

# TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

## Minutes of Meeting No. 2564

Wednesday, October 28, 2009, 1:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

One Technology Center – 175 E. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

<b>Members Present</b>	<b>Members Absent</b>	<b>Staff Present</b>	<b>Others Present</b>
Cantrell	Marshall	Brierre	Boulden, Legal
Carnes		Fernandez	Steele, Sr. Eng.
Dix		Huntsinger	Hamer
Keith		Matthews	
Leighty		Sansone	
McArtor		Armer	
Midget			
Shivel			
Walker			
Wright			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Thursday, October 22, 2009 at 12:00 p.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk, as well as in the Office of the County Clerk.

After declaring a quorum present, Chair Cantrell called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

### **REPORTS:**

#### **Worksession Report:**

Ms. Cantrell reported that immediately following today's TMAPC meeting there will be a work session on PLANitULSA.

#### **Director's Report:**

Ms. Matthews reported that staff will be attending three meetings with the Fregonese Consultants today and tomorrow.

Ms. Matthews reported on the TMAPC receipts for the month of September 2009 and they are still down in numbers.

Ms. Matthews reported that Mr. Alberty is out of the office the rest of the week in order to be with his wife who is having knee surgery.

**Minutes:**

**Approval of the minutes of October 7, 2009, Meeting No. 2562**

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted 8-0-1 (Cantrell, Carnes, Dix, Leighty, McArtor, Midget, Shivel, Walker "aye"; no "nays"; Keith "abstaining"; Marshall, Wright "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of October 7, 2009, Meeting No. 2562.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. Cantrell stated that Item 3 will be removed from the consent agenda in order to allow for an abstention.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

All matters under "Consent" are considered by the Planning Commission to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. Any Planning Commission member may, however, remove an item by request.

- 2. **BOA 20994-** (0331) Plat Waiver (PD 2) (CD 1)  
1006 North Quaker, Tulsa Independent School District # 1

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The platting requirement was triggered by BOA 20994 which may allow a 30 foot tall wind powered vertical teaching generator tower as an accessory to an existing school facility in an RM-1 zoning district. The Board is expected to consider this proposal at their meeting the day before the TMAPC hearing on this plat waiver request. The plat waiver will only be required if the case is approved. A new plat for this site was approved in 2006.

It is the policy of TMAPC to waive the platting requirement for Use Unit 4 public protection and utility facilities/antennas and supporting structures. Therefore, staff can recommend **Approval** of the requested plat waiver.

**The Planning Commission considered the consent agenda.**

**There were no interested parties wishing to speak.**

**TMAPC Action; 9 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Cantrell, Carnes, Dix, Leighty, Keith, McArtor, Midget, Shivel, Walker "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Marshall, Wright "absent") to **APPROVE** the consent agenda Item 2, BOA-20994 plat waiver per staff recommendation.

**CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA**

- 3. **Change of Access** – (9312) QuikTrip, Lot 9, O'Connor (PD 5) (CD 5)  
Park Addition,  
East of South Memorial Drive and North of East 21<sup>st</sup> Street South

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This application is made to allow a change of access to add one access on East 21<sup>st</sup> Street South and one on South Memorial Drive. The property is zoned CS.

The Traffic Engineer has reviewed and approved the request and staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the change of access as submitted.

**There were no interested parties wishing to speak.**

**TMAPC Action; 9 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted **8-0-1** (Cantrell, Carnes, Leighty, Keith, McArtor, Midget, Shivel, Walker "aye"; no "nays"; Dix "abstaining"; Marshall, Wright "absent") to **APPROVE** the change of access for QuikTrip, Lot 9, O'Connor Park Addition per staff recommendation.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Ms. Wright in at 1:32 p.m.**

Ms. Cantrell stated that staff has received a request for a continuance for Item 5, PUD-646-3 to November 4, 2009.

