

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
December 17, 2002
Revised January 14, 2003

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Allison Rolfe	National Wildlife Federation (<i>Note: Proxy</i>)
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Lynne Baker	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Phil Pryde	SD Audubon Society
Richard Nowicki	American Institute of Architects
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values
Wallace Tucker	Coalition for Transportation Choices

Public at Large:

Almeda Starkey	
Carol Leone	
Charlene Ayers	
Chris Morrow	Latitude 33
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
J. Tanalski	Valley Center
Jeanne Pagett	
Jeff Pasek	San Diego Water Dept.
Jerry Winter	
John Ingalls	San Dieguito CPG
Karen Tucker	Fallbrook Land Conservancy
Michael Thometz	MERIT
Ron Pennock	

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for November 5, 2002
- Bowlby made additions to his comment (pp. 3, 6th bullet) to read: Bowlby disagreed with the concept of no yield reduction...a lot of endangered species rely on these areas. Thinks removing the number of people and amount of development encroachment from the edge is important; edge effects such as lighting, human intrusion, pets, and noise.
 - Bowlby stated that Silver had stated that the MSCP ratios were arbitrarily derived and that coastal sage scrub was too sensitive a resource to lose half of it and wanted Silver's comments placed in the minutes verbatim (pp. 4, 4th bullet). The comment will not be written verbatim but rather poignant elements will be taken.
 - ❖ Silver stated his perspective was that the ratios were a trial and in his view, they had a bit of a checkered history in how they arrived, where they were, and what went into it but they got there in a certain way that was a bit arbitrary. Felt they did not work in the following ways: 1) the way it was mentioned for non-native grasslands, 2) coastal sage scrub – generally, the most common mitigation for coastal sage scrub is 1 to 1, which he thinks is too low, and losing 50% of it is simply too sensitive a habitat for that to happen, and 3) allocation of on-site credit.
 - Bowlby corrected his statement (pp. 5, 2nd bullet under *Wetlands*) to read: Bowlby distributed a handout that addressed allowable uses in wetlands, which would be limited to public service infrastructure that cannot avoid impacts. Adams responded that he did not recall the latter half of that addition and requested a review of the tape.
 - ❖ Bowlby distributed a handout that addressed allowable uses in wetlands. Thought that language like maximum avoidance, without listing the allowable and restricted uses, would leave things up to interpretation and felt a clear line needed to be drawn about what is and is not allowed. This language says that wetland impacts shall be avoided with the exception of essential public service utilities and a definition about what public service utilities are will probably follow this proposal. Hopes we can stick with the existing county standards, only clarified as needed, to make the allowances for essential public service utilities where they cannot be avoided.
 - ❖ **Clarification made at the January 14, 2003 meeting:** Bowlby wanted to clarify that *“they” in the last sentence represented wetland impacts*: Hopes we can stick with the existing county standards, only clarified as needed, to make the allowances for essential public service utilizes where [wetland impacts] cannot be avoided.
 - Pryde stated that he had asked for Oberbauer's comments on the viability of native and non-native grasslands (pp. 3, 2nd bullet under *Biological Mitigation*) and requested it be placed in the minutes. The tapes will be reviewed.
 - ❖ Pryde had asked whether it was true or not true that birds and other wildlife that breed in grasslands are not very particular about whether it is native or non-native. Oberbauer responded that the non-native grasslands on the map are dominated by wild oats and other types of species of grasses, as well as, components that are frequently of native species that may not be grassland. So animals do not really care whether they are native or non-native grasses. This applies to the Grasshopper Sparrow as well.
 - **Motion:** Adams moved to table the minutes. Whalen seconded. Motion passed.

Agenda Item II: “Tools” Sub-committee Update –

- a) TDRs/PDRs
- Holler went over some assumptions that were put together with the tools subgroup. Stated that these are not yet framework points for a TDR/PDR program but the discussion items might be included as we attempt to assemble such a program. With respect to PDRs, staff needs to go through and identify and prioritize areas; those areas might be similar to pre-approved mitigation areas for MSCP or ag conservation easements. With respect to TDR programs, we are discussing the idea of having a program that will be defined by subregions based on community planning boundaries. Also had a discussion on how we might establish values for TDRs and that we need to structure the program so that interjurisdictional TDRs would be allowed sometime in the future if we

