

Comparing Recommendations to draft revised Council Policy 600-24, November 2021

Prepared for Community Planners Committee of November 30, 2021

Menu of Options (Original prepared November 2019 by Council District 7)

(Legend: Recommendation **incorporated in whole or part**, **not incorporated**, not applicable)

Each row (x axis) in the matrix below represents one CPG reform recommendation. Each column (y axis) below lists the differences and similarities on each reform recommendation from the various community inputs into this policy process. Starting from the farthest right column and reading towards the left shows the chronological development of the recommendations. Any modifications by the subsequent group to consider the reforms are highlighted in bold or underlined red.

Recommendations

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (modifications from Group B in red and underlined)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
	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. <i>Meeting agendas, minutes, rosters, and annual reports are disclosable public records and must be retained as described in Policy. City will monitor these via annual reports submitted by CPGs.</i>	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.	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. <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i>

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
2	Establishing a seven day due date for receipt of CPG formal action recommendations to the Development Services Department Project Managers. <i>(Minor modifications by the CPC)</i> <i>A CPG must submit its advisory recommendation on a development project, if any, to the City within seven calendar days of the CPG's action and/or recommendation.</i>	Establishing a 72-hour due date for receipt of CPG formal action recommendations to the Development Services Department Project Managers. <i>(Minor modifications by the taskforce)</i>	Establishing a due date for receipt of CPG recommendations to Development Services Department Project Managers. <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i>
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 Form 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. <i>Each CPG must follow a uniform, mandatory process for recording and posting CPG project review recommendations..using a revised annual report or a Bulletin 620 Distribution Form.</i>	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. <i>(A minor modification by the taskforce)</i>	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 modifications to the project proposed by the group. <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i>
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. <i>CPGs will be responsible for posting public documents on their website/ social media platform. The City will endeavor to post CPG actions on the City's website.</i>	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.	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. <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i>

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
5	Including election results in the record retention requirements. <i>Election results are considered official records and must be maintained by the CPGs in accordance with this Policy. Must be part of annual reporting submitted to City Clerk.</i>	Including election results in the record retention requirements.	Including election results in the record retention requirements. <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i>
6	Making member applications mandatory, subject to record retention requirements, and submitted to the City Clerk. <i>Written applications submitted to the CPG by individuals wishing to serve as voting members, and election results, are considered official records and must be maintained by the CPGs in accordance with this Policy</i>	Making member applications mandatory, subject to record retention requirements, and submitted to the City Clerk. <i>(Minor modifications by the taskforce)</i>	Making member applications mandatory, subject to record retention requirements. <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i>
7	Require that each CPG determine a maximum duration for each meeting, with the ability to extend the time by a majority vote of the CPG. <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i> <i>City encourages CPGs to establish a maximum duration of meetings.</i>	Require that CPGs determine a maximum duration for meeting, with the ability to extend the time by a majority vote of the CPG.	Require that CPGs determine a maximum duration for meeting, with the ability to extend the time by a majority vote of the CPG. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>
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. <i>It is the policy of the Council, on behalf of the City, that City representatives consistently inform and educate project applicants of the role of CPGs in the City's project review process.</i>	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.	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. <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i>

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
	Development Process		
9	CPC didn't support this recommendation.	CPG meetings, when discretionary land use items are on the agenda, must be taped (either video or audio). <i>(A recommendation by the taskforce)</i>	
10	For a development project that requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the CPG must submit their comments before the public review period closes. <i>(Major modifications by CPC)</i> <i>For a development project that requires an EIR, a recognized CPG must submit its comments before the public review period closes.</i>	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. <i>(A recommendation by the taskforce)</i>	
11	Prioritize action items that inform City decision-making early in the agenda but preserve the authority of the Chair and the CPG to adjust the agenda. <i>(Major modifications by CPC)</i> <i>The City encourages CPGs to prioritize items in their agendas that inform City decision making as a courtesy when City staff are attending the CPG hearing.</i>	Prioritize action items that inform City decision-making in the order of the agenda.	Prioritize action items that inform City decision-making in the order of the agenda. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>
12	Members of the appropriate City staff should attend when a discretionary land use item is before the CPG. (Minor modifications by CPC) <i>City may monitor CPG agendas to determine whether City staff should attend the meeting.</i>	We determine that members of the Planning Department staff should attend when a discretionary land use item is before the CPG. (Major modifications by the taskforce)	Determine if members of the Planning Department staff should attend all CPG meetings. <i>(A recommendation by the Grand Jury)</i>

