

AGENDA ITEM NO.



# COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

For the meeting of: July 10, 2012

Date: June 28, 2012

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Martha Spencer, Interim Director, Planning and Building Department

Subject: Continued Discussion on the Key Issues Identification for Board Review of the Planning Commission Approved Draft General Plan.

### RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Open the public hearing and receive a staff report.
2. Receive public comments.
3. Deliberate and select the list of key issues to guide the Board's review of the Draft General Plan.
4. Continue the public hearing to July 16<sup>th</sup>.

### SOURCE OF FUNDING:

The cost of preparing this staff report was borne by the General Fund through the Planning and Building Department – Advance Planning Division's FY 2011-2012 budget and the General Plan user fees.

Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
Martha Spencer, Interim Director, Planning and Building

CAO Approval \_\_\_\_\_

**REVIEW:**

Auditor \_\_\_\_\_ County Counsel \_\_\_\_\_ Personnel \_\_\_\_\_ Risk Manager \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**TYPE OF ITEM:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Consent  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Departmental  
 XX \_\_\_\_\_ Public Hearing  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**PREVIOUS ACTION/REFERRAL:**

Board Order No. H-2, D-1, C-1

Meeting of: June 12, June 18, and June 25, 2012

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT**

Upon motion of Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_

Ayes \_\_\_\_\_  
 Nays \_\_\_\_\_  
 Abstain \_\_\_\_\_  
 Absent \_\_\_\_\_

and carried by those members present, the Board hereby approves the recommended action contained in this Board report.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

**Kathy Hayes, Clerk of the Board**

## DISCUSSION:

At the June 25, 2012 meeting, the Board continued the public hearing process on the Planning Commission's approved Draft Plan. Staff provided a brief presentation on issues raised during the June 18, 2012 meeting and discussed the proposed process and timeline for Board review of the Draft General Plan. The Board then accepted public comments on the key issues for review and continued the meeting to July 10, 2012. The Board also directed staff to return with an analysis of the recommended additions to the Key Issues List considering public comment received by the Planning Commission, final votes, and requirements of state law.

### Public Comments Received by the Planning Commission

Attachment A includes the index of written comments received by the Planning Commission during their review of the 2008 Hearing Draft Plan (which also appears on the Department's website) and a summary chart analyzing these comments. Verbal comments presented during the Planning Commission hearings were not analyzed due to the volume of testimony received and the difficulty of interpreting the commenter's issues.

The summary chart separates the authors into four categories: 1) working groups; 2) stakeholder groups; 3) agencies; and 4) individuals. The chart also categorized the type of letter submitted – voting charts, comments on the plan and/or plan policies and comments on the review process. It should be noted that the Planning Commission reviewed 55 detailed "voting charts", 37 of these were submitted by the working groups that were formed primarily to provide comments to the Commission on the draft General Plan. The Commissioners usually referred to these charts while proposing revisions to policy language.

The majority of the letters received by the Commission were on the Land Use Element (Chapter 4 of the General Plan). Of the 192 general comment letters submitted by individuals, approximately 100 letters were concerning policies found in the Land Use Element. Over half of these letters recommended adoption of Alternative A or specific policies contained in Alternative A (Healthy Humboldt Coalition submitted 142 individual petitions supporting Alternative A).

The issues that received the most public comments included:

- Protecting open space lands, utilizing infill policies
- Addition of the Industrial Timber and Ranchlands land use classifications
- Houses on timberlands (in particular, TPZ lands)
- Merger Ordinance revisions
- Subdivisions on resource lands (AE, AG, T and IT)
- New development in high fire hazard areas
- Cell towers
- "Rails to Trails" policies
- Streamside Management Areas (definitions, setbacks, allowable uses)
- Cultural resources protection ordinance
- Billboards
- Water Export
- Water storage in impaired waterways
- Noise ordinance

- Public participation policies, in particular, Section 1500

The majority of the policies that address these issues are already on the staff recommended short list; however, based upon a review of the public comments, staff recommends the addition of FR-P8, I-S5, BR-S5, BR-S7, BR-S10, WR-P25, N-G2 and N-P2 to the list.

Planning Commission Votes and Requirements of State Law

Attachment B provides an index of all the key issues recommended for review. It documents Planning Commission votes, requirements of state law, and the extent of public comment received by the Planning Commission. Each item is given a priority rank based on these criteria. Recommendations for additions to the Key Issues List were received from the following organizations and individuals:

- Humboldt Association of Realtors (HAR)
- Healthy Humboldt Coalition (HH)
- Rural Lands Working Group (RLWG)
- League of Women Voters (LOWV)
- Public Participation Working Group (PPWG)
- Individuals: (Karen Brooks I<sub>(KB,)</sub>; Brian Mitchell I<sub>(BM,)</sub>; & Ellin Beltz I<sub>(EB)</sub>)

Staff recommends that all items with a priority ranking of 1 and 2 be placed on the Key Issues List for review. The key issues with narrow Planning Commission majority votes are given a priority rank of "1", and the following items have been added to the recommended Key Issues list with a priority rank of "2".

<u>Key Issues Item</u>	<u>Source</u>
§1.2 Purposes of a General Plan.	PFWG
§1.7 Population	PFWG
Public Guide narrative.	PFWG
2.5 Key Terms.	PFWG
<u>Key Issues Item</u>	<u>Source</u>
3.3 Background.	PFWG
<b>G(overnance) P(olicy)</b> - Gx1. Accessible General Plan.	PFWG
GP-P4. Community Development Services Role.	LOWV
GP-P10. Public Participation.	HAR, PFWG
GP-P11. Accessibility.	PFWG
GP-S4. Public Education	PFWG
GP-IM1. Progress Reports.	LOWV
GP-IM3. Update Schedule.	LOWV
GP-IM5. Meaningful Participation.	LOWV
GP-IM13. Customer Service Training and Satisfaction.	LOWV
GP-IM16. Citizen Handbook.	PFWG
<b>G(rowth) P(lanning)</b> GP-P6. Use of On-Site Sewage Systems within Urban Development Areas.	HAR, HH, I <sub>(BM)</sub>
GP-P10. Conversion of Resource Lands.	HAR, HH, I <sub>(BM)</sub>
GP-S9. Urban Reserve.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>
UL-S1. Allowed Uses in Mixed-Use Areas.	HAR, HH
RL-G1. Rural Residential Development.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>
RL-IMx. Increase Inventory of Rural Residential Lands.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>
FR-P8. Protection of High Quality Timberlands.	HH

I-S5. Other Development Outside of Fire District Boundaries.	HAR
BR-S5. Streamside Management Areas Defined.	HAR, RLWG
BR-S7. Development within Streamside Management Areas.	RLWG
BR-S10. Development Standards for Wetlands and Other Wet Areas.	HAR, RLWG
N-G2. Incompatible Land Uses	HAR
N-P2. Guide to Land Use Planning	HAR

Attachment C provides a summary of the recommended Key Issues List with the priority 1 and 2 items sorted by topic and the date of the Board meeting the item is scheduled to be discussed. It is important to note that while this list will be used as a guideline to assist the Board in focusing its discussions, it will not preclude consideration of other items during the Board's deliberations.

During the July 10 meeting, staff will provide a brief presentation on the recommended Key Issues List. After receiving public comments, staff recommends the Board deliberate and select the list of key issues to guide the Board's review of the Draft General Plan.

The Department's website will continue to be used as a tool to communicate the progress of the Board's review of the Draft General Plan. It has all the comment letters received by the Planning Commission, and all the written public comments received by the Board up to the last public hearing on this item.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Awarded grants, General Plan user fees, and the General Fund contribution to the Advanced Planning Division has paid for the costs of the General Plan Update Program to date.

This project fits into the County's Strategic Framework in several ways.

- The project is consistent with the Mission Statement; the General Plan Update will serve the needs and concerns of the community, and enhance their quality of life. It provides a framework for strategically pursuing a broad range of services provided by the County and other agencies, and guiding new development toward the goals presented in the Plan.
- The General Plan Update supports the self reliance of the community by clarifying County policy and regulations in a broad number of subject areas, and presenting them in a format that is easy to understand and available on the internet.
- The General Plan Update will safeguard the public trust by establishing clear County policy and regulations guiding new development.
- The proposed implementation measures of the General Plan Update ensure its sustainability over time.
- The General Plan Update increases the transparency, accessibility, and accountability of the services provided by the County by establishing clear roles and procedures, using language that is easy to understand and available on the internet. The General Plan Update promotes interjurisdictional and regional cooperation.
- The General Plan Update is intended to be "an effective voice for our community in areas outside traditional mandates". The General Plan Update includes provisions for public involvement that extend far beyond the requirements of state law. Public

involvement encouraged by the General Plan Update will include discussions of natural resource and the County's economic future. The General Plan Update also intends to engage new partners through its implementation measures.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

The General Plan Update program has been a multi-year project. Multiple agencies have been involved in the review and preparation of the Planning Commission approved Draft General Plan. The County has been in communication with the Planning Commissioners, County Counsel and the County Administrator's office on the transmittal of these draft documents.

ALTERNATIVES TO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Board's discretion.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A Index of Public Comments Received by the Planning Commission.

Attachment B Comparison of Key Issues Lists.

Attachment C Summary of the Recommended Key Issues List

## **Attachment A**

Index of Public Comments Received by the Planning Commission on the  
2008 Hearing Draft General Plan

**Table 1. Index of Public Comments Received by the Planning Commission on the 2008 Hearing Draft General Plan**

Commenter	Charts	Comment on Plan	Comment on Process
<b>Working Groups*:</b>			
HAR	11	23	7
HH	5	10	2
RLWG	14	8	2
PPWG	1	1	
CSWG	2	2	
CRWG	1	6	
BWG	2		
HWWG	1	1	
<b>Stakeholder Groups:</b>			
HELP		7	14
HumCPR	1	3	2
HWC		4	
Farm Bureau	2	3	
Buckeye	See RLWG		
NCGA		8	
NCHB	2	5	2
EPIC		4	
Green Wheels	2	2	
Siskiyou Land Conservancy		2	
Baykeepers		3	
RR Audubon	1	1	
Friends of the Eel/VanDuzen		3	
LOWV	1	2	1
NEC		2	
Salmonid Restoration Federation		2	
Civil Liberties Monitoring Group	(See PPWG)	2	
Northcoast Rail Authority		1	
Area One on Aging		2	
Eureka Chamber of Commerce		1	
<b>Agencies</b>			
Caltrans		1	
US Navy		1	
DFG	2	5	
HMWA	1		
RWQCB		1	
USFWS		1	
HBMWD	1	5	
Harbor District		1	1
HCSD		1	1
FRC	1	2	
<b>Individuals</b>			
General Comments:	4	192	5
Healthy Humboldt Petitions – support for Alternative A		142	

