DRAFT

Steering Committee Minutes
February 2nd, 2008

Steering Committee Members

Mark Price	Alpine	Vern Denham	Pine Valley
Chuck Davis	Bonsall	Lucille Goodman	Pine Valley
Donna Tisdale	Boulevard		
Bev Esry	Campo	Carl Meyer	Potrero
Jim Russell	Fallbrook	Bud Swanson	Rainbow
Robert Frey	Hidden Meadows	Helene Radzik	Ramona
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba	Lora Lowes	Spring Valley
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura	Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Shelver	Julian	Jack Phillips	Valle De Oro
Rick Smith	Lakeside	Oliver Smith	Valley Center
Joe Chism	Pala-Pauma		

Planning Commission

Bryan Woods, Planning Commission

Staff

Devon Muto, Chief
LeAnn Carmichael, Planning Manager
Bob Citrano, Planner III
Eric Lardy, DPLU Staff
Jimmy Wong, DPLU Staff
Claudia Anzures, County Counsel

Public

Andy Washburn	Valley Center CPG
Barbara Pianko	ESDCAR
Charlene Ayers	Ranters Rooste
David Sibbett	Latitude 33 Engineering
DeDe Soto	
Henry Palmer	Twin Oaks
Julie Bugbee	Lakeside
Larry Johnson	Campo/Lake Morena CPG – Vice Chair
Liz Higgins	SDAR
Michael Thometz	MERIT
Y. Sachiko Kohatsu	District 3 – Supervisor Slater-Price
Tom Weber	
Emmet J	Twin Oaks
Mary Allison	East County Property Owners Association

Meeting Commenced at 9:06 a.m.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Woods called the meeting to order and introductions were made, Mr. Muto appreciated the Steering Committee Members for volunteering their time on Saturday and to his staff for organizing the meeting. Mr. Woods mentioned that John Ferguson, longstanding Chair for the Spring Valley Community Planning Group has passed away.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Woods opened the floor for Public Comment. Henry Palmer addressed the group explaining that they should consider what allowing uses By Right means; he presented photos of a Mushroom Growing Facility that was allowed By Right in an A70 Zoning area.

III. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 10, 2007 MINUTES

Mr. Shelver noted that Bob Redding did attend from the Julian Community Planning Group, but did not sit at the table because there was no room. Mr. Woods said that there would be that addition and asked for other comments.

Ms. Goodman made a correction to a quote that was not correctly attributed to her on Page three Paragraph three.

Phillips: Motion to Approve Minutes
Price: Second
Motion Passes: 19-0-0

IV. Announcements/Project Updates

Mr. Muto addressed the group and explained the Schedule, highlighting the completion date of Fall 2010 date. Additionally he informed the group that PBS&J is the consulting firm that was selected to complete the general plan.

Mr. Swanson asked Mr. Muto to explain to the group how the consultant was selected. Mr. Muto explained the County of San Diego's Request for Qualifications process that occurred and that there were five teams that applied, three teams that were interviewed and PBS&J was selected from there.

Questions arose on if the name of PBS&J, and Mr. Muto clarified that PBS&J is the name of the company. He gave descriptions of the two project managers, Kim Howlett and Elwood "Woody" Tescher. He also clarified that they are there to help us take the project through until the end, not reinvent the project.

Mr. Swanson asked if DPLU was in charge of the project still and Mr. Muto confirmed that this is the case.

Mr. Muto explained that in the schedule staff is working on the draft regional elements, and are going to soon start technical review on the entire plan. Mr. Russell asked who the stakeholder review is, and it was clarified that the stakeholder groups are the Steering Committee and Interest Group.

Mr. Muto explained that there two elements starting technical review, Land Use with the distribution of the Draft Land Use Element at following the Steering Committee Meeting, and Safety with some of the fire experts.

