



PRIORITIZATION MEETING SUMMARY

Monday, July 18th, 2016 | 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

Samuel Tucker Elementary School Cafeteria | 435 Ferdinand Day Drive

On July 19, 2016, a public meeting and open house was held to begin prioritizing draft indicators organized by theme areas. Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions of staff on the City Strategic Plan process, including an online or hard copy survey. The following city staff were present and were later joined by Mayor Allison Silberberg and Councilwoman Del Pepper:

- Greg Useem, Office of Performance & Accountability
- Rebecca Schrier, Office of Performance & Accountability
- Jonathan Mahlandt, Office of Performance & Accountability
- Gus Carvalho, Office of Performance & Accountability
- Katherine Carraway, Department of Planning & Zoning
- Mary Catherine Collins, Department of Planning & Zoning
- Radhika Mohan, Department of Planning & Zoning

The meeting began with a welcome and recap by Radhika Mohan, Principal Planner in the Department of Planning & Zoning. She reviewed the time frame of the previous City Strategic Plan and explained how the new City Strategic Plan would incorporate the work of the City's performance management system, Results Alexandria. She further explained that community input would continue to be important in the planning process and reviewed the civic engagement process timeline, highlighting past meetings and online engagement.

Greg Useem, Director of the Office of Performance & Accountability, followed with the purpose of the meeting and open house, which was to gain input from participants on the prioritization of indicators to track the progress of goals identified in the strategic planning process. He noted that participants could select up to ten indicators that they wished the City would improve upon through an online and hard copy exercise. Later, Mr. Useem described key next steps in the City Strategic Plan process, which included a series of engagement opportunities throughout the week in locations across the City to help participants fill out the survey. He also mentioned that staff would continue to incorporate community input into the draft and that the draft would be shared with the community for comment and review prior to going to City Council for consideration of adoption in the Fall.

After a period of questions and discussion by meeting participants, staff offered to initiate the open house portion of the evening and answer questions individually. The majority of meeting participants opted to continue the discussion as a large group rather than focusing on the prioritization survey, which many indicated they would not fill out. The following are some of the key points from the participant's discussion:

- Some of the goal themes are not reflective of community input, specifically the theme of “Unique Identity.”
- Neighborhoods should play a greater role in the vision statement of the Plan.
- The idea of community is lost in the draft language of the Plan.
- The City should develop a process for evaluating how well civic engagement is working. One participant suggested including measures for civic engagement under the “Unique Identity” and “Well-Managed” categories
- If the City is performing well in a particular theme area or indicator, then it might not need to be in the Plan.
- Development (or Redevelopment) should be a theme area.
- The process should start with baseline information on how the city performs currently.
- The process should start with the community understanding what the City has already committed to (development-wise) for the next 6 years.
- Neighborhood planning boards should be explored in the City.
- The Plan should not be a wish list of things, it should be a measureable, specific document.
- A strategic plan starts with what is based in law and governed by City Council.
- Data and information developed to date is still useful and can be reorganized to be more reflective of community input.
- Community members who haven’t been with the process from the beginning are at a disadvantage due to lack of background information presented at earlier meetings. If participants are not present from the beginning, they are hindered from providing meaningful input.
- Transportation issues, such as potholes and traffic on Duke Street, need to be addressed specifically, with measurable and achievable objectives
- Mayor Silberberg suggested that the planning process could be delayed to accommodate concerns. She also suggested to the community members that they exchange contact information and gather informally to discuss their concerns.