

# BVCP Process Subcommittee Meeting Notes

June 15, 2016 – 11:30-1:00

Fishbowl Conference Room - Muni Building



## Subcommittee Purpose

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) Process Subcommittee's Role is to monitor and provide input on the public process throughout the BVCP Update process. The BVCP Committee consists of 2 council members (Weaver, Brockett), 2 planning board members (Gerstle, May), a Boulder County Commissioner (Jones), and a County planning commission member (Gargano).

**Attendees:** Aaron Brockett, John Gerstle, Leonard May, Sam Weaver

**Staff:** Jean Gatzka, Lesli Ellis, Caitlin Zacharias, Sung Han, Chris Ranglos, Steven Giang, Susan Richstone, Michael Davidson, Nicole Wobus

**Public:** (7 members)

**\*Comments by subcommittee** are the bullet points that begin with bold text.

**\*\*Staff responses are in italics.**

## Proposed Agenda

### 1. Update from last meeting (10 minutes)

- 4 body consideration of public requests, public hearings, proposed approach and schedule – clarification of sequencing and process for “reconsideration” by other approval bodies (*this will be discussed at the July meeting*).
- Staff provided an initial Proposed Schedule for decision-making (4 Body) Updates and Hearings. (Note: the revised schedule reflecting committee input is attached.)
  - **Can you clarify what an IGA is for the public?** *IGA (intergovernmental agreement) is an agreement w/city and county to implement the plan. Current agreement expires at the end of 2017. The renewal will take place as part of this update. See link below for additional information about IGA in Boulder. <http://www.bouldercounty.org/property/build/pages/igas.aspx>*
  - **The schedule shows a lot of public meetings. Is there a way to possibly combine meetings to avoid overload?** *Could combine open house for the requests requiring two-body review, CU south, and policy updates.*
  - **The focused meetings for local issues (including policy issues) are appropriate.** Breaking it down by topic and/or area will help avoid overload.
  - **For the October joint hearing, do not include the change requests and CU South together.** Depending on the progress by that date, staff could do an update under “matters” on CU South.
  - **Support for joint board meeting (EAB, et al.) Joint meeting will allow the different boards to collaborate with one another.** Consider inviting county boards
  - **Planning Board will look into the special meetings being considered together with City Council.**

### 2. BVCP Survey and Engagement Planning (60 minutes)

*Questions:*

- *Does the subcommittee recommend moving forward with a short online survey focusing on pivotal questions about proposed changes to the plan?*
  - **Yes (addressed below).**

- *If so, does the committee have recommendations about survey schedule, logistics, how best to garner feedback from decision-makers, and/or logistics?*
  - **For the community survey update, the team recommended a combination of hard copy for some and postcards for others (50/50 split).** This survey will be more complicated. For the BVCP survey, we could consider 25% hard copy and the rest could receive a postcard with an invitation to take the survey online. We want to make sure everyone has an equal opportunity to respond to the survey. Something a little more substantial than a postcard for the online invitation, however, would work best, as postcard mailings can get easily misconstrued and discarded.
  - **We should be looking to address inherent contradictions in the survey results.** As policymakers, it's hard to meet all these goals. We need the help of the community in ordering these priorities. It is critical to provide good definitions of concepts so people have a similar understanding of what is proposed.
  - **This survey could be smaller and more targeted than the last survey.**
  - **The focus areas of this survey should include jobs/population balance, discussion around community benefit, the arts, and a visual preference survey.**
  - **The survey could include a question on whether recipients participated in the previous survey.** This would allow us to understand if there have been shifts in position (e.g., Did you respond to the previous survey, and if so, how have your positions changed)?
  - **One option is to send the survey back to those who participated in the first one to see if there has been a shift in opinion.** However, that would not be statistically valid.
  - **Education is only a part of the purpose of the survey.** Main purpose is to hear back from people
  - **How essential is it to get input from Planning Board and City Council on the questions for the survey?** *Essential, they need to have buy-in before the survey goes out. Aim for update under matters in August.*
  - **Use street level visualizations or photos to give people an on-the-ground sense of abstract concepts.** *Intent is to ensure the survey has good graphics so people really understand the questions and implications. Staff has been exploring 3-D visualization techniques, and will continue this conversation with project consultants. A major goal of the BVCP update is to make it more graphic.*
  - **Support for hiring consultants to do these visualizations.** Potential areas something like this could work in are Broadway or the Diagonal Plaza. We need to show what a mixed-use center could look like. *Staff is doing finer-grained analysis on the neighborhood centers in the community and figuring out commonalities. These type of visualizations could align with the land use categories.*
  - **Hundreds of other towns might be asking these same types of questions.** Perhaps there are stock photos that could help with this. However, renderings help contextualize in the local setting.
  - **Can staff post the work from 2000 involving visual representations?** *Staff will look into this.*
- *Does the subcommittee have feedback on the proposed community engagement approach and events?*
  - **The idea of hosting a town hall meeting with one or two council members to invite the community to come talk about what it cares about has been explored. BVCP events could link up with that. However, if the town hall meetings are open to any topic, will they detract from the BVCP?** The town hall meetings are really supposed to be open topics. That type of venue might not be the best for this BVCP but it would be good to ensure elected-officials are at the events.
  - **In the BVCP events, highlight recent developments and potential future developments.** Receiving responses to these and how they may inform what we do with other sites (e.g., Pollard site). This may stimulate discussion because it's specific.