Mr. Muto stated that the implementation programs are going to be worked on in the next few months, and that staff wants to get conservation subdivisions back to the group in one of the next meetings

Mr. Muto described that the Draft EIR is one of the next tasks on the schedule, and that the critical path for that is getting the mapping alternatives finalized for traffic, air quality and noise modeling. He then explained that PBS&J has been working on an interim report, preparing existing conditions data into a format for the EIR that the technical analysis can be inserted into when it's available. He described that the steps after that are revisions to the EIR, Agency Review, Public Review and lastly taking the project to hearing.

Mr. Muto stated that we are going to give project updates to the hearing bodies in the middle of this year, and there would be an opportunity for comment to the board at that time.

Mr. Muto went on to describe that PBS&J has some projects in the unincorporated county, and stated that PBS&J is working on Father Joe's Villages - San Vicente Children's Camp, San Diego County Water Authority on the San Vicente Dam Raise Project, a project with DPW on the State Route 54/94 noise monitoring, and lastly a project with the Yuima Municipal Water on the Environmental Assessment/EIR for the Northern Route Pipeline located in the Pauma Valley.

Mr. Woods asked if anyone had questions on the timeline. Mr. Russell commented that there should be more reports to the Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors on specific items, giving the Conservation Subdivision as an example. Mr. Muto responded that hopefully one a year would be enough, but if more are needed then they can happen. Mr. Woods suggested that reports, not official hearings may be a venue to give updates to the hearing bodies.

Mr. Jemmot asked why a progress report is before stakeholder review and revisions are over, he said that the progress report should be after the stakeholder review. Mr. Muto said that the progress report is to make the hearing bodies aware of the process, and that the progress reports are not tied to anything. He stated that if he feels it makes sense to put the progress report after stakeholder review then we might do that.

V. Distribute Regional Land Use Element

Mr. Woods asked if there are any other questions, and there was no response. He indicated that he wanted to switch items VI and VII to get into Village Limit Line/Rural Village Boundary to get into the discussions. He emphasized that the draft lines are not finalized and are arbitrarily drawn by staff.

It was brought up that item 5 was skipped and Mr. Woods asked Mr. Muto to speak on this item. Mr. Muto explained that technical review of the Draft Land Use Element is going to begin today after many months of staff working hard on it. He described that included in the packet would be three copies of the Draft Land Use Element, and a table that compares the Steering Committee and Interest Group's previously endorsed goals and policies to the respective policies in the Draft Land Use Element. He stated that staff would like to see comments from the Steering Committee members in one month.

Mr. Phillips asked if the goals and policies that were previously endorsed by the Steering Committee over many months working on have been change and explained that he has a problem if the intent of 8 years worth of work has been changed. Mr. Muto responded that yes there have been changes, but that he thinks it is more defensible and easier to implement and hopes that the group will reserve judgment until they have read the document.

Mr. Phillips asked if the document handed out is a strikeout underline version. Mr. Muto explained that the Draft Land Use Element is more comprehensive then the Endorsed Goals and Polices, but that there is a comparison chart to be handed out. Mr. Woods commented that he understands where Mr. Phillips is coming from, but that he thinks staff has is making a sincere effort to complete this plan and that they are attempting to retain the intent that was given before.

Mr. Muto did point out that there are some of the Endorsed Goals and Policies that are linked to other elements and are not in the table. Mr. Swanson asked for clarification that the comments are due in one month, and Mr. Muto replied that we are asking for comments on March 3rd. Mr. Woods explained that there is a short time frame, and said that since this is important he hopes people hold special meetings if needed.

Mr. Phillips asked if the feedback is going to be at another Steering Committee meeting, Mr. Muto explained that staff is going to compile all of the comments together after they are turned in and that they will be brought back in strikeout/underline format at another Steering Committee Meeting. Mr. Phillips stated that he feels this is a complete change over the function of the Steering Committee and that these items need to be debated in a public forum.

Mr. Muto replied that the Draft Land Use Element was drafted with the ideas of the Steering Committee in it, but that the committee is too large to work on the entire general plan. Mr. Woods added that the natural progression of this process could have been to meld together the Interest Group and Steering Committees comments.