- 5. **PUD-646-3 – Doug Walker/Truong Residence** (PD-26) (CD-8)  
North of the northeast corner of South Sheridan Road and East 109<sup>th</sup> Place South (Minor Amendment to reduce the required rear setback from 35 feet to 20 feet for a small portion of the northeastern corner of the house.) (Continued from 10/21/09)

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Ms. Matthews stated that an interested party has requested a continuance to November 4, 2009. The applicant is in agreement with the continuance.

**TMAPC Action; 10 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted **10-0-0** (Cantrell, Carnes, Dix, Keith, Leighty, McArtor, Midget Shivel, Walker, Wright "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Marshall "absent") to **CONTINUE** the minor amendment for PUD-646-3 to November 4, 2009.

\* \* \* \* \*

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**4. FY 01-14 CIP Amendments**

Community Intervention Center facility to be added to the Capital Improvements Plan and find it in accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has reviewed the proposed reuse of the former 911 facility at 600 Civic Center as a Community Intervention Center for juveniles and finds it to be in accord with the District One Plan, an adopted part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area. The City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment has recently approved it on that site.

The Civic Center has been designated as an area for governmental functions and related uses. As stated in the proposal, the juvenile facility will assist law enforcement personnel by providing a short-term detention and drop-off site for juveniles under law enforcement supervision. This use is in keeping with the government and related uses designation. Moreover, it appears to be a reasonable reuse of an existing facility. Therefore, staff recommends that the TMAPC also find it in accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

**The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.**

**TMAPC Action; 10 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **10-0-0** (Cantrell, Carnes, Dix, Keith, Leighty, McArtor, Midget, Shivel, Walker, Wright "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Marshall "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of the FY 01-14 CIP Amendments for Community Intervention Center facility to be added to the Capital Improvements Plan and find it in accord with the Comprehensive Plan per staff recommendation.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **6. TMAPC afternoon and/or night meetings**

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The TMAPC requested staff investigate potential consequences of moving its meetings from a 1:30 p.m. start to a later time to better accommodate citizen attendance. Staff contacted the following: Don Cannon, City Council Administrator; Mark Hogan, One Technology Center (OTC) Security; Tawnie Larson, OTC Building Manager and Central Parking. At the present time, apparently there are no other City of Tulsa boards, authorities or commissions that hold regularly scheduled meetings in City Hall before or after normal building hours so some of the procedures for accommodating evening meetings are being defined for the first time.

We have received the following information in response to our inquiry regarding how a move of TMAPC meetings to evening might affect building security, operations and availability as well as costs.

1. The OTC City Council room is available for Tuesday or Wednesday evening meetings.
2. Building security would need to be provided after 6 p.m. at a cost of \$50 per hour. Due to the uncertainty of how long meetings may last we would need to arrange for security in advance. We do not currently pay for building security and this additional cost would need to be funded.
3. Building operating costs for lighting and heat and air would be charged at \$25 per hour after 6:00 p.m. We do not currently pay for building operating expenses and this additional cost would need to be funded.
4. Operations for TGOV would require a trained and experienced non-city operator after 5:30 p.m. at an estimated cost of \$50 per meeting. Due to the uncertainty of how long meetings may last, if the entirety of Planning Commission meetings are to be televised, we would need to arrange for an operator in advance. We do not currently pay for TGOV operators and this additional cost would need to be funded.
5. Public parking availability may be limited or more costly particularly for people arriving after 5:00 p.m. on evenings when a Performing Arts Center event is conducted. There will be no additional costs for Planning Commissioner parking however, regardless of how long a meeting may last.
6. The parking garage utilized by staff will charge an extra \$1.00 for exiting after 7:00 p.m. This additional cost can be absorbed by INCOG.
7. The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) requires payment of overtime compensation (1.5 x hourly rates) for non-exempt employees working more than a 40 hour work week. Several staff members who attend TMAPC meetings qualify for overtime pay under the FLSA. If the TMAPC decides to begin meetings at 4:00 p.m., overtime provisions of the

Act will not be triggered for meetings of one hour or less. We will utilize compensatory leave provisions of the Act, flexible working hour policies and strategic agenda item sequencing to eliminate or greatly minimize any additional staff costs associated with late afternoon or evening TMAPC meetings.

