

Taskforce on Community Planning Group Reform

Draft Findings & Recommendations

Introduction

In April of this year, the Land Use and Housing Committee vote to establish an ad hoc group to review and compile recommendations for revisions to Council Policy 600-24. The task force consisted of eleven members with the following backgrounds: three representative of the Community Planners Committee (Dike Anyiwo, Barry Schultz, Albert Valasquez), two representatives of small businesses (Carla Farley, Angela Landsberg), a current or past member of the Planning Commission (Vicky Granowitz), a current or past employee of the Department Services Department or Planning Department (Dan Normandin), a member of a Mass Transit/Mobility advocacy organization (Maya Rosa), a member of the Building Industry Association (Matt Adams), a member of an Environment/Climate Change advocacy organization (Matthew Vasilakis), and an Urban Infill developer (Rammy Cortez).

The Taskforce on Community Planning Group Reform convened to review existing recommendations that were proposed in the City Audit, the Grand Jury report, and the Democracy in Planning report produced by Circulate San Diego. The Taskforce also considered additional recommendations proposed by its members. The purpose of the Taskforce is to find recommendations that are supported by diverse stakeholders in land use and transportation issues. Then present the consolidated recommendations to the Community Planners Committee (CPC) for a vote, and ultimately present recommendations that have been vetted by the Taskforce and CPC to the City Council.

To make clear the source of the recommendations, the Taskforce intentionally voted on each individual recommendation, sometimes with modifications, instead of consolidating or writing new recommendations from scratch. The below findings and recommendations were supported by a majority of Taskforce members. Recommendations that were not supported by the Taskforce were not included except for two that were tie votes (located in the Other Recommendations section). There are several recommendations with varying levels of overlap that the Taskforce did not consolidate, and therefore there will be repetition if a specific issue was addressed in more than one of the sources of recommendations.

The Grand Jury report included a number of findings. The Taskforce voted on the findings as well as the recommendations, and those findings are included separately below. The recommendations are broken down into major categories and numbered for ease of reference. The original source is also included with each recommendation. Recommendations that have been modified from the original source will be demarcated by **bold** for insertions.

Findings

Any request with a marginal **change to a project, outside the scope of the project, must be validated by city staff if requested by the applicant before it can** form the basis for satisfactory compromises between the developer and the CPG. **Appropriate requests will be further defined in the administrative guidelines.** *(A finding by the Grand Jury with minor modifications by the taskforce.)*

Community Planning Groups that are unable to meet CP 600-24 quorum and attendance requirements should be considered for disbandment or consolidation with a neighboring CPG. While this would be unlikely to increase diversity, as suggested by the Grand Jury, it could facilitate the review and processing of development proposals and community plans. *(A finding by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce.)*

If members of the City Planning Department attended all CPG meetings **when a discretionary land use item is before them then** issues could be resolved in a timely manner. *(A finding by the Grand Jury minor modifications by the taskforce.)*

In some cases, there are insufficient volunteers to allow CPGs to maintain a diverse membership. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

Membership of some CPGs is not sufficiently diverse to represent their communities. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

Neither the CPGs nor the City has recruitment procedures that meet the stated goal of increased diversity. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

Periodic training **of board members would help them** stay current on the Brown Act and changes in City policies. *(A finding by the Grand Jury with minor modifications by the taskforce).*

Policy, procedure, or development issues sometimes arise during CPG meetings, and if left unanswered or incorrectly answered, it can result in confusion or delays. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

San Diego City Council Policy 600-24 DOES NOT provide sufficient guidelines on appropriate additions or modifications to development projects. *(A finding by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce).*

Council Policy 600-24 and the Administrative Guidelines shall be updated to define the acceptable scope of additions and/or modifications that may be requested by a CPG, as well as an appropriate range of ancillary requests. If after reviewing the guidelines the parties still cannot reach an agreement, the Planning Department will make a final determination on the efficacy of a CPG request(s). *(A finding by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce)*

The degree to which members of CPGs are representative of the geographic sections of the community and diverse community interests cannot be determined. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

The work of some Community Planning Groups can be **impaired** by a lack of diverse membership and citizen interest. *(A finding by the Grand Jury with a minor modification by the taskforce).*

