



Re: Theme Two Rewrite

Below are comments Kristy Bruner, Community Planning Director, verbally presented at the February 18 Hearing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I will be brief since you already have our written comments, where we outlined what we see as the major improvements, remaining missing topics, and some places where inconsistencies could be clarified. It is our understanding that rather than revisiting votes or previous discussions, tonight you are simply confirming staff's interpretation of your previous votes. With that in mind, we expect that you will consider many items during your final review of the entire plan, rather than this evening.

After looking at the staff report, I have a few comments. First, as a member of the Buildout Task Force and Employee Generation Task Force, I agree with the third point raised by Tony Wall that the Task Force numbers should not be referenced the way they currently are in the plan. There are many assumptions tied to these resulting numbers; and it is critical that these assumptions are understood when using the numbers in any way. The same goes for the employee generation numbers. Referring to these numbers, without sufficient noting of assumptions in all cases where they are discussed, is a concern. Findings, with assumptions, should be in the appendix. Based on comments from other commissioners, it seems that some of the assumptions for the data (particularly regarding the PRD assumptions) were unclear.

Overall, without getting into too much detail and line-by-line review, the draft should be very clear about the use of discretionary tools, and how this affects other statements such as a desire for predictability, and that "additive growth is not appropriate". Right now, the way the draft was written, is sending some mixed messages, which we hope are clarified before moving forward.

Thank you again for all your work.