

To: Board of Supervisors
From: PPWG

For Meeting of Oct. 21, 2013

Subject: GPU Chapters 2 & 3.

Chairman Sundberg and Members of the Board

We appreciate the opportunity to participate. Please include consideration of the following PPWG responses to the Staff recommendations for Chapters 2 & 3.

Chapter 2: The Public Guide

2.1 Purpose

PPWG appreciates and considered the Staff's recommendations and we agree with some and not with others. We stand by our recommended amendment to section 2.1 and our addition of section 2.8 and section 2.9 as better serving the purpose of educating the public. However, we support that our proposed section 2.9 should also be a draft standard GP-SX.

PPWG agreed with the 2011 Planning Commission decision to restore the entire Framework Plan §1500 into the GPU. And, we recall that the 1984 Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors also agreed to have the entire §1500 placed into both the Plan and the Handbook. We are pleased that the Staff supports continuing that practice.

When the PC directed staff to include the entire Framework §1500 into the GPU Chapter 3, the method staff used unexpectedly segregated and dispersed the §1500 provisions variously among unrelated governance provisions. The internal consistency of the parts of §1500 had been mixed up resulting in diminished coherency which is contrary to the original intent.

The PPWG recommendation seeks to maintain the integrity of the original §1500 and have those provisions for public participation centralized into a focused Section 2.8 of the Public Guide. Please consider, if a citizen is looking for GPU provisions for public participation they will only find the word "PUBLIC" once in the entire GPU Table of Contents, associated only with Chapter 2, The **Public Guide**. And, as the "**Public Guide**," Chapter 2 is naturally where the public will look for guidance on how to participate.

Regarding concern for "Redundancy": It is understood that the placement of §1500 into Chapter 2 would "possibly" seem redundant to some. However, in the case of public participation, redundancy is not perceived as a problem. Redundancy is a commonly used tool in educational practices which is clearly pursuant to Principle "10. *Maximize the opportunities to educate the public about the planning process, in order to have meaningful participation in the development and maintenance of the Plan.*"

Regarding "potential for internal inconsistency": There should be no inconsistency with the authentic §1500 in Chapter 2 and the mixed up segregated segments dispersed into chapter 3. The staff is surely capable of assuring this internal consistency. The §1500 represents a very tiny portion of a very huge and complex document that is also required to be totally consistent. The former director and senior staff have previously assured the Planning Commission and Public that the mixed up parts of §1500 as presented in Chapter 3 are a 100% accurate restoration of Framework plan §1500.

Chapter 3: Governance

PPWG supports the staff proposed implementation recommendation for a new GP-IMX.
PPWG recommends augmenting the Staff recommended GP-IMX with a compatible policy and a standard as follows:

Add a NEW GP-P10 I. Evaluations. Public Participation in any general planning legislative amendment and revision process shall be continually evaluated.

Add a NEW - GP-S7. Evaluation of Planning Process. Establish a standard set of procedural criteria for evaluating any planning process that involves the general public. Such criteria should include but not be limited to the following:

1. Evaluation forms shall be available at all public meetings and hearings at all levels of the planning process and utilize a 1 to 10 rating system from Poor to Excellent.
2. The evaluation forms should provide for identification of the specific meeting or hearing subject, place and time.
3. The evaluation forms should contain a space inviting suggestions for improving the process.
4. The evaluation form should contain contact information of the presenter(s) or moderator(s).
5. The evaluation results should summarize the focus of the meeting or hearing and publish all (civil) comments submitted and be made available to the public and be provided to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

PPWG recommends a more comprehensive alternative to the Staff draft definition of Citizen's Handbook, as follows:

Citizen's Handbook: A comprehensive reference work for educating and guiding the County citizenry about the development and application of California planning law, Humboldt County planning law, and the rights of individuals, groups and communities to have meaningful participation in any County legislative process of amending, revising or implementing general plan goals, policies, standards or implementation measures.