# GOT A PLANNING PROBLEM? APPOINT A COMMITTEE Worthy Goals, Little Follow-through

### SUMMARY

The 2008-2009 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury (Jury) examined the work of four committees appointed by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to provide assistance in formulating policy with regard to County planning issues. Each committee was appointed as a result of Supervisorial reaction to public frustration with the perceived level of service provided by the Housing & Community Development and the Planning & Development Departments. The County is fortunate to have a significant number of citizens willing to volunteer time and expertise to support these committees. In return for their response to the County's calls for help, these committees were met with passivity from the BOS that could discourage future participation from all but the most ardent citizen volunteers. The Jury found that one of the committees had simply been allowed to disappear without a trace. Another had met its commitment and submitted a report to the BOS, but few recommendations have yet seen the light of day. recommendations, to apply in-lieu fees to all residential development, had been inadequately communicated to the BOS by County staff resulting in what the Jury believes was an ill-informed decision by the BOS. The Jury recommends that the BOS reconsider that recommendation to apply in-lieu fees to all new residential development. The third committee has morphed into a follow-on committee, which, now in its fourth year of operation, is functioning and submitting reports to the Board. In the case of this currently functioning committee, the Jury found that it is comprised of talented people making numerous constructive contributions. But after six years the Planning & Development Department has not adopted a methodology for this committee to establish specific goals, guide its pursuit of these goals, or measure progress toward their achievement. The Jury makes specific recommendations to increase the committee's effectiveness and responsiveness to the BOS.

## BACKGROUND

The Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors (BOS) has a history of establishing committees to assist them in developing policy and processing initiatives related to housing, particularly affordable housing, in the County. Considerable time and talent has been, and is currently being, invested in these committees. The Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury selected four committees, each of which was assigned high profile responsibilities by the BOS, to determine whether their efforts were effectively contributing to the goals established by the Board. The four committees examined were the:

- 1) Housing Advisory Committee (HAC)
- 2) Affordable Housing Policy Committee (AHPC)

- 3) Process Improvement Team (PIT)
- 4) Process Improvement Oversight Committee (PIOC)

## **METHODOLOGY**

The Jury reviewed the charters and directives issued by the BOS to establish the committees and their goals, reviewed minutes of committee meetings, examined the reports issued and presentations made by the committees to the BOS. It also interviewed selected members of the committees, and in the case of the PIOC attended a series of its meetings and examined the documentation relating to the issues under review by that committee. To investigate the process employed by the PIOC to guide its efforts, the Jury: 1) examined the techniques used by Planning & Development and the Committee to select issues/processes for analysis, 2) compared the selected issues with the goals set by the BOS, 3) investigated the methods used by P&D and the committee to analyze the processes associated with their selected issues, 4) examined the structure of the committee, and 5) reviewed how committee issues are communicated to the BOS.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

## **Housing Advisory Committee (HAC)**

In order to address a variety of perceived problems with the affordable housing program, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) conceptually approved the HAC in July 2003 and granted formal approval in October 2003. The HAC was designed around a detailed set of by-laws and a code of ethics with the purpose "...to assist in and make recommendations regarding the development of housing within the County, and affordable housing in particular, through the development of policies, projects, strategies, and programmatic goals and objectives." This was to be achieved through a hierarchy of committees:

- 1) A Steering Committee of some 20+ members meeting on a monthly basis,
- 2) An additional seven subcommittees, meeting not less than bi-monthly, focused on
  - a. Multi-family Housing
  - b. Senior Housing
  - c. Homelessness
  - d. Special Needs Housing
  - e. Farm Worker Housing
  - f. Homeownership
  - g. Workforce Housing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Board Agenda Letter 10/16/03: "Approval and Adoption of Housing Advisory Committee, etc."

3) The entire HAC, chaired by the Housing & Community Development Director, would meet at least quarterly, and report to the BOS on an "as needed basis."

The HAC's first year assignment was to complete a countywide audit for each housing group in the State-mandated Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). Its goal was to develop a baseline for growth and to submit the results to HCD. The Committee would then take the numbers and, working with P&D, identify the resources necessary to accommodate projects to address the housing needs. According to its charter, "These findings will be presented to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration and direction..." During months nine and ten of the first year, the strategy for the second year would be presented to the BOS.