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
<a href="#">GPU-1</a>	Claire Perricelli.	1-27-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports infill, redevelopment, preservation of resource lands and walkable communities
<a href="#">GPU-2</a>	Humboldt County Resource lands working group	1-27-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requests the release of all the alternatives at the same time along with the draft EIR in order to review and compare alternatives.
<a href="#">GPU-3</a>	Stacey Becker	2-09-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A, infill development, growth patterns that reduce our carbon footprint and wants more protection of resource lands
<a href="#">GPU-4</a>	Stacey Urhammer	2-27-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports infill development and protection of ag lands, in particular prime soils. Does not want to see the big developments proposed for south Eureka.
<a href="#">GPU-5</a>	Dave Dorsey	3-14-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Framework Plan
<a href="#">GPU-6</a>	Georje Holper	3-27-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned regarding additional development in the Mattole watershed and lack of water.
<a href="#">GPU-7</a>	Joel Fasciani	4-16-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requests protection of agricultural lands for future crop production
<a href="#">GPU-8</a>	Cindy Graebner	4-27-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requests protection of agricultural lands for future crop production
<a href="#">GPU-9</a>	Sonny Dodson	4-28-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Framework Plan; no more subdivisions, enough patent parcels to support future development.
<a href="#">GPU-10</a>	Barbara Kennedy	4-29-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and wants to see more protection of resource lands
<a href="#">GPU-11</a>	FRC	4-29-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover letter for FRC recommendations
<a href="#">GPU-11</a> Attach a	FRC – attachment 1	4-29-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Policy recommendations from the FRC regarding the timber policies of the plan
<a href="#">GPU-11</a> Attach b	FRC – attachment 2	4-29-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comparison chart of draft policies with those recommended by the FRC
<a href="#">GPU-12</a>	Richard Salzman	4-30-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and additional protection of resource lands
<a href="#">GPU-13</a>	Lynn Kerman	5-1-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and advocates for policies that provide for future sustainability
<a href="#">GPU-14</a>	Thomas Brundage	5-1-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Advocates for limiting future subdivisions in the rural lands as new development will affect the availability of water in the streams for fish and environment.
<a href="#">GPU-15</a>	McKinleyville Land Trust	5-7-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports infill development in urban areas, protection of wildlife, habitat and sensitive species and advocates for the use of community forests.
<a href="#">GPU-16</a>	Tom Lisle	5-14-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and wants to see more protection of resource lands
<a href="#">GPU-17</a>	Steve Horner	4-21-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Questions regarding the housing inventory and urban development maps.
<a href="#">GPU-18</a>	Bill Barnum	6-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Information on California Demographics
<a href="#">GPU-19</a>	Stacy Vynne	5-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Information on the Climate Leadership Initiative
<a href="#">GPU-20</a>	HAR (section 4.2)	4-24-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding Section 4.2 Growth Planning
<a href="#">GPU-21</a>	HAR (section 4.3)	4-24-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding Section 4.3 Urban Lands
<a href="#">GPU-22</a>	HAR (section 4.4)	4-24-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding Section 4.4 Rural Lands
<a href="#">GPU-23</a>	Andy Alm	4-30-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and wants to see more protection of resource lands in particular, ag lands, does not support the McKay tract subdivision (not infill)
<a href="#">GPU-24</a>	The Buckeye	4-27-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request to re-locate townhall meeting of 4-30-09 to larger venue
<a href="#">GPU-25</a>	The Buckeye	4-30-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Initial comments on the Forest Resources policies
<a href="#">GPU-27</a>	Julie Fulkerson	4-22-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requests protection of resource and open space lands for future crop production and sustainability
<a href="#">GPU-28</a>	Farmer's Mkt Association	4-30-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Agricultural Resources policies
<a href="#">GPU-29</a>	HAR	4-28-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request to re-locate townhall meeting of 4-30-09 to larger venue
<a href="#">GPU-30</a>	HumCPR	4-28-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned about the notice and size of venue for townhall meeting of 4-30-09
<a href="#">GPU-31</a>	HELP	4-28-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request to re-schedule townhall meeting of 4-30-09 to larger venue with more notice
<a href="#">GPU-32</a>	Healthy Humboldt – citizens comments (51 comment ltrs)	4-30-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		51 petition letters requesting protection of resource lands and Alternative A.



Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
<a href="#">GPU-33</a>	Terra Prucha	4-30-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Real Estate advertisement for TPZ lands
<a href="#">GPU-34</a>	NCHB	4-28-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned about the notice and size of venue for townhall meeting of 4-30-09
<a href="#">GPU-35</a>	HAR	5-6-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Section 4.7 Public Lands
<a href="#">GPU-36</a>	HAR	5-26-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Section 4.8 Land Use Classifications
<a href="#">GPU-37</a>	HAR	5-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Section 4.5 Ag Lands
<a href="#">GPU-38</a>	HAR	5-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Section 4.6 TimberLands
<a href="#">GPU-39</a>	HAR	6-09-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		General comments on the Land Use Element
<a href="#">GPU-40</a>	HELP	6-12-09			Requests a town hall meeting for Garberville
<a href="#">GPU-41</a>	Healthy Humboldt petitions (43 letters)	6-22-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		43 letters support of support for Alternative A submitted by Healthy Humboldt
<a href="#">GPU-42</a>	Georje Holper	6-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A, restoration zoning and protection of our resource lands.
<a href="#">GPU-43</a>	Virginia Graziani	6-16-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Suggests stronger language in support of AOB in all plan options and requests a way to deal with unpermitted buildings outside of the GPU process
<a href="#">GPU-44</a>	Humboldt Watershed Council	6-16-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A, two tier TPZ approach, riparian buffers, community forests, watershed based planning, restoration zoning, expansion of FRC.
<a href="#">GPU-45</a>	Lynn Kerman	6-10-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and use of community forests.
<a href="#">GPU-46</a>	Lawrence Kluck	6-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Water discharge violation notice from RWQCB
<a href="#">GPU-47</a>	Mattole Restoration Council	6-10-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports policies for water conservation practices in rural areas (less permitting hassles) better rural road standards, voluntary easements, protection of ag land
<a href="#">GPU-48</a>	Melissa Moore	6-09-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and wants to see more protection of resource lands
<a href="#">GPU-49</a>	Greg Nesty	6-09-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and wants to see more protection of ag lands in the Jacoby Creek area.
<a href="#">GPU-50</a>	Lauren Oliver	6-10-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and wants to see more protection of resource lands, two tier TPZ zoning, restoration zoning,
<a href="#">GPU-51</a>	Resource Lands Working Group	6-08-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Section 4.6 TimberLands – plan alternative charts
<a href="#">GPU-52</a>	Suzanne Simpson	6-10-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and protection of ag lands, advocates for policies that provide for future sustainability
<a href="#">GPU-53</a>	Jennifer Taylor	6-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and use of community forests.
<a href="#">GPU-54</a>	Bill Thorington	6-07-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A, two tier TPZ approach, riparian buffers and community forests.
<a href="#">GPU-55</a>	Don Tuttle	5-12-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Increase of fighting fires in timberlands due to encroachment of houses
<a href="#">GPU-56</a>	Lisa Brown	6-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and more protective ag policies, AE zoning in Jacoby Cr. Valley, a TRD program instead of the PRD program
<a href="#">GPU-57</a>	Eric Almquist	6-13-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A, infill development and protection of forest resources with allowance of some residential development w/ management.
<a href="#">GPU-58</a>	Perry Bressman	6-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requesting a noise ordinance as a part of the GPU
<a href="#">GPU-59</a>	Judy and Pete Haggard	6-10-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and community forest to protect the McKay tract, smaller carbon footprint.
<a href="#">GPU-60</a>	VanDuzen Watershed Group	6-17-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Disputed Bill Barnum's testimony of 6-11-09. Supports Alternative A, against sprawl and the McKay tract development
<a href="#">GPU-61</a>	Mary Anderson	6-17-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding water storage and rural development
<a href="#">GPU-62</a>	Paulette Andrews	5-25-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Does not favor Alternative A if the Industrial Timber classification would not allow her to rebuild her home that was built with permits.
<a href="#">GPU-63</a>	Greg Bloomstrom	6-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Forester that is concerned with increased housing next to forestlands – makes it difficult to manage for timber. Review those TPZ parcels under 80 acres for eligibility based upon existing management practice
<a href="#">GPU-64</a>	Kevin Caldwell	6-01-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned that the policy options and PR program are leading individuals to only support Alternative A.
<a href="#">GPU-65</a>	Civil Liberties Monitoring	6-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Areas of agreement for plan policies and programs

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
	Project				with a group of citizens of Sohum lead by the Civil Liberties monitoring project.
<a href="#">GPU-66</a>	DFG Notes of 11-07-08	6-11-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Meeting notes for November 7, 2008 with CDS, DPW, DFG and RWQC staff on General Plan policies and various water resources issues
<a href="#">GPU-67</a>	Maggie Draper	6-10-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and community forest to protect the McKay tract, smaller carbon footprint, protection of ag lands.
<a href="#">GPU-68</a>	Farm Bureau Section 4.3?	6-05-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Section 4.5 Agricultural resources – plan alternative charts specific policy recommendations
<a href="#">GPU-69</a>	Sandy Ferretto	5-09-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concern regarding big box development, big concert venues and adult entertainment – wants this addressed in the GPU.
<a href="#">GPU-70</a>	Sandy Ferretto	6-01-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments specific to the GPU and the proposed rezone of the Sohum Community Park to PR
<a href="#">GPU-71</a>	Elizabeth Finger	6-01-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and more protective ag policies, AE zoning in Jacoby Cr. Valley, infill development and IZ.
<a href="#">GPU-72</a>	Healthy Humboldt	7-07-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Land Use Element, Growth management and Urban Lands policies
<a href="#">GPU-73</a>	Kevin Caldwell	7-08-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requested information regarding the CAP and flood elevations for Phillipsville
<a href="#">GPU-74</a>	Joyce King	7-07-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Urban Lands policies
<a href="#">GPU-75</a>	Virginia Graziani	7-13-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Support for Alternative A and submitted specific policy comments on various Land Use policies.
<a href="#">GPU-76</a>	Rudy Ramp email	6-16-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Support for Alternative A and protection of resource lands, open spaces and rural living.
<a href="#">GPU-77</a>	Bob McKee	7-01-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports continuation of the framework plan and review of changes by a citizens advisory committee
<a href="#">GPU-78</a>	HCRLWG	7-23-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Section 4.4 Rural Lands – plan alternative charts specific policy recommendations
<a href="#">GPU-79</a>	Healthy Humboldt petition	7-23-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Petition letters requesting protection of resource lands and Alternative A.
<a href="#">GPU-80</a>	Barnum Timber	7-15-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concern for proposed IT designation on Barnum Timber lands and loss of value
<a href="#">GPU-81</a>	Kevin Caldwell	8-19-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Use of the Open Space Designation for the Philipsville area
<a href="#">GPU-82</a>	Kristen White	8-30-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Growing Hemp on family farms.
<a href="#">GPU-83</a>	Healthy Humboldt Petition	9-08-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Petition letters requesting protection of resource lands and Alternative A.
<a href="#">GPU-84</a>	Healthy Humboldt - map	9-17-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Map illustrating “leapfrog” development
<a href="#">GPU-85</a>	Hum CPR	9-17-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Land Use Element, Rural Lands policies
<a href="#">GPU-86</a>	North Coast Growers Assoc.	9-17-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding prime soils, AE designation and agricultural policies.
<a href="#">GPU-87</a>	Humboldt Watershed Council	10-06-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Land Use Element, Forest Resources policies
<a href="#">GPU-88</a>	Healthy Humboldt	10-06-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Land Use Element, Forest Resources policies
<a href="#">GPU-89</a>	Healthy Humboldt petitions	10-06-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Petition letters requesting protection of resource lands and Alternative A.
<a href="#">GPU-90</a>	Mike Atkins	10-06-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Land Use Element, Forest Resources policies
<a href="#">GPU-91</a>	Sean King email	10-06-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Healthy Humboldt’s position of Forest Resource policies – protect against sprawl development
<a href="#">GPU-92</a>	Kimberly Tays Binnie email		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and more protective open space protection policies.
<a href="#">GPU-93</a>	Jan Clarridge email	10-08-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports more protective ag and open space policies – protect resource lands.
<a href="#">GPU-94</a>	Carol McFarland email	10-07-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and more protective open space and resource protection policies
<a href="#">GPU-95</a>	Michelle Gruen	10-13-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports policies that protect a rural lifestyle and the continuance of living on resource lands.
<a href="#">GPU-96</a>	Humboldt Watershed Council	10-13-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Land Use Element, Forest Resources policies
<a href="#">GPU-97</a>	Richard Salzman email	10-14-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and more protective open space and resource protection policies
<a href="#">GPU-98</a>	Kristi Stoen	10-14-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Reflective of the management of Palco and impacts to Humboldt County

