss. The Commission goes through the list in the order that they've been presented. Items that were displayed toward the end of the list go onto the bike rack.
2. **More info needed:** The Commission recognizes that more information is needed before a decision or recommendation can be made.
3. **A larger discussion** than is wanted at that time: If the comment involves what is acknowledged as a big discussion, then it might be put off until later.
4. **There is a neutral vote**, or the Commission otherwise agrees that further discussion is needed.

In every case, **what is missing is: What is the priority of this item? What is its level of importance?**

This new form addresses that.

4 - How the form would be used

The form could be used as a PDF that you'd fill in; as an MS Word document form that would be filled in; as an e-mail form; or **simply as a checklist of info pieces that you'd put into your own writing**. (It could be easily made into a data-entry form, which greatly assists the organization, but the Commission has strongly stated that you do not want another program or place to go for entering material, and I support you on that.)

As mentioned above, this form is very similar to what Commissioners Simmons and Lehman (and perhaps others of you) are already doing -- it just formalizes things a bit, **and adds some missing info that will help the process**.

Later here I will give a real-life example of a comment from this week (May 9), as your comment would be displayed in this form.

5 - The basis of the form

1. If there were a bit **more information** in your comments, the discussion and decisions **could be completed more efficiently**.
2. **Certain critical information is absent:** Specifically a summary, a chapter reference (mostly there, sometimes not), and a level of priority.
3. There can **be a one-sentence summary** -- not more than 120 characters and preferably shorter.
As an example, that previous sentence here has 16 words and 96 characters (with spaces). You should be able to state the title of your comment briefly -- and not as a narrative (i.e. paragraph) but as a true title.
4. **The summary is descriptive and non-ambiguous.** You can recall the discussion around the Vision Statement, where it was not clear which of the two Vision Statements was being discussed. This confusion has occurred other times too.
5. **Level of priority is a critical factor.** We need to know **how important this matter is to you**. Just the change of one word can be a huge alteration in scope or intent -- "shall / should / can / may / will" being the well-known examples, and there are plenty of others.

The Commission discussed making the distinction between regular comments and minor typographical errors, so that is now incorporated.

6 - The form. Here is a blank form. Again, we are looking at the information that it contains. The nature of the form, and whether you use a form at all can be discussed. We are looking at the content that is here, and how that would help you.

[illegible]

6 - How the form would be used -- an example from the May 9 compiled comments.

Planning Commissioners' Input Form for Gateway Area Plan / General Plan Consideration	
Reference: [H-2d] i.e. GA-7a	Date: [5/4/23]
Reference Document:	For meeting date: [5/9/23]
[Design & Historical Preservation]	Your Name / [AMX]
Page: (if known) [5-27]	Initials (3)
<input type="checkbox"/> Gateway Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	Your importance: 1-10 [8]
<input type="checkbox"/> Form-Based Code	Consent okay? Yes/No [No]
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Measure	Typo correction? []
<input type="checkbox"/> General City Policy	Staff assigned priority: []
<input type="checkbox"/> Other []	Staff use only []
Summary:	
[A "noteworthy" structure is not defined - Add language how to determine.]	
One sentence. 120 characters maximum.	
Existing wording or reference:	
[See page 5-27 - page 25 in the May 9 packet]	
Copy-and-paste original section. Or Staff can supply.	
What you are proposing for the wording:	
[Actual language to be determined.]	
Enter how you want to see this policy/section worded.	
Your explanation:	
["Noteworthy is not defined. I suggest changing the term to make it consistent. More significantly, the City may or may not be able to keep current its listing of potentially historic buildings. In order to prevent a building that is historic but not on the list from falling through the cracks, I propose adding language that requires some level of review to determine whether an unlisted property is or is not a potentially historic resource.]	
FIW v1.3 - 5-07-2023	

7 - The important information is included and displayed

- Important Information -

Planning Commissioners' Input Form
for Gateway Area Plan / General Plan Consideration

Page in the document **Your level of importance**

Reference: [**H-2d**] i.e. GA-7a Date: [**5/4/23**]
 Reference Document: [**Design & Historical Preservation**] For meeting date: [**5/9/23**]
 [**5-27**] Your Name / Initials (3) [**AMX**]

Your ID

☐ Gateway Plan ☒ General Plan Your importance: 1-10 [**8**]
☐ Form-Based Code Consent okay? Yes/No [**No**]
☐ Implementation Measure Typo correction? []
☐ General City Policy Staff assigned priority: []
☐ Other [] Staff use only []

Summary:
 [**A "noteworthy" structure is not defined - Add language how to determine.**]
 One sentence, 120 characters maximum.