Mr. Jemmott asked if electronic copies are available and Mr. Muto replied that we can look into making one available. Mr. Esry asked if documents can be sent via fax or e-mail and Mr. Muto conformed that she could. Mr. Muto clarified that this is an initial draft for

Steering Committee Review and that we would like the distribution to reflect that. Ms. Carmichael also noted that to E-mail the document we will need to shrink the size of it and omit some graphics.

Mr. O. Smith stated that he would prefer everything electronic; he also stated that since each group has a monthly meeting cycle that they should get 6 weeks to return the comments with a group decision. Mr. Woods said that since this is so important and staff agrees that we would like extend the deadline for comments to be due in 6 weeks.

Ms. Esry wanted a clarification out from County Counsel because she was told in the past that e-mailing anything other then the agenda and minutes was a violation of the Brown Act. Ms. Anzures said that she is going to check with her colleagues on that item, and she would send something via the planning department.

Mr. O. Smith commented that when he asked for a map of Valley Center from the planning department and he forwarded it to his entire group.

Ms. Lowes commented that it seems to her that the Brown Act does not limit the flow of information, but you can not have discussion in e-mail on these items. Mr. Woods said that he agrees with that and thinks that when County Counsel sends a statement on the subject that it can be resolved.

Mr. Swanson asked for the new date and it was clarified that March 17th was the new date to turn in comments.

Mr. Meyer asked how many interest group meetings there have been, and how many steering committee meetings there have been. Mr. Woods stated that they have been about even since the Interest Group was established, Mr. Meyer asked why they were meeting more times at one point and it was responded that the Interest Group was playing catch up after it was started.

VII. Village Limit Line/Rural Village Boundary

Mr. Woods said that we are going to go to item 7, switching it with item 6. Mr. Muto began to explain the Village Limit Line/Rural Village Boundary Concept and handouts, it was discovered that more handouts were needed and there was a break to make more handouts.

Ms. Radzik asked a question if there had been any more consideration to having joint Steering Committee/Interest Group session to get more understanding. Mr. Muto responded that that is still being considered, but at this time we are just trying to get the project going again, he noted that in the future we can look at having joint sessions.

After the Break Mr. Woods explained that the group is starting again with the Village Limit Line/Rural Village Boundary, with the goal to be done with discussions at 11:00 so people can speak with staff about the maps posted in the hallway. He made sure that everyone had the handouts and asked Mr. Muto to go over the Limit Line/Boundary definitions.

Mr. Muto explained that they have handed out some of these maps as examples, iterated that they are not final lines and is just for discussion purposes. Furthermore he described that we have distributed the previously endorsed definition and the Draft Definitions, which are really just an expansion of the previously endorsed one.

Mr. Muto explained that the Village Limit Lines encompass all areas that new village densities are indented to, but there are some existing areas at village densities that are outside the Village Limit Lines. He further explained that the line helps DPLU direct growth, infrastructure, and civic uses into that area, as well as varying standards for things such as landscaping or roads.

Mr. Russell asked if we can change the definition from "not intented to expand" to "not allowed to expand". Mr. Muto said we can consider it and asked that it be turned in as a comment. He went on to describe the how the Rural Village Boundary was developed. He explained that it encompasses a broader range of land uses, and allows us to identify these key places that we can focus planning efforts and intense uses into those areas. Mr. Muto stated that this is why one of these is a Limit Line and Rural Village Boundary.

Mr. Phillips asked if we are using the Semi-Rural .5 verses VR-2 in this definition, he remembers that this was switched to allow Valle De Oro put their limit line outside of the half acre land use designations. Ms. Carmichael answered that VR-2 is allowed as semi-rural in cases that are already built out.

Mr. Chism asked if there is any attempt to address areas that are located next to casinos that consider themselves urban and how that is fit in the Village Limit Line. Mr. Muto said that the reason to have the Village Limit Line/Rural Village Boundary is so we can say this is where growth should occur, he noted that there are also have policies which address that issue.