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
<a href="#">GPU-99</a>	Hank Pierson	10-14-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports policies that allows more subdivision and development on rural lands.
<a href="#">GPU-100</a>	Anthony Urhammer	10-15-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and more protective open space and resource protection policies
<a href="#">GPU-101</a>	Josh Brown	10-15-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and more protective open space and resource protection policies in particular the use of the Industrial Timber designation.
<a href="#">GPU-102</a>	Marisa D'Arpino	10-15-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and more protective open space and resource protection policies
<a href="#">GPU-103</a>	Tammy Miranda	10-16-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports policies that protect a rural lifestyle and the continuance of living on resource lands.
<a href="#">GPU-104</a>	Harry Vaughn	10-22-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports policies similar to those found in Alternative A that provide more protection to resource lands and fish habitat. Rural lifestyle does not necessarily mean better management.
<a href="#">GPU-105</a>	Liz Finger	10-22-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and more stringent resource protection policies with a provision of ecosystem approach to lands in TPZ that may not be logged.
<a href="#">GPU-106</a>	Virginia Graziani	10-23-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		General comments on the GPU process, meetings in So Hum, working lands resource group participants and rural residential lifestyle impacts.
<a href="#">GPU-107</a>	Dottie Russell	10-22-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports more options for housing in SoHum.
<a href="#">GPU-108</a>	HumCPR	10-15-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Land Use Element, Agricultural Lands and Forest Resources policies
<a href="#">GPU-109</a>	Kevin Caldwell	11-30-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding rural lands policy and development restrictions.
<a href="#">GPU-110</a>	Sonny Dobson email	12-04-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Recommends policies for slow growth, protection of ag resources and limit to the number of large venue concerts.
<a href="#">GPU-111</a>	Healthy Humboldt	10-19-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Reminder of earlier comments submitted regarding the ag and timber resources policies.
<a href="#">GPU-112</a>	Ford Family	10-20-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned regarding the loss of property rights for more restrictive policies regarding development of timber lands in particular, FR-P7 and merger.
<a href="#">GPU-113</a>	Greg Bloomstrom	10-20-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on forest resource policies FR-P4, P8 and S2 (D) and (E).
<a href="#">GPU-114</a>	John LaBoyteaux	10-28-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Merger Ordinance as it relates to the subdivision of rural lands for the use of marijuana cultivation; includes a letter from the Farm Bureau to Mike Thompson.
<a href="#">GPU-115</a>	HELP	11-14-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		FRC Recommendations
<a href="#">GPU-116</a>	HELP	11-23-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Allow public testimony at all GPU meetings
<a href="#">GPU-117</a>	HELP	12-09-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Allow public testimony at all GPU meetings
<a href="#">GPU-118</a>	Kevin Caldwell	11-19-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Questions regarding the ability to rebuild homes on AE and AG lands
<a href="#">GPU-119</a>	NCHB	11-18-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		FRC Recommendations
<a href="#">GPU-120</a>	Steve Hackett	02-01-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on forest resource policies and concern regarding the background information on forest resources regarding TPZ and development
<a href="#">GPU-121</a>	Healthy Humboldt	12-04-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Re-submittal of comments on Ag Resources
<a href="#">GPU-122</a>	Farm Bureau	2-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Updated comments on Ag Resources Chart
<a href="#">GPU-123</a>	Don Courtemanche	12-17-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requesting a policy for agricultural resources regarding large music venues
<a href="#">GPU-124</a>	Steve Hackett	2-18-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned that the proposed agricultural and forest resource policies will remove value and property rights of landowners. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">GPU-125</a>	Dawn Peterson	2-18-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Revise ordinance to require noticing of cell towers in ag and timber zones.
<a href="#">GPU-126</a>	Timberland Cooperative – Declaration of Intent	2-18-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Proposal by industrial timber companies to manage their properties for timber and not residential conversions in lieu of increased regulations.
<a href="#">GPU-127</a>	Farm Bureau	2-18-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Revised recommendations of agricultural resources policies.
<a href="#">GPU-128</a>	Farm Bureau	2-23-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Letter supporting the right to build a house on a legal parcel.
<a href="#">GPU-129</a>	Farm Bureau	3-11-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Revised comments on agricultural resources standards AG-S2, S3
<a href="#">GPU-130</a>	Healthy Humboldt	3-11-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Section 4.6 TimberLands – plan alternative charts

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
<a href="#">GPU-131</a>	NC Growers Association	2-18-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on agricultural resources standards AG-S1, S2, S3
<a href="#">GPU-132</a>	NC Growers Association	3-15-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Additional comments on agricultural resources standards AG-S1
<a href="#">GPU-133</a>	NCHB	11-19-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concern regarding data presented on Forest Resources section.
<a href="#">GPU-134</a>	Charles Ciancio	11-24-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Section 4.6 TimberLands – plan alternative charts
<a href="#">GPU-135</a>	Humboldt County BOS	4-15-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Palco bankruptcy letter from Humboldt Board of Supervisors dated
<a href="#">GPU-136</a>	Chuck Harvey	4-26-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concern over Planning Commission's vote on Forest Resources regarding houses on TPZ lands.
<a href="#">GPU-137</a>	HAR	1-07-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Rural Residential Land Inventory
<a href="#">GPU-138</a>	HAR	4-09-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Noticing discrepancies for GPU meetings
<a href="#">GPU-139</a>	HAR	5-05-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Correction to 4-16-09 PC minutes
<a href="#">GPU-140</a>	HAR	5-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TPZ and taxation process for residential structures
<a href="#">GPU-141</a>	HAR	6-03-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request that GPU "subcommittee" follow Brown act
<a href="#">GPU-142</a>	HAR	10-20-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned regarding the taking of vote tallies by the Commissioners regarding Plan A
<a href="#">GPU-143</a>	Resource Lands Working Group	6-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover letter for Land Use Classifications chart and policy recommendations
<a href="#">GPU-144</a>	DFG TPZ recommendations	1-18-08	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		California Department of Fish and Game recommendations for the TPZ ordinance
<a href="#">GPU-145</a>	HELP	5-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		General Plan Update schedule and PC review process
<a href="#">GPU-146</a>	HELP	5-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request that all FRC recommendations be included in the policy option chart
<a href="#">GPU-147</a>	NC Growers Association	5-27-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Revised recommendations from the NCGA regarding the agricultural policies (AE subdivisions)
<a href="#">GPU-148</a>	NC Growers Association	5-27-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Submittal of verbal testimony provided the commission on 4-30-09
<a href="#">GPU-149</a>	Nancy Corell	5-11-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Support of ecosystem management as a policy recommendation on timberlands
<a href="#">GPU-150</a>	Resource Lands Working Group	6-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Policy recommendations for Section 4.8, Land Use Classifications - redline of policy chart
<a href="#">GPU-150a</a>	Resource Lands Working Group – cover letter	6-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover letter for Land Use Classifications policy recommendations on alternatives chart
<a href="#">GPU-151</a>	EPIC	6-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Support for the Industrial Timber Land Use Classification as found in Alternative A
<a href="#">GPU-152</a>	Bill Barnum	6-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Review of article submitted on rain catchments systems in the rural lands as a water source for rural residential
<a href="#">GPU-153</a>	HELP	6-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Recommends that the Commission include all FRC recommendations in the Forest Resources section.
<a href="#">GPU-154</a>	HAR	6-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding the Merger Ordinance
<a href="#">GPU-155</a>	John Laboyteaux	6-10-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		State law guiding Williamson Act Contracts and subdivision and family transfers
<a href="#">GPU-156</a>	Gordon Leppig	6-17-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Email transmittal on rural development cover letter
<a href="#">GPU 156a</a>	Gordon Leppig	6-17-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Affects of exurban development on biodiversity - case studies in the western states.
<a href="#">GPU-156b</a>	Gordon Leppig	6-17-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Exurban and vineyard conversion in the Russian River Watershed and the effects of these land use changes on spawning habitat for listed salmonids.
<a href="#">GPU-157</a>	Don Courtemanche	7-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned with the conversion of agricultural land to no agricultural uses
<a href="#">GPU-158</a>	HCRLWG	7-15-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding the TI land use classification
<a href="#">GPU-159</a>	HCRLWG	7-15-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding the AGR land use classification
<a href="#">GPU-160</a>	HAR	7-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Recommendations on Land Use Classifications - redline of policy chart
<a href="#">GPU-161</a>	HAR	7-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding the use of the word "rural" in a land use classification title
<a href="#">GPU-162</a>	Mary Cruse	7-20-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Telecommunications Element policy language
<a href="#">GPU-163</a>	Lisa Brown	7-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Telecommunications Element regarding health effects and siting concerns
<a href="#">GPU-164</a>	Liz Finger	7-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Telecommunications Element regarding health effects and siting concerns

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
<a href="#">GPU-165</a>	Jessica Doremus	7-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Telecommunications Element regarding health effects and siting concerns
<a href="#">GPU-166</a>	Tera Prucha	7-26-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Process and treatment during Commission meetings
<a href="#">GPU-167</a>	Healthy Humboldt	7-27-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comments regarding Forest Resources policies and less than 3 acre conversion process and potential environmental effects of increased development.
<a href="#">GPU-168</a>	Sean McLaughlin	7-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Telecommunications Element – redline of policy language
<a href="#">GPU-169</a>	Tina Nerat	7-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Telecommunications Element – redline of policy language
<a href="#">GPU-170</a>	Ali Freeland	7-29-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Clarification and proposed definition for the term “forest ecosystems values”
<a href="#">GPU-171</a>	Tina Nerat	7-29-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Clarification regarding policy recommendations submitted with July 22, 2010 letter on Telecommunications chapter
<a href="#">GPU-172</a>	Sean McLaughlin	7-29-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Clarification regarding policy recommendations submitted with July 22, 2010 letter on Telecommunication chapter
<a href="#">GPU-173</a>	Healthy Humboldt	7-29-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Clarification and proposed definition for the term “forest ecosystems values”
<a href="#">GPU-174</a>	Connie Stewart	7.22.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Telecommunications Element – redline of policy language
<a href="#">GPU-175</a>	HELP	7-29-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerns regarding the new review process for the GPU chapters
<a href="#">GPU-176</a>	HCRLWG	7.29.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding Chapter 5, Infrastructure and level of service requirements
<a href="#">GPU-177</a>	Barnum Timber	7.29.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request to re-designate the Barnum Timberlands out of Industrial Timber designations
<a href="#">GPU-178</a>	Public Works	7-29-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding Chapter 5, Infrastructure Redline of policy language
<a href="#">GPU-179</a>	HAR	6-24-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding the term “healthy ecosystems”
<a href="#">GPU-180</a>	NCGA	6-17-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Recommended wording for AE, Agriculture Exclusive land use classification
<a href="#">GPU-181</a>	Blake Lehman- HAR	6-24-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Assistance on GPU policies from a real estate background
<a href="#">GPU-182</a>	Beverly Filip	7-15-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Telecommunications Element – regarding environmental and health issues
<a href="#">GPU-183</a>	Charles Ciancio	7-27-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Letter to Commissioner Mayo requesting help on changing IT land use designations on clients property
<a href="#">GPU-184</a>	Lisa Brown	08-12-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Telecommunications Element – regarding recommended revisions to G-4 and S-1
<a href="#">GPU-185</a>	Charles Ciancio	8.12.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<a href="#">GPU-186</a>	Glenn Zeimer	8.12.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Infrastructure Element, in particular the fire related standards of I-S5 and I-S6.
<a href="#">GPU-187</a>	Robert Morris	8.12.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Opposed to the Industrial Timber designation
<a href="#">GPU-188</a>	Bob Barnum	8.12.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request to re-designate the Barnum Timberlands out of Industrial Timber designations
<a href="#">GPU-189</a>	HAR	8.12.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Circulation Element policies/standards
<a href="#">GPU-190</a>	Tom McMurray	8.12.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Radio Frequency spectrum chart
<a href="#">GPU-191</a>	Jan Kraepelien	8.12.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Board resolution establishing the Broadband working group
<a href="#">GPU-192</a>	Bonnie Blackberry	8.12.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requesting live interactive telecommunication sites in remote areas to participate in county government
<a href="#">GPU-193</a>	Beverly Filip	8.12.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Articles on health effects from wireless technology
<a href="#">GPU-194</a>	Tom Grover	8.19.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Telecommunications Element goals policies and standards.
<a href="#">GPU-195</a>	HUM CPR	8.19.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Infrastructure Element, in particular the fire related standards of I-S5 and I-S6.
<a href="#">GPU-196</a>	HAR	8.19.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Infrastructure Element, in particular the fire related standards of I-S5 and I-S6.
<a href="#">GPU-197a</a>	Beverly Filip	8.19.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Articles on health effects from wireless technology
<a href="#">GPU-197b</a>	Beverly Filip	8.19.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Articles on health effects from wireless technology
<a href="#">GPU-197c</a>	Beverly Filip	8.19.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Articles on health effects from wireless technology
<a href="#">GPU-198</a>	Greenwheels	8.23.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover letter on the Circulation Element, and recommendations on Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-199</a>	Greenwheels	8.23.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on the Circulation Element Plan