Existing wording or reference:
 [**See page 5-27 - page 25 in the May 9 packet**]
 Copy-and-paste original section. Or Staff can supply.

What you are proposing for the wording:
 [**Actual language to be determined.**]
 Enter how you want to see this policy/section worded.

Your explanation:
 [**"Noteworthy" is not defined. I suggest changing the term to make it consistent. More significantly, the City may or may not be able to keep current its listing of potentially historic buildings. In order to prevent a building that is historic but not on the list from falling through the cracks, I propose adding language that requires some level of review to determine whether an unlisted property is or is not a potentially historic resource.**]

FJW v1.3 - 5-07-2023

8 - Summary

1. I see only the compiled comments -- I have no idea how you are submitting your comments now.
2. The form can be used as a fill-in-the-blanks PDF, a fill-in-the-blanks MS Word doc, a free-form Word doc, a free-form e-mail template, or just as a suggestion as to what info could be included in your comments. ("Free-form" meaning you can type wherever you want.
3. I am presenting this as a form, because a standard form potentially makes it easier for staff to compile, and maybe makes it easier for you too. The form itself is not the main point here -- it's the info that the form requires. Your comment input should include:
 1. Priority: Your evaluation of how important this is. **This is the key point.**
 2. Consent: Your evaluation - Can this be a consent item.
 3. Document / Page Number: Make it easier for others to find what you are referencing.
 4. Your name / initials.
4. If this basic information is included in your comment, then going through this material will be more efficient and will more accurately reflect what the Commission wants.

There are many ideas presented here. **As an individual, you can select what seems best for you.** There can be group agreement on which aspects to use, but that's not necessary. Using any bit of what is presented here has the potential to add efficiency to your process.

Thank you.

-- Fred Weis



Mads Odom

From: janepwoodward [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2023 11:22 AM
To: Peter Lehman; Scott Davies; Christian Figueroa; Judith Mayer; Dan Tangney; Matthew Simmons; Joel Yodowitz; Karen Diemer; David Loya
Subject: Public Comkment for May 9 PlanCo meeting
Attachments: 5_9 2023 Planco Comments.doc

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

May 9 2023 PUBLIC COMMENT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

I read the Staff Report for today's meeting to try to determine the exact items on tonight's agenda, and concluded as follows:

- 1) As noted under "Recommendation," the meeting tonight will focus on the Historical Preservation Element and topics in the Gateway Area Plan Concerns and Solutions List. Does that include all topics in the Concerns & Solutions list, or only those related to affordable housing, gentrification and homeownership as implied in the Introduction? This lack of clarity is a problem for the public if you want to avoid our wanting to address the other topics such as sea level rise in our comments.
- 2) It would have been very helpful to both PlanCo and the public if the Concerns and Solutions list had been provided as an attachment, rather than having to search for it.
- 3) Note that in the recommendation, "as time allows the Commission should return to the Circulation Element and Land Use Element "Bike Rack" items." It would have been useful to have an attachment with those "Bike Rack" elements.
- 4) In the Introduction, it says "as time allows, the Commission will return to policy recommendations held over from previous meeting." Same problem. Those policy recommendations need to be attached.

If you want to save the time and energy of the Commissioners and the public, it's quite important to make it easy for them to access the actual items that will or may be on the agenda, even if there may not be time to discuss them. Please fix this.

Thank you for your attention,
Jane Woodward, Arcata resident

The pertinent Staff Report items for tonight's meeting are quoted below.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission use its updated meeting framework to provide a recommendation on the General Plan Updates, including the Gateway Area Plan, and the Form-Based Code for the Gateway Area by July. **Staff recommends the Commission use the framework to discuss amendments to the Historic Preservation Element and topics included in the Gateway Area Plan Concerns and Solutions list. As time allows, the Commission should return to the Circulation Element and Land Use Element "Bike Rack" items.**

INTRODUCTION:

This meeting will focus on reviewing the Historic Preservation Element, as well as the impacts related to affordable housing, gentrification, and homeownership included in the “Concerns and Solutions” list finalized by the PC on November 8, 2022. The Commission will use the April 27, 2023, amended Framework (Attachment A) to make changes to the draft Elements. As time allows, the Commission will return to policy recommendations held over from previous meetings.