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
	Elections		
13	Candidates should not be required to have attended more than two meetings in the past 12 months to be eligible to join a CPG board. <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i> <i>Candidates cannot be required to have attended previous meetings.</i>	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.	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. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>
14	Community members should not be required to have attended previous CPG meetings to be eligible to vote to elect members of the CPG. <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i>	Community members should not be required to have attended previous CPG meetings to be eligible to vote.	Community members should not be required to have attended previous CPG meetings to be eligible to vote. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>
15	Define CPG resident representation as renters or homeowners. <i>Furthermore, for the purpose of ensuring better representation of unique interests, a CPG may create separate "appointed seats."</i>	Define CPG resident representation as renters or homeowners. <i>(Major modifications by the taskforce)</i>	Defining CPG representation to include a distinct category for renters and consider setting a minimum number of seats for that category. <i>(Recommendation from the City Audit)</i>
16	In-person voting should be available for at least two hours and should may run at least two hours concurrently with the meeting. <i>CPGs should adopt procedures to ensure a fair and open process; for example, making voting available for at least two hours at the time and place of the CPG's regularly scheduled meeting.</i>	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. <i>(Minor modifications by the taskforce)</i>	In-person voting should be available for at least two hours and should run at least the two hours after the state time of a CPGs Regularly scheduled meeting. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>
17	Make explicit that CPGs are allowed to use social media, in accordance with the Brown Act. <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i> <i>The City encourages recognized CPGs to use websites and social media accessible to the general public to post meeting agendas, minutes, reports, and general and contact information, provided such use is consistent with the Brown Act – to be maintained by CPGs.</i>	Make explicit that CPGs are allowed to use social media.	Make explicit that CPGs are allowed to use social media. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
18	The City shall develop and implement a robust outreach plan to publicize CGP elections. <i>The City <u>may</u> assist with outreach efforts. CPGs will be required to submit a Public Participation Plan re: how they will endeavor to expand and diversify participation.</i>	The City shall develop and implement a robust outreach plan to publicize CPG elections. <i>(A recommendation by the taskforce).</i>	
	Membership		
19	CPC didn't support this recommendation. <i>If unable to meet quorum for a period of 3 months, City may place CPG in temporary inactive status, to allow the CPG to work through its membership issues to return to active status. If the CPG remains unable to meet quorum and attendance requirements for six consecutive months, then the Mayor may recommend to the City Council that the CPG's recognition be revoked.</i>	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. <i>(Major modifications by the taskforce)</i>	Review Community Planning Group boundaries and determine if consolidation of some CGPs should take place. <i>(A recommendation by the Grand Jury)</i>
20	CPC didn't support this recommendation. <i>CPGs must from time to time complete a demographic survey to ensure voting members and meeting attendees are representative of their community.</i>	Gather relevant demographic data of CPG board members in an audit immediately and require new CPG 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. <i>(Major modifications by the taskforce)</i>	Gather relevant demographic data of CPG board members in an audit immediately and require new CPG board members complete a demographic survey at every election or time of appointment. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>
21	CPC didn't support this recommendation. <i>CPGs may develop procedures for a limited waiving this limitation in service (term limit) after a 6-month effort or if risking falling below minimum number of voting members.</i>	Require a termed-out board member to wait two years until they can run for their CPG again without exceptions.	Require a termed-out board member to wait two years until they can run for their CPG again without exceptions. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
22	The Planning Department should develop methods and provide resources to improve recruiting that could result in more diverse CPG membership. <i>The City may assist with outreach efforts. CPGs will be required to submit a Public Participation Plan re: how they will endeavor to expand and diversify participation.</i>	The Planning Department should develop methods and provide resources to improve recruiting that could result in more diverse CPG membership.	The Planning Department should develop methods and provide resources to improve recruiting that could result in more diverse CPG membership. <i>(A recommendation by the Grand Jury)</i>
	Training		
23	All CPG members should be required to complete the eCOW or COW training each time they are reelected or reappointed. <i>Recognized CPGs must develop operating procedures detailing the training requirements of all CPG voting members to complete the City's formal education program, which is offered online, each year and each time they are elected, re-elected, appointed, or re-appointed.</i>	All CPG members should be required to complete the eCOW or COW training annually each time they are reelected or reappointed. <i>(Minor modifications by the taskforce).</i>	Determine if all CPG members should be required to complete the eCOW training each time they are reelected or reappointed. <i>(A recommendation by the Grand Jury)</i>
24	Planning Department or DSD should provide required ongoing education for decision making processes and planning. <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i> <i>City intends to continue to provide annual training similar to current practices.</i>	Provide required ongoing education for decision making processes and planning.	Provide required ongoing education for decision making processes and planning. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>