Based on an analysis of the length of the 2008 and 2009 TMAPC meetings the annual cost (additional out-of-pocket expenses) would be approximately \$3000 per year. In light of the additional expenses that would be incurred, it would be advisable to seek City Council and Mayor concurrence with moving the meeting time (and possibly day) and funding for the additional expenses which would be incurred for meetings that extend past 5:30 in the evening.

*Attachment: Tawnie Larson emails (10/13/09 and 10/2/09) regarding additional building expenses*

From: Larson, Tawnie @ Oklahoma [mailto:tawnie.larson@cbreak.com]  
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2009 4:30 PM  
To: Alberty, Wayne  
Subject: RE: TMAPC late meetings

Wayne-

I've heard from Mr. Chandler and we would charge the TMAPC the same amount that we charge the tenants of the building for after hours lights and air.

The cost is \$25 per hour after 6 pm. This is in addition to the \$25 per man hour for guards after 6pm and as Mark Hogan indicated, there will be a minimum of two guards for the meetings so that one can be inside the Chambers and one outside at the entry/exit.

Therefore, the total cost would be \$75 per hour for every hour after 6 pm, (\$25 per hour for after hours HVAC/Lights and \$25 per hour per man for security).

As you may know, we have a 24/7 tenant right next door to the Chambers so we need to be sure that we don't have any issues that may affect them, therefore if you anticipate a problem that will need extra security, please notify us so that it can be provided, and billed the same as above.

If the meetings extend past 6 pm then at the end of each month we would calculate and bill for any charges incurred.

### **TMAPC COMMENTS:**

Ms. Cantrell asked Mr. Brierre to explain the possibility of having two TMAPC meetings per month due to budget cuts.

**Rich Brierre**, Director of INCOG, Two West 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 800, 74103, stated that everyone has probably seen the coverage of the budget cuts that have been the Mayor has recommended to the City Council. Each department was requested to reduce their budget by 2.5 percent and this will affect INCOG as well. In response to this request INCOG anticipates the likelihood of needing to have a reduction in staff by one position and some juggling of duties. There was a recommendation that the TMAPC have two meetings a month rather than three a month. The lengths of the meeting have been shorter and the volume of cases has been less. The work load, in terms of rebalancing some of that with the staff adjustment, is what INCOG will have to face.

In response to Ms. Wright, Mr. Brierre stated that Legal can check on the State Statutes regarding the required number of meetings the TMAPC is required to have. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission have two meetings per month.

Ms. Wright asked if a reduction in meetings also means a reduction in staff or does reduction in meetings save a staff position. Mr. Brierre stated that the reduction in meetings would help accommodate the adjustment in work load that will have to be redistributed.

Mr. Boulden stated that the State Statutes require one meeting per month for the Planning Commission. The Board of Adjustment is required to meet two times a month. Title 19, Section 863.6 states that there shall be at least one meeting each month and all meetings shall be open to the public.

Ms. Cantrell opened the floor for discussion or thoughts in terms of how to proceed.

Mr. McArtor stated that it seems that if additional funds are needed to go to night meetings, then this should go to the City Council before making a decision. Ms. Cantrell stated that that probably would be the prudent way to at least get a general feel. If this is written into TMAPC's budget request for the next year and the TMAPC has already gone to a night meeting it would probably be expected. Whatever decision the Planning Commission makes, if there is a consensus that, provided City Council is comfortable with this, that we willing to do this either once or twice a month, then that would be the way to proceed.

