



City of Seattle Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee

List of Key Themes from Interviews January 15, 2008

PROCESS

Between December 11, 2008 and January 13, 2009, Triangle Associates conducted interviews with 22 of the 24 members of the Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee (NPAC).^{*} Interviews with the remaining members will be conducted as soon as possible and this report may be revised to reflect their input. The key themes that emerged from the interviews are presented in the following order:

1. Understanding of the NPAC's purpose
2. Members' core interests in the NPAC process
3. Key issues and concerns
4. Suggestions about the Charter
5. Essential elements for the success of the process
6. Hopes for the process
7. Concerns about the process

The interviewees' recommendations for developing a common base of information to inform NPAC members' participation, as well as member requests for specific information are attached to this report in Appendix A. The interview questions are included in Appendix B.

KEY THEMES

1. Understanding of the NPAC's purpose

There is not a broadly-shared understanding of the NPAC's responsibilities.

- Some members referenced the 13 actions identified in the City Council resolution that created NPAC (Resolution 31085) as the roadmap for its work. They say they understand and accept that the focus of the Committee's work will be to review and to make recommendations and provide advice to the City on the specified issues relating to neighborhood plan status reports and neighborhood plan updates.
- Many others say that they are not entirely sure what the City expects the Committee to accomplish. Are there three primary activities and ten secondary, or are all 13 primary?

^{*} Because of a mistake in the NPAC member roster in December, one alternate was also interviewed, bringing the total number of interviews completed to 23.



- Members asked questions about how their input will mesh with the work that staff at the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) and the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) are to carry out. Some want the different City departments to clearly describe to the Committee what they are working on, including policy initiatives that are in the process of being developed, so that NPAC will not be operating in a void or potentially blindsided in the future. They say this approach will allay suspicions about the City’s intentions.
- Some members also point out that they are unclear if, how, and for what purposes the City will use the group’s advice and recommendations.

2. Members’ Core Interests in the NPAC Process

- ***Long-term sustainability:*** This term encompasses walkable communities, affordable housing, attention to “community builders” like parks, open space, libraries and community centers, and good local schools. It also includes healthy commercial centers and transportation options like transit and bike paths that can reduce our area’s reliance on cars.
- ***Effective communication with communities and an inclusive public involvement process:*** Many Committee members indicated that effective communication about the neighborhood planning update process and outreach that engages the full range of community members (including residents, businesses and traditionally under-represented residents) are high priorities. Some want to be able to distribute monthly synopses about the Committee’s work to their District Councils and groups, to encourage interest and understanding.
- ***Enabling neighborhoods to have input on what will happen in their communities as growth happens:*** Changes are already occurring in some communities and it is not all positive. In some cases, growth has led to displacement of small businesses, parking and traffic impacts, loss of affordable housing, and loss of community character. To help communities prepare, there needs to be good community outreach and resources to back up the effort. The effort requires recruiting and educating people about their neighborhood plans and providing resources to assist them in updating the plans. It also means appropriate City departments need to work with communities to implement the plans.
- ***Empowering all neighborhoods to be creative and providing them with the tools needed to make their communities great and having the support of the City to achieve their visions.***
- ***Having the Committee and neighborhoods drive the update process, not the City:*** “The City has defined the task; let the Committee decide how to be successful.” “The City should let issues come up from the neighborhoods.”

3. Key Issues and Concerns

- ***Interweaving sustainability as an overarching principle in all aspects of city design.*** NPAC should provide a set of guidelines for sustainability and clearly define ways to measure if we’re meeting it.
- ***Transportation:*** All modes that can move people and knit the City together without requiring the use of cars are important: bus rapid transit, light rail, streetcars, bicycles, walking, etc.

