GREEN BELT PROJECT

IMPROVING THE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA PROCESS

BY CASEY CLARK & MEGAN BOYD
PROCESS

This project used the DMAIC process. The five phases of DMAIC are:

- Define
- Measure
- Analyze
- Improve
- Control
DEFINE

- Problem Statement
- Problem Description
- Scope
- Expected Outcomes
- Project Team
- Project Deliverables
- RACI Chart
Problem Statement:

Addenda to the Tulsa City Council Committee and Council meetings bypass the established agenda process, resulting in an increase of associated costs creating inefficiencies that impact both internal and external customers.
Project Description:

What is the service to be improved?
Agendas for Committee and Regular meetings of the City Council.

What are current customer expectations?
That the agendas be correct, organized and in compliance with the Open Meeting Act.

How are we currently failing to meet expectations?
Multiple addendums, typos and errors coupled with confusion in how to get items on an agenda.
SCOPE

Review City Council committee and Council meetings addenda for the months of August, September, and October 2017 with a focus on origination, type of defect, and category of addendum (zoning, budget, etc.) with the understanding that we cannot evaluate the process of other departments, commissions, and other city-related entities.

NOT IN SCOPE

• Software used to create the agendas
• Other agendas for the City of Tulsa
EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- Reduced instance of waste, specifically addenda, edits, typos and errors.
- For submitters, a clearer understanding of how to add items to the agenda and how the process works.
- For Council staff, consistency in the process and rules.
- New Sigma Level: 3.
PROJECT TEAM

Sponsor:
Sarah Davis, Interim Council Administrator

Black Belt:
Mayo Baugher, Council Aide

Green Belts:
Megan Boyd, Media Specialist & Casey Clark, Council Aide

Subject Matter Expert:
Lori Doring, Council Secretary
PROJECT DELIVERABLES

- Updated process map
- Survey results
- Data Analysis for August, September and October 2017 agendas
- Evaluation and Sigma Level for May 2017 vs. May 2018
- Poka-Yoke (Error proofing)
## RACI Matrix

R - Responsibility, A - Accountable, C - Consulted, I - Informed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Deliverable (or Activity)</th>
<th>Project Sponsor (Sarah)</th>
<th>Project Manager (Megan &amp; Casey)</th>
<th>Green Belt Leader (Penny)</th>
<th>Black Belt (Mayo)</th>
<th>SME (Keith &amp; Lori)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Define</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Statement</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Description</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Deliverables</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACI Chart</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Map</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months of Agendas and Addendums</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Results</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crunch the Numbers, 3 months of data</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Process Map</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017 vs. May 2018</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Point</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poka-Yoke</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURE

- Process Map
- Survey
- 3 months of agendas & addenda
The current process map for the City Council Agenda Process, while accurate, is somewhat difficult to follow and includes steps that would be better placed in a separate process map.

As the team mapped the process, we discovered many different ways an item can make its way through the approval process, depending on the item type (zoning, resolution, ordinance, etc.).

These steps are not necessary for the agenda process, omit special circumstances and meeting groups, and make the process cluttered.

The following slide displays the current process map.
SURVEY

• A survey was sent to all departments that submit Council agenda items.

• The 10-question survey assessed the departments' current submission process and what improvements would be helpful in the future.

• The following two slides list the survey questions.
1. Which department do you represent?

2. How often do you submit items to the City Council to be placed on an agenda?

3. Do you have a specific person (or persons) in your department that submit items for placement on a City Council agenda?

4. If so, are the staff members referenced in the previous question informed about City Council agenda deadlines?

5. What are the deadlines?
6. Do you have a process (written or verbal) for how items are submitted from your department to be placed on the City Council agenda?

7. Is there a designated person in your department that reviews draft agendas when sent out via email by the Council Secretary?

8. Who do you contact if you have a question about placing an item on the City Council agenda?

9. Is there anything the Council Office can do to make the process easier for you or your staff?

10. Do you have any comments, suggestions, or questions regarding the City Council's agenda process?
3 MONTHS OF DATA

The months of August, September and October of 2017 were selected for data collection. Agenda items vary depending upon the time of year. This can be due to agenda item type, current initiatives or other factors. This time frame was selected as it would give the best overall picture of defects while not requiring the collection of an entire year. It also gives the team the opportunity to compare relatively quickly this year's data to last year's data and see if there is more improvement.
This chart displays a brief overview of the data collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF AGENDAS</th>
<th>ADDENDUMS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ADDENDA FILED</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF ADDENDUMS</th>
<th>TOTAL FILINGS OF ADDENDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/2/17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 (UED), 6 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>2 (UED), 2 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9/17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (PW), 6 (Pre-Meeting), 2 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>1 (PW), 1 (Pre-Meeting), 2 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16/217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/29/17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>3 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (UED), 4 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>1 (UED), 1(Regular Meeting)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (UED), 1 (PW), 2 (Pre-Meeting), 4 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>1 (UED), 1 (PW), 1 (Pre-Meeting), 1 (Regular Meeting)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (UED), 1 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>1 (UED), 1( Regular Council)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 (UED), 5 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>2 (UED), 2 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>2 (Regular Council)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYZE

- Survey results
- 3 months of data
SURVEY RESULTS

How often do you submit items to the City Council to be placed on an agenda?

