File #: 18-0202, **Version:** 2 **Item #:** A-6.

CC - (1) Discussion of City Council, Planning Commission and Potential Committee Roles in the General Plan Update (GPU) Process; and (2) Direct the City Manager as Deemed Appropriate.

Meeting Date: September 11, 2017

Contact Person/Dept: Ashley Hefner/CDD

Phone Number: (310) 253-5744

Fiscal Impact: Yes [] No [X] **General Fund:** Yes [] No [X]

Public Hearing: [] **Action Item:** [] **Attachments:** [X]

Commission Action Required: Yes [] No [X] **Date:**

Public Notification: (E-Mail) Meetings and Agendas - City Council (09/07/17)

Department Approval: Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director (9/6/17)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council (1) Discuss City Council, Planning Commission and potential committee roles in General Plan Update (GPU) process; and (2) Direct the City Manager as deemed appropriate.

BACKGROUND

On August 14, 2017, City Council received a presentation on the draft Request for Qualifications (RFQ), outline Request for Proposals (RFP), and Summary Matrix of Best Practices. City Council emphasized the importance of establishing committees early in the planning process. On August 30, 2017, City Council discussed the various components of committees and directed that an in depth discussion take place at the September 11, 2017 meeting. City Council also directed the following on August 30th:

- That a standing agenda item be placed on each City Council agenda for the purpose of updates, discussion, or as otherwise necessary.
- That the process schedule reflect special City Council meetings for major GPU milestones,

reflect training time for new Council Members following the election, and reflect tasks related to appointing committees.

- That, to the extent feasible, GPU staff reports and attachments should be provided to Council Members 10 days prior to Council meetings.

DISCUSSION

The State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) recently released an update to their General Plan Guidelines (GPG) which summarizes the purpose, timing and composition of advisory bodies as follows:

> *"Establishing a diverse advisory board or committee comprised of experts and community members can be helpful throughout the general plan update process. An advisory body can provide insight as to how to reach multiple populations, address potentially controversial issues, understand sensitive community needs, and represent a greater portion of the community. Establishment of the advisory body early in the process allows the board to inform the general outreach strategy from the beginning. An advisory board can also establish what community engagement will include for its own jurisdiction, and how community and stakeholder input is handled and communicated back to the public. Additionally, an advisory body can help build community capacity on issues such as data use and evaluation, as well as the historical context of land use planning.*
>
> *A manageably sized advisory body - around 10 people with an effective facilitator - should include multiple voices from the community and represent its diversity. General plan advisory board members should be drawn from the broad range of communities that exist within a jurisdiction to represent the varied interests that the public engagement process hopes to capture and to inclusively inform and enhance the general outreach strategy Committees are a body to provide guidance, and selective decision-making authority, to planning processes. The appointment timing, scheduling, composition, focus, and level of involvement of committees can be tailored to meet specific process and technical objectives." (GPG page 29, see Attachment 2)*

The advisory body may be tailored to fit each community. For example, during its 2010 update process, the City of West Hollywood had a 42 member General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) appointed by the City Manager that met seven times over several months from the public engagement/visioning phase through the development of proposed alternatives. The City of Beverly Hills took a slightly different approach, appointing 14 members that had often previously served on the Council, with an additional seven topic committees of about 15-20 members each. Each committee met numerous times and conducted its own workshops and events.

Each City should base its committee framework on an agreed-upon set of principles for achieving specific process and technical objectives. A sample of other ways of organizing and operating committees is detailed in Attachment 1.

The City Council may want to consider how existing City bodies, particularly the City Council and Planning Commission, will be involved in the advisory and decision-making process. For example,

many jurisdictions rely heavily on the Planning Commission throughout the GPU process for land use planning review and recommendations since the Planning Commission has an advisory role in land use matters in the City.

OPR emphasizes a rational process for creating advisory bodies, by first establishing optimal roles and key objectives that then inform the details. To proceed, staff recommends the City Council first establish agreement on principles and objectives unique to each advisory body by discussing the following steps in order (as each informs the next):

1. Optimal roles and objectives for the City Council, Planning Commission, other City bodies as deemed relevant, General Plan committees to be appointed, and staff.
2. Community participation issues that Culver City faces, including groups most likely to be left out, and how advisory bodies can help to ensure equitable participation.
3. The best advisory body framework to achieve desired process, technical, and equity outcomes; including identification of specific tasks and objectives for each body to work toward.
4. The optimal appointment term, meeting frequency, number of participants, and range of qualifications / expertise to be represented on each advisory body.

Based upon the above principles, the City Council could consider the following committee framework for the GPU processes:

City Council Ad Hoc Subcommittee

- Purpose: Receive regular reports from appointed committees and advise and report back to City Council; and be involved at each major decision point and/or milestone in the work product; e.g., documentation, analysis, and recommendations
- Term: Continuous from before consultant kickoff through Plan draft phase
- Frequency: Monthly or bimonthly throughout entire term
- Size/Composition: Two Councilmembers

General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

- Purpose: Advise broadly on project, including:
  - Ensuring equitable representation of stakeholders and diverse points of view
  - Weighing in on a comprehensive, cohesive vision for guiding change
  - Providing additional review and commentary on subcommittee findings and recommendations and proposed policy and approaches
- Term: Continuous from before consultant kickoff through Plan draft phase
- Frequency: Monthly or bimonthly throughout entire term
- Size: 10-12 members, plus facilitator
- Composition: A mix of residents, business owners and employees, planning experts, technical experts, up to four department heads (Community Development, Public Works, Transportation and others as needed), and others with qualifications sufficient to advise on process and plan objectives

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

- Purpose: Make recommendations to ensure public engagement goals are achieved (see GPG discussion for the critical contribution CACs make in ensuring equitable participation)
- Term: Continuous from before public engagement kickoff through Plan draft phase
- Frequency: Monthly or bimonthly, with largest effort during first-year outreach and visioning
- Size: ±5 members
- Composition: Community members and representatives from groups such as social service organizations, neighborhood groups, and business improvement districts

Technical Advisory Committees (TACs)

- Purpose: Review and provide comment on technical methods, data analysis, findings, and policy recommendations
- Term: As needed based on project schedule and other process needs
- Frequency: As needed based on project schedule and other process needs
- Size: ±5 per topic (Assuming ±10 elements, there could be ±50 TAC members)
- Composition: Technical experts; the mix of appointees should reflect the topics to be discussed and the outcomes to be achieved

At the August 30th meeting, City Council discussed that each Council Member could select two GPAC committee members with an additional two members consisting of executive staff representatives, resulting in a committee of 12. The Mayor and/or City Manager could select the representatives with consideration of scheduling and area of expertise. Selection of members for a CAC and TACs was not discussed.

Next steps in creating advisory body framework

- Determine roles and objectives of advisory bodies for initial planning process
- Determine number and purpose of committees
- Determine whether each of the committees will be continuous or of limited duration
- Determine appropriate meeting frequency based on project schedule, milestones, and desired outcomes
- Determine appropriate number, qualifications, and mix of appointees for each committee
- Name and request participation of appointees

FISCAL ANALYSIS

There is no fiscal impact associated with these discussion items.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Committee case study matrix
2. Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines section on committees
3. Revised schedule

MOTION

That the City Council:

1. Discuss City Council, Planning Commission and potential committee roles in the GPU process;

2. Direct the City Manager as deemed appropriate.