

BVCP Process Subcommittee Meeting #7

January 20, 2016 Noon-1:30

Park Central Room 401 Conference Room



Subcommittee Purpose

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) Process Subcommittee's Role will be 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: Sam Weaver, Aaron Brockett, John Gerstle, Leonard May, Elise Jones,

Staff: Lesli Ellis, Jean Gatza, Courland Hyser, Caitlin Zacharias, Michael Davidson, Susan Richstone, Steven Giang, Ben Irwin, Jay Sugnet, Nicole Wobus

Public: (3 members)

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

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

Proposed Agenda

1. Report back on actions recommended at last meeting. (10 minutes)

- Local listening sessions
 - *The summary of the listening sessions are posted on the BVCP website.*
- Process schedule / BOCC & PC Process for public hearings and public requests
 - *The requests have been separated by its areas and properties. Pooling time for requesters and members of the public are up to 5 minutes (in the process of finalizing).*
 - **Where are we currently in the process?**
BOCC and Boulder County Planning Commission will have a public hearing on Jan. 26 and the PC will provide direction that evening. BOCC will provide direction on Jan. 27. City Council and Planning Board will hold a public hearing on the Area II and III properties on Feb. 2. PB will provide direction that evening and council will provide direction on Feb. 29.
 - **Is there a possibility for a request to be reviewed again once it has been dismissed?**
The request does not move on, but the information about the request will be provided to decision-making bodies.
 - *Reminder that the governing bodies are going through a screening process. They are not at the point of decision-making.*

2. Debrief - Phase 1 & 2 Engagement (20 minutes)

- Engagement Measures (*see attachments – Engagement Plan; Summary of Community Engagement - from Dec. 15 memo*)
- Did the engagement for phases 1 & 2 measure up to subcommittee members' expectations? (*see intended outcomes on other side of agenda*)
 - **What Went Well?**
 - i. **The kick-off meeting was fantastic as well as the listening sessions.** Great turn out at the Kick-off. The meeting remained positive and celebratory; the introduction videos did a nice job to support that.
 - ii. **Gunbarrel listening session** – The meeting was well attended and successful. The listening session was still constructive and had positive conversations regarding a specific property and the broader comprehensive plan.

- iii. **Liked how the different departments came together at the listening sessions to discuss the various projects that are taking place in the community.** This helped attract more participants from the neighborhoods.
- iv. **The survey was phenomenal.** The process of developing the survey was great, and good information was produced. Providing both the weighted and un-weighted data made the survey results more credible. Reconnecting in the middle and deciding to send out reminders was a great choice- provided a higher response rate.
 - i. **How successful was the targeted outreach?** *The Hispanic and immigrant populations were targeted where feedback remained at a very high level. As the process moves forward, staff will need to initiate more going-to meetings with options, so that we can hear from everyone in the community (families, younger population). In regard to youth engagement, YOAB students took on a personal project to engage their respective high schools and report back to staff on their findings.*
 - v. **It is important to stress the importance of targeted outreach and in going out into the community to the other boards and commissions.** As staff develops more options and specific focus areas, the boards and commissions will become more engaged. Ask the different boards and commissions about their priorities and how they fit in the comprehensive plan – with guidance from staff.
 - vi. **Planning emails are doing well.**
- **Unmet Expectations or Areas of Concern**
 - i. **Provide more clarity on how targeted outreach was performed, so that people can better understand how the expectations were met.**
 - ii. **Have more professional or volunteer facilitation at meetings.**
 - iii. **Provide more data on engagement efforts such as listing which groups were or weren't engaged.** Provide numbers in how many people were engaged through targeted outreach. This will help provide more transparency in the city's engagement efforts.
 - iv. **Engage people more through social media.** Provide more coverage on meetings through social media.

3. Draft Engagement Planning for Phase 3 (40 minutes) - Attached

- Taking into consideration that the types of questions to ask and input needed around the focus topics will inform the engagement formats as work progresses, are the concepts outlined on the draft plan moving in the right direction on engagement planning for Phase 3?
 - *It is important to make sure that the input staff has received from the public informs the next steps of the comp plan update. There is a lot of information that staff is receiving and producing at the same time. Staff needs to help the public better understand the information that is produced, so that they can provide informative feedback. Working to find common ground and understanding is also important. There needs to be more targeted outreach and meetings that are celebratory and engaging.*
 - **How has the community feedback been used?** *Feedback has shaped the areas of focus, now it's time to go back, and confirm with the public.*
 - *Next phase is about finding the concepts and verifying the questions. Community conversation will help shape options and how the analysis should be approached, which will lead to future scenarios, and options.*
 - **How do topics like jobs:housing balance, and middle-income housing strategy relate to the comp plan?** *Through adjustments in the policy and land use map. Ask the questions: "Does the*

written policy about jobs:housing need to change?” ,“Should we change the mix by changing the land use map?” , “ What do we get from our residential land use?”.

