



POST PROJECT EVALUATION SURVEY

Attachment D

Post Project Evaluation Survey

ATTACHMENT D

DRAFT Planning Commission Post Project Evaluation
Downtown Livability Initiative Code Amendments
Version 2 – Consolidated Changes Based on October 11, 2017 Discussion

1. Did the processes associated with completing the Land Use Code Amendments meet the Planning Commission's expectations with respect to the following:
 - a. Scope/Schedule
 - i. The process and tools to complete project work were effective.
 - b. Data/Analysis
 - i. The data used in the project was sufficient in type and detail to analyze the scope requirements.
 - ii. Results of the data analysis were available and easily understood by the Planning Commission.
 - c. Written Reports
 - i. Written materials prepared for the Planning Commission were well organized, comprehensible and accurate.
 - d. Communications
 - i. Communications about the project to the Planning Commission were effective and timely.
 - e. Presentations (incl. Study Sessions/Open Houses/Hearings)
 - i. Staff presentations to the Planning Commission presented a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.
 - f. Transmittal (incl. written transmittal and oral presentation to City Council)
 - i. The written transmittal of the Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council was accurate and complete.
 - g. Other Comments
 - i. Blank area for Planning Commissioners to provide feedback about things that were done well on the project, and areas for improvement.
2. Questions Specific to the Project
 - i. The Citizens Advisory Committee's work added value to the overall process.
 - ii. White papers were developed early in the Downtown Livability Initiative code amendment process to inform policy discussion. This was an effective means to establish consistent policy awareness throughout the project.
 - iii. The Early Wins code package that was adopted towards the beginning of the Commission's work added value to the overall project.

Summary of Changes

- Business Results, section 1, removed.
- Project Processes, section 2.f (Planning Commission) removed.
- Overall survey reduced to 10 questions and 1 area for additional comment.

Post Project Evaluation Survey

DRAFT Planning Commission Post Project Evaluation

Downtown Livability Initiative Code Amendments

Revision marks reflect direction provided by the Planning Commission October 11, 2017. You may need to change your view to see the revision marks. Review>Tracking>All Markup (vs Simple Markup)

1. ~~Do the Land Use Code Amendments transmitted to Council by the Planning Commission deliver results requested by City Council?~~
 - a. ~~Business results~~
 1. ~~The incentive system creates an appropriate balance between private return on investment and public benefit. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 2. ~~The code amendments include elements that promote downtown as a great urban environment while also softening undesirable side effects on Downtown residents. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 3. ~~The code amendments will increase Downtown's liveliness, street presence, and the overall quality of the pedestrian environment. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 4. ~~The code amendments will promote a distinctive and memorable skyline that sets Downtown apart from other cities and likewise create more memorable streets, public spaces, and opportunities for activities and events. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 5. ~~The code amendments will encourage sustainability and green building innovation in Downtown development. Will enable design that promotes water, resource, and energy conservation, and that advances ecological function and integrity. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 6. ~~The code amendments will respond to Downtown's changing demographics by meeting the needs of a wide range of ages and backgrounds for an enlivening, safe and supportive environment. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 7. ~~The code amendments will promote elements that create a great visitor experience and a more vital tourism sector for Downtown. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 8. ~~The code amendments will strengthen Downtown's competitive position in the global and regional economy, while reinforcing local roots and local approaches. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 9. ~~The code amendments will maintain graceful transitions with adjoining residential neighborhoods, while integrating these neighborhoods through linkages to Downtown attractions. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 10. ~~The code amendments refine the Code to provide a good balance between predictability and flexibility, in the continuing effort to attract high quality development that is economically feasible and enhances value for all users. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 11. ~~The code amendments promote through each development an environment that is aesthetically beautiful and of high quality n design, form and materials; and that reinforces the identity and sense of place for Downtown and for distinct districts. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~
 12. ~~The code amendments advance the theme of "City in a Park" for Downtown, creating more green features, public open space, trees and landscaping; and promoting connections to the rest of the parks and open space system. (BCC Guiding Principle)~~

Post Project Evaluation Survey

~~2.1.~~ Did the processes associated with completing the Land Use Code Amendments meet the Planning Commission's expectations with respect to the following?:

