



Observer Reporting Form

Feature Evaluated	Yes	No	Comments
Meeting started on time?	X		
All members present?		X	
Members attentive?	X		Seemed engaged, asking questions from public and each other to gain clarity on subject matter
Did members appear to have done their "homework"?	X		For the most part, members seemed prepared. One area to note, during the discussion of the Item #47, some members seemed confused on what Slope Protection was intended for.
Were members courteous to each other and the public?	X		Members assisted citizens by explaining procedures and clarifying of how to oppose a request. Members allowed for public to speak longer than their allotted minutes.
Agenda sent/posted 72 hours before?	X		Amendments and agenda copies were provided at the meeting.
Agenda items clearly described what was to be discussed?	X		
Adequate opportunity for public input?	X		Members explained meeting procedures, notified audience of opportunity to oppose consent agenda or other items. Members allowed for public to speak longer than their allotted minutes.
Was there an appearance that some action items were discussed in closed rather than open session?		X	
Was background information available to the public?	X		
Facilities adequate? (room size, lighting, ventilation, speakers audible, accessible to handicapped)	X		

Were any issues on the agenda relevant to LWV positions or programs? During the discussion of Item # 47, the use of the Slope Protection ordinance seemed to confuse several members. A Member asked for Donaldson to explain Slope Protection because she felt the Commission did not have a clear idea of what it was and needed additional explanation to assess the request being made. Questions such as was Slope Protection duplicative of the grading permits and why was Slope Protection is needed when the parcel did not include a large hill were asked by members. One member stated that Slope Protection was not just for viewshed but also water quality protection and reduction in potential stormwater runoff and/or flooding. Another member stated that the public had spoken loudly that they wanted MPC to review these requests and provide adequate oversight. She further stated that the public is concerned about drainage and slope development. Developers (applicants of Item #47) remarked that Slope Protection would disallow development on much of the site. Staff had recommended to deny this request and Donaldson stated that staff recommendation is

consistent with the Sector Plan for Slope Protection. One member suggested that they look at amending plan for removal of Slope Protection. One member made a motion to allow the land to be zoned OB, stating that there was still some slope protection. The motion passed for it to be OB with similar PC to be reviewed.

Do you recommend League action on any of these issues? If possible, it would be good to find appropriate persons to review Slope Protection with MPC, explaining the benefits and the public value. It might also be helpful if we could engage the public to let MPC know that they value Slope Protection and want to see it used wisely.

Other Concerns: MPC staff (engineering) did not seem prepared to comment or provide expertise to items that were contested or respond to objections made.

Observer: Tiffany Foster Meeting: Knoxville/Knox County MPC Date: May 13, 2010

Please submit completed forms to Observer Corps Committee Chair