- **There needs to be more qualitative outreach to places like coffee shops with more specific questions related to the Comprehensive Plan.**
- **Will the BVCP update focus more on changing policy or the land use map?** *Changes in text will be done by working with other departments that have recently adopted a plan. Both policy and land use map changes can lead to future changes to the zoning regulations and code.*
- **The definition of community benefit is not clearly defined.** The City Charter does not mention the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan, but it does in the BRC. Have a discussion in the process about possibly bringing the comp plan into the charter. Integrating the idea of “community benefit” into site-review is important to keep in conversation.
- **The process of drafting the options and analysis will be difficult but we need to ensure sufficient time to get this right.** Writing the draft of the second survey will be complex. Development of questions about tradeoffs can be used for various forms of outreach. Ensure the results from different venues can be aligned. Be clear about topics – policy vs. land use.
- **Show the timeline of the change requests on the diagram.** *After February, we will produce a list of requests that will be further analyzed for the next three months.*
- **How much scenario planning will occur? People will need to understand the different impacts each scenario will have- trace the spread of impact. How much of this is envisioned? What should the evaluation impact be? Staff is working with departments across the city to measure these impacts.**
- **Have a document that explains what people’s comments are doing.** Ask the question, “How does community input influence the different options and analysis?”
- **Work on integrating more professional/experienced facilitating for discussions.**
- **Is it important to host localized meetings for future engagement?** *Yes, if there is capacity. This type of engagement helps to get more people involved. Make sure that people’s expectations are going to be met by being on a common page about what input will be taken and considered.*

4. Input on communication planning & website re-organization (10 minutes)

- *Focusing on how the website can be re-organized to make the content on the website easily accessible and have it flow, so that the people can navigate it more easily.*
 - i. **Provide better ways to search so people can do a more narrowed search on what is currently on the page.**

5. Public Comment (10 minutes)

- 1. Donna George- What is the planning email? Yes, to having localized meetings in the future. The community plan for Gunbarrel has changed last minute producing results that doesn’t align with the community’s values. A community plan needs to be developed for Gunbarrel. People might not have the opportunity to talk specifically about their own land use change requests at the joint Boulder County Commission, and Planning Commission meeting because their time will be pooled. All change requests are different and unique. If we don’t get to put in our public input now, when can we?

Sam Weaver - advices to schedule individualized meetings and mail change request packets to the decision-making bodies.

John Gerstle – encourage emailing comments because they get careful considerations.

- 2. Michael Caplan- Given the fact that you meet once a month, what are you doing in between the meetings to continue the dialogue? There needs to be continuity so that a deeper dialogue is taking place in-between these meetings. The agenda left a lot out for lessons learned and about how to move ahead. The information presented needs to be digested.

Next meeting: February 17 – *focus on 3D modeling and how we may employ these tools in next engagement.*

Community Engagement Intended Outcomes for Phase 1 & 2:

(These were not listed in the plan but were used to guide development of the engagement plan and events / formats)

- A cross-section of Boulder constituents are:
 - Informed about the Comprehensive Plan Update and process,
 - Intrigued by and aware of the process and how they can become involved.
- Leaders from targeted constituent groups and demographics are engaged and are reaching out to their constituents.
- City staff and decision-makers hear from constituents about engagement preferences and ideas and use that information to plan future engagement.
- Technical analysis (e.g., trends, challenges and opportunities) is complete; well-designed and understandable; and widely available for community review and comment.
- Constituents understand the data, projections and analysis and provide their views about priority issues to further explore.
- Decision-makers engage in the update process and feel fully informed of community reactions and priorities.
- The schedule and process for public land use or policy change requests is set by decision-makers and understood by community members.
- Key issues and priorities of participants summarized, categorized and quantified to inform analysis and next steps.