Mr. Leighty stated that we are living in an era where transparency is everything. There has been a lot of public input on this and a lot of requests. He would assume, like anything else that the number of people who have spoken up would probably be representing a much larger number of people who are not quite as

vocal about this. He would support the idea of going to 4:00 p.m. meeting and suggested earlier that it be a 5:00 p.m. or 5:15 p.m. meeting. In the consideration of a more transparent process, this really needs to be done. How this is worked out between Administration and the City Council to pay for it is really kind of in their boat. He thinks this should be sent to them and let them figure out how to pay for it and if it can't be paid for, then it could be put on a future agenda. Mr. Leighty concluded that he would support moving the meetings to 4:00 p.m.

Ms. Wright asked what would happen with the training sessions and work sessions. Ms. Wright expressed concerns that with the Comprehensive Plan updates coming soon, it is necessary to be flexible with the times to allow the public to attend. Ms. Cantrell stated that this is something that will have to be discussed. Her expectations are that the two meetings wouldn't be permanent and hopefully when businesses and development pick up enough, the Planning Commission would need to go back to three meetings. Mr. Brierre stated that it is likely that when there is more economic activity it would have more impact to the City and there would be the need for more meetings. The Planning Commission has the prerogative to hold special meetings and some of those in conjunction with PLANitULSA could be held as special meetings. Discussion ensued regarding whether to have one public hearing held at 4:00 p.m. and one meeting with the continuances, training session and work session held at the usual time, starting with the 11:00 a.m. training session, TMAPC regular meeting at 1:00 p.m. and work session immediately following. Ms. Cantrell stated that currently, the fourth Wednesday of each month tends to have no actual public hearing items. It may make sense to put issues that tend to evoke less general public input on one meeting, such as plats, etc. with the site plans.

Mr. Carnes stated that he would like to go on record that notwithstanding Mr. Leighty's idea, he cannot support the Planning Commission spending any more money when the headlines today stated that 37 people were laid off. Mr. Carnes indicated that he will not be voting in favor of this issue.

Commissioner Keith stated that she supports Mr. Carnes in that thinking as well. If one looks at the parking rates in the evening it could be problematic. There are a number of issues and she is not sure it would be a win-win situation. At this time she believes with the impact of what INCOG is facing, she doesn't think it is a good time to even look at this. Ms. Cantrell stated that that is fine, but she would strongly disagree about parking. Ms. Cantrell further stated that she has come downtown during the day and evening and it takes her two seconds to find a parking space at night. Every PLANitULSA meeting that she attended has been during the evening and there were no problems with parking.

Ms. Cantrell stated that she would weigh in and then listen to others. She understands the issue of money, but she personally would like to at least express to the City Council the Planning Commission's willingness to hold late afternoon



meetings. It is not going to cost her any more money and she would like to express her willingness to hold later afternoon meetings and leave it up to the City Council, since they are the ones in charge of the budget. If they believe that \$3,000 dollars per year is not something they want to commit to for afternoon meetings, then that is their prerogative. As a volunteer, she is willing to come at 4:00 p.m. in order to make the meetings more open to the public's input. She agrees with Mr. Leighty that this is something that we have gotten a tremendous amount of input on and people really want to see us more available to the public.

Mr. Shivel stated that he would follow in the camp of Mr. Carnes at this point to go forward and say that we would be open to it. The purpose of the Planning Commission is a recommending body to the City Council to state a position and the TMAPC should say that we are willing to if the City Council is willing to is asking them to bite the bullet rather than the Planning Commission taking a specific position. He is reluctant to do it at this point and time with the business being down, and perhaps the time to do this is in the future when things pick up.

Mr. Leighty stated that he would like to respond to Mr. Shivel. If the Planning Commission doesn't send it to them, then they really don't have an opportunity to go one way or the other. He indicated that it looks like there is a split vote and he would respect his fellow Commissioners and would like to have an opportunity to make a motion to approve it and if it gets a second, then vote on it.

Mr. Cantrell stated that Mr. Midget wanted to speak and then Mr. Dix.