DRAFT

Recommendations

Conduct of Meetings

- 1) Ensuring that Community Planning Group (CPG) rosters, annual reports, and meeting minutes contain all the required elements as described in Council Policy 600-24 through proactive monitoring of those documents. *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*
- 2) Establishing a **72-hour** due date for receipt of CPG **formal action** recommendations **to the** Development Services Department Project Managers. *(A recommendation from the City Audit with minor modifications by the taskforce).*
- 3) Developing a formal mechanism for recording and posting CPG project review recommendations, either using a revised annual report that includes all project recommendations or using the Bulletin 620 Distribution Forum revised to include the number of times the applicant presented to the group per project and any major **conditions** to the project proposed by the group. **The reporting mechanism should be uniform and mandatory for all CPGs.** *(A recommendation from the City Audit with minor modifications by the taskforce).*
- 4) Identifying deadlines for CPGs to provide the Planning Department with rosters, minutes, and annual reports, so that the Planning Department can post them online to ensure this information is available to the public in a centralized location *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*
- 5) Including election results in the record retention *requirements.* *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*
- 6) Making member applications mandatory, subject to record retention requirements, **and submitted to the City Clerk.** *(A recommendation from the City Audit with minor modifications by the taskforce.)*
- 7) Require that CPGs determine a maximum duration for meetings, with the ability to extend the time by a majority vote of the CPG. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*
- 8) The Planning Department should coordinate with the Development Services Department to communicate a consistent message to project applicants of the role of CPGs in the project review process. *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*

Development Process

9) CPG meetings, when discretionary land use items are on the agenda, must be taped (either video or audio). *(A recommendation by the taskforce).*

10) For a development project that requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the CPG must submit their recommendations before the public review period closes. If a CPG doesn't provide recommendations during the public review period their recommendations will not be considered for the project. *(A recommendation by the taskforce).*

11) Prioritize action items that inform City decision making in the order of the agenda. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

12) **We determine** that members of the Planning Department staff **should attend when a discretionary land use item is before the CPG.** *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce.)*

DRAFT

Elections

13) Candidates should not be required to have attended more than one meeting in the past 12 months to be eligible to join a CPG board. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

14) Community members should not be required to have attended previous CPG meetings to be eligible to vote. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

15) Define CPG **resident** representation as **renters or homeowners** *(A recommendation from the City Audit with major modifications by the taskforce).*

16) In-person voting should be available for at least two hours and should run at least two hours after the stated time of a CPGs regularly scheduled meeting **if voting can run concurrently with the meeting.** *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning with minor modifications by the taskforce)*

17) Make explicit that CPGs are allowed to use social media. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

18) The City shall develop and implement a robust outreach plan to publicize CGP elections. *(A recommendation by the taskforce).*

Membership

19) **Community Planning Groups that are unable to meet CP 600-24 quorum and attendance requirements should be considered for disbandment or consolidation with a neighboring CPG.** *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce).*

20) Gather relevant demographic data of CPG board members in an audit immediately and require new CGP board members to complete a demographic survey at every election or time of appointment. **The survey should include: Age, Business Owner or Property Owner, Ethnicity, Gender, Length of Residence, Neighborhood, Professional Background, Race, Religion, Renter or Owner, Years of Service on CPGs.** *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning with major modifications by the taskforce).*

21) Require a termed-out board member to wait two years until they can run for their CPG again without exceptions. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*

22) The Planning Department should develop methods and provide resources to improve recruiting that could result in more diverse CPG membership. *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury)*

DRAFT

Training

23) **All** CPG members should be required to complete the eCOW **or** COW training **annually** each time they are reelected or reappointed. *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury with minor modifications by the taskforce).*

24) Provide required ongoing education for decision-making processes and planning. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

25) Requiring annual training for all CPG members, not just new members.

The COW will include:

A mandatory Brown Act training for all members.

A separate advanced curriculum for returning members

There should be specific training at the COW and/or offered during the year which might include:

For Chairs and Vice-Chairs of CPG's and any CPG subcommittee/Ad Hoc Committee.

Advanced training in the Development Review Process specific to CPG responsibilities and limits.

CEQA review training.

An interactive component where new members can learn from experienced CPG members.

(A recommendation from the City Audit with major modifications by the taskforce).

26) The Planning Department, in conjunction with relevant City departments, should provide a comprehensive training program that includes:

- 1) Mandatory training segment focused entirely on project development reviews
- 2) Sessions **for** CPG members and the public to increase understanding of the review process and roles and responsibilities.

(A recommendation from the City Audit with minor modifications by the taskforce).