- **Implementation of Neighborhood Plans:** Some members express dissatisfaction with the prior process because participants expected the City to implement what was in the plans and this didn't happen. Members say that the link between planning and implementation should be strengthened. If there's a commitment to adopt a vision, then there has to be an equal commitment to adopt the capital improvements, social services and other things needed to make it real. The "big three" are social services, transportation and recreation/parks.
- **Preservation of community character, local businesses, and affordable housing:** In some communities, the recent growth has displaced local businesses and threatened to disrupt unique cultural characteristics. Housing has become more expensive. How do we protect local businesses and community character, and keep housing affordable as we grow?
- **Understanding the basis for growth projections and how the City uses them to make decisions that affect neighborhoods:** What do the housing and job targets mean and how are they being used? Some developers are pushing for targets that are much higher than those in city or state-wide plans. In some cases, communities have already exceeded the growth identified for their areas.
- **Concerns about the use of incentive zoning to increase density outside of areas designated for growth:** We had a planning model focusing growth in urban villages. Now, the City is using incentive zoning that will encourage upzoning and increased density both inside and outside of urban villages, so the lines are being blurred between areas designated for growth and the surrounding areas.
- **Increasing density vis-à-vis preservation of single-family zoning:** How and where should population growth be accommodated? Some members want the Committee to take a hard look at the proportion of Seattle that is zoned single-family – a "consumptive" land use pattern that they believe has negative consequences for the environment, healthy human habitat and long-term sustainability. They say this zoning is also the reason that most of the current growth is concentrated in local business districts, many of which are quite small.
- **Clarity about the City's role:** To avoid creating false expectations, the City needs to be clear about: 1) what the City does and does not intend to do with respect to updating neighborhood plans; 2) the extent of resources the City can provide to support neighborhood planning; and 3) what the City intends to do to implement neighborhood plans.
- **Creating a link between the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan and Neighborhood plans:** Neighborhood plans are incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Plan under the auspices of the state Growth Management Act (GMA). The next round of neighborhood planning should focus more on the policy language, because that's what gets adopted in the City's Comprehensive Plan to meet GMA requirements. NPAC needs to link the scope of neighborhood plans to the City's Comprehensive Plan process and annual amendments, so they are in sync.
- **Expectations for the Status Reports and next steps:** The status reports need to include issues that go beyond zoning capacity and include other metrics to determine the success of neighborhoods in meeting their goals. If the status reports show there's lots of work still to be done to implement



the neighborhood plans, what's next? Where's the action that comes after the planning? If there are resource constraints, how do we avoid raising false expectations?

- ***Prioritizing neighborhoods for plan updates in 2010 and 2011:*** Several members expressed regret that all of the neighborhood plans are not to be updated at once, since such a process would provide a holistic view of the City. Members are wondering if the next priorities (after the three to be updated in 2009) should be the neighborhoods where the least implementation has occurred, or where there has been significant change since the plans were adopted, or something else?

- ***Additional key issues proposed for Committee consideration:***
 - Use of city-approved outside contractors for review/revision of urban center and hub urban village plans. This is important to some, because the contractors would be accountable to the neighborhoods.
 - The City should hire qualified urban planning/urban design firms to study each neighborhood and coordinate with neighborhood groups and DPD to help to reshape the neighborhood plans to create forward-looking, 25-year visions of how the community should evolve and accommodate both City and community goals.
 - Prioritize sequence of review/revision process to bring urban centers and hub urban villages forward.
 - Consider breaking out urban centers from the larger planning areas to which they are currently linked.
 - Adjust height/density limits in urban centers in ways that ensure that space will be reserved by developers for on-site open space, on-site parking, transit stops/shelters, libraries, schools, recreation centers, clinics, etc. Public facilities could be public/private spaces in redevelopment projects.
 - Structure an incentive bonus program with direct community input on priorities over the next 25 years, including certain development standards/bulk controls that communities can help create and shape as neighborhood plan elements.
 - Provide for a flexible incentive zoning program for neighborhoods. DPD would have control of the overarching methods and format, but allow the particulars to be honed within the neighborhood. That way, the highest priorities could be structured and shaped systematically to respond to each neighborhood's issues.
 - The lack of a hospital in West Seattle between the West Seattle Bridge and the Junction.
 - Job creation.

