

COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
POLICY and PROCEDURE CHANGES
DRAFT Recommendations from CPC

<i>TOPIC</i>	<i>District 1 Draft Proposal</i>	<i>CPC Recommendation</i>	<i>Reasons for CPC Recommendation</i>
Inclusion / Participation			
Demographic Survey	CPGs survey members for demographic info	Accept if “Decline to State” is a response option for each demographic question.	Some CPGs object to this requirement because of privacy issues, and the intimidation of prospective members. This would decrease accessibility of CPGs and will result in fewer candidates for membership.
Ethical / Equitable Inclusive Standards for CPGs	Not currently specified	Accept	Need template from the City, otherwise use current standards in Bylaws Shell
Community Participation and Representation Plan	City will require and approve a plan which is not currently specified.	Accept, but only if criteria for approval are provided	Need to know what’s required and what is “good enough”.

TOPIC	District 1 Draft Proposal	CPC Recommendation	Reasons for CPC Recommendation
Operations			
Planning Dept attendance at meetings	No assigned planner	No. Planners should be accessible, and attend if requested by the chair or project applicant.	The Grand Jury found that if members of the City Planning Department attended all CPG meetings, policy, procedure, or development issues could be resolved in a timely manner. We propose that a planner should be available to attend a CPG meeting for a specific project, when requested by the chair or applicant.
Training of CPG members			
Training	City provides training for COW and other topics	Accept	<p>Meaningful training has been recommended by CPGs / CPC for years.</p> <p>Include Brown Act, Project Review, CEQA Offer these as written/PPT presentations, and on demand via Video / E-learning.</p> <p>Training should include “Where do I find it?” e.g. Municipal Code, Procedures, Required findings.</p>
Certification of Training	CPG maintains record of training	Accept	CPG will retain electronic copies of completion certificates provided by the City.

TOPIC	District 1 Draft Proposal	CPC Recommendation	Reasons for CPC Recommendation
Financial / Clerical / IT			
Website	Terminate City webpages for CPGs	No	<p>The City can provide webpages for agendas and minutes as it presently does, while disclaiming any connection with the content. City support for webpages increases transparency and outreach for CPGs.</p> <p>Costs of a separate website are an unreasonable burden on less-affluent CPGs.</p>
Bank Account	Require CPGs to have bank account	Accept, but only for CPGs that accept City funds. Only require one signature for expenditures because multiple signatures are impractical	<p>Bank fees are an unreasonable expense which unfairly affect less affluent CPGs.</p> <p>This is an excessive restriction of CPGs' ability to manage themselves.</p>
Physical Liability Indemnification	No City support for CPG meeting venues	No	<p>Cost of insurance or payment for a meeting room is an unreasonable expense which unfairly affects less affluent CPGs. The City in the past provided a "Letter of Self-Insurance" to a CPG in lieu of individual liability insurance. Alternative is to drive until you get to a City-owned facility. Current rule states that meetings should be held in the planning area. Potential work around is for the City to get agreement from the School District to host CPG without requiring physical liability coverage.</p>

<i>TOPIC</i>	<i>District 1 Draft Proposal</i>	<i>CPC Recommendation</i>	<i>Reasons for CPC Recommendation</i>
SDPlanninggroups email address	Planning Department will no longer maintain the SDPlanninggroups address	Retain a standard email address, so the City can collect required documents	If the city requires submission of information, such as demographic surveys, rosters, training certification, Terms and Conditions, Representation Plan. etc. then it must retain an address to receive them.
Expense reimbursement	Eliminate expense reimbursement	Maintain expense reimbursement	This is especially important because of new requirements such as Zoom charges and elimination of city staff support, webpages, venue fees, bank account fees, etc. Elimination would reduce opportunity and equality for less affluent communities.
Appeals	Eliminate ability of CPGs to appeal process 2, 3, 4 decisions without a fee	Preserve no-fee appeals.	Appeals are necessary because of inconsistency between Planned Development Overlays, the Land Development Code, Community Plans, and staff decisions or interpretation. If fees are imposed, this will differentially affect less affluent communities.

<i>TOPIC</i>	<i>District 1 Draft Proposal</i>	<i>CPC Recommendation</i>	<i>Reasons for CPC Recommendation</i>
CPG Membership			
Membership on CPG	Only one voting board member per household	No.	This would unfairly restrict participation by interested citizens. There is no data on whether this is even a problem.
Meeting attendance required to vote	No prior meetings required to vote	Accept. Allow CPGs to require registration to vote.	CPGs may require registration to vote, so that eligibility can be determined.
Meeting attendance required for candidacy to the planning group	No prior meetings required for candidacy	CPG should be able to choose to require one meeting or no meetings for candidacy.	<p>Most members of the Planning Commission recommended retaining a meeting requirement at the Jan. 20, 2022 hearing. Candidates for elections should declare candidacy in advance and provide or decline to provide demographic information so that demographic and ballot information can be determined.</p> <p>Many CPG members believe that some familiarity with CPG proceedings is necessary, so that candidates know what a CPG is, and how it operates. If a candidate is committing to serve for 2 to 4 years, it's reasonable to require a small display of interest. Experience has shown attrition of members who are unfamiliar with CPGs.</p>

<i>TOPIC</i>	<i>District 1 Draft Proposal</i>	<i>CPC Recommendation</i>	<i>Reasons for CPC Recommendation</i>
Pro-rata share of seats for renters	City may require quotas for seats for various categories of members	CPGs should work toward equity and accessibility. No quota or share should be required	The emphasis should be on outreach through the required Community Participation Plan.
Required Break in Service	2-year break required	Retain current one-year break	More than one-year would reduce the level of experience on the CPG. Longer breaks discriminate against interested citizens.
Over-term members	Not permitted unless membership drops below 10	No – retain current rule.	This reduces retention of expertise on the CPG and serves no purpose except to penalize or discriminate against some members. Recommend retaining current rule: Over-term membership up to 25% is permitted only if there are insufficient new candidates, and must be elected with 2/3 plurality.
Ballot	Require candidate demographic info on the ballot	No	This would complicate elections, increase costs, and intimidate people from running. Information could include the membership status (resident, business member, property owner), but collection of other information such as occupation, employer, and other qualifications may intimidate candidates and should not be required.