Oversight

27) CPG members must file statements of economic interest, per the Political Reform Act. *(A recommendation from the taskforce).*

28) Direct the San Diego City **Planning** Department staff to closely monitor CPG actions and provide timely guidance to preclude requests for inappropriate project additions or modifications. *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury with minor modifications by the taskforce).*

33) If a CPG violates the Brown Act then the CPG will be referred to the City Attorney's Office for disciplinary review. *(A recommendation from the taskforce).*

28) Revise the bylaws shell in 600-24. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*

29) The annual report should be a **standardized electronic fill-in template** with expanded components for the annual report, **a member summary would include: number of members and member categories (i.e. homeowners, renters, property owners, and business representatives), turnover, mid-term election** *(A recommendation from the City Audit with major modifications by the taskforce).*

30) The City Auditor should conduct a review of CPGs **every five years**. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning with minor modifications by the taskforce).*

31) The Planning Department, in conjunction with the Development Services Department, should improve its documentation of CPG recommendations and post all CPG documents, including project review recommendations on the City website. *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*

Other Recommendations that the Taskforce deadlocked on:

Councilmembers should appoint new board members when a CPG vacancy occurs in their council district. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*

Consider incorporating appointed positions to CPGs by Councilmembers to provide balance with the elected board members. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*

DRAFT



KEVIN L. FAULCONER

MAYOR

October 10, 2018

Honorable Peter C. Deddeh
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
220 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Grand Jury Report: "San Diego City Community Planning Groups"

Dear Judge Deddeh:

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05(a), (b) and (c), the City of San Diego provides the attached response to the findings and recommendations included in the above-referenced Grand Jury Report.

If you require additional information or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Jessica Lawrence, Director of Finance Policy and Council Affairs, at 619-236-7787.

Sincerely,

Kevin L. Faulconer
Mayor

KLF/jbl

Attachments:

1. City of San Diego Response to San Diego County Grand Jury Report Entitled "San Diego City Community Planning Groups"

cc: Jeff Bryson, Foreperson, 2017/2018 San Diego County Grand Jury
Honorable Council President Myrtle Cole and Members of the City Council
Honorable City Attorney Mara Elliot
Andrea Tevlin, Independent Budget Analyst
Aimee Faucett, Chief of Staff
Kris Michell, Chief Operating Officer
Stacey LoMedico, Assistant Chief Operating Officer
David Graham, Deputy Chief Operating Officer
Mike Hansen, Planning Director
Elyse Lowe, Development Services Director



**City of San Diego Response to San Diego County Grand Jury Report Entitled
"San Diego City Community Planning Groups"**

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05(a), (b) and (c), the City of San Diego provides the following responses to the findings and recommendations that are included in the above-referenced Grand Jury Report:

RESPONSE TO FINDINGS:

Finding 1: The work of some Community Planning Groups (CPGs) can be delayed by a lack of diverse membership and citizen interest.

Response: The City partially disagrees with the Grand Jury's finding. City staff has not seen any evidence that a lack of diversity on CPGs has created project delays. Furthermore, CPGs are independent self-governing organizations which are voluntarily created and maintained by members of communities within the City. Council Policy 600-24 recognizes CPGs as "private organizations" and establishes minimum operating standards for CPGs to follow in order to maintain their status as an advisory body to the City. Article III of Council Policy 600-24 as well as the Administrative Guidelines include provisions related to CPG membership assuring representation of diverse community interests. Specific categories of membership are further defined in each of the CPG bylaws in accordance with the Bylaws Shell included in Council Policy 600-24. Since the CPGs are private organizations, it is up to each of them to ensure compliance with their Bylaws. Council Policy 600-24 recognizes that City staff can act as a resource to CPGs however it does not establish oversight responsibilities for the City. The City does not direct or recommend the election or removal of individual members of a CPG.

Finding 2: The degree to which members of CPGs are representative of the geographic sections of the community and diverse community interests cannot be determined.

Response: The City partially disagrees with the Grand Jury's finding. CPGs provide the City's Planning Department with up-to-date membership rosters each year following the CPG elections. However, the CPGs are independent, self-governing organizations and while a majority provide comprehensive rosters which include information pertaining to the representation of its members, others only provide basic contact information. Council Policy 600-24 does not include a requirement that the City determine the degree to which members of each CPG represent diverse community interests. The CPGs are required to determine that each candidate has met the applicable eligibility requirements. Since CPGs are private organizations it is incumbent upon them that they self-report.

Finding 3: Selective consolidation of some CPGs in adjacent areas could, in some cases, increase diversity and facilitate the review and processing of development proposals and community plans.

Response: The City agrees with the Grand Jury's finding. See Response to Recommendation 18-01 below.

Finding 4: San Diego City Council Policy 600-24 Guidelines provide sufficient guidance on inappropriate additions or modifications.

Response: The City agrees with the Grand Jury's finding.

