Draft

General Plan Update
Interest Group Meeting
February 6, 2008

Interest Group Committee:

Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth	American Society of Landscape Architects
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Brooke Peterson	American Planning Association
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Dave Shibley	Save Our Land Values
Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Wallace Tucker	SD Coalition for Transportation Choices

County Staff:

Devon Muto (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael(DPLU)
Claudia Anzures(County Counsel)
Eric Lardy(DPLU)
Erik Torkelson(DPLU)
Jimmy Wong(DPLU)

Public at Large:

Chris Anderson
Beverly Baillatt
Brice Bossler
Duane Bright
Brit Coupens
Bill Darnell
Tony Debellis
Carolyn Dorroh
Melanie Fallon
Laura Houle
Christina Grade
James Greco
Ruth Mattes
Paul Nordman
Camille Passan
Doug Paul
Regina Rega
John Rilling
Rikki Schroeda
Brian Siefker
Brian Sigffir
Dede Soto
Dustin Steiner
Stephan Vance
Ron White
Angie Wolf

DRAFT

Agenda Item I: Introductions

Mr. Muto began the meeting with introductions of DPLU staff and Interest Group members.

Agenda Item II: Public Comment

No comment was provided by the public.

Agenda Item III: Action Item, Meeting Minutes from 11/15/2007

The Interest Group voted to approve the November 15, 2007 meeting minutes. Carolyn Chase moved for an extension.

Agenda Item IV: Announcements/ Project Updates

Mr. Muto indicated that the project has made significant progress since the last Interest Group meeting. Mr. Muto stated that the project now has a detailed work schedule which was a critical component in the process of the project.

Mr. Muto explained that the first task on the schedule of hiring a consultant has been completed. Mr. Muto further explained that the County was no longer negotiating contracts with PMC, and instead PBS&J has been contracted to assist in the completion of the General Plan Update project. Mr. Muto stated that PBS&J has had prior experience with General Plan updates and he was pleased to have them working on the project. Mr. Muto further clarified that the role of the consultant was to be a 3rd specialty reviewer.

Mr. Shibley asked what kind of interaction was planned between PBS&J and the advisory groups. Mr. Muto answered that PBS&J will be invited to the meetings when there are critical milestones in the process and also if there is key information for them to present to the advisory groups.

Mr. Muto stated that the project has two major work paths; the first path is the preparation and completion of the text documents and the second path is working on the environmental impact report both of which have been initiated. Mr. Muto explained that some of the elements are currently undergoing technical review such as the Land Use element.

Mr. Muto stressed the importance of having an adequate range of mapping alternatives for the Environmental Impact report. Mr. Muto stated that the County has completed the hybrid map, and are close to completion with the environmentally superior map.

Mr. Pryde asked whether the board of supervisors had directed staff to create the hybrid map. Mr. Muto stated that staff had made the decision to create both the hybrid and environmentally superior map to comply with CEQA standards.

Ms. Peterson followed up by asking whether the decision to create more mapping alternatives was before PBS&J had been contracted. Mr. Muto stated that the decision to create the additional mapping alternatives was made prior to having the consultant under contract.

Ms. Higgins asked whether a draft version of the conservation subdivision ordinance would be available by the next interest group meeting. Mr. Muto stated that staff would like to have a draft prepared by the next meeting if possible.

Mr. Tabb asked if changes had been made to the conservation and subdivision ordinance. Mr. Muto answered that the ordinance has undergone changes, and staff is currently working on resolving some of the issues. Ms. Hollingworth suggested that when the County presents the conservation and subdivision ordinance it do so with both the interest group and steering committee present.

Ms. Higgins asked what timeframe members had to submit comments on the Draft Land Use goals and policies. Mr. Muto stated that comments on the draft element will be due in 6 weeks on March 17, 2008.

Ms. Peterson asked how often the Interest Group will be meeting. Mr. Muto stated that he prefer that the interest group meet quarterly, but bi-monthly maybe more appropriate due to the large amount of upcoming materials.

Mr. Muto gave a brief overview of the current County projects that PBS&J are involved in. Mr. Muto stated that currently PBS&J is involved with Father Joe Villages in Campo, San Vicente dam project, and also DPW Noise monitoring on SR-54 and SR-94. Mr. Muto stated that there is not a concern with a potential conflict of interest, because staff will have the ultimate decision on all issues.

Agenda Item V: Distribute Regional Land Use Element

Mr. Muto stated that the Interest Group would receive a Draft copy of the Regional Land Use Element, and also a goals and policies comparison table at today's meeting.