- a. Scope/Schedule
 - ~~i. The expectations and requirements of the project were well defined and understood before the project began.~~
 - ~~ii. The Planning Commission was effectively guided by the project team throughout the project life cycle.~~
 - ~~iii. The Planning Commission stayed within the parameters of the scope.~~
 - ~~iv. The actual schedule for the project was proximate to the scope schedule.~~
 - ~~v. Changes to scope and schedule were effectively managed.~~
 - ~~vi.i. The process and tools to complete project work were effective.~~
 - ~~vii. The end product accurately reflected the scope.~~
 - ~~viii. The scope requirements were effectively implemented in the outcome.~~
- b. Data/Analysis
 - i. The data used in the project was sufficient in type and detail to analyze the scope requirements.
 - ~~ii. The Planning Commission was given an opportunity to inform the type and detail of the data needed for the project.~~
 - ~~iii.ii.~~ Results of the data analysis were available and easily understood by the Planning Commission.
 - ~~iv. The type and detail of the data analysis was appropriate to address the scope requirements.~~
 - ~~v. Staff was willing and able to reasonably accommodate other analysis requested by the Planning Commission.~~
- c. Written Reports
 - i. Written materials prepared for the Planning Commission were well organized, comprehensible and accurate.
 - ~~ii. Changes to document being reviewed over a time period were tracked effectively and accurately.~~
- d. Communications
 - ~~i. The communications materials provided to the Planning Commission to orient them about the details of the project were effective?~~
 - ~~ii.i.~~ Communications about the project to the Planning Commission were effective and timely.
 - ~~iii. The appropriate communications vehicles were utilized.~~
 - ~~iv. Communications to the Planning Commission included the appropriate content?~~
 - ~~v. The Planning Commission's expectations regarding the frequency and content of information that was conveyed to Commission were met.~~
 - ~~vi. Staff provided the Planning Commission accurate and complete information to address follow-up questions in a timely manner.~~
- e. Presentations (incl. Study Sessions/Open Houses/Hearings)
 - i. Staff presentations to the Planning Commission presented a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.
 - ~~ii. Staff presentations to the Planning Commission conveyed comprehensible information in a format that was easy to understand.~~
- ~~f. Planning Commission Meetings (incl. Study Sessions/Open Houses/Hearings)~~

Post Project Evaluation Survey

- ~~i. The Planning Commission upheld the Standards and Practices (2016 retreat) during the conduct of business related to this project.~~
- ~~ii. The Planning Commission upheld the Guiding Principles (post 2014 retreat) during the conduct of business related to this project.~~
- ~~iii. The Planning Commission acted in a manner that was fair and impartial to all parties during the conduct of business related to this project.~~
- ~~iv. The Planning Commission process to conduct the work on this project is effective and efficient.~~
- ~~v. The Planning Commission had sufficient time to review the materials between meetings.~~
- ~~vi. The Planning Commission effectively dealt with controversial issues.~~
- ~~vii. The Planning Commission completed its work on this project in a timely manner.~~
- g.f. Transmittal (incl. written transmittal and oral presentation to City Council)
 - ~~i. The written transmittal of the Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council was accurate and complete.~~
 - ~~ii. The Planning Commission's oral presentation to City Council of the Planning Commission's final recommendation was accurate and complete.~~
- ~~h. Overall~~
 - ~~i. What was your overall rating of the success of the project (both what was delivered, and how it was delivered).~~
- ~~i. Open Ended Questions~~
 - ~~i. What were the most significant issues that negatively affected the efficiency and effectiveness of this project? (open ended response)~~
 - ~~ii. What were the most significant issues that positively affected the efficiency and effectiveness of this project? (open ended response)~~
- j.g. Other Comments
 - i. Blank area for Planning Commissioners to provide feedback about things that were done well on the project, and areas for improvement.
- h. Questions Specific to the Project
 - i. The Citizens Advisory Committee's work added value to the overall process.
 - ii. White papers were developed early in the Downtown Livability Initiative code amendment process to inform policy discussion. This was an effective means to establish consistent policy awareness throughout the project.
 - iii. The Early Wins code package that was adopted towards the beginning of the Commission's work added value to the overall project.