Mr. Midget stated that he has been in favor of having a night meeting and he believes that 4:00 p.m. is a great compromise. Mr. Midget further stated that he is sensitive to the economic issues that we are facing and have some real concerns about the ability to pay for the additional cost. He believes it would be important for the Planning Commission to send a message to the City Council that we are supportive of a night meeting and support the transparency, and then let the City Council make the final decision. Mr. Midget stated that he isn't going to be so naive to think that the City Council could fund such a move at this time, nor does he believe it would be a wise move to do right now. By doing this the Planning Commission would be making a statement that when the economy turns back around it wouldn't have to be addressed again. Mr. Midget reiterated that this couldn't be done with the current budget, but when the economy improves, than the City Council could address it during budget and fund it. Already INCOG is losing staff members and recommending the Planning Commission reduce their meetings to two a month.

Mr. Dix stated that he believes he is a logical person and logic tells him that with the headlines in the newspaper regarding the City of Tulsa laying employees off and INCOG having to reduce staff he could only support a motion that we table this issue completely, other than having a reduction of meetings, which would save money. As long as this move to evening meetings causes any cost

increase he would like to table it until such time as all of these people are called back to work. He can't imagine the Planning Commission asking the City Council to consider an increase in spending while there are people being put out of work. He can't wait for the Tulsa World to come down here and ask the Planning Commission what they were thinking.

Mr. Midget stated that he understands what Mr. Dix is stating. Mr. Midget further stated that the Planning Commission is not asking for the City Council to increase the budget and the only thing they are saying is that night meetings are a good idea, but maybe now is not the time.

Mr. Dix stated that he can support the evening meetings as long as there is no cost increase. But when there is a cost increase he believes it is irresponsible of the Planning Commission to ask the City Council to even consider it.

Mr. Midget stated that his point is this. If there were no economic problems today, it would cost to go to a night meeting. Staff has made that point perfectly clear and under the circumstances it is not a good idea. It doesn't make sense to do it right now since we are being asked to reduce the number of meetings. As a body, if the Planning Commission believes that night meetings have some merit, then he doesn't see anything wrong with saying as a body that there is some merit in having at least one meeting in the evening. He reiterated that it would be unreasonable for the Council to support spending more money for night meetings right now when people are being laid off from work.

Mr. McArtor stated that time had complicated this issue due to the economy. There seems to be more agreement on this issue than disagreement. The last time the Planning Commission had this discussion, he thought he heard that most everyone was in agreement with going to a 4:00 p.m. meeting and trying it for a while. He was one of the last holdouts until he became convinced that in the efforts of being more transparent, we should do this. Now the issue is the finances and it seems that there should be a way to craft the motion that could separate these two issues and vote on the philosophical issue of recommending that the Planning Commission go to 4:00 p.m. meetings, subject to the City Council, at some point in time, funding such a move when financing is available. He understands the press issue, but frankly \$3,000 dollars doesn't strike him as a whole lot of money to spread out over one year. However, that decision is not for him to make because the City Council determines the budget and it should be their choice. There should be a way to communicate the Planning Commission's desires and then subject to their discretion of when this could be funded.

Ms. Cantrell stated that she agrees completely with Mr. McArtor's statements. To counter what Mr. Dix stated, if it came down to a choice between going to evening meetings and hiring back 37 people who were laid off, then of course one would hire back the 37 people. This is \$3,000 dollars and it may be that City Council looks at something minor that could be reduced in order to have night

meetings. She believes that this is something that the City Council is elected to do and to look at the budget and prioritize. She is certain that the City Council would not make the decision to move the Planning Commission to evening meetings at the expense of someone's job. She believes that there may be other areas that they might see \$3,000 dollars is less of a priority than having some transparency on the Planning Commission. Ms. Cantrell indicated that she is very comfortable with framing the motion that says that the Planning Commission is willing to go to 4:00 p.m. meetings, provided City Council finds a mechanism to fund it or provided that they see some area where this is a higher priority than something else in the budget. She is not comfortable with saying that we are going to night meetings and City Council needs to come up with the money. It is important for the Planning Commission to send the message to City Council that the Planning Commission is willing to do that.