Ms. Higgins asked if staff had made changes to the original goals and policies. Mr. Muto stated that the original goals and policies have changed. Mr. Muto said that staff had spent time to ensure that the goals and policies were expanded upon to incorporate the appropriate planning principles into the document.

Agenda Item VI: Presentation of Land Use Alternatives

Mr. Muto explained that a lot of effort had been put into the Hybrid Map, and that the maps would be available for viewing after the meeting.

Mr. Pryde asked if the Hybrid Map was on the GP Update website. Mr. Muto stated that the Hybrid, Draft Land Use, and Referral map were available online. Mr. Muto further explained that the Hybrid map was a balance between the Referral map and the Draft Land Use map. Mr. Muto stated that on the Hybrid map staff examined areas that differed between the Draft Land Use and Referral maps, and made decision on what designation should be assigned to the area based on specific planning criteria.

Mr. Tabb asked if the Hybrid Map had been finalized. Mr. Muto answered that the map was undergoing some minor changes due to minor mapping errors, but for the most part the Hybrid map would remain unchanged. Mr. Tabb followed up by asking if any advisory groups had preformed a review on the Hybrid map. Mr. Muto stated that DPLU staff has primarily reviewed the Hybrid map because it has been staff driven. Mr. Muto explained that the Hybrid map was created to provide the County with an alternative option for the environmental review.

Ms. Hollingworth asked if staff could give specific examples of where changes on the maps had occurred. Mr. Muto explained that staff had provided a mapping comparison table to help identify specific locations where designations had been reconsidered. Mr. Muto further clarified that the "areas of difference" were areas where the Draft Land Use and Referral map differed in density levels.

Mr. Adams asked how many land use map alternatives currently exist. Mr. Muto answered that there are currently 4 mapping alternatives, the Referral, Draft Land Use, Hybrid, and Environmentally Superior.

Ms. Messer commented that she was encouraged to see that the project now seemed to be very well organized with a path to completion.

Ms. Higgins asked what the current status of each of the 6 draft elements. Mr. Muto gave a brief overview of the status of each element. The status is as follows:

- Land Use element is currently ready for external review.
- Circulation element will be renamed to the Mobility element, and is currently undergoing internal review.
- Housing element is near completion of an initial draft. Currently Staff is reviewing comments submitted by State HCD.
- Conservation and Open Space element have been combined and requires additional work to the text. It is expected that this will be the last document to undergo technical review.
- Noise element is currently being worked on by the County's consultant, EDAW and will soon undergo a technical review.

Mr. Pryde asked where Global Climate Change is addressed in the General Plan. Mrs. Carmichael stated that goals and policies pertaining to global climate change can be found throughout the General Plan, such as in the Land Use, Circulation and Conservation and Open space elements.

Mr. Pryde recommended that the policies for global climate change be placed under the Safety element due to the limited water supply that the County has available.

Ms. Higgins asked if the safety element would encounter any changes especially after the recent County wide wild fires. Mr. Muto answered that the element has been updated

based on recommendations from local fire authorities as well as state commission and committees.

Ms. Messer recommended that due to the extremely sensitive habitats in the County a biologist be added to the Safety element external technical review.

Agenda Item IV: Village/ Rural Village Boundary

Mr. Muto explained that staff had revisited the Village limit line definition not to change it, but instead to expand upon the definition.

Ms. Hollingworth recommended that the County attempt something similar to what the City of San Diego previously did when they designated areas as future urbanized zones. Mr. Muto stated that the County currently has identified future urbanized areas known as FUDA. Mr. Muto explained that the village limit line is not just a tool to restrict growth but it is another way to apply the department's planning principles.

Mr. Adams stated that the Building Industry Association does not support the idea of a village limit line, and believes that the controversy of the idea would distract attention away from completing the General Plan Update. Mr. Muto stated that more discussion will be necessary on the issues in the near future. Mr. Muto also clarified that the village limit line was already endorsed by the board in 2003.

Ms. Messer stated the concept of the village limit line is not new, and that it can be a used as an effective planning tool.

Mr. Tucker stated that he agreed with the idea of village limit lines, because it prevents developers them from developing urban sprawl.

Mrs. Carmichael explained that the village limit line is a tool when applying standards to different areas such as noise and traffic.

Mr. Tabb recommended that the definition of village limit line should be expanded to include specific plan areas.

Ms. Messer commented that the general plan update process is very detailed oriented, and that it would be good to remind Interest Group members of the history when presenting new documents to the group.

Mr. Muto concluded the meeting by stating that staff will be accepting comments regarding the Land Use element, and that the mapping alternatives were now available on the GP update website.

DRAFT