

From: Bob Froehlich [<mailto:bfroehlich@dadadini.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2014 3:17 PM
To: Richardson, Michael
Subject: GPU Meeting Mon. March 24

Michael,

I am writing to you today instead of appearing in person Monday, because a planning meeting for our local group (Garberville Redway Public Restroom Working Group) - working to put a 24/7, unlocked, public restroom, for use by all, in Garberville - conflicts with the GPU meeting.

Recently we've seen momentum building as more and more county residents are realizing what is at stake in your work to approve the General Plan Update. Many have held back from giving input because the issues seemed too complex and the learning curve too steep. But realization that stakes are high and involve decisions critical to all of our futures is becoming clear to many more county residents, taxpayers, and voters.

You have heard repeatedly that county residents consider the foundation of our county's value to be its scenic beauty, and yet four of you struck the phrase "scenic beauty" from Guiding Principle number 7. This is just one small example of how your present course moves against the majority opinion in the county. I believe you all have some similar core values that can give you the courage to alter your present course and allow you to accept that the GPU was already a document of significant compromise and should not be compromised further.

To guide your process of review the GPU offers direction in several sections, for example, in Chapter 2, Section 2.5 (Key Terms), in regard to "Policy" it says:

"A policy is a specific statement that must be followed when making decisions. It indicates an unambiguous commitment of the County to a particular course of action designed to achieve a specific goal."

"The policies contained in the Plan are expressed in terms of "shall" or "should". There is an important distinction between these two terms. As used in the Plan, "shall" indicates an unequivocal commitment, while "should" indicates a slightly less rigorous commitment to be followed in the absence of compelling, countervailing factors specified in the General Plan."

This is a very clear directive for you in your review. The key words in the first part are: "specific statement" and "unambiguous commitment." And note in the second part, there is no mention of the word "may." In your continuing review, and in your subsequent review of items previously straw-voted, we are asking that you check language against these very clear standards.

Likewise, in the same section in reference to "Goal", the GPU gives the following directives:

"A goal is a general expression of community values..." "Goals should be expressed as ends not action; they set the direction towards an ideal future."

As you have heard, and are beginning to hear more and more, the vast majority of county

residents value the natural beauty, open land, and biodiversity of Humboldt County and that is what they want to protect in "their ideal future." In your continuing review, please give priority to the language and intent of the various items as recommended by the 2012 Planning Commission Draft.

Bob Froehlich and Barbara Froehlich
Garberville