The following suggestions for amendments to the docketing process are the outcomes of Planning Commission discussion during the following two study sessions.

**July 24, 2019 (presentation led by Judy Fani, Principal Planner)**

Commissioners’ suggestions for proposed revisions:

- Consider language that would allow Council to include non-emergency city-initiated amendments on an already-approved docket. There is an existing policy that allows Council to add city-initiated amendments for emergencies only.
- Consider revisiting the minimum threshold criteria to clarify terms including time, timely, consistent, concurrent.
- In developing the docket, consider city priorities, and staff capacity to complete proposed amendments within the docket year.
- Redesign the process to include a predictable application period/schedule.
- Restructure the process to achieve a cumulative review of approved proposals.
- Reduce number of carryover items.
- Concurrent review of proposals.
- Truly amend the comprehensive plan no more than once per year.

**October 23, 2019 (presentation led by Planning Manager, Beverly Mesa-Zendt)**

Commissioners’ suggestions for proposed revisions:

- Redesign the process to include a predictable application period/schedule. Set annual intake of proposed amendments at the same time each year legislatively.
- Cite the RCW provisions, rather than list all the exemptions to the docket process allowed under the RCW.
- Codify the requirement for a pre-application conference. This will provide an opportunity for staff to ensure more complete applications and redirect applicants to a more appropriate mechanism when needed.
- Consider language that would allow Council to include non-emergency, city-initiated amendments on an already-approved docket.
- Eliminate where possible ambiguous criteria. Threshold criteria should be clear and unambiguous including the terms: time, timely, consistent, concurrent.
- Re-write criteria to include phrases such as, “shall consider” or “must meet” - wherever possible.
- Consider a list of criteria that are required and then another list of other considerations.
- Consider city priorities, and staff capacity to complete proposed amendments within the docket year.
- Consolidate items for public hearing to strengthen efficiency.
- Restructure the process to achieve a cumulative review of approved proposals.
- Reduce the number of carryover items to items that are truly ready for Planning Commission review in the docket year.
- Amend the comprehensive plan no more than once per year.
- Consult City Council. Council should weigh in on the criteria too – perhaps a briefing to solicit input as Planning Commission is developing a new process.
- Consider weighting applications at the pre-application stage to demonstrate how an application meets the criteria.
- Consider an online workflow application process where the application cannot advance if the applicant does not take certain steps.
- Consider two different processes – one of privately-initiated and another for businesses/organizations
- Develop an FAQ sheet to explain process, and intent of minimum threshold criteria, useful examples like “Neighborhood plans address policies such as….”
- Continue exploring application fee options (flat fee, minimum “gate” fee plus hourly fee, flexible fee; a fee structure with flexibility to scale fee based on intensity of the proposal; partial fee refunds for undocketed items; fee waivers for Commission or Council sponsored proposals).
- Provide provisions for Planning Commission to introduce or “sponsor” items for the docket. Develop process to address inclusion – item has majority of Commissioners’ support; abides by the minimum threshold criteria, no fee….
- Revisit the approved docket schedule – is a two-month period enough time for the Planning Commission to review a scaled down docket?
- Consider options for deferring an application for the next docket if, for instance, the item has merit but there is insufficient staff capacity.