

Date: January 13, 2014
For: Board of Supervisors 1-13-14 GPU Meeting
From: Public Participation Work Group members,
Bonnie Blackberry and Dan Taranto

RE: PPWG comments List #1 for GPU Chapters 2 and 3

Chapter 2: Public Guide

- ITEM #1: PG-P5. **Citizen Committees.** The County shall encourage the formation of working groups, citizen organizations and citizen committees to provide input on specific matters in a format consistent with the adopted policies and procedures.
PPWG recommend: Include "workgroups" for consistency(Chapter 3, GP-P10(B))
- ITEM #2: PG-P7. **Community Input.** The County shall ensure that the encourage a variety views within an area are be taken into consideration in land use decisions.
PPWG recommend: Restore "views within an area be."
- ITEM #3: PG-IM1 **Documents in County Library** The County Planning Department shall provide a sufficient minimum of two sets of county plans and regulations for distribution to the public for use throughout the County Library system.
PPWG recommend: Provide a minimum of 2 sets for the County Library Systems
- ITEM #4: PPWG recommend: Retain deleted headings without the FMWK plan numbers.

CHAPTER 3 Governance Policy

- ITEM #5: 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:
- A. 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.
 - B. The evaluation forms should provide for identification of the specific meeting or hearing subject, place and time.
 - C. The evaluation forms should contain a space inviting suggestions for improving the process.
 - D. The evaluation form should contain contact information of the presenter(s) or moderator(s)
 - E. 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 recommend: Adoption of GP-S7 Evaluation of Planning Process

- ITEM #6: GP-IMX. **Evaluation of Public Participation Programs** Establish a process to evaluate the effectiveness of any ongoing citizen participation programs including public workshops and planning meetings including public hearings, before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

PPWG recommend: Restore "Establish a process to".

Date: January 13, 2014
For: Board of Supervisors 1-13-14 GPU Meeting
From: Public Participation Work Group members,
Bonnie Blackberry and Dan Taranto

RE: GPU Chapter 2 and Chapter 3

PPWG List #2 Response to staff report regarding Attachment "C" for January 13, 2014 GPU/BoS meeting.

*Following excerpts from Staff report in BOLD, followed by PPWG comments.

1. "Board directed staff to provide clean copy of staff recommendations..."

PPWG understood that staff was going to provide a clean copy of 12-16-13 staff Attachment B. Instead staff has provided a clean copy (Attachment C) with completely new changes not previously discussed or highlighted with strike outs.

See items **PG-P3 Procedures for Fairness**, **PG-P8 Community Preferences** and **PG-IM1 Documents in County Library**. **PG-P8 Community Preferences** was totally eliminated by staff in this clean copy.

2. Staff didn't have comments from PPWG when prepared 1-13-14 draft (Attach. C)

PPWG were led to believe that we would be sent clean copy from staff on Dec.18th or 20th. After waiting until January 2, 2014 we sent in our comments on the Dec 16th staff draft (attach B). Later that day we received email from staff saying document was going on line Jan 3rd. Due to web/internet difficulties didn't get draft of Attachment C, until January 6th. PPWG received information 2 weeks later than expected, and the complete staff report relating to Chapters 2 and 3 was posted on web on Thursday January 9th, a few days before this Jan 13th meeting.

Due to above mentioned factors PPWG didn't have sufficient time to analyze and provide comments before now.

3. General direction from Board was to incorporate Section 1500 into Chapter 2 Public Guide.

PPWG believed that the Board directed staff to consolidate all of Section 1500 in one place in Chapter 2, allowing for changes necessary to ensure consistency with Chapt 3.

Of the 27 provisions in staff report (Attachment C), 10 items make reference to Chapter 3 for "more detail". Therefore approximately 40% of provisions are NOT fully consolidated in Chapter 2 as intended. The consolidation of Section 1500 into Chapter 2 remains incomplete.

4. "Staff added information to Chapter 2 and 3 but made changes in to formatting and language to make it more cohesive with this general plan and not conflict with Chapter 3."

"The following are broad examples:"

a. "Formatting was changed by eliminating the "Findings" heading and listing them as bullet points."

PPWG: In fact there are no visible bullet points.

b. "Cross referenced with Chapter 3 for continuity"

PPWG: References to "more detail in Chapter 3" are examples of incomplete consolidation.

c. "Fairness Section adapted to reflect current non-discrimination laws"

PPWG believes the staff's Non discriminatory notice may belong somewhere, but not in the Public Guide, and the existing language of FMWK§1542.1 as found in the still applicable Framework Plan and also PG-P3 as found in both of the Dec. 2 and Dec.16 versions of the two previous staff reports and subsequently deleted (without any highlighting) by the third revised 1/13 staff report is an unnecessary misfit and should be relocated elsewhere. PPWG requests that the original PG-P3 (FMWK §1542.1) be retained.

d. "Sentences or terms which were awkward were changed, examples page 4"

PPWG: None of the pages in the document have page numbers, also no identifying information on staff Attachment C other than cover page.

(Document identifying Information was provided on Dec 2, 2013 staff Attachment B).

e. "PPWG proposed goal and standard to address continual evaluation of the public process."

"..the implementation measure (GP-IMX) was made more general. This is most cost effective and allows the county to be flexible with methods of evaluating".

PPWG: What method is currently in use?

*continue to PPWG List previously sent to Board on Jan. 2, 2014 for Jan. 13, 2014 GPU/BoS meeting.