can get participation from other jurisdictions; that is not precluded at this point in time. Discussed how TDRs need a financial incentive built in. We have also discussed the concept of a base development yield and established that that should be the actual yield using essentially today's plans, codes and ordinances and that the number of units purchased would be based on value. In identifying receiving areas, those will be mapped, we will show the highest potential density on the plan, and run those higher densities in our environmental analysis and allow conversion of residential densities to commercial and industrial intensities transferring that to an FAR. Couple of additional things that have been discussed was the potential of using TDRs for offsite mitigation and using a floor as a mechanism to ensure minimum densities can be met. Stressed that this is just a discussion at this time. In terms of what we might need to do next to continue work on the program, we need to run through the work on some case studies and look at some appraisals to give us a framework on what the value differences might be. We are working on identifying receiving areas on our distribution maps, which at this point are on overlays, establishing the subregions based on value by where transfers might occur, reviewing potential numbers of TDRs from sending areas and comparing that to the numbers that might be generated in receiving sites.

- Stedt asked about FAR and how that relates to the transfer of density and intensity issue and how staff is considering that. Holler responded that Pruetz had indicated that it is not unheard of to allow a TDR to be used to increase development intensity instead of density of commercial and industrial sites. The discussion is conceptual at this point in time but it might be another option for us in terms of increasing intensities in areas.

Agenda Item III: Map Presentation –

- Maps in reference: *Interim Interest Group* and *Working Copy – December 2002*.
- Carmichael stated that she wanted to talk about the agreements, in addition to the differences, since there was a vast majority. A summary of changes will be distributed at a later time.
 - ✓ Pendleton-DeLuz: Pretty much in concert there with a relatively small area on the border; Interest Group (IG) has it at 1/40 but because of parcelization, staff kept it at 1/20 on the new working copy (WC).
 - ✓ Fallbrook: Eastern boundary with the corridor and riparian habitat in the stream valley heading over to the Santa Margarita was picked up on the WC map at 1/40; in agreement with recommendation made on IG map. Relatively few of those increases seen on the IG map in Fallbrook are being shown on the WC map; after working with the community and seeing what has already developed in the community, staff did not support a great number of increases in Fallbrook. That is a community though that is still accepting quite a bit of growth over the next few years so it is not a no-growth scenario.
 - ✓ North Mountain: 1/160 are still 1/80 on the WC map; some of those we did not support but further east we have it at 1/160 as well. Staff is in agreement for the most part with the 1/80 area. Staff has always said there were some areas in Chihuahua Valley, Oakgrove and Ranchita that we wanted to work with; there is not an official community there so it is a little more difficult there but we did work with some groups that are out there and we recognized some of those existing parcels that have development out there. You normally do not think of these areas as having development but if you go out there, there is a 300 unit mobile home park and a town center with some commercial. This map here did not recognize that but all along staff has said we were going to work with that and recognize some of the existing uses out there.
- Stedt asked for the percentage of the unincorporated area we are dealing with. Carmichael stated she believes it is 69% including Indian Reservations. Holler stated there is approximately 2.3 million acres of unincorporated area.
 - ✓ Palomar: In agreement with.
 - ✓ Pala-Pauma: The WC map has now picked up the San Luis Rey River floodplain and put it at the 1/40 which is now consistent with what we have been doing throughout the rest of the floodplains up there. Staff has not received an IG map for this area due to the disagreements between both sides so the IG map is a representation but is not necessarily an agreement of the Interest Group. The WC map still has the 1/10 in the valley floor, which is something that the environmental side has said they wanted to see at 1/20. There is a 1/20 area on the WC that the environmental side has said they wanted to see at 1/40.