Mr. Chism responded that he hears too often the argument that someone is next to a casino so they should be considered urban. Mr. Woods said he agrees and hopes that this would protect that from happening.

Mr. Frey had a question on how this line relates to a Sphere of Influence. Mr. Muto responded that the Sphere is a LAFCO tool that is completely separate from our Village Limit Line and Rural Village Boundary. He added that a Sphere of Influence is LAFCO's suggestion for areas that might make sense to annex into an adjacent city in the future. Mr. Frey clarified that the sphere has no effect unless an annexation occurs. Mr. Muto confirmed this and stated that there are some policies that address annexation in the unincorporated area.

Mr. Neirinckx commented that language which states that Community Planning Areas with only Semi-Rural or Rural Areas will not have a Village Limit Line makes his community nervous. He emphasized that he would like to see protection for Semi-Rural Communities

like Jamul who do not have a Village limit Line and would like the same protection as being outside the Urban Limit Line as they are today.

Mr. Phillips commented that the boundary Valle De Oro shares with Jamul is very important as the County of San Diego mitigated the effects of increased sewer service providing unplanned growth. He explained that the mitigation for that was that the county would not expand sewer service outside the Urban Limit Line in Policies such as I-107. He further expressed his opinion that the Urban Limit Line should be retained, in addition to the definition for the Village Limit Line to plan in the Valle De Oro community.

Mr. Woods stated that he thinks is a situation that should be worked out with staff. Ms. Tisdale expressed her concern with removing the Urban Limit Line and that it would allow more growth. Mr. Russell commented that he agrees that preventing the spread of sewer is important and Mr. Jemmott agreed also.

Mr. Woods suggested that representatives submit comments respective to their own communities with their land use element comments. Mr. Phillips asked what maps they were going to be receiving and Ms. Carmichael responded that each community would be receiving the Draft Land Use Map, Referral Map, Hybrid Map, Referral Maps that show how the Hybrid Map was created and a community handout showing that the Village Limit Line or Rural Village Boundary.

Ms. Esry asked if we are starting over and working on new maps. Mr. Woods clarified that the maps have the same densities as the last iteration and this is a process of going forward.

Mr. Swanson asked if the Board and Staff maps still exist and Mr. Muto clarified that the Board Map is now the Referral map and the Staff map is the Draft Land Use Map. Mr. Muto also explained that the Hybrid map was developed as an alternative for the Environmental Impact report.

Mr. Phillips asked about the handout which states the Hybrid Map containing the Housing Element Sites, Mr. Muto responded that he was not sure if we have been into the Presentation of Land Use alternatives subject and would like to go over the handout if we have. Mr. Woods asked the group for any more questions on the Village Limit Line/Rural Village Boundary before the group started the next item.

Mr. Denham asked if the maps that were provided show the boundary changes, and Ms. Carmichael responded that there are none proposed for Pine Valley.

Ms. Tisdale commended that she would like something that is more firm then the Rural Village Boundary. Mr. Muto responded that she should make recommendations on how Rural Village Boundary can be clarified, but that it is not as clear as the Village Limit Line because it has a broader range of uses and densities. Ms. Tisdale asked if there is going to be an opportunity to complete the update to her community plan and Mr. Muto responded that there will.

Mr. Swanson asked when the Community Plan process would be started. Mr. Muto informed the group that the once the consultant is underway working on the General Plan they would be able to begin working on the Community Plans.

Ms. Lowes asked if the Village Limit Line is a change in wording from the Urban Limit Line, Ms. Carmichael clarified that it is more similar to the country town, adding that the Urban Limit Line is made up of the FUDA/CUDA regional categories which will no longer be used.

Mr. Russell commented that he sees this line as not protecting the Rural Lands, but as a line which looks inward to direct growth within the line.

Mr. Woods asked if there were any more questions on the Village Limit Line/Rural Village Boundaries and then began the next agenda item.