**City of San Diego Response to San Diego County Grand Jury Report Entitled
"San Diego City Community Planning Groups"**

Finding 5: If a request with a marginal relation to a project occurs, it can either be resolved by the city staff without significant delay in the process or form the basis for satisfactory compromises between the developer and the CPG.

Response: The City agrees with the Grand Jury's finding.

Finding 6: Membership of some CPGs is not sufficiently diverse to represent their communities.

Response: The City partially disagrees with the Grand Jury's finding. CPGs are independent, self-governing organizations which must adhere to Council Policy 600-24 to be recognized by the City Council. Article III of Council Policy 600-24 includes provisions related to assuring a diverse membership representing community interests. Specific categories of membership are further defined in each of the CPG bylaws in accordance with the Bylaws Shell included in Council Policy 600-24. The City does not direct or recommend the election of specific individual members. City staff does recognize that diversity amongst certain CPGs can be improved and per Council Policy 600-24, is available as a resource to assist the CPGs with their efforts.

Finding 7: In some cases, there are insufficient volunteers to allow CPGs to maintain a diverse membership.

Response: The City partially disagrees with the Grand Jury's finding. In accordance with Council Policy 600-24, members of CPGs shall, to the extent possible, be representative of the various geographic sections of the community and diversified community interests. As independent, self-governing organizations, it is incumbent upon each of the CPGs to actively recruit members to represent the diverse groups which are present within their community and have been identified in Article III, Section 2 of their bylaws. City staff does recognize that diversity amongst certain CPGs can be improved and is available as a resource to assist the CPGs with their efforts.

Finding 8: Neither the CPGs nor the City have recruitment procedures that meet the stated goal of increased diversity.

Response: The City partially disagrees with the Grand Jury's finding. Article V, Section 2 of the Council Policy 600-24 Administrative Guidelines includes recommendations related to publicizing CPG elections to attract a diversity of candidates from various membership categories, including having CPGs publicize elections on their websites, sending email blasts, posting notices at public places, placing notices in community newspapers, as well as utilizing the City's TV Channel (TV24) and the City's website. City staff is available as a resource to assist CPGs with recruitment efforts.

Finding 9: Policy, procedure, or development issues sometimes arise during CPG meetings and if left unanswered or incorrectly answered, can result in unnecessary confusion or delays.

Response: The City partially disagrees with the Grand Jury's finding. The City has established procedures in place to outline the process for development project review by the CPGs and the roles for the development project applicant, CPG members, and the City's Project Manager as they relate to this process. Article VI of Council Policy 600-24 outlines the duties of a CPG when reviewing development projects. Further, the City's Development Services Department Information Bulletin 620 provides detailed guidelines for the coordination of project management with CPGs. The City

**City of San Diego Response to San Diego County Grand Jury Report Entitled
"San Diego City Community Planning Groups"**

recognizes that some development projects are controversial and that issues sometimes arise. Therefore, as outlined in Information Bulletin 620, the City provides the option for the City's Project Manager to attend the CPG meeting in which the project is being heard, given certain criteria. Additionally, the City offers several annual trainings to CPG members and the public outlining the development project review process.

Finding 10: If members of the City Planning Department attended all CPG meetings, issues could be resolved in a timely manner.

Response: The City disagrees with the Grand Jury's finding. Staff from the City's Planning Department are primarily focused on long-range planning. In most instances, questions which arise in the development review process relate to other disciplines (traffic, engineering, environmental, etc), and therefore a single staff member may not be able to address project-related issues. This would require staff from many different disciplines to attend the CPG meetings, similar to the Planning Commission and City Council hearings. It is the responsibility of the project applicant to be able to address any questions/issues related to their proposed project. Consistent with the Development Services Department Information Bulletin 620, the project applicant may request that the assigned Development Project Manager from the Development Services Department attend the CPG meeting to address the City process only. The Development Project Manager is the single point of contact for City status on a development project. However, any discussion of the merits of the project is between the project applicant and the CPG, and would not include the Development Project Manager.

Also, if there are outstanding issues related to a project, the CPG can still move the project forward and make a recommendation on a project with the vote reflecting their concerns regarding the project as presented, including those issues on which there was insufficient information available. Further, the project applicant can choose to move forward to hearing without a CPG recommendation.

Finding 11: The training provided by the City of San Diego – the Community Orientation Workshop (COW) or the electronic version (eCOW) – provides adequate preparation for new CPG members.

Response: The City agrees with the Grand Jury's finding.

Finding 12: Periodic review of training materials would help continuing board members stay current on the Brown Act and changes in City policies.