4. Suggestions about the Charter

a. Committee purpose

The Charter should clearly spell out the group's responsibilities. The Charter should be posted at every meeting along with the ground rules that describe how the group will operate.

b. Committee discussion/decision-making

Committee members are divided over whether to use Robert's Rules of Order. Those in favor stress the importance of providing structure and making decisions in a timely way. They say that in a big group, discussion has to have limits. At the end of the discussion, the group can vote, see where people are and move on. Others oppose Roberts Rules and/or feel it could weigh down the whole process. They believe Robert's Rules can prevent a true discussion from occurring, can be a way to "cram agendas down other peoples' throats," to use knowledge of the rules to control the



dialogue. Some see these rules as unfairly favoring members of mainstream cultures. Other thoughts include:

- The group needs to decide if it is going to be a voting body or not.
- If it decides to take votes, based on the interviews, most members agree with the following approach: 1) First, try for consensus of opinion. Assess whether there's consensus by a show of hands, thumbs up or down or some other method. 2) If there is not a consensus, then take a vote. 3) If there's a split vote (majority/minority), the Committee should report both the majority opinion with rationale and the minority opinion with rationale, so decision-makers are aware of all of the perspectives.

c. Agendas

- The Committee's work plan is expected to drive agendas for NPAC meetings.
- Agenda items for the next meeting should be reviewed at the close of the previous meeting, so that all members know what to expect and can offer additional items for the group to consider.
- Anyone should be able to propose something for an agenda up to a defined cut-off date (to allow adequate time to prepare). If items aren't accepted for the agenda, the reason why it was not should be provided.
- Unresolved debates from one meeting could be included in the agenda for the next meeting with a deadline for decision. Identify the number of minutes for discussion (for example, 20 minutes) and then pro rate discussion based on the number who want to speak and limit individuals to the amount of time. Then the committee can either vote or decide not to make a decision or table it.
- Include in the agenda strict time limits on the length of debate statements and the closing time for debate, subject to continuation into the next meeting if needed.
- Try to resolve issues within one meeting but do not let them stretch more than two.

d. Expectations of members

- Suggestions are pretty well covered in the Draft Charter

e. Expectations of the City

- Provide good information, excellent support, and money for outreach, take our advice seriously; and stay out of the way except to assist us.
- The City should make no decisions that relate to neighborhood planning until this group provides its recommendations; otherwise, it will undermine this process.
- The City should be transparent, open, clear and forthcoming about what are they doing, when they are doing it and how their activities relate to what NPAC is doing. Tell us about policy initiatives they are considering, even if they are just in the formative stages.
- The City should be clear about what it can and can't deliver and what it expects from us.

f. Expectations of the facilitator

- Send agendas at least a week in advance
- Set times on the agenda and once the group approves the agenda, stick to them.
- Start and end meetings on time.
- Guide the discussions to make sure things are covered. Be organized and transparent.
- Enforce ground rules about participation



- Remain totally unbiased. Treat everyone the same (from Mayor to members); treat the NPAC citizens as a client on equal par with the City.
- Facilitate, don't manage. Step in if someone is dominating, to make sure all can participate, or if people aren't following ground rules or to help someone articulate if they are not being clear.
- Have a sense of humor!
- Given size of the group, consider a "lightning round" before votes to make sure everyone has an opportunity to voice their opinion.
- Provide more of a framework for what will happen at the meeting and a structure that organizes us.
- Facilitate to open up discussion and help the members find their own directions rather than focus on meeting a city objective.
- Maintain a respectful environment; keep us on time.
- Create a space where people who are not speaking will begin to speak and slow down those who are speaking too much.

g. Suggestions about chair/co-chairs

- Elect them for a one-year term.
- Opinion about using the co-chairs to facilitate and moderate discussions is divided.
 - One suggestion is to use co-chairs, one at a time, (rather than the facilitator) to conduct debate on the content of recommendations or advisories that NPAC will send to the executive and to legislative. This would allow each co-chair to participate in those discussions half of the time.
 - Another suggestion is to have them moderate the discussions together even though this would mean they could not participate in the discussions.
 - A third suggestion is to have the facilitator moderate discussions because this would allow both co-chairs to participate and they have a lot of contribute.
- The Committee should send the co-chairs or elect a group to make regular reports in writing and in person to Councilmember Clark's committee (Planning Land Use & Neighborhoods Committee or PLUNC) and successor City Council committees that meet on Monday mornings. They invite city commissions to report and can ask questions. If subcommittees are created, subcommittee chairs could also be asked to give reports. The report should summarize the Committee's work at its most recent meeting.
- Written briefing papers should be distributed to the Mayor and all City Councilmembers. A possible process for developing the briefing papers would be as follows: at the conclusion of each meeting, the chair/co-chairs would identify what they see as the key points from the meeting and give the group a chance to comment. The agreed upon points would be included in the briefing paper.

h. Roles of members/alternates

- Each member should have an alternate to ensure full attendance at every meeting.
- Both members and alternates are encouraged to attend every meeting.
- Only members sit at the table and speak. If the member is absent, the alternate sits at the table and speaks. Otherwise, alternates sit in the audience with the public, as observers, and can speak during the public comment periods.