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
					Alternatives voting chart (chapter 7)
<a href="#">GPU-200</a>	Ad hoc Broadband Working Group	8.23.10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on the Telecommunications Element Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-201</a>	Maggie Draper	8-30-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned with the potential health effects from wireless technology
<a href="#">GPU-202</a>	HELP	8-19-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requested from BOS to stop GPU process until land inventory is corrected
<a href="#">GPU-203</a>	Green Wheels	8-26-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on the Circulation Element Plan Alternatives voting chart (chapter 7)
<a href="#">GPU-204</a>	Green Wheels – cover letter	8-26-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover letter for comments on the Circulation Element chart
<a href="#">GPU-205</a>	Charles Ciancio	8-26-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		General comments on the GPU process as it relates to the Housing Element and rural development
<a href="#">GPU-206</a>	Charles Ciancio	9-9-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding inverse condemnation and land use designations
<a href="#">GPU-207</a>	Jessica Doremus	8-26-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Sample monitoring guidelines for cell towers
<a href="#">GPU-208</a>	Tom McMurray	8-26-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on the Telecommunications Element Plan Alternatives voting chart (chapter 6)
<a href="#">GPU-209</a>	Green Diamond	8-26-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned with new standards for principally permitted uses of cell towers on resource lands (lands zoned for ag and timber).
<a href="#">GPU-210</a>	Lisa Brown	8-26-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Submitted studies calling for the need for development standards for siting cell towers
<a href="#">GPU-211</a>	Jessica Doremus	9-2-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the revised Telecommunications Policy Alternatives chart submitted by the Broadband Working Group on 8-23-10
<a href="#">GPU-212</a>	Jessica Doremus	9-2-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requests a moratorium on cell towers until a Cell Tower Ordinance is adopted.
<a href="#">GPU-213</a>	Beverly Filip	09-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the revised Telecommunications Policy Alternatives chart submitted by the Broadband Working Group on 8-23-10 – requests limited areas of County with no cell towers
<a href="#">GPU-214</a>	Healthy Humboldt	09-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		General comments on Telecommunication Element regarding siting standards and wired versus wireless
<a href="#">GPU-215</a>	Curtis Jacoby	09-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A.
<a href="#">GPU-216</a>	Greg Jiso	09-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A.
<a href="#">GPU-217</a>	Jim Smith	09-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A.
<a href="#">GPU-218</a>	Debbie Hartridge	09-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports policies that support walkable communities.
<a href="#">GPU-219</a>	Robert Homan	09-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and policies that limit urban sprawl.
<a href="#">GPU-220</a>	Maggie Draper	09-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned with the potential health effects from wireless technology
<a href="#">GPU-221</a>	Virginia Graziani	09-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned with potential health affects of cell towers but supports the inclusion of the Telecommunications Element in the GPU – proceed with caution
<a href="#">GPU-222</a>	Jessica Doremus	09-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific policy recommendations for the siting of cell towers
<a href="#">GPU-223</a>	Jean Doran	09-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports increased public transportation systems such as the Jack Pass in Humboldt county
<a href="#">GPU-224</a>	Gail Eastman	09-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Article on the health effects of wireless communications
<a href="#">GPU-225</a>	Rudy Ramp - email	09-23-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding the Circulation element and support of Green Wheels recommendations
<a href="#">GPU-226</a>	John Bergamini	09-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and policies that limit urban sprawl.
<a href="#">GPU-227</a>	Tom McMurray	09-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Various articles on the Wireless Industry and need for expanded services based upon increase in demand
<a href="#">GPU-228</a>	Sean McLaughlin	09-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding the need for universal access to telecommunication systems for all.
<a href="#">GPU-229</a>	Norma McAdams	9-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the telecommunications element as it relates to underserved communities (Hoopa tribe)
<a href="#">GPU-230</a>	HAR	9-23-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on the Circulation Element Plan Alternatives voting chart (chapter 7)
<a href="#">GPU-231</a>	Sean McLaughlin	09-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Article on telecommunication systems for the digital age
<a href="#">GPU-232</a>	Kelly Arbor	9-21-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports more bike trails and the policy recommendations of Green Wheels for Circulation Element
<a href="#">GPU-233</a>	Alan Cook	9-21-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and policies as they relate to

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
					timber policies and protecting resource lands.
<a href="#">GPU-234</a>	Suzanne Dunning	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Protect agricultural lands in General Plan policies.
<a href="#">GPU-235</a>	Patrick Mulligan	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and policies as they relate to timber policies and protecting resource lands.
<a href="#">GPU-236</a>	Fhrye Phoenix	9-20-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and policies that limit urban sprawl.
<a href="#">GPU-237</a>	Cindy Teeters	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and policies that offer higher level of protection for our watersheds.
GPU-238	Healthy Humboldt petitions:	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
	<a href="#">Kaprielian petition</a>	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
	<a href="#">Kelley petition</a>	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
	<a href="#">Marie petition</a>	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
	<a href="#">Marin petition</a>	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
	<a href="#">Miller petition</a>	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
	<a href="#">Muraoka petition</a>	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
	<a href="#">Perrine petition</a>	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
	<a href="#">Salzman petition</a>	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
	<a href="#">Chatfield petition</a>	9-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Healthy Humboldt petition
<a href="#">GPU-239</a>	Ira Blatt	9-23-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and policies and walkable communities.
<a href="#">GPU-240</a>	Complete Streets	10-07-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on the Circulation Element Plan Alternatives voting chart (chapter 7)
<a href="#">GPU-241</a>	Complete Streets	10-07-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover letter for voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-242</a>	Virginia Graziani	10-21-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Complete Streets Working Groups policy recommendations for Chapter 7, Circulation
<a href="#">GPU-243</a>	Public Works	7-22-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Policy recommendations for the Circulation Element from the Department of Public Works
<a href="#">GPU-244</a>	Complete Streets Presentation	10-14-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Powerpoint presentation given to the Planning Commission on the Circulation Element.
<a href="#">GPU-245</a>	Area One on Aging	10-12-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Complete Streets Working Groups policy recommendations for Chapter 7, Circulation
<a href="#">GPU-246</a>	Tom McMurray	10-14-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Information on telecommunications and the future of mobile data demands.
<a href="#">GPU-247</a>	Tom McMurray	10-14-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Information on networks rebroadcasting NFL games on mobile devices.
<a href="#">GPU-248</a>	HELP	10-18-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Circulation Element – HIA study
<a href="#">GPU-249</a>	Friends of the Dunes	10-14-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the policy recommendations submitted by the Complete Streets Working Group
<a href="#">GPU-250</a>	Complete Streets Working Group	10-14-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Powerpoint presentation on the Circulation Element
<a href="#">GPU-251</a>	Healthy Humboldt	10-14-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Handout supporting complete streets initiative for all travelers
<a href="#">GPU-252</a>	Jen Rice	10-14-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Handout supporting rails to trails program from GOA
<a href="#">GPU-253</a>	Virginia Graziani	10-15-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the policy recommendations submitted by the Complete Streets Working Group
<a href="#">GPU-254</a>	Mary Anderson	10-20-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the policy recommendations submitted by the Complete Streets Working Group
<a href="#">GPU-255</a>	Greg Gold – Sierra Club	10-28-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the policy recommendations submitted by the Complete Streets Working Group
<a href="#">GPU-256</a>	CSWG Draft Policy C-P17	12-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Proposed policy language revisions for C-P17
<a href="#">GPU-257</a>	Eureka Chamber of Commerce	12-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Economic Development Element
<a href="#">GPU-258</a>	Tom Grover	10-21-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Health Impact Study
<a href="#">GPU-259</a>	HAR	10-28-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Circulation Element concerning Impact Fees
<a href="#">GPU-260</a>	NCHB	10-28-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Circulation Element concerning Impact Fees
<a href="#">GPU-261</a>	Jen Rice	10-28-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Chart on Bicycle Routes and Design for Hoopa
<a href="#">GPU-262</a>	Richard Pruetz	11-7-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the protection of agricultural lands and the use of TDR's
<a href="#">GPU-263</a>	Emily Sinkhorn	10-21-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		State of Floriday Handbook on Quality/Level of Service standards for roadways
<a href="#">GPU-264</a>	Jen Rice	10-21-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Handout on travel guide for accessibility standards
<a href="#">GPU-265</a>	Peter Childs	12-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the GPU process and a call to start over
<a href="#">GPU-266</a>	Humboldt Bay Keepers	12-09-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Re-submittal of comments on the Water Resources

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
					originally submitted on 6-10-08
<a href="#">GPU-267</a>	Area 1 on Aging	10-21-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the policy recommendations submitted by the Complete Streets Working Group
<a href="#">GPU-268</a>	Connie Stewart, CCRP	10-21-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Recommended policy revisions for the Circulation Element
<a href="#">GPU-269</a>	CALTRANS	1-11-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned with Commission recommended revisions to Circulation Policy C-P17.
<a href="#">GPU-270</a>	Hum CPR	12-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned with the Commission's use of the Complete Street Working Groups chart.
<a href="#">GPU-271</a>	Sara Reid	12-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports trail development but not at the expense of our current rail system.
<a href="#">GPU-272</a>	North Coast Rail Authority	12-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Does not support use of the rails for trails if it jeopardizes future uses of rail system. Request wording for P35 addresses this.
<a href="#">GPU-273</a>	Alan Weston	12-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Petition to save the railway corridor for a trail system.
<a href="#">GPU-274</a>	Thadeus Wuest	12-16-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the development of a tourist train and does not want to see any policies in the plan that jeopardizes the future use of the rail system.
<a href="#">GPU-275</a>	HAR	10-28-10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Economic Development Element
<a href="#">GPU-276</a>	HAR	1-20-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on the Economics Element Plan Alternatives voting chart (chapter 9)
<a href="#">GPU-277</a>	John Weibe	2-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports cluster housing
<a href="#">GPU-278</a>	Maggie Herbelin	1-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element and support of watershed based planning.
<a href="#">GPU-279</a>	HAR	2-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned that staff will circumvent the review process for submitted alternatives charts
<a href="#">GPU-280</a>	John Wiebe		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requests cluster housing as a part of the GPU policy document
<a href="#">GPU-281</a>	Lisa Brown	3-10-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Green Belt policies for the Open Space Element and Alternative A
<a href="#">GPU-282</a>	Bob Froehlich email	3-16-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports policies that protect large tracts of land for open space
<a href="#">GPU-283</a>	Nancy Correll	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the strongest policies that protect open space lands for recreation; advocates for cooperation between agencies
<a href="#">GPU-284</a>	Scott Menzies email	3-16-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comment on the Economic Element regarding "more rigor/regulation" and "less rigor/regulation" vs "streamlining" for policy language.
<a href="#">GPU-285</a>	Nancy Correll	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the strongest policies that protect open space lands for recreation; advocates for cooperation between agencies
<a href="#">GPU-286</a>	Healthy Humboldt	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.3, Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-287</a>	Healthy Humboldt	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.2 Open Space Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-288</a>	NCHB	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.2 Open Space Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-289</a>	HumCPR	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.2 Open Space Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-290</a>	NC Growers Association	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on Section 10.2 Open Space Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-291</a>	Siskiyou Land Conservancy	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on Section 10.2 Open Space Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-292</a>	USFWS	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-293</a>	Department of Fish and Game	3-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-294</a>	HELP	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding cost of General Plan as it relates to the Biological studies conducted.
<a href="#">GPU-295</a>	HAR	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments of Mineral Resources section.
<a href="#">GPU-296</a>	Harriet Hill	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-297</a>	Humboldt Bay Keepers	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-298</a>	HAR	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-299</a>	HAR	3-10-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redlined comments on Section 10.2 Open Space Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-300</a>	HELP	2-10-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on Economic Element Plan



Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
					Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-301</a>	HELP	3-7-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on Economic Element Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-302</a>	HELP	3-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on the Open Space Element.
<a href="#">GPU-303</a>	Healthy Humboldt email	3-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Input regarding the need to address trails in the Open Space Element
<a href="#">GPU-304</a>	NCHB	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-305</a>	RLWG	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-306</a>	RLWG	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover for comments on Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-307</a>	Nola Roiz email	4-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding policies addressing light and glare within the Scenic Resources section of Open Space
<a href="#">GPU-308</a>	Sierra Pacific	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on biological definitions used in Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-309</a>	RLWG	3-10-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover for comments on Section 10.2 Open Spaces Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-310</a>	RLWG	3-10-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.2 Open Space Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-311</a>	Redwood Region Audubon	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on biological definitions used in Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-312</a>	HAR	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Selected comments on biological definitions used in Section 10.3 Biological Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-313</a>	DFG	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Recovery strategy for Coho Salmon as it relates to Humboldt Co.
<a href="#">GPU-314</a>	EPIC	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Support for Alternative A policies for the Biological Resources section of the Plan.
<a href="#">GPU-315</a>	Friends of the Van Duzen	3-24-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports strong policy protection measures for riparian setbacks and fish recovery.
<a href="#">GPU-316</a>	Cultural Resources Working Group – cover letter	3-22-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover for comments on Section 10.6 Cultural Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart.
<a href="#">GPU-317</a>	Cultural Resources Working Group – chart	3-22-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.6 Cultural Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-318</a>	HAR	4-28-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comment letter on Section 10.6, Cultural Resources
<a href="#">GPU-319</a>	Healthy Humboldt	5-10-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.7 Scenic Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-320</a>	HAR	5-11-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comment letter on Section 10.7 Scenic Resources
<a href="#">GPU-321</a>	HAR	5-11-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.7 Scenic Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-322</a>	HAR	5-11-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.6 Cultural Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-323</a>	RLWG - cultural	4/7/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.6 Cultural Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-324</a>	RLWG – minerals	4/7/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.4 Mineral Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-325</a>	RLWG – scenic	4/7/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.7 Scenic Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-326</a>	RLWG – waste mgmt	4/7/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Section 10.5 Waste Management Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-327</a>	Paul Trichilo – Van Duzen watershed group	5/5/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Support for increased riparian setback for protection of aquatic and biological resources.
<a href="#">GPU-328</a>	Ed Voice	5/19/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request incorporation of Wild and Scenic federal law into the Scenic Resources section.
<a href="#">GPU-329</a>	EPIC	3/29/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Biological Resources section regarding support of Alternative A policies in particular increased SMA buffers.
<a href="#">GPU-330</a>	Healthy Humboldt	5/19/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request to supervisors to not slow down the GPU process.
<a href="#">GPU-331</a>	Sandy Fretto	5/3/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Letter submitted to the BOS regarding the Garberville CSD Kimtu project as it relates to the General Plan Update for inducing growth.
<a href="#">GPU-332</a>	Amanda Waterdown	5/3/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Scenic Resources section regarding protection of scenic roadways.