Response: The City agrees with the Grand Jury's finding.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommendation 18-01: Review Community Planning Group boundaries and determine if consolidation of some CPGs should take place.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented as City staff has reviewed such factors as membership, attendance, voting, geography, and other issues and determined that no further consolidation of CPGs should take place at this time. Staff will continue to monitor the above-listed

**City of San Diego Response to San Diego County Grand Jury Report Entitled
"San Diego City Community Planning Groups"**

factors at the time in which a community goes through the community plan update process and evaluate any potential for boundary changes at that time.

Recommendation 18-02: Determine if the Planning Department should develop methods and provide resources to improve recruiting that could result in more diverse CPG membership.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented as the Planning Department has already taken steps to develop some tools to assist CPGs in both understanding the current makeup of membership within their group and developing a list of potential methods which CPGs can utilize to improve their recruitment process and meet the objective of this recommendation. This includes the creation of a standard template for CPG rosters, which requires each CPG to identify the membership category for every member. Further, the Planning Department is working with the City's Performance and Analytics Department to develop an electronic survey to be sent out to every CPG member citywide to solicit their input on improving and expanding recruitment efforts to encourage diverse representation on CPGs. Because CPGs are independent, self-governing organizations it is their responsibility to determine how to effectively use the tools developed by the Planning Department to implement recruitment efforts.

Recommendation 18-03: Determine if members of the Planning Department staff should attend all CPG meetings.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented as staff from the Planning Department did an evaluation of the staff resources necessary to attend all CPG meetings every month. It was determined that the addition of 7 new Associate Planners would be necessary to perform this function. A preliminary analysis of the costs determined that the current average annual cost including salary and benefits for an Associate Planner is \$106,630. Therefore, there would be an annual budget impact of an additional \$746,410 for the Planning Department to fund these positions. Following this evaluation the Planning Department has determined that this is not an effective way to address the issue.

Per the Planning Department's Work Program, the primary functions of the Department involves maintaining the City's General Plan, preparing comprehensive community plan updates, targeted community plan amendments, as well as multi-disciplinary focused planning for citywide efforts such as housing and climate change. Planning Department staff attend CPG meetings on a quarterly basis to keep them informed of the work that is within the Department's purview. Staff additionally attends CPG meetings and subcommittee meetings on a monthly basis when there is an active community plan update.

Planning Department staff are only involved in project review on Process 4 and Process 5 projects and only focus those reviews on long-range planning issues and therefore would not be able to address a majority of the questions which may arise at a CPG meeting. It is the responsibility of the project applicant to be able to address any questions/issues related to their proposed project. Further, as discussed in the response to Finding 9 above, the City provides the option for the Development Services Department's Project Manager to attend the CPG meeting in which a project is being heard, given certain criteria.

**City of San Diego Response to San Diego County Grand Jury Report Entitled
"San Diego City Community Planning Groups"**

Recommendation 18-04: Consider directing the San Diego City Neighborhood Services Department staff to closely monitor CPG actions and provide timely guidance to preclude requests for inappropriate project additions or modifications.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented as staff from the City's Development Services Department already monitors CPG actions and provides guidance regarding CPG recommendations as provided within policy documents and staff procedures. Further, staff proactively discusses this subject during CPG trainings including the COW, PCOW, and Project Review Trainings. Staff from the Development Services Department and the Planning Department will continue to review the standard documents distributed to both CPGs and applicants to ensure they provide clear and up to date instructions.

Recommendation 18-05: Determine if all CPG members should be required to complete the eCOW training each time they are reelected or reappointed.

Response: The recommendation has been implemented. City staff has determined that it would be beneficial to require that all CPG members either take the eCOW or attend an in-person COW every two years as a refresher.

Notes from CPC meeting on 10.22.19

Motion to support Recommendation #1, #2, #4, #5, #8, but to change “72 hours” in #2 to “Seven calendar days.”

#2 Establishing a **seven calendar day** due date for receipt fo CPG formal action recommendations to the Development Services Department Project Managers.

Vote 25-2 Passed

Motion to support Recommendation #15.

Vote 17-10 Passed

Motion to support Recommendation #18

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to reject Recommendation #19

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to support Recommendation #23 but to remove “annually”.

#23 All CPG members should be required to complete the eCOW or COW training ~~annually~~ each time they are reelected or reappointed.

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to support Recommendation #24 but insert “Planning Department or DSD...”

#24 **Planning Department or DSD will** provide required ongoing education for decision-making processes and planning.

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to Support Recommendation #25 but remove “annual”

25) Requiring ~~annual~~ training for all CPG members, not just new members.

The COW will include:

A mandatory Brown Act training for all members.