The Grand Jury was unable to locate any evidence that a report was ever submitted to the BOS. The Director of HCD was replaced in January 2007, more than three years after formation of the HAC. Although the HAC was referred to in the 2007-2008 County Operating Budget as "...an advisory body...to the Santa Barbara County HCD and the Board of Supervisors (BOS)", the Jury concluded that this committee had dissolved well prior to that period with nothing to show for its efforts and with no formal notification to the BOS. The 2008-2009 County Budget contains no references to the HAC.

## **Affordable Housing Policy Committee (AHPC)**

In November 2006 in recognition of the continuing problems associated with affordable housing programs, particularly in the oversight of for-sale units, HCD recommended a five-member Stakeholders Advisory Group. This group was to represent the five Supervisorial Districts to "...review the goals, policies and outcomes of the Inclusionary<sup>3</sup> Housing Program and alternatives to the Inclusionary Program."<sup>4</sup> Subsequently renamed the Affordable Housing Policy Committee (AHPC), it convened in December 2006 and submitted its report with 13 recommendations to the BOS in June 2007. County staff recommended acceptance of all 13 AHPC recommendations with the condition that nine of the recommendations required further study by County staff. The BOS, in its turn, rejected one of the Committee recommendations and instructed staff to proceed with either further study or implementation of the remainder. In November 2007 HCD, in conjunction with the County's Planning & Development Department's Long Range Planning Division, prepared a matrix of the 13 AHPC recommendations with an Three of the recommendations had been anticipated schedule for completion. implemented by May 2008. The remaining approved recommendations required modification of the Housing Element of the County General Plan which is scheduled for completion in August 2009.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Inclusionary programs require new residential developments to include some affordable units in the project.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Board Agenda Letter 11/14/2006: "Affordable Housing Compliance Project"

The only recommendation not approved by the BOS either for implementation or further study was AHPC's Recommendation Number 5:

The County must do more, and it should do all that it may do within current legal constraints, to develop new revenue sources earmarked for subsidized affordable rental housing construction and a robust secondary mortgage-financing program. Currently, the Inclusionary Housing Program (IHP) applies only to developments of five or more residential units. Appropriate study and related findings are needed to allow the County to apply the IHP to all housing across the community and more effectively finance affordable housing in all Housing Market Areas. It is strongly recommended that in-lieu fees be based on a matrix of sale price and square footage of the property and be paid at the close of escrow, not at tract map recordation. Further study should explore these incentives.

The County CEO's response to the BOS in support of this recommendation stated: "We believe further study is required prior to making a recommendation on this issue." Nevertheless, the BOS voted to deny the recommendation.

It is the view of the Jury that inherent in the County's commitment to the IHP must be the development of creative approaches to securing additional sources of funding. This particular recommendation appears to offer significant potential for generating that additional funding. Furthermore, a precursor to this recommendation already exists as a proposal in the 2003-2008 County Housing Element, Section V: Housing Goals, ... Goal 1 ... Policy 1.4, Service Worker Housing Policy:

The county shall require that new construction of primary single dwelling units over 5,000 square feet and additions of 500 square feet or more that increase the total square footage of a house to over 5,000 square feet, in the South Coast and Santa Ynez HMAs, (Housing Market Area) pay a fee to offset the disproportionate demand for low wage service workers that dwelling units this size are likely to create.

## And as a part of Policy 1.4, Action 1:

Within one year of adoption of this Element, the county shall consider adopting an ordinance that implements the service worker housing policy and establishes the service worker housing fee.

Initially, it was unclear to the Jury why the BOS did not accept the Affordable Housing Policy Committee recommendation, which is an expansion of the Service Worker Housing Policy. However, after reviewing the recording of the BOS meeting when this item was presented and voted on, the Jury concluded that in its presentation to the Board, the staff did not adequately address the intent and impacts of this recommendation. As a result, the BOS did not have sufficient information necessary to make an informed decision.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Board Agenda Letter June 5, 2007: "Affordable Housing Policy Committee Report, Attachment A"

## **Process Improvement Team (PIT)**

The 1999-2000 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury, having received numerous complaints from citizens, conducted an investigation of the County's Planning & Development Department. It issued some 30 recommendations for improvement, 13 of them focusing on the need for internal process improvement<sup>6</sup> and "streamlining". Responding to multiple Grand Jury reports, and to a variety of perceived internal Department problems, the Assistant Director sponsored the formation of a six-member in-house team in February 2003. Its purpose was to "...analyze the ministerial permit process and develop needed improvements." "Ministerial" describes a governmental decision involving little or no personal judgment by the public official. A building permit is ministerial if the ordinance requiring the permit limits the public official to determining whether the zoning allows the structure to be built in the requested location. The current Jury was told that the term "identify" is interpreted to mean "define" in the sense of translating a process into a flow chart. In its report to the BOS in September 2003, P&D noted that one of the goals for the Permit-Process steering group was to "Flow chart the order of required departmental approvals...."