Mr. Leighty stated that he likes the idea and if Mr. McArtor can make that motion he would be supportive of it.

Ms. Wright stated that she has a couple issues and one is what will be on each meeting. Last time the discussion was to have two 4:00 p.m. meetings and one meeting to continue at the regular time, which included the training session and work session. If the Planning Commission goes to two meetings a month, then one meeting would still probably be training, work session and regular meeting and the other meeting would be the bulk of the public hearing and that could end up running long. There are several different items or issues that the Planning Commission doesn't know will be coming down later. It is very important to go ahead and send the message that we are open to late afternoon meetings. Anyway this is looked at, the meetings will become longer and we will have a longer day than normal. Our original concept of thinking that most of the meetings are within two and half hours will now have to be doubled. One is philosophical and one is financial and no one knew the financial issue would be coming up when evening meetings were first discussed.

Mr. McArtor moved to communicate to the City Council the Planning Commission's recommendation to move to 4:00 p.m. meetings as soon as the City Council believes it is economically feasible for us to do so.

Mr. Leighty seconded the motion.

Ms. Cantrell asked staff if this should be communicated in a letter. In response, Mr. Boulden answered affirmatively.

Ms. Cantrell stated that if the motion were to pass and the Planning Commission is agreeable, she will work with staff on the communication with City Council.

Commissioner Keith asked if the Planning Commission is locking themselves in at 4:00 p.m. by stating that. Work sessions may need to be held earlier in the

day. Ms. Cantrell stated that she thought this motion would be for at least one meeting for the 4:00 p.m. meeting and keeping the training session, work session and one regular meeting at the usual time. Commissioner Keith stated she thought it would be important to keep the training session, work session and one Planning Commission at the usual time since it could make for a very long day for volunteers and staff. Ms. Wright stated that their previous conversations have been about leaving the training session and work session and one Planning Commission at the usual time.

Mr. McArtor stated that his motion doesn't cover the training session, work session or one Planning Commission being held at the usual time. He invited Commissioner Keith to amend the motion: Commissioner Keith amended the motion that work sessions times be at the discretion of the Chair and the Board.

Ms. Cantrell offered an amendment that stated: at least one Planning Commission session would continue to remain at its current 1:30 p.m. time. This would make sure that at least one would remain at 1:30 p.m., which would be the same one that has the training session and work session.

Mr. Leighty requested to discuss the motion. He believes that the motion makes it more difficult for the Commissioners and volunteers, basically taking up half of a business day, plus going into the evening. This is more of a hardship for some of them and he would rather keep the work session preceding the meeting.

Ms. Cantrell stated that she believed that previously the discussion was that one meeting during the month would go to 4:00 p.m. and the other one would stay as it is today. There would be one meeting at 1:30 p.m. and work session immediately following and any training sessions would be at 11:00 a.m. before the regular meeting.

Mr. Leighty stated that he didn't understand it that way, and someone mentioned earlier that the Planning Commission talked about this before but that is not the way he remembered it. He thought that all of the meetings would be moved to 4:00 p.m. and that is what he was supporting.

Commissioner Keith stated that she believes that would be a burden for staff and unnecessary expense.

Mr. McArtor stated that he understood the previous discussion was that not all meetings would be moved to 4:00 p.m., but to only move one or two a month and leave one at 1:30 p.m., which is the one that has training sessions and work sessions.

Ms. Wright stated that Mr. McArtor is correct and this has been discussed among the Planning Commissioners.