A separate advanced curriculum for returning members

There should be specific training at the COW and/or offered during the year which might include:

For Chairs and Vice-Chairs of CPG’s and any CPG subcommittee/Ad Hoc Committee.

Advanced training in the Development Review Process specific to CPG responsibilities and limits.

CEQA review training.

An interactive component where new members can learn from experienced CPG members.

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to Support Recommendation #26 but remove “mandatory” and add “#3 All trainings will be in online or in-person.”

#26 The Planning Department, in conjunction with relevant City departments, should provide a comprehensive training program that includes:

- 1) ~~Mandatory~~ Training segment focused entirely on project development reviews
- 2) Sessions for CPG members and the public to increase understanding of the review process and roles and responsibilities.
- 3) **All trainings will be online or in person.**

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Community Planning Group Operations
Discussion for Community Planners Subcommittee

Reference: Administrative Guide for CP 600-24

Reference: Performance Audit of Community Planning Groups

Chris Nielsen, University Community Chair

7 October 2019

Purpose and Summary

The City Council’s Land Use and Housing Committee held a hearing on April 10, 2019, concerning a Performance Audit of City Planning Groups conducted by the City Auditor in 2018. We examine the Auditor’s report point by point and indicate the resources required to respond to each recommendation. If possible we want to recommend changes that are within the capabilities of CPGs and that have low impact on City staff.

A summary of the responses to the Auditor’s recommendations is given below. “Extra City IT” means that there will be ongoing IT costs to the City if the Auditor recommendation is adopted.

Item	Accept?	Extra City IT?	Notes
1a	Yes		More training administration required
1b	Yes		Acceptance is qualified
1c	Yes		
1d	No		Bylaw revisions need justification
1e	Yes	Yes	
1f	Yes	Yes	Needs a time range for posting
1g	Yes	Yes	
2a	Yes		Revise DSD Form 620
2b	Yes		
3a	Yes	Yes	Web site maintenance / complexity
4a	Yes		Guideline revisions
5a	Yes		Course work development

Auditor's Recommendations

Recommendation #1: CPG transparency, compliance, representation, and performance

The Auditor made seven recommendations:

a.) *Requiring annual training for all CPG members, not just new members.*

Response: **We recommend COW or eCOW training biannually.** We would encourage members to attend or take on-line other DSD training courses such as DSD Projects, CEQA, or Brown Act in order to increase the level of expertise of PG boards.

b.) *Expanding the components for the Annual Report to include a member summary (number of members, turnover, elections), overall summary of project review with voting results, the number of times the applicant presented to the group per project and any major modifications to the project proposed by the group (also see Finding 2).*

Response: **Include Rosters for the beginning and end of the CPG year. Adopt project summary tables only if the following "rules" for counting appearances are used. These rules should be added to the Administrative Guide for CP 600-24.** An "appearance" at the PG should be counted only when it is for a subcommittee recommendation on a project, a 620-vote recommendation on a project before the full PG, or if there is a follow-up or appeal to a denial. Each time a project enters a new phase with a City-required appearance before the PG the "counter" is reset. This would properly account, for example, for a Plan Amendment Initiation followed by a full project recommendation as events to be counted separately.

c.) *Including election results in the record retention requirements.*

Response: **Include the election results in the meeting minutes.**

d.) *Defining Board representation to include a distinct category for renters and consider setting a minimum number of seats for that category.*

Response: **Reject this recommendation without supporting data.** This would require all CPGs to amend their bylaws. The variation in board composition from PG to PG makes a City-wide implementation difficult with a single rule change. Before considering such a change make an attempt to survey the PGs to determine the number of renters on each board. Renters may be 50% but their proper representation on PGs is not clear.

e.) *Making Membership Applications mandatory and subject to record retention requirements.*

Response: **Accept recommendation.** We need a satisfactory solution to record storage.

f.) *Identifying deadlines for CPGs to provide the Planning Department with rosters, minutes, and annual reports, so that the Department post them online to ensure this information is available to the public in a centralized location.*

Response: **Accept recommendation. 60-90 days?** City would have to provide the score keeping.

g.) Ensuring that the CPG rosters, annual reports and meeting minutes contain all the required elements as described in Council Policy 600-24 through proactive monitoring of those documents.

Response: **Accept recommendation.** Changes would require City follow up to ensure compliance or randomly check compliance.

Recommendation #2: Project recommendations

The Auditor made two recommendations:

a.) Develop a formal mechanism for recording and posting CPG project review recommendations either using a revised Annual report that includes all project recommendations or use the Bulletin 620 Distribution form revised to include the number of times the applicant presented to the group per project and any major modifications to the project proposed by the group.