In July 2003 the BOS received its first report regarding this in-house team's work, "Process improvement for Ministerial Permitting", and, on the recommendation of P&D, formally approved the creation of a Process Improvement Team (PIT) to "...accelerate the implementation of short-term improvements and develop a full implementation plan, including pilot testing, for the medium-term and long-term improvements." This constituted a significant expansion of the initial in-house, six-member team effort. Four steering groups totaling 150+ members were organized into focus areas with the following initial priorities:

- 1. Nature of the Interaction
- 2. Permit Process
- 3. Policies and Zoning Ordinances
- 4. Training, Tools, Supervision and Management

In that same year, the 2002-2003 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury issued a report *CAUGHT IN THE WEB* focusing on P&D. One of that Jury's objectives was "... to examine closely the ministerial permitting process. A ministerial permit is supposedly a simple permit to obtain, requiring only administrative approval, as opposed to a discretionary permit which requires more review, time and costs." That Grand Jury tracked three permit applications through the approval process and found it to be "... slow, frustrating and confusing. The permitting process needs to be further streamlined."

The current Jury has been told repeatedly that the process remains "slow, frustrating and confusing."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Board Agenda Letter 9/25/2007: "Process Improvement Update". P&D defines process improvement as "...a series of actions taken to identify, analyze and improve existing processes within an organization to meet goals and objectives."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Board Agenda Letter July 10, 2003: "Process Improvement for Ministerial Permitting"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Board Agenda Letter September 10, 2003: "Process Improvement for Ministerial Permitting"

## Process Improvement Oversight Committee (PIOC)

Note: This Jury found that much of the quoted language and many of the terms used in the remainder of this report are not easily understood but are used routinely in the planning environment.

Approximately two years after the 2002-2003 Grand Jury report was released, P&D notified the BOS that as a direct result of the Process Improvement Team, P&D had implemented 1) a customer feedback system, 2) a novice training video, 3) guidelines for grading/slope protection and 4) an internal training course. In addition initiatives were under review including grading standards, an application submittal checklist, and the Zoning Ordinance Reformatting Project (ZORP). However, as reported to the BOS in February 2005, 9 the four-steering-group structure was proving to be unwieldy and in May 2005 the BOS approved replacing the PIT with a single Process Improvement Oversight Committee (PIOC) consisting of 25 members, 10 and issued a revised (second) set of priorities:

- 1. Ministerial Permits
- 2. Appeals
- 3. Agriculture
- 4. Customer Relations
- 5. ZORP (Zoning Ordinance Reformat Project)

As the only active committee of the four BOS improvement committees, the PIOC received the most attention from the current Grand Jury. The Jury wishes to thank the Committee Coordinator for being extremely responsive and forthright and for providing a wealth of background information to the Jury relating to Committee progress.

One year after formation of the PIOC, P&D provided an extensive progress report to the BOS based on input from the Committee and received approval to proceed with a new (third) set of priorities:<sup>11</sup>

- "Downshift" agricultural-related LUPs (Land Use Permits) to Zoning Clearances
- Change Development Plan threshold for agricultural-related projects
- Montecito version of ZORP
- Improve inter-departmental coordination...
- "Downshift" appropriate LUPs to Zoning Clearances or Exemptions
- "Downshift" review of certain discretionary applications
- LUPs that follow discretionary approvals
- Streamlined process for projects in the Los Alamos Community Plan Area

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> P&D Memo to BOS February 6, 2005 RE: Process Improvement

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Board Agenda Letter May 12, 2005: "Process Improvement Plan for P&D"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Board Agenda Letter May 11, 2006: "Report on Process Improvement Plan"