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
<a href="#">GPU-333</a>	HAR	5/3/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding noticing for the County public outreach program.
<a href="#">GPU-334</a>	HBMWD	4/21/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request to delete MR-P6 from the Mineral Resources section regarding Water Diversion projects.
<a href="#">GPU-335</a>	Jim Hoff	4/28/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Scenic Resources section regarding billboards and private property rights.
<a href="#">GPU-336</a>	Humboldt Bay Harbor District	4/28/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Request to make a presentation to the Planning Commission and increased public outreach.
<a href="#">GPU-337</a>	Support for Cultural Resources Working Group	4/1/11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Support from cultural resources professionals and THPOs for the cultural resources working group's policy recommendations.
<a href="#">GPU-338</a>	Kathleen Stanton	5-26-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific policy recommendations for the Cultural Resources section
<a href="#">GPU-339</a>	Claudia Brundin	5-19-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Support for the development of a Cultural Resources Ordinance and Committee.
<a href="#">GPU-340</a>	NCHB	5-26-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Summary of FRC motions
<a href="#">GPU-341</a>	NCHB	5-26-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Summary of FRC motions/chart of forestry policy choices
<a href="#">GPU-342</a>	Baykeepers	5-26-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific policy recommendations for Scenic Resources regarding billboards.
<a href="#">GPU-343</a>	RLWG	6-8-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific policy recommendations for Biological Resources regarding sensitive species/habitat.
<a href="#">GPU-344</a>	HELP	5-23-11			Comments on public participation process.
<a href="#">GPU-345</a>	Don Courtemanche	5-19-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Scenic Resources section regarding wild and scenic rivers.
<a href="#">GPU-346</a>	Kelli Costa	6-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Scenic Resources concerning the naming of Fieldbrook Road as a Scenic Road.
<a href="#">GPU-347</a>	HWMA	4-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Recommended edits to the Waste Management section.
<a href="#">GPU-348</a>	HAR	7-13-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover letter for voting chart on the Water Resources Element
<a href="#">GPU-349</a>	HAR	7-13-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 11, Water Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-350</a>	HBMWD	6-22-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 11, Water Resources Narrative section and cover letter
<a href="#">GPU-351</a>	RLWG	6-16-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 11, Water Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-352</a>	Janet Eidness	6-16-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Cultural Resources section regarding Cultural Resources Ordinance (CU-S5).
<a href="#">GPU-353</a>	Healthy Watersheds Working Group	7-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 11, Water Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-354</a>	HBMWD	7-18-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 11, Water Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-355</a>	Sandy Feretto	7-19-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on water withdrawals on the South Fork Eel River in regards to water resources policies.
<a href="#">GPU-356</a>	Harbor District	7-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		The Harbor District requested to work with staff on changes to the narratives in the Plan regarding the District
<a href="#">GPU-357</a>	HCSD	7-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Requests that staff address their issues raised in a letter previously sent March 28, 2011
<a href="#">GPU-358</a>	Claire Perricelli.	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Comments submitted by the Healthy Watersheds Working Group and Plan Alternatives voting chart recommendations
<a href="#">GPU-359</a>	Don Courtemanche	7-18-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on water withdrawals on the South Fork Eel River in regards to water resources policies.
<a href="#">GPU-360</a>	RWQCB	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Chapter 11, Water Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart, supports Alternative A policies.
<a href="#">GPU-361</a>	EPIC	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Comments submitted by the Healthy Watersheds Working Group and Plan Alternatives voting chart recommendations, in particular, protection of salmon species and flow of the rivers.
<a href="#">GPU-362</a>	Friends of the Eel River	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Comments submitted by the Healthy Watersheds Working Group and Plan Alternatives voting chart recommendations and restoring river flows and discouraging water exports.
<a href="#">GPU-363</a>	RLWG	7-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Revised redline comments on Chapter 11, Water Resources Plan Alternatives voting chart
<a href="#">GPU-363</a>	RLWG – cover letter	7-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover letter for revised comments on Water

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
					Resources chart
<a href="#">GPU-364</a>	Healthy Watersheds group	7-14-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Cover letter for comments on Water Resources chart
<a href="#">GPU-365</a>	Humboldt Baykeepers	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element, in particular, stormwater runoff policies.
<a href="#">GPU-366</a>	Kathleen Stanton	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Cultural Resources section regarding Cultural Resources Ordinance (CU-S5).
<a href="#">GPU-367</a>	HBMWD	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Powerpoint slides for PC presentation on 7-21-11 for the Water Resources Element.
<a href="#">GPU-368</a>	Ketra Meyer, Salmonid Restoration Federation	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Comments submitted by the Healthy Watersheds Working Group and Plan Alternatives voting chart recommendations, in particular, protection of salmon species and flow of the rivers.
<a href="#">GPU-369</a>	HBMWD	8-4-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on Chapter 11, Water Resources Element specific to Commissioner questions from 7-21-11 meeting.
<a href="#">GPU-370</a>	Ali Lee, Rocky Cr.Watershed	8-3-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports Alternative A and the Comments submitted by the Healthy Watersheds Working Group and Plan Alternatives voting chart recommendations.
<a href="#">GPU-371</a>	Northcoast Environmental Center	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Comments submitted by the Healthy Watersheds Working Group and Plan Alternatives voting chart recommendations, in particular, protection of salmon species and flow of the rivers.
<a href="#">GPU-372</a>	Don Allen, Salmonid Restoration Federation	7-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Comments submitted by the Healthy Watersheds Working Group and Plan Alternatives voting chart recommendations, in particular, protection of salmon species and flow of the rivers.
<a href="#">GPU-373</a>	Ellen Bryant	7-25-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element in particular, supports LID, water reuse and water conservation policies.
<a href="#">GPU-374</a>	Ed Voice	7-29-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element and the importance of including the protection policies contained in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
<a href="#">GPU-375</a>	Ali Lee	8-3-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports the Comments submitted by the Healthy Watersheds Working Group and Plan Alternatives voting chart recommendations, in particular, protection of salmon species and flow of the rivers.
<a href="#">GPU-376</a>	Don Courtemanche	8-10-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element in particular concern for water storage and export and impacts on the Eel River.
<a href="#">GPU-377</a>	Jennifer Kalt	8-18-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element in particular recommendations for Low Impact Development policy revisions (WR-P38, IM26).
<a href="#">GPU-378</a>	Humboldt Watershed Council	8-11-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element in particular recommendations on WR-G2, G5, P2, P5, and P31.
<a href="#">GPU-379</a>	HBMWD	8-4-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element in particular recommendations on water exports as it relates to their operation on the Mad River.
<a href="#">GPU-380</a>	Redway CSD	8-25-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element in particular recommendations for re-use of water, off site storage and conservation funding.
<a href="#">GPU-381</a>	HBMWD	8-25-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Water Resources Element in particular recommendations on water exports as it relates to their operation on the Mad River.
<a href="#">GPU-382</a>	Department of Fish and Game	8-25-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 11, Water Resources Plan Alternatives Chart and cover letter.
<a href="#">GPU-383</a>	HAR	9-06-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 12, Energy Element Plan Alternatives Chart and cover letter.
<a href="#">GPU-384</a>	RLWG	9-08-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 12, Energy Element Plan Alternatives Chart and cover letter.
<a href="#">GPU-385</a>	Jim Zoellick	9-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific policy recommendations on Chapter 12, Energy Element sent by email.
<a href="#">GPU-386</a>	HELP	9-21-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concern over the timing and release of the noise and safety element charts.
<a href="#">GPU-387</a>	Michael McCaskle	9-22-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned regarding the loss of point of sale requirement for energy audits.
<a href="#">GPU-388</a>	HELP	9-22-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concern over the timing and release of the air quality element chart.
<a href="#">GPU-389</a>	Humboldt Bay Keepers	10-5-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments on the Safety Element regarding sea level rise.
<a href="#">GPU-390</a>	Bernice Huston	9-7-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding the noise element as it relates to

Index #	Name	Date Received	Plan Policy	EIR	Summary of Comments
					the noise level in Glendale.
<a href="#">GPU-391</a>	Mary Anderson	9-6-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Supports watershed planning for land use as it relates to water resources.
<a href="#">GPU-392</a>	Sandy Feretto	9-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concern of the designation of USA and WSA for the GSD maps
<a href="#">GPU-393</a>	Bob Froehlich	9-7-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned over the impacts of additional development in southern Humboldt regarding water.
<a href="#">GPU-394</a>	HAR	10-5-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 15, Air Quality Element Plan Alternatives Chart and cover letter.
<a href="#">GPU-395</a>	Healthy Humboldt	10-5-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific Policy recommendations on the Safety Element.
<a href="#">GPU-396</a>	Healthy Watersheds	9-8-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific Policy recommendations on the Water Resources Element.
<a href="#">GPU-397</a>	US Navy	9-8-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerns for noise and safety policies that would prohibit overflight exercises.
<a href="#">GPU-398</a>	NC Growers Assoc.	10-18-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Recommendations regarding agricultural protection policies in the flood zone (Safety Element).
<a href="#">GPU-399</a>	RLWG	10-6-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 15, Air Quality Element Plan Alternatives Chart and cover letter.
<a href="#">GPU-400</a>	RLWG	10-13-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 14, Safety Element Plan Alternatives Chart and cover letter.
<a href="#">GPU-401</a>	HELP	11-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concern over the timing and release of the governance chapters/charts.
<a href="#">GPU-402</a>	Peter Childs	11-11-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concern over the lack of time for public comment on the governance chapters/charts.
<a href="#">GPU-403</a>	Dan Taranto	11-15-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Comments regarding the Governance chapter – evaluation tool to review
<a href="#">GPU-404</a>	Fern Konieczny	11-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Copy of Framework Plan – public participation policies
<a href="#">GPU-405</a>	Fern Konieczny	11-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Citizen’s handbook
<a href="#">GPU-406</a>	HELP	11-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerns about the lack of the 30 day review time for the Governance materials
<a href="#">GPU-407</a>	HELP	11-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerns about the lack of the 30 day review time for the Governance materials
<a href="#">GPU-408</a>	League of Women Voters	11-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		General comments on the Governance Section and process
<a href="#">GPU-409</a>	League of Women Voters	12-07-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter s 1, 2, and 3 for the Governance Plan Alternatives Chart and cover letter.
<a href="#">GPU-410</a>	Public Participation Working Group	12-15-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Specific comments on Chapters 1, 2, and 3 and the overall review process
<a href="#">GPU-411</a>	Public Participation Working Group	12-15-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 3 for the Governance Plan Alternatives Chart.
<a href="#">GPU-412</a>	Tom Grover	11-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Builders Bill of Rights
<a href="#">GPU-413</a>	HAR	11-17-11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Redline comments on Chapter 3 for the Governance Plan Alternatives Chart.
<a href="#">GPU-414</a>	HELP	01-23-12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Questions on purpose of plan and citizen committees
<a href="#">GPU-415</a>	HCSD	02-07-12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Concerned about Lafco policy regarding water service, rezoning specific parcels for multi-family
<a href="#">GPU-416</a>	Kay Escarda	01-26-12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned about public review of Chapters 1, 2, & 3
<a href="#">GPU-417</a>	Peter Childs	02-09-12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Concerned about public involvement process.