Response: Addressed **above in (1b) if the Annual Report mechanism is chosen.** The DSD Form 620 needs a formal revision in any case.

b.) Establishing a due date for receipt of Community Planning Group recommendations by DSD Project Managers.

Response: **Accept recommendation.** This might be combined with a DSD Form 620 revision. DSD needs to inform the CPG of time-critical due dates for projects with shot-clocks.

Recommendation #3: CPG Performance Analysis

The Auditor made one recommendation:

a.) The Planning Department in conjunction with DSD should improve its documentation of CPG recommendations and post all CPG documents, including project review recommendations, on the City's website.

Response: **Accept recommendation but may require additional IT resources by the City. If the PG is distributing applicant presentation material electronically to the board, it should also be posted on the group's City web site in order to comply with the Brown Act (Admin Guide for CP 600-24, p. 32).**

Recommendation #4: CPG Project Review

The Auditor made one recommendation:

a.) The Planning Department should coordinate with DSD to communicate a consistent message to project applicants on the role of CPGs in the project review process.

Response: **This should be a guideline published by the Development Services Department and endorsed by CPC if necessary.** Applicants frequently do not know when their projects are complete enough for review by CPGs. CPGs in turn need to have consistent rules for telling applicants that their projects are incomplete.

Recommendation #5: CPG Project Recommendations

The Auditor made one recommendation:

a.) The Planning Department in conjunction with relevant City departments should provide a more comprehensive training program that includes 1) A mandatory training segment focused entirely on project development reviews and 2) Sessions open to both CPG members and the public to increase understanding of the review process and roles and responsibilities.

Response: **Accept recommendation.** Staff provides a project review training course already. Given the large number of CPG members this needs to be an “eProject” course as well. Extra resources will be required by the City to develop on-line courses where none are currently offered.

Community Planners Committee

Planning Department • City of San Diego
9485 Aero Drive, MS 413 • San Diego, CA 92123
SDPlanningGroups@sandiego.gov • (619)-235-5200

Tuesday, October 22, 2019
Silver Room, San Diego City Concourse
202 C Street, San Diego

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA -- 6:30-9:00 p.m.

- NOTE: If a Sign Language Interpreter, aids for the visually impaired, or Assisted Listening Devices (ALDs) are required, please contact the Planning Department at (619)533-6307 at least (5) five workdays prior to the meeting date to insure availability. Times assigned for each item are approximate. The order of agenda items may be modified at the beginning of the meeting at the discretion of the Chair.*
- ITEM #1 – 6:30 **CALL TO ORDER / INTRODUCTIONS:** Please turn off or silence mobile devices. Meeting is being recorded.
- ITEM #2 **NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT** - 2 minutes per issue
Identification of issues that are within the jurisdiction of the CPC, but not on the agenda. No discussion or action is permitted, except to establish a subcommittee for study, or place the item on a future agenda.
- ITEM #3 **MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA**
- ITEM #4 **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 27, 2019**
- ITEM #5 – 6:45 **12th UPDATE TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, PHASE II – Action Item.** Rene Mezo, City of San Diego Planning Department, 41 amendments to the Municipal Code are proposed. They will go to Planning Commission on Oct. 24.
- ITEM #6 – 7:45 **COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP REFORM TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS ON REVISIONS TO COUNCIL POLICY 600-24 – Action Item.** Barrett Tetlow, Albert Valasquez, Dike Anyiwo, Barry Schultz, Vicky Granowitz, Dan Normandin, Matt Adams, Maya Rosa, Matthew Vasilakis, Carla Farley, Angela Landsberg, and Rammy Cortez. Councilmember Scott Sherman established a task force on CPG reform, which is requesting CPC input on their recommendations, for inclusion in a report to the Land Use and Housing Committee and City Council.
- ITEM #7 – 8:45 **REPORTS TO CPC:**
- Staff Report
 - Subcommittee Reports
 - Chair’s Report
 - CPC Member Comments

ITEM #8 – 9:00 **ADJOURN TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING, NOVEMBER 26, 2019**

FUTURE ITEMS

Port Master Plan Update (TBD)

Canyon Enhancement Plan (TBD)



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: December 12, 2018

TO: Kyle Elser, Interim City Auditor

FROM: Mike Hansen, Director, Planning Department

SUBJECT: Management Response to the Performance Audit of Community Planning Groups

The City of San Diego (Management) acknowledges the Office of the City Auditor Performance Audit of Community Planning Groups (Audit). Management has a fundamental disagreement with the basis of the Auditor's recommendations that Community Planning Groups (CPGs) are "Service Organizations" and as such, the City delegates certain responsibilities to them. CPGs are independent self-governing organizations which are voluntarily created and maintained by members of communities to provide a forum for members of the public to make land use recommendations to the City. While Management is in disagreement as to the basis in which the Auditors arrived at their conclusions, Management is in agreement that City Council Policy 600-24 should be amended to address each of the recommendations in the Audit.