In September 2007 P&D submitted another report to the BOS reviewing actions to date.<sup>12</sup> This time, however, rather than requesting approval for yet another set of priorities, P&D advised the BOS that it had decided to focus on:

- 1. Additional noticing improvements
- 2. Shift of some small LUPs to Zoning Clearance
- 3. Shift of some small agriculture-related permits to Zoning Clearances
- 4. Shift of review level for some applications (shifting selected CUP's {Conditional Use Permits} to LUPs)
- 5. Other agriculture-related permits

Despite P&D's changing set of priorities, the Process Improvement Oversight Committee has demonstrated real staying power over the past five years. The members are highly motivated, knowledgeable and forthright with each other and members of the Jury. The Committee contains advocacy groups, architects, neighborhood representatives, and permit expediters. P&D, on behalf of the Committee, issues a detailed quarterly progress report with recommendations to the BOS. The Department's stated approach has been to agendize for PIOC consideration non-controversial issues, which they refer to as "low-hanging fruit", in order to demonstrate success prior to tackling the more difficult, potentially higher payoff, issues facing the County.

With this as a backdrop, the Jury defined the parameters of its investigation to clarify the role of the PIOC and establish performance benchmarks to judge its effectiveness.

#### **Issue/Process Selection**

In April 2003 the Deputy Director, Planning & Development, conducted a written survey of staff members to ascertain their thoughts regarding problems and possible approaches to improving the ministerial permit process from the standpoints of service to customer and internal work environment. The survey addressed over 70 issues, from overall comments relating to customer service down to evaluations of specific department documents. The Jury makes the following general observations:

- It is commendable that this survey was conducted as a first step toward change.
- It appears that the survey was used as an aid in isolating problems for internal review.
- There is no clear indication as to how the survey results translated into the PIOC process.
- No follow-on survey was conducted to measure progress against the initial "problem list".

The Process Improvement Oversight Committee meets on a monthly basis for two hours. The PIOC acts as a "sounding board" for issues that have been raised by P&D. The Jury was told that the PIOC provides P&D and the BOS with some level of assurance that P&D process improvements have external customer input. In the PIOC Draft Meeting Minutes of February 28, 2008, there is evidence that P&D and the PIOC, after three years, still have some concern with their current approach:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Board Agenda Letter September 25, 2007: "Process Improvement Update"

Strategy for focus of Oversight Committee & process improvement efforts – The Committee agreed that it makes sense to go back to the beginning of the process to look at the applications, checklists and preapplication process. We'll discuss these items plus overall priorities & recommendations for work to be done this calendar year.

## Process Improvement Oversight Committee Accomplishments vs. Board of Supervisors' Goals

On March 6, 2007, following four years of update reports to the BOS, P&D issued "Significant Accomplishments and Upcoming Projects", a report including the following list of "significant accomplishments":

## **Continuous Process Improvement**

- Changes are underway<sup>13</sup> to provide customer with project time estimates...
- Changes have been proposed to the follow-up permit process for Conditional Use Permits ...
- Revisions have been proposed to the Coastal Development Permit process ...
- Permits for minor developments ... are in development ...
- Staff completed the Zoning Ordinance Reformatting Project, ...
- The Coastal Zoning Ordinance is in the process of being integrated into the Montecito Land use ...
- The level of information provided to the public has been increased significantly ...
- A new Petroleum Ordinance tightens the regulatory activities ...
- Staff has worked with the Oversight Committee and the Agricultural Advisory Committee on various proposals ... and have been temporarily placed on hold ...
- The Oversight Committee and staff have focused efforts on ministerial permitting, appeals processes, agricultural permitting, customer service and the zoning ordinances. The Department will continue to focus on these areas under the Continuous Process Improvement umbrella.

The Jury was struck by the admission in the P&D statements that after so many years only one of its goals had been fully achieved; and that was the Zoning Ordinance Reformatting Project. This report indicates to the Jury that there was not an effort by P&D, and therefore the PIOC, to develop specific measures of success related to their assigned goals.

This lack of rigor in defining specific goals and developing a system to measure progress toward their attainment is reflected in the ambiguity of the concluding statement of P&D's follow-on status report to the BOS on October 16, 2007:

Some people may believe that the Committee has largely fulfilled its charge relating to the five priorities (Ministerial Permits, Appeals,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Emphasis added

Agriculture permits, Customer Serving (sic) and ZORP) whereas others believe there are many issues that could still be addressed.

