

## Richardson, Michael

---

**From:** bonnie blackberry <bonnie@civilliberties.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 19, 2013 10:52 AM  
**To:** Richardson, Michael  
**Cc:** Fennell, Estelle; DAN TARANTO; Peter Childs  
**Subject:** GPU/PPWG input

Michael,

The following are recommendations submitted to The Board of Supervisors by PPWG on September 21, 2013. ( We had previously submitted other recommendations for Chapters 2 and 3.)

Our new Sept 21st submittal with following Standards did not get reviewed.

In order to speed along the process, we would appreciate if you would review our draft submittal for Standards for GP-IMX Evaluations of Public Participation Programs and our Citizen's Handbook definition, and let us know if you see any problems or items we could modify before sending to the board.

It is our understanding that the board would like to complete review of Chapters 2 and 3 on December 2nd and we'd like to know if you have any problems with our proposed standards and Citizen's Handbook definition.

Thanks,  
Bonnie and Dan  
PPWG

### Chapter 3: Governance

#### ITEM 1

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 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.

**ITEM 2:** 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.