The following summarizes the recommendations contained in the Audit and the response from Management to the recommendations.

Recommendation #1:

To help ensure CPG transparency, compliance, diverse community representation, and performance, we recommend that the Planning Department develop a proposal for City Council to consider revisions to Council Policy 600-24 and the Administrative Guidelines to Council Policy 600-24 to include, but not limited to:

- A. Requiring annual training for all CPG members, not just new members;
- B. Expanding the components for the Annual Report to include a member summary (number of members, turnover, elections), overall summary of project review with voting results, the number of times the applicant presented to the group per project and any major modifications to the project proposed by the group; (also see Finding 2)
- C. Including election results in the record retention requirements;
- D. Defining Board representation to include a distinct category for renters and consider setting a minimum number of seats for that category;

- E. Making Membership Applications mandatory and subject to record retention requirements.
- F. Identifying deadlines for CPGs to provide the Planning Department with rosters, minutes, and annual reports, so that the Department post them online to ensure this information is available to the public in a centralized location;
- G. Ensuring that the CPG rosters, annual reports and meeting minutes contain all the required elements as described in Council Policy 600-24 through proactive monitoring of those documents.

Management Response: Agree.

Management will develop a proposal for City Council to consider revisions to City Council Policy 600-24 and the Administrative Guidelines to include, but not be limited to, each of the subjects contained within Recommendations 1 A-G.

Target Implementation Date: December 2019

Recommendation 2:

To help ensure CPG transparency, compliance, and performance, we recommend that the Planning Department develop a proposal for City Council to consider revisions to Council Policy 600-24 and the Administrative Guidelines to Council Policy 600-24 to include, but not limited to:

- Developing a formal mechanism for recording and posting CPG project review recommendations either using a revised Annual report that includes all project recommendations or use the Bulletin 620 Distribution form revised to include the number of times the applicant presented to the group per project and any major modifications to the project proposed by the group.
- Establishing a due date for receipt of Community Planning Group recommendations by DSD Project Managers. (Priority 2)

Management Response: Agree.

Management will develop a proposal for City Council to consider revisions to City Council Policy 600-24 and the Administrative Guidelines to include, but not be limited to, each of the subjects contained within Recommendation 2.

Target Implementation Date: December 2019

Recommendation 3:

To ensure the City and other stakeholders have sufficient information to analyze CPG performance and influence, we recommend the following:

The Planning Department in conjunction with DSD should improve its documentation of CPG recommendations and post all CPG documents, including project review recommendations, on the City's website. (Priority 3)

Management Response: Agree.

Management will develop a procedure for CPGs to submit their recommendations in a manner that is readily accessible to the public.

Target Implementation Date: December 2019

Page 3
Kyle Elser, Interim City Auditor
December 12, 2018

Recommendation 4:

To ensure that applicants fully understand the role of CPGs and their impact on the project review process, we recommend the following:

The Planning Department should coordinate with DSD to communicate a consistent message to project applicants on the role of CPGs in the project review process. (Priority 3)

Management Response: Agree.

Management, within Planning Department and Development Services Department, will coordinate with staff to reinforce standard Project Tracking System comments be utilized to provide a consistent message to project applicants in accordance with DSD Information Bulletin 620.

Target Implementation Date: February 2019

Recommendation 5:

To ensure that CPGs do not make unenforceable recommendations, we recommend the following:

The Planning Department in conjunction with relevant City departments should provide a more comprehensive training program that includes:

- A mandatory training segment focused entirely on project development reviews; and
- Sessions open to both CPG members and the public to increase understanding of the review process and roles and responsibilities. (Priority 3)

Management Response: Agree.

Management will work with staff to coordinate a more comprehensive training program to include, but not be limited to, the above-listed subject areas.

Target Implementation Date: May 2019



Mike Hansen, Director
Planning Department

cc: Honorable Mayor Kevin Faulconer
Honorable City Attorney Mara Elliott
Kris Michell, Chief Operating Officer
Stacey LoMedico, Assistant Chief Operating Officer
Erik Caldwell, Interim Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Smart & Sustainable Communities
Ronald Villa, Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Internal Operations
Andrea Tevlin, Independent Budget Analyst
Rolando Charvel, City Comptroller
Elyse Lowe, Director, Development Services Department