## **Attachment B**

Comparison of Key Issues Lists

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4)</b>				
3	Guiding Principles.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	The Board of Supervisors reviewed and approved Guiding Principles 1 – 10 in 2004, and the Planning Commission unanimously added Principals #11 & #12. Further review does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	§1.2 Purposes of a General Plan.	PPWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Adding clarifying text to this section may be appropriate.
2	§1.7 Population	PPWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Population data should be updated with current information, although data comparing rural and urban population growth rates should go into the next Housing Element update (2014), not the introductory section of the General Plan.
3	Text: “Community Plan” (p. 2-1).	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Unique community plan policies are carried forward with the General Plan. Further deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	Public Guide narrative.	PPWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for increased public participation, so adding clarifying text to this section may be appropriate.
2	2.5 Key Terms.	PPWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for increased public education, so adding clarifying text to this section may be appropriate.
3	Text: “Narrative” (p. 3-1).	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	3.3 Background.	PPWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Adding clarifying text to this section may be appropriate.
2	<b>G(overnance) P(olicy)</b> - Gx1. Accessible General Plan.	PPWG	4-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 3-2 of Binder 2 (the Plan Alternatives Comparison Chart).	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for increased public involvement, so adding clarifying text to this section may be appropriate.
2	GP-P4. Community Development Services Role.	LOWV	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Updating the text to describe recent changes to the Planning and Building Department’s name and role seems appropriate.
Note: Northern California Association of Home Builders recommends adding all the Draft General Plan to the Key Issues list				

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
3	GP-P8. Required Findings and Criteria for Amendments.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	4-0 vote; discussion on p. 3-2 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	1452.2 Findings Required.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	GP-P10. Public Participation.	HAR, PPWG	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 3-12 of Binder 2.	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for increased public participation, so adding clarifying text to this item may be appropriate.
2	GP-P11. Accessibility.	PPWG	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 3-15 of Binder 2.	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for increased accessibility to the decision making process, so adding clarifying text to this item may be appropriate.
3	GP-P13. City General Plans.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	GP-S4. Public Education	PPWG	4-0 vote; discussion on p. 3-27 of Binder 2.	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for increased public education, so adding clarifying text to this item may be appropriate.
2	GP-IM1. Progress Reports.	LOWV	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 3-31 of Binder 2.	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for making the General Plan more clear.
2	GP-IM3. Update Schedule.	LOWV	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 3-31 of Binder 2.	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was extensive public comment on the role of Planning Advisory Committees, so further consideration of the Planning Commission's recommendation seems appropriate..
2	GP-IM5. Meaningful Participation.	LOWV	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 3-32 of Binder 2.	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for increased public participation, so adding clarifying text to this item may be appropriate.
3	<i>GP-IM5x1 Participation Evaluations (proposed new PPWG item)</i>	PPWG	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.
2	GP-IM13. Customer Service Training and Satisfaction.	LOWV	4-0 vote; discussion on p. 3-33 of Binder 2.	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for improved customer service from County staff.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
2	GP-IM16. Citizen Handbook.	PPWG	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 3-35 of Binder 2.	At the Planning Commission meetings, there was broad support for increased public participation.
3	<b>G(rowth) P(lanning)</b> -G1. Land Inventory and Service Availability.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-G2. Community Planning Areas.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-G3. Timed Development and Infrastructure Investments	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<del>2612 To maximize the opportunity for local community involvement in planning...</del>	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-P2. Urban Development Areas.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-P3. Urban Levels of Development.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-P4. Urban Service Area.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-P5. Connection to Public Wastewater Systems within Urban Service Areas	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.



**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
2	GP-P6. Use of On-Site Sewage Systems within Urban Development Areas.	HAR, HH, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.2-5 of Binder 2.	The Planning Commission had extensive discussion on this topic. There appears to be broad public support for further review of the Commission's recommendation given that both the Humboldt Association of Realtors and the Healthy Humboldt Coalition are requesting further review..
3	GP-P7. Connection to Public Water Systems.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-P8. Urban Expansion Areas.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-P9. Urban Expansion Area Review.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.2-7 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	GP-P10. Conversion of Resource Lands.	HAR, HH, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.2-8 of Binder 2.	There appears to be broad public support for further review of the Commission's recommendation.
3	GP-P11. Evaluation of Urban Expansion Area Proposals.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-S4. Urban Development Area.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	GP-S5. Urban Service Area.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	GP-S9. Urban Reserve.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote 7-23-09; no discussion recorded. Revised (7-0 vote) 7/22/10.	The GP-S9 that appears in the Draft Plan does not reflect the revisions made on 7/22/10. See pages 4.2-15 and 4.8-13 of Binder 2 for discussion. While further deliberation may not be necessary, the Board should note the Planning Commission recommended language on p. 4.8-13.
3	Urban Lands Section	I <sub>(KB)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-G2. Design and Function.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
3	UL-G4. Community Character.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-P2. Streamlined Subdivision Approval.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-P3. Streamlined Approval of Business Expansion.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub> , I <sub>(KB)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-P4. Support for Micro and Small Business Development.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-P7. Neighborhood and Town Centers.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-P8. Neighborhood Connectivity.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	UL-P9. Historic Structures.	PC	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the proposed changes in the DEIR seems appropriate.
3	UL-P12. Design Review.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-P13. Big Box Design	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-P15. Pedestrian-Friendly Streetscape.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	UL-S1. Allowed Uses in Mixed-Use Areas.	HAR, HH	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	There appears to be broad public support for further review of the Commission's recommendation since both the Humboldt Association of Realtors and the Healthy Humboldt Coalition requested review.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
3	UL-S4. Definition of a “Big-Box” Retail Store.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-S6 Landscaping Standards.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.3-14 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<del>UL-IM1. Streamlined Subdivision Approval.</del>	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-IM2. Neighborhood and Town Centers.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.3-15 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-IM7. Review and Update the Subdivision Ordinance.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-IM8. Review and Update Design Review Ordinance and Areas.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-IM11. Review and Update the Sign Ordinance.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	UL-IM15. Marijuana Cultivation and Dispensary Ordinance.	I <sub>(KB)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<del>UL-IMx. Form-Based Code.</del>	HH	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission’s recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	RL-G1. Rural Residential Development.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	4-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.4-1 of Binder 2.	Based on extensive public comment and Planning Commission discussion, further consideration of the Planning Commission’s majority recommendation seems appropriate.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
3	RL-G2. Rural Land Development.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	RL-P1. Compatible with Resource Production.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	RL-P2. Water Withdrawal.	I <sub>(KB)</sub> , I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.4-4 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	RL-P4. Fire Safety Hazards.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	RL-P5. Road Constraints & Rural Development.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.4-5 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	RL-PX. Density Transfers for Rural Residential Development	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.4-7 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	RL-S3. Cottage Industry Standards.	I <sub>(KB)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.4-9 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	RL-S4. Subdivision Standards.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.4-11 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
<b>2</b>	<b>RL-IX. Increase Inventory of Rural Residential Lands.</b>	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.4-16 of Binder 2.	While they unanimously decided to move forward without this item, the Planning Commission struggled with that decision. Further consideration of the Planning Commission's recommendation seems appropriate.
3	AG-G2. Preservation of Agricultural Lands.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	AG-P5. Conservation of Agricultural Lands.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.5-5 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
3	AG-P6. Agricultural Land Conversion - No Net Loss	HAR, I <sub>(KB)</sub> , I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.5-7 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	AG-P7. Agricultural Production in Conservation Areas.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.5-8 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	AG-Pxxxx. Second Dwellings.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	AG-S1. Subdivision of Planned Agricultural Exclusive (AE) Lands.	PC, HAR, RLWG	3-2-1 vote; discussion on p. 4.5-13 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	AG-S2. Agricultural Grazing (AG): 40 v. 160 acre min. parcel size.	PC, HAR, RLWG	3-3 vote; discussion on p. 4.5-8 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate. Also, Mitigation Measure 3.2.3.1a from DEIR uses the 160 acre version to avoid the loss of agricultural lands from direct conversion to other uses.
3	AG-S3 Subdivision of Planned Agricultural Grazing Lands.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	5-1 vote; discussion on p. 4.5-15 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	AG-S4. Planned Rural Development Program Clustering Incentives.	PC, HAR	Split vote; discussion on p. 4.5-16 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	AG-IM6. Williamson Act Contracts.	I <sub>(KB)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	AG-IMx. Compliance with Regulations.	I <sub>(KB)</sub> , I <sub>(BM)</sub>	5-1 vote; discussion on p. 4.5-20 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
3	FR-G3 Supply of Productive Forestlands	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	4-1 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-1 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	FR-G4. Incompatible and Conflicting Uses.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	4-2 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-2 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	FR-P2. Timber Harvest Plan Review.	PC, HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	3-3 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-3 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	FR-P3. Timber Management Regulations.	PC, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	3-3 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-4 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
2	FR-P8. Protection of High Quality Timberlands.	HH	3-1 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-5 of Binder 2.	With only three (3) Planning Commissioners voting in favor of this item, further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	FR-P9. Residential Construction on TPZ Zoned Parcels.	PC, HAR, RLWG, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	3-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.6-6 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	FR-P10. Substandard Lots and TPZ Rezoning.	PC, HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	3-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.6-8 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	FR-P11. Lot Line Adjustments.	HAR, RLWG	5-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.6-9 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	FR-P15. Conservation Easements and Management.	PC, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	3-2 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-10 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	FR-P17. Forestland-Residential Interface (FRI).	PC, RLWG, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	3-2 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-11 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
1	FR-P19. Maintain Public Roads.	PC	3-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.6-12 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	FR-S1. Planned Rural Development Program Clustering Incentives.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-13 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	FR-S2 Forestland-Residential Interface (FRI).	RLWG	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.6-13 of Binder 2.	Based on extensive public comment and Planning Commission discussion, further consideration of the Planning Commission's majority recommendation seems appropriate. Also see DEIR modifications.
3	FR-S4. Timberland Subdivisions.	RLWG, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	4-1 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-14 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	FR-Sx. Second Units.	HAR, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	FR-IM3. Support Voluntary Conservation Programs.	PC, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	3-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 4.6-19 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	FR-IM4. Merger Ordinance Revisions.	HAR	5-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the proposed changes in the DEIR seems appropriate.
3	FR-IM5. Develop Ordinance to Regulate Land Uses in TPZ lands.	I <sub>(BM)</sub>	5-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	FR-IM7. Implementation of Forestland-Residential Interface (FRI) Overlay	RLWG	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-21 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 16<sup>th</sup> – Part 1. Governance (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and Land Use Element (Chapter 4) (continued)</b>				
1	FR-IMxx. Substandard Lots.	PC	3-2 vote; discussion on p. 4.6-23 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	PL-P2. In-holdings.	PC, HAR	3-3 vote; discussion on p. 4.7-3 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	PL-P3. Acquisitions.	RLWG	6-0; discussion on p. 4.7-4 of Binder 2..	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	PL-P7. Public Access.	PC, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	3-3 vote; discussion on p. 4.7-6 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	Residential Medium Density (RM) Land Use Designation.	HAR	6-0; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	Urban Reserve (UR/) Land Use Designation.	PC, HAR	4-3 vote; discussion on p. 4.8-12 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	Timber Production (T) Land Use Designation.	PC, RLWG, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	2-2-2-1 vote; discussion on p. 4.8-28 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's split vote recommendation seems appropriate.
1	Industrial Timberland - IT Land Use Designation.	PC, HAR, RLWG, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	4-3 vote; discussion on p. 4.8-30 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	<i>Agricultural Exclusive (AE)</i> Land Use Designation.	RLWG, I <sub>(BM)</sub>	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 4.8-32 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	<i>Agricultural Grazing (AG)</i> Land Use Designation.	PC, I <sub>(KB)</sub> , I <sub>(BM)</sub>	3-2-1 vote; discussion on p. 4.8-33 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	Ranchland (AGR) Land Use Designation.	PC, HAR, RLWG	4-3 vote; discussion on p. 4.8-35 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority and the proposed changes in the DEIR seems appropriate.



