

Hi Adam. I've got some comments for you regarding the Scope of Work and the Public Participation Plan for the Comp Plan update. I offer, first, my thinking on requesting additions. Then I present a list.

Comp Plans are important tools. In our case, the Comp Plan is probably not seeing as much use as it should. I think this may be, in part, because it is too wordy. It often reads like a history of City planning. This makes it less likely to be a go-to reference document. I am probably an outlier in my use of the Comp Plan to check policy support for ideas: a glutton for punishment.

Would it be possible to remove this history and other descriptions of thought processes from the Comp Plan and store it in another document? Further, where something useful can be said in half as many words, it should be written that way. It would be great if, for this update, at least the Introduction for the Plan and the introduction for the Land Use, Housing, and Transportation Elements could be updated.

The Comp Plan renders itself less useful by its lack of appropriate headings for goals and policies. This is particularly apparent Land Use Policies, Natural Environment (Goal 18) and Parks and Open Space Policies (Goals 19 and 20) in the Land Use Element. We have policies about critical areas, conservation of the natural environment, and parks and open spaces tangled up, to an extent. A careful reading, though, reveals that Goal 18 is mostly about critical areas, so it should be headed as such. Goal 19 is mostly about the natural environment, which would be a good heading. Goal 20 is mostly parks and recreation, so that could retain the existing heading, but, of course, it will probably be moved to the new Parks and Open Space Element, necessitating additional adjustments.

This brings up a question: Did the Parks and Rec Commission and the Parks staff consider the policies in Goal 20 as a reference as they developed the PROS? I hope so. These policies were adopted prior to the appointment of a Parks and Rec Commission. Anyway, PROS and Goal 20 will need to be reconciled.

Another heading that hides rather than highlights what is in our Comp Plan is "STAR" for Goals 26 through 29 in Land Use Policies. The STAR ratings system was terminated 2019 prior to the Comp Plan update that included climate policies. Accordingly, the Planning Commission, on my motion, recommended that this heading be changed to Climate. Something was lost in translation and this change was not made. It should be changed to "Climate". You'll see a little more about this in an email that I sent to Alison on 2/26 and copied you.

Related to this same mix up, the last paragraph in Climate Change in the Introduction to the Land Use Element was to be deleted. Again, the Commission knew that the STAR program had terminated so we wanted to delete that reference. Further, it was clearly decided that a Sustainability Plan was no longer recommended given we believed that the focus should

change to emphasizing climate action planning, with sustainability a presumed way of doing *all* business in the City.

Finally, the Commission wished to delete Goal 26 for the same reason but this is not reflected in the Comp Plan. It should be deleted in this update.

In Attachment A, Table 2, LU-7 notes that the Climate Action Plan will be adopted by reference as Goal 28. There is a suite of climate policies in the Capital Facilities Element also, as 1.20 through 1.23. It should be noted that the CAP is adopted by reference there also.

Back to headings: Goal 25 should have a heading, "Historical Preservation" particularly since this is a GMA-required planning policy.

The Action Plan appearing as Goal 30 in the Land Use Policies: This goal and policies may not be current, but I see minimal value in trying to update it and, for that matter, putting action plans in Comprehensive Plans that are updated every nine years. The annual capital budgets and program plans updated and approved by the Council are the de facto action plan. I'm not sure how insistent the Dept. of Commerce is on including action plans. I see only this one in the Comp Plan though there are Implementation Actions in other elements, which amount to the same thing. Maybe these can be deleted, again to make our Plan more simple and truthful.

I see in the subtasks the intentions to adopt other plans by reference. This is an important improvement and it will be helpful to list them in the appendices, preferably separately rather than on one appendix, as now. Clarity is needed regarding the relationship of the Comp Plan to functional or other plans. A decision should be made (or explained) as to how the Comp Plan and other plans complement each other. Is it the intent that the Comp Plan will include overarching goals and policies that guide the formation of functional plans (or whatever is the appropriate term, depending upon the plan)? Would it be more efficient and more useful for everyone if the goals and policies appeared in one or the other, but not both? This would generally render it moot to have to reconcile the Comp Plan when the latest functional plan is updated. A discussion of plans adopted by reference should be included in the Comp Plan Introduction, clarifying the above topics, as well as appropriate explanation regarding individual plans adopted by reference at relevant points in the Elements.

In the Transportation Element, when bike and pedestrian modes of travel are the topic, the reference to the Bike/Ped Plan should be included. There should be a reference to the Comprehensive Arts and Culture Plan along with the presentation of Land Use Goals 23 and 24 regarding arts and culture.

Considering the vast effort going into transportation planning, I recommend that the Council consider appointing a Transportation Commission. It's a huge area of City responsibility and

residents have strong views about it. This City function might benefit from citizen input and scrutiny.

The Land Use Issues in the Land Use Element might need to be updated.

Introduction, Vision Statement, How the Values are Manifested: There are topics in shaded boxes. Some of these topics need to be edited since words that should be part of one phrase appear on separate lines, negating the meaning. Some updates in this section may be needed based upon work in elements.

Additions to Scope of Work:

1. Update the Introduction to the Plan and the Introductions to the Land Use, Housing, and Transportation Elements.
2. A discussion of plans adopted by reference should be included in the Comp Plan Introduction, clarifying the above topics, as well as appropriate explanation regarding individual plans adopted by reference at relevant points in the Elements. Explain the purpose of the adopted plan, the relationship of the Comp Plan to plans adopted by reference, noting the relative authority of each, the lead commission or board on updates, and the frequency of update. This is currently needed, at least, for the Bike/Ped Plan and the Comprehensive Arts and Culture Plan (in Land Use Goals 23 and 24).
3. Add appropriate headings to the Land Use Policies, Natural Environment (Goal 18) and Parks and Open Space Policies (Goals 19 and 20) in the Land Use Element. Reconcile Goal 20 with PROS.
4. Change the heading for Goals 26 through 29 in Land Use Policies from STAR to Climate Change.
5. Delete the last paragraph in Climate Change in the Introduction to the Land Use Element.
6. Delete Goal 26 in the Land Use Element.
7. Adopt the Climate Action Plan in reference to climate policies 1.20 through 1.23 in the Capital Facilities Element.
8. Add the heading "Historical Preservation" to Goal 25 in the Land Use Policies.
9. Evaluate Goal 30 in the Land Use Policies for relevance.
10. Update Land Use Issues in the Land Use Element, as needed.
11. Edit shaded boxes in Introduction, Vision Statement: How the Values are Manifested.

Regarding the Public Participation Plan, it seems to be well-crafted. I will offer, from my participation in the public outreach for the residential development standards, a few ideas.

There were three types of community workshops.

Staff presentations followed by attendees sitting at tables together telling each other what we thought the City should do. A City staff person was taking notes and sometimes facilitating. I think each group presented afterwards. I found it quite frustrating to spend my time in this manner. It was hard to get an opportunity to speak. A lot of time was spent in a frustrating manner listening to all manner of ideas about what the City should do, some of it having not much to do with updating the residential development standards. Some had axes to grind. The staff presentation was good.

The second workshop probably involved staff presentation again but then participants could queue up and share their ideas verbally with the Planning Commission and probably a few Council members, as well. No one on the dais responded to what they were hearing. This was fairly sterile but not any more so than testifying at any public meeting. Again, staff input was good.

The third version involved citizens queuing up to share ideas and ask questions of panelists which were, as I recall, Planning Commissioners. Staff was brought in to answer questions, as well. This was pretty satisfying.

Ok, those are my comments. The proposed package of Scope of Work, Schedule, and Public Participation Plan are put together very well. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.