If the Department Director who recommended establishing the PIOC and its charge does not know if it has fulfilled its charge, who does?

The 1999-2000 Grand Jury noted in its final recommendation, #30, relative to P&D: No matter what the philosophical split of the BOS, the predictable philosophical division, heavy with political overtones, should stop....

Politics must be put aside if the County is to grow in a way that provides housing and work for its citizens...

It may still be that some level of continuing divisiveness, parochialism, mixed messages, or "don't rock the boat" attitude has found its way into P&D's culture with the result that its approach to process improvement continues in the mode of having "... consciously left more challenging issues for later rounds." <sup>14</sup>

The Jury has observed a number of PIOC meetings and was impressed with the knowledge and enthusiasm of all participants. However, the committee members' conscientious efforts and the P&D staff contributions have not been focused in a way that drives measurably toward achieving the specific goals established by the BOS.

## **Process Analysis**

The PIOC has no written charter or documented process to guide its analysis and efforts. However, the P&D representatives to the PIOC recognize the requirement for flow charts and informed the Jury that flow charts were used to develop the Accela<sup>TM</sup> software system, which is intended to track and manage activities within P&D. Furthermore, the P&D link on the County Website contains a number of flow charts pertaining to the permitting process.

The Jury was provided a list of 21 P&D processes and their flow charts, and the Jury was told that these charts were used to support the development of P&D's software. We attempted to examine the most basic and high-use process charts:

- 1) The Ministerial Process, applicable to projects that are exempt from discretionary review
- 2) The Building & Safety Permit Process

Despite the changing priorities and goals established for the PIOC, emphasis on the ministerial permit process is a common thread through the five-year improvement period. The Jury assumed that this process would by now be well defined, but it is not. On the basis of the chart provided, **this process cannot be navigated**. The deficiencies in this chart were also present in the other charts reviewed.

Section III of the 2003-2008 County Housing Element states that the County has "Introduced a 'fast track' permit process for projects that provide a large number of units

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Board Agenda Letter September 10, 2003: "Process Improvement for Ministerial Permitting"

at affordable levels or for persons with disabilities." In fact, the Jury learned that there is no separate fast track process for these projects.

### **Committee Structure**

Members of the Grand Jury attended four Committee meetings and reviewed the agendas and results of 10 meetings conducted during 2008. A total of 34 different people attended these meetings. In the words of the Committee Coordinator "... the membership is somewhat fluid".

- Although membership in the PIOC is specified as 25, participation from this select group ranged from 11 to 14 people at any particular meeting. This is in contrast to the original 150+ member PIT.
- The overall level of participation was generally consistent at about 13 people per meeting, with a core membership (attending at least half of all meetings) of 11 people from the 25 members.
- The committee agendas and meeting minutes are distributed to 65 people, including all BOS aides.
- Those attending virtually all the meetings included the Committee Chair, the Committee Coordinator, the Executive Director of the Coalition of Labor Agriculture and Business (COLAB), the Director, Development Services (formerly Assistant Director of P&D), a P&D staff member, and a private architect from Santa Barbara. The BOS was rarely represented.

The meetings observed by the Jury were well conducted. The Chair and Coordinator kept to the agenda, the meetings were efficient, all points of view from throughout the County were considered, there was a high comfort level among all participants, the P&D staff offered detailed insights, and consensus was achieved on most issues. We commend these committee members for their involvement and contributions. However, observations on the level of discourse and consensus must be tempered with the realization that P&D has so far:

- limited the discourse to non-controversial issues,
- not effectively engaged other departments that interface with P&D,
- not reached closure on the main goals established for it and the PIOC.

The effectiveness of the PIOC appears to be limited by the level of authority they have been granted and the absence of a disciplined technique to select and analyze the P&D processes.

### **Reporting to the Board of Supervisors**

The PIOC Coordinator and the Director, Development Services have been diligent in submitting reports to the BOS. However, because of a stated reluctance to take on the more controversial or higher payoff issues facing the Department, and the lack of standards against which to report Committee progress, the reports come across as "political documents" that do not, in the opinion of this Jury, distinguish between the wheat and the chaff. Furthermore, the tone and substance of the reports reflect the impression the Jury received from the interviewees – that P&D and the PIOC are more interested in obtaining approval for recommendations than in the recommendations

themselves. This group was not initially formed to engage in a political process; it was formed to engage in process improvement. Its members recognize the realities of the situation, but do not focus on objectively developing concrete quantitative improvements and recommendations that have the potential for high payoff regardless of the perceived response from the BOS.