**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 23<sup>rd</sup> – Building Communities (Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 9)</b>				
3	IS-P2. Prioritization.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	IS-P3. Public infrastructure and Services Standards.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	IS-P4. Requirements for Discretionary Development.	HAR	6-1 vote; discussion on p. 5-3 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	IS-P17. Law Enforcement.	PC, HAR	4-3 vote; discussion on p. 5-8 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	IS-S1. Adequate Public Infrastructure and Services Ordinance.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 5-14 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	IS-S4. Subdivisions Outside of Fire District Boundaries.	PC, HAR	4-2-1 vote; discussion on p. 5-15 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
2	I-S5. Other Development Outside of Fire District Boundaries.	HAR	5-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 5-15 of Binder 2.	Based on extensive public comment and Planning Commission discussion, further consideration of the Planning Commission's majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	IS-S7. Dedication or In-lieu Fee Requirements.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	IS-IM2. Adequate Public infrastructure and Services Standards.	HAR	6-1 vote; discussion on p. 5-18 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 23<sup>rd</sup> – Building Communities (Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 9) (continued)</b>				
3	IS-IM3. Comprehensive Fiscal Impact Study.	HAR	6-1 vote; discussion on p. 5-18 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	IS-IM4. Impact Fees for New Development.	HAR	6-1 vote; discussion on p. 5-18 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	IS-IM5. Fiscal Impact Assessment.	HAR	6-1 vote; discussion on p. 5-18 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	IS-IM8. Infrastructure and Services Funding Sources.	HAR	6-1 vote; discussion on p. 5-19 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	IS-IM14. Storm Drainage Impact Fees.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	IS-IM16. Sheriff's Office Funding Sources.	PC	4-3 vote; discussion on p. 5-21 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	IS-IM18. Fire Impact Fees.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 5-21 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	IS-IM22. County Service Area-Fire Protection.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	IS-IM28. Use of Parkland and Fees.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	T-IM15. Research Possible Monitoring Policy.	PC	3-3 vote; discussion on p. 6-18 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	C-G2. Balanced Transportation Opportunities.	PC	3-2-1 vote; discussion on p. 7-1 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 23<sup>rd</sup> – Building Communities (Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 9) (continued)</b>				
1	C-P1. Orderly Development.	PC	3-2 vote; discussion on p. 7-3 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	C-P2. Consideration of Land Uses in Transportation Decision Making.	PC, HAR	3-2 vote; discussion on p. 7-5 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	C-P3. Consideration of Transportation Impacts in Land Use Decision Making.	PC, HAR	2-2-1 vote; discussion on p. 7-5 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	C-P4. Mitigation Measures.	PC, HAR	3-2 vote; discussion on p. 7-6 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	C-P8. Coordination Between County Agencies.	HAR	5-2 vote; discussion on p. 7-7 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	C-P11. Roadway Functional Classifications.	PC	3-2-2 vote; discussion on p. 7-10 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	C-P12. Multi-modal Level of Service/Quality of Service Criteria.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 7-11 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	C-P14. Efficiency and Capacity.	PC	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 7-11 of Binder 2	Consideration of DEIR modifications seems appropriate.
1	C-P23. Public Transit Service	PC	3-3-1 vote; discussion on p. 7-17 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	C-Pxx. Long Term Transit Plan.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 7-18 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 23<sup>rd</sup> – Building Communities (Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 9) (continued)</b>				
3	C-Pxxx. <del>Long-Term Transit Plan</del> <u>Transit Hubs.</u>	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 7-11 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority. Note correction to policy title.
3	C-P25. Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service Standards.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 7-19 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority. Note correction to policy title.
3	C-P27 Right-of-Way Design Standards.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 7-21 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	C-P34. Bicycle Facilities.	PC	4-3 vote; discussion on p. 7-23 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	C-P35. Development of Railroad Right-of-Ways for Bicycles and Pedestrians.	PC	4-2-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 7-23 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	C-P42. Re-establishing Regional Rail Service.	PC	4-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 7-27 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	C-P47. Frontage Improvements.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 7-29 of Binder 2	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	C-S3. Traffic Thresholds of Significance.	PC, HAR	4-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 7-33 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	C-S9. Prioritization of Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities and Routes.	HAR	5-2 vote; discussion on p. 35 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 23<sup>rd</sup> – Building Communities (Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 9) (continued)</b>				
3	C-IM2. Tracking Road Improvement Requirements.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 7-39 of Binder 2	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	C-IM5. Roadway System Construction.	PC, HAR	4-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 7-40 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	<del>C-IM6. Coordination with Public Health.</del>	PC, HAR	4-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 7-41 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	C-IM10. U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvements	PC, HAR	4-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 7-42 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	ED-G2. Natural Resource Assets.	HAR	5-1-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-1 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	ED-G8 Regulatory and Permit Streamlining.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-5 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	ED-G12. Land Inventory.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-7 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<i>ED-G14. Economic Development of Water Resources. (proposed new HAR item)</i>	HAR	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.
3	<i>ED-G15. Private Sector Support. (proposed new HAR goal)</i>	HAR	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>July 23<sup>rd</sup> – Building Communities (Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 9) (continued)</b>				
3	ED-P2. Job Growth and Workforce.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	ED-P6. Large Format Retail.	PC	4-2-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-10 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	ED-P11. Port Development.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	ED-P14. Industrial and Business Parks.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-15 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	ED-P17 Commercial Development.	HAR	5-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-16 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	ED-P19. Marijuana Industry.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-17 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<del>ED-P20. Existing Businesses.</del>	HAR	6-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-18 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	ED-S2. Large Format Retail.	PC	4-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-21 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	ED-IM1. Economic Development Strategy.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	ED-IM4. Permit Streamlining for Business Growth.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-23 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	ED-IM7. Large Format Retail.	PC	4-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 9-25 of Binder 2	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

<b>Priority Level</b>	<b>Key Issue #</b>	<b>List Source</b>	<b>Planning Commission Votes and Discussion</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>July 23<sup>rd</sup> – Building Communities (Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 9) (continued)</b>				
3	ED-IM8. Transportation and Infrastructure.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<i>ED-IM11. Coordinate Economic Planning. (proposed new HAR item)</i>	HAR	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.
3	<i>ED-IM12. Private Financial Resources. (proposed new HAR item)</i>	HAR	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12)</b>				
3	CO-G3. Conservation and Open Space Program.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	CO-G5. Open Space and Residential Development.	PC	4-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10-3 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's majority recommendation seems appropriate given the diverging opinions of the details from individual Commissioners.
3	CO-P1. Conservation and Open Space Program.	HAR	4-2 vote; discussion on p. 10-4 of Binder 2	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	CO-P1x. Transfer of Development Rights.	HAR	6-1 vote; discussion on p. 10-5 of Binder 2	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	CO-P3. Conservation Easements.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10-5 of Binder 2	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12)</b> (continued)				
1	CO-P4. Greenbelts.	PC	3-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10-8 of Binder 2	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	CO-P6. Develop and Maintain County Parks.	RLWG	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 10-9 of Binder 2	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	CO-P7. Encourage Private Outdoor Recreation.	PC, HAR	3-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10-10 of Binder 2	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	CO-S1. Identification of Local Open Space Plan.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 10-14 of Binder 2	This standard was added to ensure consistency with state law. Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	CO-S2. Identification of the Open Space Action Program.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 10-16 of Binder 2	This standard was added to ensure consistency with state law. Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	CO-S3. Conservation and Open Space Element Consistency Determination.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 10-16 of Binder 2	This standard was modified to ensure consistency with state law. Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	CO-S4. Open Space Consistency Determination on Substandard Parcels.	HAR, RLWG	4-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10-17 of Binder 2	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	CO-S5. Lot Line Adjustments on Resource Lands.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 10-19 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.



**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12) (continued)</b>				
3	BR-Gx. <i>Recognize and Protect Private Property Rights. (proposed new HAR item)</i>	HAR	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.
3	BR-P5. Streamside Management Areas.	RLWG	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 10.3-5 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	BP-P8. Oak Woodlands.	PC, RLWG	4-2-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.3-7 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	BR-S1. Development Excluded from Sensitive Habitat Policies.	RLWG	6-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.3-10 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
2	BR-S5. Streamside Management Areas Defined.	HAR, RLWG	4-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.3-13 of Binder 2.	Based on extensive public comment and Planning Commission discussion, further consideration of the Planning Commission's majority recommendation seems appropriate. The Planning Commission received considerable testimony from state agencies on this item.
2	BR-S7. Development within Streamside Management Areas.	RLWG	6-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.3-20 of Binder 2.	Based on extensive public comment and Planning Commission discussion, further consideration of the Planning Commission's majority recommendation seems appropriate. The Planning Commission received considerable testimony from state agencies on this item.
2	BR-S10. Development Standards for Wetlands and Other Wet Areas.	HAR, RLWG	5-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.3-26 of Binder 2.	Based on extensive public comment and Planning Commission discussion, further consideration of the Planning Commission's majority recommendation seems appropriate. The Planning Commission received considerable testimony from state agencies on this item.
3	BR-S12. Discretionary Review within Oak Woodlands.	RLWG	5-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.3-31 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12)</b> (continued)				
1	BR-IM3. Biological Review and Referral.	PC, RLWG	4-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.3-33 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	BR-IMx2. Wetlands Bank.	HAR, RLWG	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.3-36 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	MR-P2 Right to Mine.	RLWG	5-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.4-3 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	MR-P9. Location of Mineral Haul Routes.	RLWG	5-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.4-10 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	MR-P10. Maintenance of Mineral Haul Routes	RLWG	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.4-10 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	MR-P11. Permit Conditions to Reduce Impacts.	PC	4-3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.4-12 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate. Also see DEIR modifications.
3	MR-P12. Off-Channel Terrace Mining	RLWG	6-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.4-10 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	MR-S5. Forest and Agricultural Borrow Pits.	RLWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	MR-IM4. Combining Zone.	RLWG	7-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.4-21 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	MR-IM6. Fees to Offset Road Use by Vehicles Transporting Mineral Products.	RLWG	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 10.4-21 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12)</b> (continued)				
3	CU-P1. Identification and Protection.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.6-1 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	CU-P2. Consultation.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.6-3 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<i>CU-Pxx. Development Not Viable or Mitigation Cost Prohibitive. (proposed new HAR item)</i>	HAR	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.
3	CU-S2. Confidentiality.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.6-7 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	CU-S5. Assessment and Treatment of Impacts to Significant Historic Structures and Districts.	PC, HAR	3-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.6-13 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	CU-Sxx. Cultural Resource Commission Recommendations & Mitigation.	RLWG	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.6-20 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	CU-Sxxx. CEQA Review.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.6-20 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12)</b> (continued)				
3	CU-IM1. Cultural Resources Ordinance and Advisory Committee.	RLWG	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 10.6-21 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	SR-G1. Scenic Resource Protection.	HAR	5-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.7-1 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	SR-P8. Removal or Relocation of Billboards in Railroad Right-of-Way.	PC	3-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.7-15 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
1	SR-P9. Removal of Illegal Billboards.	PC	3-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.7-15 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	SR-IM1. Mapping of Scenic Areas, Heritage Landscapes and Scenic Roadways.	RLWG	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 10.7-25 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	SR-SXX. Permits for Billboards.	HH	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 10.7-25 of Binder 2.	This one is appropriate for consideration by the Board because there is some question whether the language in the General Plan accurately states the Planning Commission's recommended wording.
3	Review for effect on ministerial permits on resource lands. (unspecified implementation)	RLWG	n/a	In reviewing the Scenic Resources chapter, the Planning Commission discussion demonstrates they considered the effects of the proposed policies on ministerial permits on resource lands, so deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendations does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	WR-G8. Restoration of Impacted River Flows.	PC, HAR	3-3-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 11-4 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's split vote recommendation seems appropriate.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12)</b> (continued)				
3	WR-Gx. <i>Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District. (proposed new HAR item)</i>	HAR	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.
3	WR-P2. Protection for Surface and Groundwater Uses.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 11-9 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-P3. Proactive Protections.	HAR	6-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-P5. Critical Watershed Areas.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 11-13 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-PX1 Requirements for Water Storage in Temperature Impaired Watersheds.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 11-14 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-P7. Cumulative Impacts of Rural Subdivision.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-Px4 Well Permit Applications	HAR	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 11-22 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-Px5. Important Groundwater Recharge Areas.	RLWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-P17. Watershed Planning.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 11-27 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-P19. Regional Water Management Planning.	HAR	6-1 vote; discussion on p. 11-28 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12)</b> (continued)				
3	WR-P24. Restoration of Flow Rates.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 11-30 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-P25. Compliance with Water Code Export Law.	HAR	4-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 11-31 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-Px. Water Export Facilities.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 11-33 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-S2. Development within Critical Water Supply Areas.	RLWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-S3. Development within Critical Watershed Areas.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-S4. Protection of Groundwater Recharge Areas.	RLWG	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 11-40 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-S5. Water Withdrawal Permitting.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 11-41 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-S7. Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) Implementation.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	WR-S12. Water Export Projects on Humboldt County Rivers.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 11-46 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12)</b> (continued)				
3	WR-IM12. Groundwater Management Plans.	RLWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	This Standard reflects state requirements. Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	Energy Element text revisions to inventory all energy sources	I (EB)	n/a	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-G1. Countywide Strategic Energy Planning.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-P1. Land Use and Development Review.	HAR	4-1 vote; discussion on p. 12-3 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-P10. Transportation Management Plans.	HAR	4-0 vote; discussion on p. 12-11 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	E-P11. Energy-efficient Landscape Design.	PC, HAR	3-2 vote; discussion on p. 12-12 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	E-P13. Water Efficiency.	HAR	4-0 vote; discussion on p. 12-13 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-P15. Wind Energy Overlay Zone.	I (EB)	4-0 vote; discussion on p. 12-14 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-S3. Wind Generating Facilities.	I (EB)	5-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 12-20 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-S5. Electrical Transmission Lines.	I (EB)	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 13<sup>th</sup> – Open Space, Water Resources and Energy (Chapters 10, 11 and 12)</b> (continued)				
3	E-S7. Solar Access Protection.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 12-26 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-IM1. Alternative Energy Use.	I (EB)	4-0 vote; discussion on p. 12-28 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-IM5. Wind Energy Development.	I (EB)	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-IM6. Energy-conserving Landscaping.	I (EB)	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-IM9. Develop Incentives for Private Sector.	I (EB)	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 12-31 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	E-IM13. Renewable Energy Permitting Process.	I (EB)	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 12-34 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	Review for portions of the program that should be separate from the General Plan Update (unspecified implementation).	RLWG	Not considered.	In reviewing the Energy Element, the Planning Commission discussion demonstrates they considered whether the items in the General Plan belonged there or in a different document. Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendations does not appear to be a compelling priority.
<b>August 20<sup>th</sup> – Noise, Safety and Air Quality (Chapters 13, 14 and 15)</b>				
2	N-G2. Incompatible Land Uses.	HAR	4-2 vote; discussion on p. 13-1 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	N-P1. Minimize Noise from Stationary and Mobile Sources.	RLWG	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 13-2 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.