- Members keep alternates up-to-date in case the alternate has to step in when the member is absent.
- What outreach, if any, is expected of members (for example, at large members) who do not have an obvious constituency?
- Does the Committee want to set norms for attendance, with a specific provision to replace a member who doesn't comply with those norms? (i.e., miss a specified number of meetings in a row without a compelling reason or some other criterion?)

i. Operating procedures/ground rules

The following items were mentioned by members and are already covered in the draft Charter:

- Share the air time so everyone has an equal opportunity to contribute and participate; don't speak a second time until everyone else has had a chance to speak the first time; don't dominate
- Encourage quieter members to contribute
- Be concise, constructive, collaborative and positive when you offer comments
- Be respectful; speak one at a time; don't interrupt
- Be honest; if there's a conflict of interest, disclose it
- Bring an open mind and a problem-solving attitude to the discussions, with a goal of reaching solutions
- Respect others' opinions whether or not you agree with them

Proposed additions to the discussion ground rules include:

- Bring a sense of humor to the Committee. This isn't life and death. Come with the sense that this is a gathering of bright minds working toward a common goal, not a "meeting." Have fun.
- Leave negative assumptions and attitudes at the door.

j. Plenary session formats

- Several members have expressed strong opposition to using breakout groups during full committee meetings; they want all of the members to hear the full discussion and debate, not just abbreviated reports from small group work

k. Preferred ways to complete Committee assignments

More frequent meetings

- Some members are willing to attend meetings more frequently than monthly if needed to meet timelines, but others would find this a burden.

Longer meetings

- No one chose this option.

Limiting the number of issues discussed

- A few members think the group will have to identify the top priority items, limit them to an achievable number, and focus on them, to be able to complete the Committee's assignments; however, at this point, most members did not want to choose this option.

Use of subcommittees between sessions

- If additional time is needed to complete Committee tasks, a large majority of members are in favor of creating subcommittees to carry out specific assignments between NPAC meetings



and bringing a report of their discussions, findings, and recommendations (if any) to the full Committee for consideration and a decision, if appropriate.

1. Other suggestions

- People listen differently when they know an individual, and groups work better together if members know one another. Find ways for Committee members to get acquainted outside of the regularly-scheduled meetings, perhaps at a separate “Neighborhood Planning 101” session, or over informal lunches.
- A Committee product that would encourage more consistency in neighborhood planning across the City would be a set of guiding principles to recommend to neighborhoods that are undertaking planning along with a full set of issues that each neighborhood should consider before deciding which of the issues are most important and appropriate for its specific plan.

5. Elements essential for success of the NPAC process

- Clarity about expectations, goals, our product, and then getting it done on time.
- Teamwork, positive spirit, open-mindedness and a sense of humor.
- Transparency from the City and everyone else.
- Creating a way for people on the Committee to get acquainted. You listen differently once you know people.
- Posting the charter and ground rules visibly at every meeting, to keep us grounded.
- A schedule is needed to drive it.
- A partnership attitude rather than an adversarial attitude.
- Good information; sufficient funds for adequate outreach; productive deliberation by the committee; serious consideration by the Mayor and Council of our recommendations; and the neighborhoods view this committee as a valid exercise so they’ll support the results.
- The Committee is able to get members to: 1) understand expectations, 2) accept those expectations and agree to work within them, and 3) agree to work toward a common goal. That equates to a “common vision.”
- Members do not hold up voting, claiming that they have to check back with or get direction from constituents before making a decision.
- Keeping a city-wide focus and staying on task.

6. Hopes for the process

- Through this process, the neighborhoods are empowered and that leads to implementation of the plans with active facilitation and cooperation of the City.
- We will get everyone (City and neighborhoods) on same page, produce better plans, and reduce hostility and mistrust.
- We’ll help to produce walkable neighborhoods in the future, where people and cars can co-exist and where transportation plays a bigger role in how we operate in Seattle. In 20 years, Seattle will have the transportation infrastructure we need to be a player on the national and international stage.
- NPAC will be an opportunity to help put an implementation and updating process together that is efficient and workable.