- Often: 55%
- Occasionally: 27%
- Rarely: 18%
Do you have a process for how items are submitted from your department to the City Council agenda?

- Yes, written
- Yes, verbal
- Yes, written and verbal
- No
Do you have a specific person (or persons) in your department that submit agenda items?

- Yes: 82%
- No: 18%
If so, are these staff members informed about City Council agenda deadlines?

- Yes: 73%
- No: 27%
This was the most interesting data point. Some respondents replied that they would contact someone for the deadlines in the event they needed to submit an item. These responses were still coded as "incorrect" as the deadline is not known.

Also, some respondents replied with information about deadlines for addenda. This showed that the Council Office must be more diligent in explaining what the deadlines mean and that addenda are to be avoided and not factored into the time one has to submit items.
Is there a designated person in your department that reviews draft agendas when sent out via email by the Council Secretary?

- This data shows a majority of departments review the drafts.
- The Council Office could do better to communicate the need for review of drafts to prevent addenda.
Whom do you contact if you have a question about placing an item on the City Council agenda?

- 47% Council Secretary
- 18% Council Aide
- 17% Council Administrator
- 12% Department Staff
- 6% City Clerk

- This data shows City staff does have contacts if help is needed.
- The Council Office could communicate a designated contact person and best practices.
Is there anything the Council Office can do to make the process easier for you or your staff?

- The requested person was added to the distribution list.
- The Council Office should provide the updated process map to departments.
- It should also complete a provide the process map for how different agenda item types make their way through the approval process.
Do you have any comments, suggestions, or questions regarding the City Council's agenda process?

- Provide process map
- Meeting and deadline calendar
- Use BCC line
- Clarify what items must be cleared through the Mayor's Office prior to Council
- No

- The Council Office should make process maps available to City departments.
- The Council Secretary now provides a calendar with upcoming meeting dates and deadlines on emails with the agendas.
- The Council Secretary now uses the BCC line for recipients of the agendas to keep the email clear and improve readability.
- Coordinate with other departments to provide information on each group's process.
3 MONTHS OF DATA

- The months of August, September and October of 2017 were selected for data collection.
- More than half of addenda came in the form of late submissions.
- About a third were due to amended language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Defect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amended language (at request of another department)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulled</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended language (error)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late submission</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Late submission: 57%
- Amended language (error): 30%
- Pulled: 10%
- Amended language (at request of another department): 3%
LATE SUBMISSIONS

- The majority of late submissions originate from our own department.
- The majority of these item types were Council or Committee items.
- Explanations: Staff were regularly accepting late submissions and not enforcing the deadline.
- Individual Councilors have the right to add items late without any further approval.
- Often, entities that wanted to submit a late item would contact the Councilor for the district specific to that item, if applicable, and ask the Councilor to add the item to the agenda. This means that late adds originating from the Council Office were not necessarily Council items.

![Bar Chart]

- CITY COUNCIL: 43%
- CITY LEGAL: 20%
- ENGINEERING: 3%
- MAYOR'S OFFICE: 6%
- MAYOR's OFFICE of ECON DEV: 11%
- SPECIAL EVENT: 9%
- TMAPC: 9%
AMENDED LANGUAGE

- The majority of amended language addenda originate from our own department.
  - Explanation: During part of this time, the Council staff did not have multiple people read the agendas or specific agenda items to check for errors. Council staff would send Thursday draft agendas without items submitted late, meaning these items would bypass checks to make sure they were correct before Friday filing.

- The department with the second most number of amended language addenda is Special Events.
  - Explanation: Council staff did not enforce the deadline with Special Events because Council did not want to force groups who had spent time and money on an event to have to cancel it.

- Also, the Special Events Committee meets on Wednesdays evenings, which may create an issue as items are due by Thursday at noon.

- There were many Scrivener's errors due to the number of addresses in these applications. Would require referring to the backup material to confirm accuracy.

