

Dave Taranto

COMPARISON CHART - Evaluation Tool 11/15/11 Draft dt
Framework Plan (FP) vs DRAFT General Plan Update (GPU)
Focus: Relative Consideration for Citizen Participation (CP)

<u>CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (CP)</u>	<u>1984</u> <u>FRAMEWORK</u>	<u>2008</u> <u>DRAFT GPU</u>
1. TIMING OF CP PUBLIC DISCUSSION how to involve the public?	At BEGINNING of 4 Year Program	At ENDING of 11+ year Program
2. TIME PERIOD DEVOTED to the public discussion on how to involve the public?	PROACTIVE comprehensive planned program 16- months	REACTIVE limited case complaints not planned
3. CP POLICY BACKGROUND STUDY? (This 1981 Report was well done)	YES	NO
4. CPAC - Citizen's Participation Advisory? (Broad based 11 members appointed by PC & Supes)	YES	NO
5. CP CITIZEN'S HANDBOOK (§1541.3)?	YES	NO
6. CP SUPPORTIVE FINDINGS?(§1452.2)	YES	NO
7. CP GUIDING PRINCIPLE(S) / POLICY(S)? explicit statement(s) of unequivocal commitment	YES	NO
8. COMMON SENSE PRINCIPLE? (§1441)	YES	NO
9. NEWSPRINT DRAFT GEN PLAN DRAFTS	YES	NO
10. COUNTYWIDE ACCESS to NEWSPRINT DRAFT?YES (stacks in markets, libraries, total county saturation)	YES	NO
11. COST OF ACQUIRING DRAFT PLAN & MAPS	FREE	\$30-40+\$
12. INTERNET WEBSITE DOCUMENTS?	pre digital	YES
13. COUNTYWIDE WEBSITE ACCESS?	pre digital	Not Yet!
14. COST OF INTERNET and EQUIPMENT	pre digital \$0	Expensive
15. PERCENTAGE OF TEXT: 900% variation devoted to CP in the FMWK vs GPU	<u>Chapter One</u> 27% of 22 pages	<u>Part One</u> 3 % of 22 pg