	<p style="text-align: center;">Group A</p> <p>Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Group B</p> <p>Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Group C</p> <p>Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).</p>
25	<p>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 CPGs and any CPG subcommittee/Ad Hoc Committee. Advanced training in the Development Review Process specific to CPG responsibilities and limits.</p> <p>CEQA review training. An interactive component where new members can learn from experienced CPG members. <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i> <i>City intends to continue to provide annual training akin to current practices.</i></p>	<p>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 CPGs 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. <i>(Major modifications by the taskforce)</i></p>	<p>Requiring annual training for all CPG members, not just new members. <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i></p>
26	<p>The Planning Department, in conjunction with relevant City departments, should provide a comprehensive training program that includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Mandatory training segment focused entirely on project development reviews. <i>(will be developed)</i> 2) Sessions for CPG members and the public to increase understanding of the review process and roles and responsibilities. 	<p>The Planning Department, in conjunction with relevant City departments, should provide a comprehensive training program that includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <i>(Minor modifications by the taskforce)</i> 	<p>The Planning Department, in conjunction with relevant City departments, should provide a comprehensive training program that includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Mandatory training segment focused entirely on project development reviews. 2) Session open to both CPG members and the public to increase understanding of the review process and roles and responsibilities. <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i>

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
	3) <u>All trainings will be online or in person.</u> <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i>		
	Oversight		
27	<u>The City Attorney should consult with the FPPC to determine if CPG members should file statements of economic interest.</u> <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i> <i>Per implementation of updated Council Policy 600-24 and new status of CPGs, CPG members will not be required to file statements of economic interest.</i>	CPG members must file statements of economic interest, per the Political Reform Act. <i>(A recommendation by the taskforce)</i>	
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.	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. <i>(Minor modifications by the taskforce)</i>	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. <i>(A recommendation from the Grand Jury)</i>
29	CPC didn't support this recommendation.	If a CPG violates the Brown Act then the CPG will be referred to the City Attorney's Office for disciplinary review. <i>(A recommendation from the taskforce)</i> <i>CPGs are expected to ensure good faith, voluntary compliance with the Brown Act and proactively cure violations themselves to prevent legal actions. Furthermore, violating Brown Act risks CPG recognitions being ignored or risk loss of recognition. Individual voting members of a recognized CPG, as well as the group as a whole, could potentially be subject to civil remedies. Civil remedies may include relief to prevent or stop future or ongoing violations of the Brown Act, or to void past actions of a</i>	

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
		<i>CPG, and may in some cases include payment of court costs and attorney's fees.</i>	
30	Revise the bylaws shell in Council Policy 600-24 . <i>Bylaws shell replaced with Terms and Conditions as attachment to revised CP 600-24.</i>	Revise the bylaws shell in 600-24. <i>Bylaws shell replaced with Terms and Conditions as attachment to revised CP 600-24.</i>	Revise the bylaws shell in 600-24. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>
31	The annual report should be a CPC approved 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. The template should include an open comment section. The City should include any software to make the template available on private computers. <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i> <i>Annual report to be required but not by a CPC approved standardized electronic fill-in template.</i>	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. <i>(Major modifications by the taskforce)</i>	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). <i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i>
32	The City Auditor should conduct a review of all City retained CPGs documents every five years. <i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i> <i>The City may conduct an audit from time to time. Council Policy cannot direct the actions of the independent City Auditor.</i>	The City Auditor should conduct a review of CPGs every five years. <i>(Minor modifications by the taskforce)</i>	The City Auditor should conduct a review of CPGs. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>

	Group A Supported by the Community Planners Committee (CPC) (<u>modifications from Group B in red and underlined</u>)	Group B Supported by the CPG Reform Taskforce (modifications from Group C in bold)	Group C Original recommendations from one of the three reports (<i>Grand Jury, Audit Report, Circulate Democracy in Planning</i>).
33	<p>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. The City must provide clear and specific directions to locate all CPG documents.</p> <p><i>(Minor modifications by CPC)</i> <i>City will endeavor to post project review recommendations. CPGs will be responsible for posting their own documents on their website or social media platform.</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p><i>(A recommendation from the City Audit)</i></p>
	<u>Other Recommendations</u>		
	CPC didn't support this recommendation.	The Taskforce deadlocked on this recommendation.	Councilmembers should appoint new board members when a CPG vacancy occurs in their council district. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>
	CPC didn't support this recommendation.	The taskforce deadlocked on this recommendation.	Consider incorporating appointed positions to CPGs by Councilmembers to provide balance with the elected board members. <i>(Recommendation from Democracy in Planning)</i>