**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 20<sup>th</sup> – Noise, Safety and Air Quality (Chapters 13, 14 and 15) (continued)</b>				
2	N-P2. Guide to Land Use Planning.	HAR	4-2 vote; discussion on p. 13-3 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	N-P3. Noise from U.S. 101 and 299.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 13-4 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	N-P4. Protection from Excessive Noise.	RLWG	6-0 vote; discussion on p. 13-4 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	N-S2. Noise Impact Combining Zones.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<i>N-S2x. Noise Impact Combining Zones. (proposed new HAR item)</i>	HAR	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.
3	N-S7. Noise Reduction Requirements for Exterior Areas in Residential Zones.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 13-7 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	N-S8 Short-term Noise Performance Standards (Lmax)	RLWG	6-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 13-8 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<i>N- Sx. Modification or Waiver of Noise Insulation Requirements. . (proposed new HAR item)</i>	HAR	Not considered.	This proposed new item will be presented during the public comment period for this chapter, and it may be deliberated by the Board at their discretion. Items not considered by the Planning Commission may have to be recirculated to them for a recommendation if they involve substantial changes.
1	N-IM7x. Noise Control Ordinance.	PC	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 13-17 of Binder 2.	Consideration of the proposed changes in the DEIR seems appropriate.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 20<sup>th</sup> – Noise, Safety and Air Quality (Chapters 13, 14 and 15) (continued)</b>				
3	S-G4. Fire Risk and Loss.	HAR	7-0 vote; discussion on p. 14-1 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	S-PX2. Prohibition of Residential Subdivisions within Floodplain.	HAR	6-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 14-9 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	S-P21. Development Compatibility.	PC	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Consideration of the proposed changes in the DEIR seems appropriate.
1	S-P22. Airport Land Use Compatibility Criteria.	PC	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Consideration of the proposed changes in the DEIR seems appropriate.
1	S-P26. Hazardous Waste.	PC	3-2 vote; discussion beginning on p. 14-19 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	S-S6. Flood Plains.	HAR	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	<del>S-S7. Tsunamis.</del>	HAR	5-1 vote; discussion beginning on p. 14-26 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
1	S-Imx4. Impervious Cover Limits.	PC, HAR	3 – 3 vote; discussion beginning on p. 14-37 of Binder 2.	Further consideration of the Planning Commission's narrow majority recommendation seems appropriate.
3	AQ-Px1. Transfer of Development Rights	RLWG	5-0 vote; discussion on p. 15-7 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.
3	AQ-P15. Preservation and Replacement of On-site Trees.	RLWG	7-0 vote; no discussion recorded.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Table 1. Comparison of Key Issues Lists**

Priority Level	Key Issue #	List Source	Planning Commission Votes and Discussion	Notes
<b>August 20<sup>th</sup> – Noise, Safety and Air Quality (Chapters 13, 14 and 15) (continued)</b>				
3	AQ-S4. Preservation and Replacement of On-site Trees.	RLWG	5-0 vote; discussion beginning on p. 15-11 of Binder 2.	Deliberation of the Planning Commission's recommendation on this item does not appear to be a compelling priority.

**Priority Level for Board of Supervisors Review**

- 1: Most compelling, the Planning Commission struggled with these items with a narrow majority making the recommendation.
- 2: Moderately compelling; the Planning Commission was clear in their recommendations, but further consideration would likely have broad public support.
- 3: Least compelling.

**List Source Abbreviations:**

- PC: Planning Commission split votes with a < 66% majority  
HAR: Humboldt Association of Realtors  
RLWG: Rural Lands Working Group  
HH: Healthy Humboldt Coalition  
LOWV: League of Women Voters  
PPWG: Public Participation Working Group  
I (Individuals): I<sub>(KB)</sub>: Karen Brooks, I<sub>(BM)</sub>: Brian Mitchell, I<sub>(EB)</sub>: Ellin Beltz

**Policy abbreviations**

- |  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| AG - Agricultural Resources              | MR - Mineral Resources |
| BR - Biological Resources                | N - Noise Element      |
| C - Circulation element                  | PL - Public Lands      |
| CO - Conservation and Open Space         | RL - Rural Lands       |
| CU - Cultural Resources                  | SR - Scenic Resources  |
| E – Energy Element                       | S - Safety Element     |
| ED - Economic Development Element        | T - Telecommunications |
| FR - Forest Resources                    | UL - Urban Lands       |
| IS - Infrastructure and Services Element | WR - Water Resources   |

## **Attachment C**

Summary of the Recommended Key Issues List

## Attachment C

Staff recommended "short list" for policy review by the Board  
July 10, 2012

### July 16<sup>th</sup> Board meeting: Chapters 1, 2 and 3, Setting/Governance and Chapter 4, Land Use Element:

#### Chapter 1, Introduction

- Section 1.2 Purposes of a General Plan
- Section 1.7 Population

#### Chapter 2, Public Guide

- Narrative (Public Guide)
- Section 2.5, Key Terms

#### Chapter 3, Governance

- Narrative (Background, page 3.3)
- GP-Gx1. Accessible General Plan
- GP-P4. Community Development Services Role
- GP-P10. Public Participation
- GP-P11. Accessibility
- GP-S4 Public Education
- GP-IM1. Progress Reports
- GP-IM3. Update Schedule
- GP-IM5. Meaningful Participation
- GP-IM13. Customer Service Training and Satisfaction
- GP-IM16. Citizen Handbook

#### Chapter 4.2, Growth Planning

- GP-P6. Use of On-site Sewage Systems within Urban Development Areas
- GP-P10. Conversion of Resource Lands
- GP-S9. Urban Reserve

#### Section 4.3 Urban Lands

- UL-P9. Historic Structures
- UL-S1. Allowed Uses in Mixed-Use Areas

#### Section 4.4 Rural Lands

- RL-G1. Rural Residential Development
- RL-IMx. Increase Inventory of Rural Residential Lands
- RL-IM1. Inventory of Rural Residential Lands

#### Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources

- AG-S1. Subdivision of Planned Agricultural Exclusive (AE) Lands
- AG-S2. Agricultural Grazing (AG) Land
- AG-S4. Planned Rural Development Program Clustering Incentive Options: Tier 1 clustering program: Density credit

#### Section 4.6 Forest Resources

- FR-P2. Timber Harvest Plan Review
- FR-P3. Timber Management Regulations
- FR-P8. Protection of High Quality Timberlands
- FR-P9. Residential Construction on TPZ Zoned Parcels
- FR-P10. Substandard Lots and TPZ Rezoning
- FR-P15. Conservation Easements and Management
- FR-P17. Forestland-Residential Interface (FRI)

- FR-P19. Maintain Public Roads
- FR-S2 Forestland-Residential Interface (FRI)
- FR-IM3. Support Voluntary Conservation Programs
- FR-IM4 Merger Ordinance Revisions
- FR-IMxx. Substandard Lots

**Section 4.7 Public Lands**

- PL-P2. In-holdings
- PL-P7. Public Access

**Section 4.8 Land Use Classifications**

- UR/ - Urban Reserve Land Use Designation
- AG - Agricultural Grazing Land Use Designation
- AGR - Ranchlands Land Use Designation
- IT - Industrial Timberland Land Use Designation
- T – Timber Land Use Classification (houses as primary versus compatible use)

**July 23<sup>rd</sup> Board meeting: continuation of Chapter 4, Land Use Element and introduction of Building Communities chapters (Chapter 5, Infrastructure, Chapter 6, Telecommunication, Chapter 7, Circulation and Chapter 9, Economic Development):**

**Chapter 5, Infrastructure**

- IS-P17. Law Enforcement
- IS-S4. Subdivisions Outside of Fire District Boundaries
- IS-S5. Other Development Outside of Fire District Boundaries
- IS-IM16. Sheriff’s Office Funding Sources

**Chapter 6, Telecommunications**

- T-IM15. Research Possible Monitoring Policy

**Chapter 7, Circulation**

- C-G2. Balanced Transportation Opportunities
- C-P1. Orderly Development
- C-P2. Consideration of Land Uses in Transportation Decision Making
- C-P3. Consideration of Transportation Impacts in Land Use Decision Making
- C-P4. Mitigation Measures
- C-P11. Roadway Functional Classifications
- C-P14. Efficiency and Capacity
- C-P23. Public Transit Service
- C-P34. Bicycle Facilities
- C-P35. Development of Railroad Right-of-Ways for Bicycles and Pedestrians
- C-P42. Re-establishing Regional Rail Service
- C-S3. Traffic Thresholds of Significance
- C-IM5. Roadway System Construction
- C-IM6. Coordination with the Division of Environmental Health
- C-IM10. U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvements

**Chapter 9, Economic**

- ED-P6. Large Format Retail
- ED-S2. Large Format Retail
- ED-IM7. Large Format Retail

**August 13<sup>th</sup> Board meeting: Continuation of Buildings Communities chapters and introduction of Chapter 10, Open Space, Chapter 11, Water Resources, and Chapter 12, Energy:**

**Section 10.2, Open Space**

- CO-G5. Open Space and Residential Development

- CO-P4. Greenbelts
- CO-P7. Encourage Private Outdoor Recreation

**Section 10.3, Biological Resources**

- BR-P8. Oak Woodlands
- BR-S5. Streamside Management Areas Defined
- BR-S7. Development within Streamside Management Areas
- BR-S10. Development Standards for Wetlands and Other Wet Areas
- BR-IM3 Biological Review and Referral

**Section 10.4, Mineral Resources**

- MR-P11. Permit Conditions to Reduce Impacts

**Section 10.6, Cultural Resources**

- CU-S5. Assessment and Treatment of Impacts to Significant Historic Structures and Districts

**Section 10.7, Scenic Resources**

- SR-P8. Removal or Relocation of Billboards on Public Lands and Right-of-Ways in the Northwestern Pacific Railroad Right-of-Way
- SR-P9. Removal of Illegal Billboards
- SR-SXX. Permits for Billboards

**Chapter 11, Water Resources**

- WR-P25. Compliance with Water Code Export Law
- WR-G8. Restoration of Impacted River Flows

**Chapter 12, Energy Resources**

- E-P11. Energy-efficient Landscape Design

**August 20<sup>th</sup> Board meeting: Continuation of Chapters 10, 11 and 12, and introduction of Chapters 13, Noise, Chapter 14, Safety, and Chapter 15, Air Quality:**

**Chapter 13, Noise**

- N-G2. Incompatible Land Uses
- N-P2. Guide to Land Use Planning
- N-IM7x. Noise Control Ordinance

**Chapter 14, Safety**

- S-Imx4. Impervious Cover Limits
- S-P21. Development Compatibility
- S-P22. Airport Land Use Compatibility Criteria
- S-P26. Hazardous Waste

**Air Quality:**

**No split votes on this chapter therefore there are no items on the “short list”**

**Policy abbreviations**

AG - Agricultural Resources

BR - Biological Resources

C - Circulation element

CO - Conservation and Open Space

CU - Cultural Resources

E – Energy Element

ED - Economic Development Element

FR - Forest Resources

IS - Infrastructure and Services Element

MR - Mineral Resources

N - Noise Element

PL - Public Lands

RL - Rural Lands

SR - Scenic Resources

S - Safety Element

T - Telecommunications

UL - Urban Lands

WR - Water Resources