Ms. Cantrell stated that right now, by saying simply that the Planning Commission is interested in moving one to the 4:00 p.m. period, it may be many months down the road before there is a budget for this. To determine the logistics at that time, the Planning Commission would know how many meetings per month there will be. This can be refined in time, but at this time the TMAPC will be simply sending the message to the City Council of willingness to hold one meeting per month at the 4:00 p.m. time period.

Mr. Leighty stated that this is getting more convoluted in what he was thinking. He indicated that when he is given the opportunity, he will make a motion to move all of the meetings to the 4:00 p.m. meeting time. The reason for this is for transparency purposes and to answer the public outcry that has been calling for this. There have been letters and people who appear at the meetings requesting this. He would like to be on record that he is supporting the 4:00 p.m. start time and he would like to make a motion.

Ms. Huntsinger informed the Chairman that there is already a motion and second on the floor.

Mr. Leighty withdrew his second.

Mr. Midget seconded Mr. McArtor's motion and amendment.

Ms. Cantrell stated that the motion is that the Planning Commission would communicate with City Council the Planning Commission's willingness to move at least one meeting per month to the 4:00 p.m. time period as soon as economically feasible.

Mr. Shivel stated that this would allow the City Council to move forward and then would it have to come back to the Planning Commission to determine which meeting would be held at 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Midget stated that right now the Planning Commission will have to wait to see how the funding shakes itself out. The Planning Commission doesn't know if they will have three meetings a month or two meetings a month. It is hard to pinpoint which meeting at this time.

Discussion ensued regarding which meeting should be moved to 4:00 p.m. or whether to table the issue until funding is available.

Ms. Cantrell stated that she believes it is significant to let the City Council know that the Planning Commission is willing to have a 4:00 p.m. meeting if and when the funds are available.

Mr. Leighty stated that he would like to respectfully request that Mr. McArtor withdraw his motion and allow him to make his motion as he asked to earlier.

When he said he was in agreement with Mr. McArtor's motion, he apparently didn't know what it was. He would like to be on the record to make a motion to send the City Council that this Planning Commission, in the interest of transparency, endorses the idea of moving all of the meetings to 4:00 p.m. The work sessions can tag along with them, if the Planning Commissioners would allow him to make that motion by withdrawing the motion. If it doesn't get seconded, then someone could reintroduce the motion.

Mr. McArtor asked Mr. Leighty if his motion failed, would he support the motion that is currently on the floor. Mr. Leighty stated he probably would not. He further stated that it would appear that this puts him in a tough spot because he does want to support it even if it is just one meeting, but his idea is to really do what the public has asked us to do.

Ms. Cantrell reiterated that the way the motion reads right now is "at least one afternoon meeting" and conceivably if the City Council funds the afternoon meetings, he could make that motion at that time that all of the meetings at 4:00 p.m.

Commissioner Keith asked Mr. Brierre if it wouldn't work better for staff to keep one of the meetings at 1:30 p.m. with the work session and training session. In response, Mr. Leighty stated that as soon as we have one public hearing meeting at 1:30 p.m., then we will have the same people stating that they couldn't be present and didn't have a weigh-in on this. Ms. Wright stated that as long as she has been on the Planning Commission the first two meetings of the month are reserved for issues that require public hearings and the last meeting typically doesn't have anything where there would be public hearing input. It is simply a housekeeping and Planning Commission meeting and it doesn't seem that this particular meeting of the month causes a hardship on the community. It is the first two meetings of the month that have been the ones that citizens asked to be placed at a time when they can attend. The motion now states that at least one meeting a month would be at 4:00 p.m.

Mr. McArtor moved the question.

**TMAPC Action; 10 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **MCARTOR**, TMAPC voted **6-4-0** (Cantrell, McArtor, Midget, Shivel, Wright, Walker "aye"; Carnes, Dix, Keith, Leighty "nays"; none "abstaining"; Marshall "absent") to **APPROVE** the recommendation that the Planning Commission is willing to move at least one TMAPC meeting per month to the 4:00 p.m. time period as soon as it is economically feasible.

\* \* \* \* \*