- We will walk out of there with viable tools that are going to be usable going forward. It needs to be led by people who are community-oriented and have community ownership.
- We maintain mutual respect, stay open minded and find ways to collaborate.
- The Committee maintains its independence.
- We develop clear recommendations (and minority opinions if applicable) that the City Council, DON and DPD (and other agencies) can act on. We give good direction to City staff.
- We can agree on good ways to develop and support citizen planners, with funding and access to independent consultation as desired during the actual planning process.
- The mix on the Committee will create an environment where new members can provide creative ideas and “old timers” can share what they learned from the former process, so we can come up with a great process and a “living document” that can be used for future neighborhood plan updates.
- Advisory committees can be very powerful; look at the example of the Advisory Committee for the Alaskan Way Viaduct. It was the Committee—not the Mayor, County Executive or Washington State Department of Transportation—that came up with the solution.

7. Concerns about the process

- Inclusive process: While almost all members speak about the importance of reaching out to all residents in neighborhoods, a number of members highlight the importance of outreach to traditionally under-represented communities. They say that the Committee needs to devise outreach methods that are effective and encourage subgroups to join forces, become directly engaged, and share responsibilities for plan development and stewardship. However, people who have experience with this kind of outreach point out that informing and involving populations who have not been engaged previously (for cultural reasons, because of language barriers, or for other reasons) are time and resource intensive. It requires much more than translating fliers into multiple languages and getting people to a first meeting. It means explaining this process in terms that are meaningful to them and describing why their participation is needed and valuable. It can mean slowing down the process and intensifying the outreach effort. If there is not a significant commitment of resources to achieve the desired outcome, it is unlikely to be successful. Members have expressed concerns about whether or not the City will provide adequate resources for such an inclusive process.
- There is concern that the City will make decisions on issues that impact neighborhoods before the Committee has time to make recommendations on the status reports or updating the plans. If this happens, it will undercut the Committee’s work and neighborhoods will not have control over what happens to them.
- Some members express concern about how seriously the City will consider the Committee’s advice. Without a commitment by the City to really listen to the Committee, they are concerned that the process will not be a worthwhile use of members’ time, that it will be “just for show” or “to check a box.”
- There is concern that members will put their individual agendas ahead of the group task.
- Some members fear that Seattle’s drawn-out “process” will dilute the Committee’s recommendations and delay their implementation.
- Others fear that the Committee will end up rubber-stamping policies the City wants, rather than articulating what neighborhoods want. It means dealing with tricky, hot-button issues related to



density and transportation, but, if we shy away from those big topics without real genuine input, we'll have done a disservice to the whole process.

- Some members worry that the Committee won't have enough information to analyze the issues well and develop good recommendations.

APPENDIX A

Recommendations for developing a common base of information

Background information to understand the context for the NPAC process

- For the Committee as a whole to develop a common vocabulary and an understanding of the process, provide background information about: 1) the structure and hierarchy that the neighborhood planning process exists within, including the GMA, Comprehensive Plans, and Neighborhood Plans, and 2) the "players," including the Mayor, City Council, City departments, Planning Commission and Puget Sound Regional Council.
- Provide a status report on neighborhood plans that includes the following: a map showing locations of neighborhoods with completed plans; summaries of major recommendations from each completed neighborhood plan as well as neighborhood visions where they were articulated; and a status report on implementation as of 2008.
- Give a brief history of the previous planning process, so the Committee doesn't have to reinvent the wheel, identify the lessons learned from it, including pitfalls to avoid, and a list of initiatives from that time that have not yet been addressed. Acting Co-Chair Cindy Barker would be a good person to give such a capsule history.
- Tell us how and for what the neighborhood plans are used.

Background reading

- DPD and DON could distribute a 21-page report by the Evans School of Public Affairs of a forum held in March 2008, entitled *Civic Engagement for the 21st Century Project. Neighborhood Planning in Seattle: A Community Forum Report*.
- Members should be familiar with the three neighborhood plans that are to be updated in 2009.
- Members should be familiar with the neighborhood plans for their own areas.
- The City should share the results of a forum sponsored by the Southeast District Council called *Transportation Transformation* and one-page summaries of the eight neighborhood plans in the District.
- A recently-compiled matrix of key points from the neighborhood plans should be available to Committee members (*exact source not cited*).

