

Attachment M
Flip Chart Notes from Checklist Test
Feedback From Applicants
City of Yakima
March 22, 2001

1. Order of the questions
 - Similar question in different places (Donna – ver 4b)
 - May be difficult to avoid duplication (Harold)
 - Ask for less detail in 1.5 (Debbie – ver 5)
 - Project description may duplicate other questions (Harold)
 - Example of good project description in guidance would be great
2. The way pages looked
 - Prefer questions (Donna)
 - Some headings confusion (e.g., land use, zoning, water sections) (Jim – ver 5)
3. Lines vs spaces
 - If done electronically it doesn't matter
 - Some like white space
 - Some like lines
4. Boxes/tables
 - Encourage person to fill in
 - Break up page
5. Guidance in form
 - Place guidance in form (Jim, Debbie, Donna)
 - Doesn't mind separate documents (Harold)
 - More pages (longer checklist), okay if it helps save time
 - Some valid reasons for having guidance separate from form
6. Check boxes
 - Confusing when no question
 - Generally okay
 - Could be a problem with electronic
 - Hard to line-up with questions
7. Double column
 - Don't like
8. Understanding/technical
 - Technical level – okay, very low level terms used (all)
 - Guidance out of order with questions in the form
 - Didn't understand waste material question (Debbie – ver 5)

- Transportation question confusing – what is off-site (Harold, Donna – ver 4b)
- Change question to: Will transport other than road or sidewalk be used? -- air, water, rail, pedestrian, bike (Harold)
- Closest surface water, conflict between checklist and guide (ver 4b)

9. Duplicate questions

- Cumbersome (Donna, Debbie – ver 4b and 5)
- No big deal (Jim)

10. Getting information

- For consultant easy
- No more than existing
- For test, site visit would have helped
- Asked city and got answers
- For tougher stuff, provide source/reference in checklist in case they don't have (or don't look in) the guidance document

11. Enough questions

- Form asked for enough (Jim – ver 5)
- Didn't care (Donna)

12. Did not like

- Section headings – don't like 1.2, 1.3.13 (Jim)
- Questions not clearly written in checklist, frustrated having to go to guidance every time
- Suggest existing checklist (form) with guidance added like SEPA handbook
- SEPA form has allowed them to fill the gaps – allowed them to ask for traffic studies
- Have seen communities more willing to send incomplete forms back to applicant

13. Liked most

- Part C, yes/no, clear questions, answer, and directions what to do (would prefer to not have been asked plant and animal questions in part B) (Donna – ver 4b)
- Did optional part in Version 5 (Debbie, Jim – ver 5)
- “Mild”, “moderate”, “major” allows applicant to indicate “mild” when they don't have specific numbers (Jim – ver 5)
- Allowed “in-between” over existing checklist answers of N/A (Jim – ver 5)

14. Where do we go

- Keep existing checklist with guidance (Donna, and others?)

General Comments:

- Jim (a consultant) – Time is more critical than level of difficulty these days.
- Debbie (Ecology perspective) – 2.15, would like to know if water is there or available regardless of project.
- Donna – Stormwater not a utility