- ✓ Borrego: In agreement with vast majority. In Ranchita, the IG map has it mapped at 1/4 and staff reduced the amount of that and put it at 1/10 on the WC map to reflect the parcelization on the ground better and groundwater, which is pretty much a limitation for that area. In agreement with Mesa Grande, Santa Ysabel, Scissors Crossing, and Rancho Guejito areas.
- ✓ Valley Center: Staff programmed in a great deal of the growth reflected on the IG map in the town center. Staff is still working with that community on what that town center is going to be but the WC does represent a considerable amount of growth for that community in the core but not quite as much as the IG map shows. The northern part of Valley Center is 1/40 but some of this remains at the 1/20 on the WC map.
- Pryde asked if Carmichael was referring to planning groups when stating there is agreement between maps. Carmichael responded that that is a whole other discussion because there are bits and pieces throughout both of these maps that we are not in agreement with the planning groups; for example, in Borrego, there is an area that shows up as 1/20 on both maps, the group wants to see it at 1/4. It is their large agricultural area and they would like to see the farmers have the option to move to houses instead of the intensive water uses that they are using right now.
 - ✓ Valley Center: There is one other section that is at 1/20 on the WC and 1/40 on the IG map. In the actual core, we do have a good number of similarities but again not quite as much growth as the Interest Group had planned.
 - ✓ Bonsall: We are seeing some increases on the WC to correlate with some of the increases on the IG map; Bonsall is fairly close. We have agreement on the San Luis Rey and Moosa Creek at 1/40.
 - ✓ Twin Oaks: There are three areas that are different between the two maps; the areas show as 1/20 on the IG and 1/10 on the WC map. Other than that Twin Oaks and North County Metro are pretty much in agreement.
 - ✓ San Dieguito: In agreement between the two maps over most of this. The discrepancy is over the area where we have on the WC a mixture of 1/20 and 1/10 where the IG has it all mapped at 1/40. The Harmony Grove town center now shows up as a proposal that we want to do the population and transportation modeling for on the new WC. It centers the growth in its northern area and is pretty compact. The southern portion might be an area we need further discussion on.
 - ✓ North County Metro: This is an area north of Citrus Ave that we had at 1/2 and we are now proposing go to 1/1 on the new WC map; that will add some intensification of uses in that area but it seemed like it was an appropriate increase there.
 - ✓ Ramona: We worked extensively with the Ramona planning group for the past several months. Their previous proposal was pretty close to representing a no-growth stance for Ramona but working with the group and getting down to focusing on the town center where the growth could be accommodated with the infrastructure and then reducing growth in the outlying areas has really been our goal over the last few months and we found working with the group that they have been very receptive to that idea so we have come to agreement on a considerable amount of the area in Ramona. It does not represent the extent of growth the IG map has on it but it does add considerable growth for the Ramona community and it does concentrate it in the village core and village surroundings and reducing in the outlying areas. In the grasslands area, we are continuing to work together with the property owners there to hopefully put together a plan that takes care of the preservation of the grasslands that allows the growth to be pushed to a more appropriate area of the community.
 - ✓ Lakeside: Staff had increased some of the growth in the village core area to correlate with the IG map, however some of the areas, like Blossom Valley on the edge with Alpine, the increases do not go quite as high. It is the Alpine side that does take some additional growth in that area, the remainder of that was built out at the 2 ac and the community felt strongly about retaining that.
 - ✓ Alpine: The corridor was maintained at 1/40 to link El Capitan Reservoir further south to the Sweetwater River at the 1/40 on the WC map. Other increases in density are pretty much reflected in the WC map.
 - ✓ Crest: The 1/40 on the WC map still show as 1/20; the community is pretty strong on that aspect.
 - ✓ Jamul: Inside the CWA, the WC map now reflects some additional increases in their village core area so it does show some increases over the IG map. However, once you go east of the CWA, the new WC map has those at 1/10 or 1/40 depending on various factors such as

