



Final Deliberations

Having started the Comprehensive Plan Update process in 2009, members of the Planning Commission (OPC) are now preparing to enter the final stage of their role in the Comprehensive Plan Update: determining final recommendations for the City Council.

As agreed upon in the Comprehensive Plan Update Charter (Charter), Commissioners opted to conduct a review and deliberation process with two phases:

- A. Initial deliberations; and
- B. Final deliberations

The Final Deliberations are noted in the Charter as the time when the public record closes, Commissioners consider the public input from throughout the process, and conduct final votes on recommendations for Council.

This means that the Commission has limited time for the Final Deliberations, and that determining priorities for this review period are essential to ensuring the most critical issues are discussed and forwarded to Council for consideration.

Extended Timeline

The Council Land Use and Environment Committee (LUEC) reviewed and approved a proposed timeline extension on October 25. The extension was then approved by Council on November 5.

The extended timeline includes six additional meetings beginning in January and ending in March of 2013:

December 3, 2012
December 17, 2012
January 7, 2012
January 28, 2012
February 11, 2012
February 25, 2012
March 4, 2012
March 18, 2012

Establishing Priorities

The Planning Commission Leadership Team and CPU Sub-Committee (CPU) both discussed a list of known “inputs” to the Final Deliberation process. “Inputs” can be considered sources of issues for consideration, or frameworks upon which to determine how critical an issue is to address.

The Commission shall address during Final Deliberations the following list of priorities in order:

1. **The July Draft Vision and Values.** Commissioner will have dedicated time to review the vision and values again to ensure they represent the community and provide context for decision-making throughout the rest of the deliberations.
2. **The July Draft Substantive Change List.** The Substantive Change (Attachment 2) list highlights those goals and policies that are substantively different from the existing (1994) Comprehensive Plan. Staff defined “substantive changes” as those changes that would result in the City doing business in a new or different way; a change in direction.
3. **Trends or Highlights from the Public Comments or Commissioners.** These are issues or topics that have clearly risen to the top of the public’s concern and interest throughout the public comment period.

Examples of these items may include:

- a. Views
 - b. Downtown planning
 - c. The designation of Carlyon, Wildwood, and Governor Stevens neighborhoods as within an Urban Corridor
 - d. Street connectivity (Decatur Street and Fern Street)
 - e. Earthquake preparedness and emergency response
4. **The Scope of the Comprehensive Plan Update.** The Scope was recommended by the Planning Commission and adopted by Council in 2010. Staff used the Scope to determine what to update in the existing Plan. If OPC wishes to expand the Scope of the Update and discuss new topics, a formal request will need to be approved by Council.
 5. **New Draft Language Request by Commissioners from Staff or Individual Commissioners.** Throughout the Initial Deliberations, Commissioners have requested that staff provide for the Final Deliberations draft language for a list of topics. Also, individual Commissioners have expressed a desire to

put forward for discussion their own draft language or substantive goal or policy revisions.

6. **Non-Substantive Text Edits.** Commissioners have expressed a desire to compile or submit to fellow Commissioners for review and discussion individually drafted text edits. (Note: these are defined here as more “editorial” in nature. Suggested edits that are substantive, or directly change the outcome of goal or policy language are included in #4.)

Final Deliberation Meetings

With a finite amount of time available, and a lot to review, the Commission will need a process that uses time efficiently, facilitates robust discussion, and ultimately leads to clear recommendations for Council. ***To accomplish this, priorities #1-6 are addressed in order over the course of the scheduled meetings.***

The purpose of starting with beginning with priority #1 is because the Commission will run out of time, so the most important issues and topics are discussed first. If time allows, and Commissioners efficiently move through the top priorities, staff will continue to work with the Leadership Team and CPU to determine how to best support discussion on lower priority items, such as non-substantive text edits (Priority #6).

Consent Agenda

For the July Draft Substantive Change List, the Commission will use a Consent Agenda format. This is a tool for identifying items that need or don't need further discussion by Commissioners during Final Deliberations.

To save time and make meetings more efficient, Council will often review and approve a Consent Agenda. Any items that Councilmembers wish to discuss at a meeting may be “pulled” from the Consent Agenda; however, this is generally reserved for items where the decision is not readily apparent from the background materials and analysis provided in advance by staff.

For an item to be pulled from the Consent Agenda, it needs a minimum of three votes.

Trends or Highlights from the Public Comments or Commissioners

The following process will be used to determine the topics to be covered under priority #3: Trends or Highlights from the Public Comments or Commissioners:

1. Commissioners each bring prepared to the December 3 meeting a list of topics they feel should be discussed because they were:
 - a. Trends or highlights from the public comments; or
 - b. Determined by a Commissioner to be an issue needing deliberation
2. Staff will compile the lists and provide them to Commissioners near the end of the meeting.
3. The Commission will vote on each topic, using an “instant run-off” voting procedure.
4. The Commission will vote to determine the top-ranked topic. Commissioners will then vote to determine the second-ranked topic. The process repeats until all topics are ranked. (Commissioner Bardin will provide CPU with an example of how to use this voting method.)
5. Topics that receive less than three votes will be removed from the list, and will not be brought forward for deliberation.

Additional topics may be brought forward during the process; however, three votes are needed to add it to the list for deliberation.

Motion and Voting Process

A critical element of determining the Final Deliberation process is establishing an effective and efficient voting process. CPU recommends that instead of following a formal process, Commissioners commit to having a clear and purposeful dialogue is substantive and moves the conversation forward.

The Commission will abide by the following voting procedures:

- Commissioners need to bring forward for deliberation clearly articulated proposals that other Commissioners can respond to readily.
- Commissioners shall provide clear and concise responses that are for or against proposals. Commissioners may also provide a clearly articulated amendment or alternative to the proposal under consideration.

- For a proposal to be considered agreed upon, it requires approval of the majority (5 or more Commissioners).
- If a majority vote can't be reached, the Commission will not forward a recommendation on the topic (i.e. the staff recommendation moves forward.)
- Two-thirds of the members present or greater shall vote in support of a topic for it to be brought back for additional discussion or reconsideration.
- One all-encompassing motion will be made near the end of the deliberations to confirm and recommend to Council all the approved proposals.
- Commissioners may draft "minority statements" to be submitted to Council for consideration.