

From Ed Clarke

Comments on Development Process Draft 11.29.10		
Page	Section	Comment
*	NA	I think the entire report should be able to be evaluated over time. We should be able to say in 5 years whether the recommendations accomplished their goals. As a result various metrics and benchmarks need to be included in the report to help assess progress.
13	Neighborhood Associations	This definition if enforced would disqualify existing associations, for example, CNI. It should be enforced or modified. (See page 20)
17	Pre Application Phase	This section should clarify when the “clock starts” to track time to approval.
	A.1.a	Ditto
18	A.2.a	“...encourage a near-term meeting”: Should this recommendation <u>require</u> such a meeting?
		Who calls this meeting?
		Recommend that a document be prepared summarizing the outcome of this meeting which will set expectations for process. City staff responsible for producing and monitoring expectations contained in document.
20	B.1	“Encourage neighborhood review...”- should this be <u>require</u> ?
	B.2	Recommend Goal B.2 be restated to “Enable City staff to better facilitate meetings between Applicants and neighborhood stakeholders,” to better align with B.1.
		Facilitators: A previous version had a provision for using facilitators who are trained to help the process move forward. I see no mention of this any more in these recommendations. I recommend it be restored. Facilitators can own the “process” in a way that stakeholders cannot and do not comment on the “content” of the discussion. City staff should <u>not</u> play this role since they need to be free to speak from their professional expertise and to comment on the “content” of the discussion. Alders can play this role but not all may be skilled in the process of facilitation. Alders also feel pressure to respond to voters and therefore may find it difficult to enforcing good meeting process.
		This section should be clarified as to who can speak “for” a neighborhood. Some Neighborhood Associations (NAs) transcend a given neighborhood, e.g. CNI “represents” 5 neighborhoods. Some Neighborhood Business Associations (NBAs) transcend one neighborhood, e.g. Northside Business Association encompasses many neighborhoods.
		Final sentence seems to empower the Alders and the NAs to call and facilitate the meetings. This seems to enhance the status of the NAs when in all of the previous sections the NBAs were mentioned in parallel. This should be clarified. I recommend that since B1 places all neighborhood stakeholders on an equal footing, the responsibility for the

		meetings should be shared equally between all stakeholders.
24	D.1	Paragraph 2: “as of right”???
		Last sentence in paragraph 3 proposes a “review of the development process within 18 months”. What is the point of this review and how is it related to the zoning process or the PUD process? Is this the general review we are encouraging in J.3?
		The Zoning Administrator appears to play a key role in establishing the need for a PUD. The role of this person and office needs to be included in the feedback loop encouraged between stakeholders and city staff recommended in J.3.
	D.2	I agree with this goal. However, there is only one situation which seems to be presented as an example not as a recommendation. The report should flesh out this goal and come up with specific recommendations for staff to decide without further approvals.
25	E.1	I agree with this recommendation. Who will do this work? E.2.a seems to give this role to the Organizational Development and Training Office (ODTO). This seems an odd role for this group. Is it the work of the EDC to review these recommendations and forward them to the City Council or is this staff work? I have no strong feelings on this but the report should be clear on who has been given this task.
	E.2.a	This seems to give the ODTO an assessment role for behavior of the various Boards and Commissions. I think the content of this section is very important but I think it should be clarified as to who is monitoring the work of the Boards and Commissions and what authority they have to improve inappropriate behavior.
26	F.1	Who is responsible for this task? If it is staff, does the EDC have a role in reviewing and or approving for submission to the Council?
		I think there is a need to distinguish between clarifying “mission” as well as “jurisdiction”. The jurisdiction issue seems straightforward in insuring that groups are not discussing things that other groups have already ruled on. The mission issue however is one we have heard about more such as when a Board or Commission takes up issues which are not in its mission. Such issues may or may not be in the purview of any other group (jurisdiction). “Mission creep” can be handled not simply by a review of documents but through an assessment process of the groups. I recommend that this is a role for staff to the Boards and Commissions since they are at the meetings and can speak from their professional expertise as to where the issue under discussion falls under the group’s mission. Board and Commission Chairs need to have a role here as well.
	F.2	I strongly support this provision and see no justification for limiting the authority of the Council in this manner for these issues.
27	G.2	Eliminate “consider”
	G.3	Eliminate “consider”
28	G.7	It is still not clear to me whether a given Board or Commission can “stop” a project before other groups have had their review. I

		recommend some clarifying statement regarding the relationship of the approval bodies such as found in G.8.a.
		We have discussed having a “parallel” process which would result in all of the recommendations arriving at the Council which could make a “holistic” decision even if one of the bodies may disapprove. This is partially addressed by G.1, but only under the guise of streamlining.
	G.7.d	Who is responsible for this task?
	G.8.b	What kinds of “certain” projects? Small ones?
	G.8.d	How does this recommendation interface with G.8.b? Is one of them redundant?
29	G.8.e	Eliminate two instances of “consider”.
	G.8.f	Strengthen this recommendation by eliminating the “evaluate” language. If we think this is a good recommendation, we should say so.
	G.9	Eliminate “consider”.
32	I.1	Clarify boards and commissions to which this would apply. Second sentence in paragraph one seems to say we do this now for Plan Commission and Common Council approval. To what bodies would the recommendation expand this practice?
	I.3	Eliminate “could” in three instances.
34	K.1	Consistency of Neighborhood Plans and Comprehensive plan is a key issue. But this issue goes beyond these two documents. There are more plans (Build Plans for example) that all need to work together. This section should be expanded to include this issue.
		New neighborhood plans should be reviewed by staff to insure consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning ordinance before forwarding to the Council.
		Neighborhood Plans are approved by the Council and are often reviewed by the EDC and perhaps by other bodies. What are the criteria for approval? We have seen neighborhood plans which make recommendations which may be better for the local area than they are for the city as a whole. How are these two issues balanced?
		What is the role of a Neighborhood Plan in the approval of a development process? What weight does it have as compared to, for example, Neighborhood Association comments?
		What mechanism’s exist for helping neighborhoods to “consider economic feasibility and market realities” when creating a plan? Should this be a factor in the review of such plans by various bodies?
35	K.2.c	I do not favor giving members a stipend with no accountability mechanism to insure it is being expended appropriately. I recommend creating a city fund to which members can apply for off-setting costs of “attending conferences or training...”
38	N	While I agree in theory that previous reports have many good un-adopted ideas, I am uncomfortable recommending that they all be adopted wholesale. I think they need review to see if they still are relevant to our economic situation.