- parcelization, biological habitats, steep slopes. The WC map does not pick up the 1/80 that are proposed in Jamul; it still shows at the 1/40.
- ✓ Julian: The 1/80 is reflected at 1/40 on the WC map and the community reaffirmed that they wanted to maintain the 1/40. Julian's population growth will really occur pretty much no matter what we put on that map because of the extent of parcelization that has already occurred in Julian; those existing legal lots are out there so that is a concern for the Julian planning group.
 - ✓ Descanso: There is a bit of a difference close to the core of the community. The WC map does show a little bit of growth programmed in at the 1/10 on the IG map pretty much outside of the floodplain and tier 1 habitat and directly adjacent to the 2 du/ac that exists out there today.
 - ✓ Pine Valley: We are in agreement with Mt. Laguna and the whole surrounding area.
 - ✓ Tecate: Thinks we have agreement on that now even though the two maps reflect two different scenarios. The IG map did not reflect the existing commercial and industrial that is out there today and the new map is not what was previously proposed on the working copy; the previous proposal showed a great deal of growth and commercial and industrial in the Tecate region. That has been revised to reflect the existing uses out there and where there was a gap in between two industrial uses, we still allowed a bit of growth on industrial and commercial but certainly not to the extent that was proposed on the working copy.
 - ✓ Potrero: The planning group is close to accepting the concepts that we have all put forward however the 1/80 are reflected at 1/40 and some of the 1/40 are reflected at the 1/10 on the new WC.
 - ✓ Lake Morena: The WC shows some 1/10 and 1/20 and that is going back to what the Board had endorsed for Lake Morena saying they could maintain what the community has come with so far. In Cameron Corners, adjacent to their commercial development that exists and could occur in the future, a small amount of growth was planned in that area to reinforce Cameron Corners as being the core versus Campo or Lake Morena because of the groundwater and water quality issues and floodplain issues found elsewhere in this whole area. This is the area that growth should occur in that whole region so we programmed some of that in.
 - ✓ Jacumba and Boulevard: In agreement with.
- Scarborough stated that this is a working copy and there is some flexibility in that. We are not done yet; we need to know the points to address in order to move forward.
 - Bowlby felt that some of the changes, especially those proposed east of the CWA, go against the grain of the principles we were establishing. Stated we were talking about a majority of 80-acre parcelization and the containment of any further subdivision east of the CWA so it would seem that the proposed changes on that side of the line are headed in the wrong direction. Does not think it is a good idea to have a one map concept or at least to evaluate a one map concept within the EIR. Sees that not only are we increasing the population targets throughout the unincorporated areas but we also have vast areas of semi-rural, semi-urban development planned and now it looks like the east side is going to contain that too so he thinks we need a study that reflects a plan that reduces the semi-rural and reduces the population as opposed to increases. Scarborough replied that an EIR does not just take one map. An EIR studies two, three or four for exactly those purposes so an EIR is not going to have one map in it. Holler agreed. Additionally, we are running this through the SANDAG model for transportation impacts, also population.
 - Adams stated that the CWA is not the demarcation line and that is not how we embarked in this process. Does not support any reductions in the semi-rural as Bowlby has proposed; feels it is not well thought out and could propose some problems in the future in providing for some of our growth which is inevitable. Asked for a breakdown of public lands (approximately 69% or 1.5 million acres of unincorporated area) since Pryde mentioned that the designation of public lands does not necessarily mean open space and preserves, but could be developed with public utilities, etc. Pryor responded that given the pattern we have, we can tell how many acres are going to be in each one of those density categories so that you know how many acres you are working with. Adams stated that he wanted to be able to compare it to what is being preserved because a lot of that public land is "green" and requested the data for the next meeting.
 - Coombs asked if the Working Copy map shows the higher density in the cores and village centers; concerned that we are not identifying the potential increase in population in infill and redevelopment. Stated she would like to see a smart growth map that identifies areas within the village core and the surrounding area for increased densities. Holler responded that the Interest

Group and the Working Copy have increases in density in some of the village core and village areas. When we do our population modeling, we pick those areas up where further subdivision and increases would be allowed but areas that are currently shown as built, we do not have a number because it is built already. Pryor replied that when you are dealing with a rural area like we are, where you basically have small villages, you would not use the same approach as you would with a large city where you are looking at land values going into tremendous swings where you can afford to buy land and rebuild. While we still are approaching it from a very practical standpoint of service and delivery, we cannot apply the same principles as they can in the city. Coombs wanted to raise some examples of unincorporated land that are virtually in the cities – Spring Valley is one of them.

❖ **Addition made at the January 14, 2003 meeting:** Baker felt her comments from the December 17, 2002 meeting should have been included. Baker explained the history of the Interim Interest Group map, which was the first draft map based on the wish list from some environmentalists and builders for certain areas, however it is not the consensus of the entire group that the group agrees on this map. Wanted to talk about her support for staff to develop one map and to remind everyone that the final product should be a synthesis of input from the community, the environmentalists, and the builders and that the focus of basic planning principles should be embedded in what staff comes up with. Reiterated support for one map going forward. Also, wanted to mention a detail in Borrego Springs, while understanding their concern for larger parcel sizes being tied to agriculture, it is her understanding that we will be addressing the aquifer overdraft issue in other manners in this update for Borrego Springs. Pryor agreed and responded that we are well aware of that overdraft situation and have talked to the community already about some options they may want to consider.