- **If you distill down to three local meetings for the focus areas, will they get too big?** *Staff will find appropriate venues, facilitators, and break down content to even more specific geographies within the event. Staff has paired subcommunities with lower turnout with those that had higher turnout in the listening sessions to create a nice balance.*
  - **How well are we reaching populations that don't typically engage at these type of meetings?** *In the fall, we didn't have many younger folks attend these meetings. Staff will go to community organizations and meet with them during their typical meeting times. Other forms of engagement to reach those who don't typically engage include online outreach, popups, and focus groups.*
  - **It's an important milestone to have the community come together to discuss the scenarios.** Bring in a team of facilitators, maybe one table per topic. There should be a keynote address to set the tone. Considering this as a milestone moment. Chautauqua may be considered as the venue. This was the same venue for the comp plan kickoff event. *Staff will strategically consider venues. There were some space constraints at Chautauqua when doing breakout sessions.*
  - **Will participants be looking at concrete scenarios at the upcoming events in the fall?** *Yes. Conversations will be much more focused on specific topics, choices, proposed changes.*
  - **Do you have in mind a roundtable of representatives from organizations and constituent groups?** Or will the meeting just be open to the public in general? *Staff would like to consider how to do both. Could look at the University Memorial Center as a possible venue. We hope to have more information about the structure of this meeting at one of the next process meetings.*
  - **The idea of extending to specific interest groups is good.**
- *Is a joint meeting with all/most advisory boards recommended?*
    - **Yes. If not all advisory boards can attend one joint meeting, staff may consider holding two joint meetings.**

*Does the subcommittee have feedback on the schedule and dates for approvals and study sessions?*

**(Addressed above)**

### 3. Public Comment (10 minutes)

Donna George: is it alright for member of the community to invite staff or the Planning Commission to a property to show them around? *Staff will follow up.* What is the policy on community benefit and where does it fit in? Affordable housing should not be the only priority when evaluating community benefit.

Michael Caplan: The survey needs common definitions so people are responding to the same things. Facilitation is important, but as important if not more so is the design work of events done beforehand. Who might we want to invite from the public?

Dinah McKay: Palo Park came across as already a done deal. A bad precedent is an example of what happened in Gunbarrel with the subcommunity plan. It was destroyed. Stop further bad precedents in Gunbarrel. Ms. McKay provided handouts to the committee.

Mike Smith: I attended the comp plan kickoff at Chautauqua. Concern is that 4 bodies aren't taking the comp plan seriously. There is an affordable housing "jihad." 20 violations of the comp plan will occur if the parcels in Gunbarrel are annexed, upzoned, and developed. The BVCP has to be a two-way street.

Kate Chandler: I'm happy that you're talking about statistically-valid surveys. You should have six listening sessions, not three. Meetings should be in a central location. Chautauqua and CU are not very accessible to everyone in the community.

Dave Rechberger: When you talk about survey- the meetings and decision-making on the requests are taking place before the survey results. Regarding visualizations: if people make comments on pictures, that's great, if their comments are reflected in the final choices.

Lynn Segal: highlight demand for central trips to Denver. Do a visualization of commuters and emphasize cost to commuters (e.g., productivity, loss of family time). Emphasize intra-city transport.

Next meeting: Scheduled for July 20 – finalize engagement planning; survey; discuss process and recommendations to inform changes to amendment procedures