DISTRIBUTION OF AMENDED LANGUAGE ADDENDA

- Human Resources: 6%
- Park and Recreation: 6%
- Police: 6%
- City Council: 39%
- City Legal: 11%
- Special Event: 22%
- TMAPC: 11%
MEETINGS WITH MOST DEFECTS

- The meeting with the most defects is the Regular Council meeting.
- These are mostly due to added items and amended language.
- Explanation: During part of this time, Council staff did not enforce deadlines or have multiple people read the agendas to check for errors.
ITEM TYPES WITH MOST DEFECTS

- The item type with the most defects is UED - Urban and Economic Development.
- These defects are added items and amended language.
- Explanation: UED items, which are often zoning items, must often travel through many entities before landing on the Council agenda. This creates more room for errors.
- UED items are often ordinances, which include language that is more likely to change.
- Typically, urgent items are more likely to be UED items rather than Public Works items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Pre-Meeting</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UED Item</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Item</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORDINANCES - SECOND READING</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORDINANCES - FIRST READING</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYOR’S ITEMS</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEARING OF PUBLIC COMMENTS</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL ITEMS</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITIES, BOARDS &amp; COMMISSIONS</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UED Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDENDUM - AMENDED LANGUAGE PER REQUEST OF CITY ATTORNEY’S OFFICE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDENDUM</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMENDED LANGUAGE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PULLED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PULLED - AMENDED LANGUAGE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFECTS BY DATE

- One theory about addenda in the office held that more addenda come before the City Council has a week off, as staffers are trying to get items that need to be approved on the agenda quickly.
- There is some evidence to support this theory, although more data is needed.
IMPROVE

- New process map
- May 2017 vs. May 2018
NEW PROCESS MAP

- An updated process map for the City Council agenda process was created.
- Several team members were included in the creation including a Black Belt and Subject Matter Expert.
- The map was streamlined and removed references to which meeting an item should go on.
- Those details will go into a separate process map.
- The updated map is found on the next slide.
MAY 2017 VS. MAY 2018

- Some improvements from this project were instituted early.
- Data was then pulled from before and after the changes to see if an improvement was made.
- May 2017 vs. May 2018 were also used to calculate the sigma level of the agenda process.
IMPROVEMENTS

- Council staffers now read the Thursday draft agendas to check for errors before they are emailed out. Previously, staffers only proofread the Friday agendas before they were filed.
- Council Staff has been stricter with the deadline for agenda items, including asking late submitters to follow the protocol of getting Council Chair approval first.
- The Council Secretary now send emails to clarify language on items more susceptible to error, such as legal or ordinance items, before publication of the agendas.
- The Council no longer posts "FYI" meeting agendas. These postings would sometimes include addenda.
After implementing these changes, the number of addenda from May 2017 to May 2018 decreased by about 71 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Defect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>canceled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended language (error)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late submission</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Defect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>late submission</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In May 2017, 29 percent of addenda came from the Council Office.
In May 2018, no addenda came from the Council Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Defect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>canceled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended language (error)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYOR’S OFFICE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late submission</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY LEGAL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYOR’S OFFICE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EVENT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER &amp; SEWER DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Defect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>late submission</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Legal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMAFPC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total: 24
SIGMA LEVEL

- The sigma level from 2017 to 2018 almost doubled

May 2017 – Opportunities for defect = 18 (total # of agendas)
  # of defects = 11 (# of agendas with addenda)
  DPMO = \( \frac{11}{18} \times 1,000,000 = 611,111 \)
  Sigma = 1.22

May 2018 – Opportunities for defect = 13 (total # of agendas)
  # of defects = 3 (# of agendas with addenda)
  DPMO = 230,769
  Sigma = 2.25
CONTROL

- Follow-Up
- Poka-Yoke (Error proofing)
The next step of the process is to collect data from August, September and October of 2018 and compare it to 2017.
The target sigma level for the agenda process is 3.
Given that the sigma level increased with only some of the recommended improvements in place, there is room for more progress.
However, it is clear further investigation is needed to determine more specific causes of addenda, which will take a greater commitment of time.
Also, the elimination of all defects is unlikely. Especially those items that come from other groups. The processes of other entities are outside the scope of the Council Office.
POKA-YOKE

Here are the additional improvements to be enacted to error-proof the agenda process. Some of these suggestions come from data and research, others from survey recommendations:

- Better inform internal and external audiences what the deadlines are and why they are important.
- Adhere to those deadlines as much as possible to create new expectations for submitters.
- Add upcoming meeting dates and deadlines to email distribution of agendas so submitters can easily see off weeks and prepare accordingly.
POKA-YOKE

- Move distribution list to the BCC line of emails to make them easier to read.
- Consider scheduling more Council meetings, or eliminating periods where there are two weeks between meeting dates.
- Enlist more recipients of the draft agendas to read them and check for errors.
- Consider evaluation of how Council agenda timing and filing impacts other City processes and how the Council is affected by processes outside of our control.
THANK YOU!