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**Agenda**

**Retrospective Goals**

**Stakeholder Interviews**

**Public Survey**

**Surrounding Jurisdictions**

**Questions for Discussion**

---

15 min

**Joint PC / BOS Meeting**

Oct 2021

Oct-Dec 2021
Stakeholder Interviews and Online Community Survey

---

45 min

**Outreach Findings Presentation**

Jan-Feb 2022
SSPA Retrospective Themes: October 2021 Joint BOS / PC Meeting

- Inclusion and Community Engagement
- Plan Amendment Prioritization
- Staff and Task Force Resource Demand
- Nomination Criteria Adjustments

SSPA Retrospective Goals: February 2022

Goal 1
Increased Inclusion and Community Engagement

Goal 2
Better Balance of Staff, Community, PC, and Board Resources
Goal #1: Increased Inclusion and Community Engagement

- Earlier engagement
- Clearer definition of roles
- Prefer current task force model with in-person meeting setting

- Emphasized equity and capacity building
- More flexible engagement
- Effective participation in virtual setting

- Prefer targeted community meetings and open houses
- Prefer virtual setting

- Comparison to Board-authorized site-specific amendments
- Prefer virtual setting
Goal #2: Better Resource Balance

- Screening useful exercise
- Mixed feedback on timeline
- Enhance land use education

- Priority on policy and small area planning with few site-specific proposals
- Concurrent entitlements

- Quicker timeline
- Greater flexibility in Comp Plan policies

- Prioritize area planning and policy
- Opportunity costs for staff and the community
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights from Other Jurisdictions - Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion and Community Engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arlington Co.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they have an equivalent process for site level plan amendments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are changes considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are proposals screened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is community engaged during review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can nominate changes to the plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal #2: Better Resource Balance

- SSPA Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMINATION PHASE</th>
<th>SCREENING PHASE</th>
<th>WORK PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>7-10 months (or more depending on complexity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Staff, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, development industry, and nominators indicated **too lengthy**
- Task Force members and community participants indicated **about right**

- Enhanced Nomination Criteria

  - site plan concepts
  - earlier nominator engagement
  - property owner’s consent
  - concurrent entitlement requirement
  - submission fees

General Support

Mixed Support
Goal #1: Inclusion and Community Engagement Questions

Questions for consideration...

- What are the pluses and minuses to the current community engagement model and formal community recommendation during Screening?

- How can those directly affected by the nomination be more intentionally involved?

- Could an alternative engagement model achieve similar objectives?
Goal #2: Resource Balance Questions

More frequent cycle with more specific eligibility criteria?

Such as...
- Property owners’ signature
- Concept plan
- Early nominator engagement
- Letter of intent to file a rezoning
- Fees

Retain North/South County cycle or go County-wide?
SSPA Retrospective

Next Steps

Oct 2021
Joint PC / BOS Meeting

Fall 2021
Stakeholder Interviews and
Online Community Survey

Winter 2022
Presentation of
Outreach Findings

Spring 2022
Retrospective Working Group to
Develop Recommendations

Summer 2022
Adoption of
New/Revised Process
Addendum: SSPA Retrospective Survey Summary and Surrounding Jurisdiction Highlights
Survey: In the future, would you prefer to engage in community planning efforts via in-person meetings, or virtually?

Task Force Members: 46 Participants, 56% in-person, 44% virtual.

Community Participants: 150 Participants, 32% in-person, 60% virtual.

Nominators / Industry: 47 Participants, 34% in-person, 57% virtual.
**Survey:** Select your top three engagement methods based on your preferences for community planning efforts. *Please select only 3 responses.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Method</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Nominators</th>
<th>TF Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending targeted community meetings for nearby residents</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving regular email updates</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending regularly scheduled (bi-weekly) task force meetings</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending open houses before the nomination period begins</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking community surveys</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending open houses during the process</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing letters to staff, the task force, PC, and/or BOS</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testifying at PC and BOS hearings</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey: What are the most effective ways for you to hear about community planning efforts? *Multiple options may be selected.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Nominators</th>
<th>TF Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District newsletter</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff contact</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District contact</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Plan Listserv</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Website</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Article</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominator Contact</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NextDoor</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyer or Poster</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Twitter, Youtube, etc)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey: Please provide your thoughts on the SSPA cycle’s overall length.

Task Force Members: 46 Participants
- 52% ...about right.
- 36% ...too lengthy.
- 9% I do not have an opinion about this.
- 2% ...too short.

Community Participants: 150 Participants
- 33% ...about right.
- 28% ...too lengthy.
- 28% I do not have an opinion about this.
- 10% ...too short.

Nominators / Industry: 47 Participants
- 50% ...too lengthy.
- 21% ...about right.
- 18% I do not have an opinion about this.
- 11% ...too short.
Which of the following changes to the nomination criteria could result in clearer, more understandable, and better-developed nominations? *Multiple options may be selected.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Nominators</th>
<th>TF Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Site Plan</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Submittal Nominator Engagement</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Intent to File Rezoning</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Signature</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Fee</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the existing criteria only</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>