

From: [Richard Spjut](#)
To: [McClenagan, Laura](#)
Subject: Fwd: "Implied Consent" model and PLN-2019-15831
Date: Thursday, July 09, 2020 1:00:05 PM

Hi Laura,

Sorry, the first one bounced back because I mis-typed your email address.
We spoke briefly on the phone a few minutes ago,
prior to me sending the message where I apologized for the lengthy, initial email.
Thank you for receiving the call and this email.

Sincerely,
Rick

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Richard Spjut <richard.spjut@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jul 9, 2020 at 12:48 PM
Subject: "Implied Consent" model and PLN-2019-15831
To: <planningclerk@co.humboldt.ca.us>, <lmclenagan2@co.humboldt.ca.us>, <tshortridge@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Dear Laura McClenagan and others of the Planning Department whom it concerns,

The purpose of this message is multifold:

1. To communicate an expression of gratitude for your work today during a phone call, to which I was privy. Thank you for your professionalism, courtesy and, in general, work.
2. An expression of gratitude for the work of Tricia Shortidge for PLN-2019-15831. Thank you for the detailed plans and your work.
3. To provide comments regarding the planning process in its current form, as experienced in the meeting on Thursday, July 9th 2020 at 10:00am (Zoom ID 956-8450-3922). I attended this meeting because I received a Public Hearing notice regarding Record Number PLN-2019-15831.
 1. I will restate again to emphasize: **I'm grateful for the details provided in the PLN-2019-15831.** *The timing of the process made it difficult to consume all of the information within the timeframe allotted.* There are many nuances with respect to such a large plan. There are many contingencies that I did not have the resources (primary time) to account for within that time-frame. Our County can provide us with a larger time-frame to view and review materials.
 2. The "implied consent" model carries with it inherent existential risk. What I mean by "implied consent" is that if one has a comment or concern regarding a particular project, one must say something within a(n often abbreviated) time-frame and within a certain context or format.
 1. Californians established "affirmative consent only" (c.f. law signed by Brown 2014) as our consent model. The "implied consent" model of our county's planning department does not align with "affirmative consent

only."

2. As an example of formatting issues, today I did not want to join the Zoom meeting because I was forced to provide an email address, and I did not necessarily know the privacy permissions for that particular meeting. I did not want to share my email with the public. Hence, why I was watching the meeting with a neighbor.
 1. In general, I prefer the Zoom meeting to in-person meetings as there are many, many other issues with in-person meetings that are circumvented by newer teleconferencing technologies.
4. To provide comments regarding PLN-2019-15831, as for the aforementioned reasons, I did not get a chance to voice my concerns (whether out of my mouth or by my own fingers...or via proxy).
 1. I would like the signage referenced on pages 16 and 19 to be added through Park Street, especially between Lindstrom and the terminus of Park Street on the East side.
 2. I would like the signage at Lincoln Ave and New Navy Base Road, especially on the gated, west side of the intersection to read "NO PARKING AT ANY TIME. TOW AWAY ZONE"
 1. Both of the aforementioned spots have been problematic spots in the neighborhood.
 3. What are the plans to enforce these signs? At times, I feel a concern that, if I were to contact the authorities every time there was a suspicious person parked in a place they weren't supposed to be camping...well, the Sheriff or CHP would identify me as someone who takes too much of our law enforcement resources.
 4. What will be done regarding vandalism of the signs? Many signs have been posted on the Samoa peninsula and many of them have suffered the fate of vandalism (either by covering of stickers, spray-paint tagging, or theft of the entire sign).
 5. Yesterday, after a third review of the document, it occurred to me that the proposed Big Lagoon changes relates to issues the BLPC has been having on C Street, and I did not have the time to coordinate attendance of others or point out my thoughts to them. I noticed that, as far as I could tell by the attendee list (and I could be mistaken here), there were no official representatives of the BLPC on hand.

Sincerely,
Richard