The Jury learned that the PIOC receives limited support from P&D and is a candidate for the County budget chopping block. The Jury is concerned that the County's failure to support this underutilized resource would further limit progress toward improving a frustrating procedure that has persisted far too long.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Finding 1a

The County established a Housing Advisory Committee of more than 50 members. The Committee never submitted a report to the Board of Supervisors and disappeared without a trace.

## Finding 1b

The Board of Supervisors and the Chief Executive Officer failed to follow through on the progress of the committee.

## Finding 2a

The County Chief Executive Officer recommended further study of the Affordable Housing Policy Committee Recommendation 5, to apply in-lieu fees to all residential development, including those with fewer than five units.

## Finding 2b

The presentation of Affordable Housing Policy Committee Recommendation 5, to apply in-lieu fees to all residential development, to the Board of Supervisors did not adequately present the intent and significance of the recommendation.

## Finding 2c

The County Board of Supervisors denied the staff's recommendation to study the application of in-lieu fees to all residential development (AHPC Recommendation 5), and the matter was dropped.

### Recommendation 2

That the County Board of Supervisors request a comprehensive staff presentation as the basis for reconsidering Recommendation 5 from the Affordable Housing Policy Committee to apply variable in-lieu fees to all residential development.

## Finding 3a

The Planning & Development Department conducted an internal survey in April 2003 to determine staff perceptions of the extent and seriousness of problems facing the Department.

## Finding 3b

There is no evidence that the original survey results were integrated into the processing used by the Planning & Development Department or Process Improvement Oversight Committee to identify, analyze, and improve the Department's processes.

## Finding 3c

A follow-up survey has not been conducted to determine if staff perceptions have changed.

#### **Recommendation 3**

That the Planning & Development Department conduct a follow-on survey to determine staff's current perceptions of the extent and seriousness of problems still facing the Department and integrate the results into the procedures used by the Planning and Development Department and the Process Improvement Oversight Committee to identify, analyze, and improve the Department's processes.

## Finding 4

Supervisors' representatives rarely attend meetings of the Process Improvement Oversight Committee.

#### **Recommendation 4**

That the Board of Supervisors be represented at all meetings of the Process Improvement Oversight Committee.

### Finding 5

The Planning & Development Department is the primary source of issues for analysis by the Process Improvement Oversight Committee.

#### Recommendation 5

That the Process Improvement Oversight Committee be given additional authority to participate in the selection of issues for analysis.

## Finding 6

The existing Planning & Development Department flow charts are inadequate for defining, analyzing and improving the processes they depict.

### **Recommendation 6**

That the Planning & Development Department and the Process Improvement Oversight Committee use properly constructed process flow charts as the basis for defining, analyzing and improving the processes applicable to the Department.

## Finding 7

The Ministerial Permit Process has been the single consistent area of emphasis selected by the Planning & Development Department for analysis and improvement.

### **Recommendation 7**

That the Planning & Development Department and the Process Improvement Oversight Committee immediately focus on the Ministerial Permit Process for analysis, improvement and closure.

## Finding 8

The Planning & Development Department has not effectively involved interfacing departments in its process improvement efforts.

## **Recommendation 8**

That the Planning & Development Department and the Process Improvement Oversight Committee involve all interfacing departments in the analysis and process improvement effort.

## Finding 9

The Planning & Development Department and the Process Improvement Oversight Committee have a stated policy of focusing on non-controversial subjects when selecting issues for analysis.

#### **Recommendation 9**

That the Planning & Development Department and the Process Improvement Oversight Committee identify problems in the process that require analysis and improvement, without regard to the problem's potential political implications.

### REQUEST FOR RESPONSE

In accordance with *California Penal Code Section 933.05*, each agency and government body affected by or named in this report is requested to respond in writing to the findings and recommendations in a timely manner. The following are the affected agencies for this report, with the mandated response period for each:

## Board of Supervisors – 90 days

Findings 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 2c, 7, 9

Recommendations 2, 7, 9

## County Planning & Development Department – 60 days

Findings 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

Recommendations 3, 6, 7, 8, 9