VI. PRESENTATION OF LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Mr. Phillips asked about the section on the Hybrid Map that discusses the Housing Element sites being included and what those sites are. Mr. Muto responded that these are areas that we have made modifications to the Land Use designation to meet our Housing Element Inventory. Additionally he said that most of the changes have been minor increases and most communities have been made aware of these changes. Mr. Phillips asked if there are any sites in his community and Mr. Muto said no there are not.

Ms. Radzik stated that housing sites are a problem in Ramona with its Smart Growth Opportunity Area (SGOA) designation and asked what the meetings with the Ramona Planning Group to refine the town center planning was. She added that Ramona is going to begin working on their Town Center Plan again and would like to see how all of that fits together. Mr. Muto stated that there is a step to define Town Center Planning more in each of the Community Plans. Ms. Carmichael added that the housing element sites are the ones that were discussed with the Ramona CPG in spring.

Ms. Radzik clarified that the Town Center Plan is going to make recommendations on the Ramona Town Center and that she does not know what effect it is going to have on the Community. Mr. Woods stated that he thinks the densities would not be changed with Ramona's Town Center Process, but that how the development occurs would be what changes.

Ms. Radzik asked for clarification on the SANDAG Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOA) and on who has Land Use Authority. LeAnn described that the SGOAs are a tool that SANDAG uses and the County of San Diego has Land Use Authority.

Mr. Muto indicated that he wanted to give an overview of the Land Use Alternatives, answer any questions then allow members of the group to walk around the room and view the maps that are posted on the walls. He described that the hybrid is a blend between the Draft Land Use and Referral Map maps, using ether one of the designations or some combination, but

does not go more or less intensive then those maps. He explained the Mapping Comparison Table that shows the differences on each map and emphasized that none of these maps are what is going for approval, that they are all an alternative for environmental analysis.

Mr. Woods stated that he is going to take public comment then allow county staff to pass out packets and answer any questions.

Mr. Washburn asked if the Hybrid Map is finalized and Mr. Muto confirmed that yes it is, adding that it was not a negotiation, but more a tool for analysis.

Mr. Thometz asked if the community groups were going to draw the Rural Village Boundary in his community, adding that it could be difficult. He also commented that he has had a problem that this process has involved individual land owners asking for specific designations and asked if there is any way to bring back reason into the process with good planning principles.

Mr. Muto responded that there is the environmentally superior map that you will also have an opportunity to comment on. He added that staff is not committed to these maps and that comments are going to be accepted on every area.

Ms. Allison asked how existing Specific Plans are being dealt with, Mr. Muto responded that existing plans are shown as Specific Plan Areas. Additionally, he said Specific Plan Areas that are not approved and have been shown before as a Specific Plan Area have been re-mapped on the General Plan Maps.

Mr. Palmer stated that he suggests staff draws the lines as a starting point, Mr. Muto responded that staff has drawn lines and the groups should use that as a starting point.

Mr. Weber commented that since the process started Borrego Springs has changed planning groups and that many of the people that are on the group side with real estate interests. He stated his concern that the group will approve changes to the map that are not good for Borrego Springs and asked if the maps are being changed at this point, Mr. Muto replied that the maps are not.

Mr. Johnson stated the Jim Bennett is doing a groundwater study and asked if that is going to be part of the EIR. Mr. Muto commented that we have taken groundwater into account in the mapping and it will be incorporated into the Environmental Analysis as much as possible.

Mr. Thometz said he is disappointed that there were not all of the Board Aides at this meeting and that he thinks it is important. Mr. Woods said he does not disagree and Mr. Muto commented that we have been asked to communicate with the Board Aides more frequently.

VIII. NEXT STEPS

Mr. Woods suggested we discuss the next meeting. Mr. Muto stated that we are looking at having another meeting in April and that staff will be sending out the date in an E-mail.

Mr. Phillips asked that any handouts be sent at least a week in advance so there can be discussion of them.

Mr. Woods concluded the meeting, thanked everyone for coming and asked them to remember to pick up their packets.