Information requests

- People need to know that GMA is intended to address profound issues related to growth management. That means we need a picture of the growth projections. How many people live here now who weren't here 5 years ago? 10 years ago? What are the housing types? How much land is devoted to single family neighborhoods and how much is devoted to multi-family and condos. This will give members a perspective on the relative proportions of each. Members also need to have a picture of the City's infrastructure: our transportation system, utilities, sewers, amenities (open spaces, parks and libraries).
- What are the current demographics and zoning across the City?



- What are the GMA targets and how is progress measured?
- Current zoning maps
- List of neighborhood open and empty spaces
- Neighborhood building inventory/survey
- Outstanding development permits; projected future development permits
- Information on types of existing businesses and jobs; projections as to future businesses and jobs
- Estimates as to new jobs projected to be created
- Latest population demographics
- Locations for possible development of additional open space
- Survey of existing affordable housing; number of affordable units lost over last 5-10 years
- Pedestrian safety issues
- Inventory of social services
- Transportation mode analysis
- Extent of tree canopy cover; "greened" areas
- Major Institution Overlays - Existing extent; projected changes
- Extent of Transit-Oriented Development - existing and projected, including capacity for additional affordable housing development over or near stations
- Neighborhood information contained in all major City policies
- Tax revenues and expenditures for each neighborhood
- Planned improvements by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) and Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)
- Proposed rezones
- Number of renters/owners

Recommended approaches to make the education process efficient

Presentations at Committee meetings

- Provide a “neighborhood planning 101” primer for members at NPAC meetings. It should not be optional. It’s important for everyone to hear the information; this will put everyone on the same footing.
- Provide information in PowerPoint presentations early in the process
- Have guest appearances by experts, including Committee members, to frame the issue(s) for 15 minutes at the start of meetings.
- Identify questions to be addressed in advance, so presentations respond to Committee members’ informational needs.
- Walk us through a neighborhood plan, so all members get a sense of what’s included (housing, transportation, public safety, etc.). Show us what successful action items followed and how its adoption was used to change policy.
- Use visuals, such as flow charts, to help us understand the structure and relationships. A good model is the League of Women Voter’s primer on the process for how legislation is passed.
- Provide “executive summaries” of key documents, so people can quickly see the most important points.

Reference materials, in print and on-line



- Create a project website and post neighborhood plans, reference materials, and Committee materials there
- Make copies of background information available in hard copy to those who prefer this approach and/or do not have access to the Internet.

APPENDIX B

Interview questions

1. Having reviewed the Committee's responsibilities as described in Resolution 31085 and Ordinance 122799 (September 2008), do you have any questions about what is expected of you as a member?
2. Please describe your core interest or stake in the Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee.
3. Please tell me about the history of your involvement in neighborhood planning and/or community organizing in Seattle or elsewhere to date.
4. What do you see as the key issues and concerns related to Seattle's Neighborhood Plan Update process? What are your views on these key issues? Are there areas that are of special interest or concern to you?
5. What background information do you think Committee members should have in common to be able to offer informed advice to the City on issues related to neighborhood plan updates? How do you think that information can best be brought to the group?
6. Based on your experiences in groups, what do you think should be included in the ground rules and charter (in addition to what you shared at the December 2 meeting, which we are already taking into account)? Are there any approaches you've seen that help groups be successful that you think would be useful for this Committee? Any things to avoid?
7. What are your expectations of fellow Committee members? How about your expectations of the City of Seattle?
8. What are your expectations of the facilitator? Do you have any advice or suggestions for how to make the process a success?
9. What do you see as essential for the success of the Committee?
10. What are your hopes and concerns about the Committee process?
11. We'd like to schedule future meetings soon and want to accommodate people's schedules as much as possible. One approach would be to meet monthly, for two or three hours, on a recurring date/time. If monthly two to three hour meetings will not afford enough time to discuss all the issues and/or meet the milestones anticipated, would you prefer:
 - More frequent meetings?
 - Longer meetings?
 - Limiting the number of issues discussed?
 - Some other solution?
12. Do you have any other comments or suggestions you'd like to offer about the Committee or its process?