- Stedt asked what actions are we going to be asking of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Holler replied that we will be taking the status of where we are right now to the Commission and the Board. We will show them the distribution, the framework, the work on equity mechanisms and so on and ask for them to direct us to continue to work on the EIR. At that point in time, it will enable us to run some additional analysis. We are not asking for them to adopt a map, but for us to continue to work on the EIR. Pryor added that we are going to ask the Board to at least give us a direction within the comfort zone that they are willing to allow us to start finishing the other elements. We are looking to make some refinements but not major changes after we take it into the Board. It will basically amount to an endorsement – talking about the principles that are applied to this, the basic densities that are being looked at; we know there are going to be changes when the modeling goes through. This is still going to remain an iterative process; we just need a baseline to start from, in which to go ahead and start the EIR work, and then we start to refine it as we start to run into those difficulties. We will have alternatives as required under CEQA; this will be one of the alternatives that we look at.
- Tucker stated that something is lost with every iteration and sees the map going towards the direction of sprawl. Thinks the TDR/PDR plan needs to get beyond the conceptual stages very quickly in order to provide the flexibility in having an alternative, where you can exchange density in one place for open space and preservation in another place.
- Bowlby stated that recognizing the parcelization east of the CWA creates a pattern that rationalizes continuing that pattern, that same semi-urban, semi-rural sprawl perpetuates.
- Nowicki asked whether the changes on the map that reflected existing conditions proposed sprawl as Bowlby suggested or if it just reflected a given area of what is already there or does it take and extrapolate the surrounding areas. Pryor responded that it is not promoting sprawl or that type of development but rather recognizes the existing parcels of land that have already been created, like the 10-acre or 20-acre parcels. There are some legal implications when you start creating larger lots or densities where you have a 10-acre parcel on the ground. So what you are seeing is what may already be in existence as far as the parcels of land. The only way you are going to take the development potential off of those parcels is to buy the land or buy the development right.
- Bowlby asked if that meant there were no larger parcels in those areas that could be subdivided into 10, 20, and 40-acre parcels thus creating new parcels of those sizes. Pryor answered no to how the question was phrased. There are some areas that may be surrounded by 10-acre parcels and if there is a 40-acre parcel right in the middle, staff would probably look at the whole area as 10 acres. He answered that there would be some but it would be very minimal because staff understands what the principle is that we are trying to get to.

Agenda Item IV: Update on Breakout Discussions –

- Scarborough mentioned that within the past two years, we have accomplished goals and policies, a framework that identifies regional categories and the elements of densities within those, are now working on the update of the standards and we have a map, as well as, what Holler mentioned in regards to equity mechanisms – these elements are all key and are all points that go together. We have had discussions with identified representatives from the two sides of the table on standards, which has allowed for some detail to be looked at. The concept would be a minimum open conservation footprint with the idea being that you would identify open space and the percentage of the parcel you would be working with; the conservation element of development to be key – these discussions are not final.
- Pryde stated that he felt there is still a lot of work to be done on the standards and asked if it needed to be included in the “package”. Pryor answered that it does not have to be included since it would not really be ingrained into the general plan. The standards really fit into the ordinances that implement the general plan (RPO, BMO). We will want to take the categories, the goals and policies, and the map as that package is sort of all ingrained together.
- Whalen asked if the entire package, including the ordinances, will be available before the general plan is adopted. Pryor responded that we will not have all the ordinances since the zoning ordinance will have to trail the general plan. We will have to do some interim improvements but will probably have enough to implement the new general plan based on densities as opposed to parcels and will, at least, have at that point enough of a TDR or PDR program that everyone will know in fact whether there is a TDR or PDR program. Going into another scenario, once you begin looking at your project and alternatives during the EIR, you are going to find that there are going to have to be changes in this plan or that plan, whichever one it may be; there may be such a thing that once you get done with that process, there may not be a need for TDRs or PDRs. Scarborough reiterated that it is an iterative process and that March will be the beginning of the EIR, which then you can begin to take care of those loose ends.
- Rolfe asked if staff will be updating the entire zoning ordinance or just parts of it. Pryor responded that we will try to amend it rather than throw it out entirely since there are some good parts to the current zoning ordinance. Rolfe asked if the development of the ordinances and crafting the changes will be a public process and if the Interest Group will be involved. Pryor responded that it will be a public process and if it is not this group, it will be another group comparable to this one that will be formed as it will be a process with a likelihood for a high degree of scrutiny, especially among the Steering Committee and the planning groups since they are the ones who look at these ordinances very carefully. Rolfe asked if staff anticipates beginning the amendment process after the adoption of the plan or some time before. Pryor replied that staff will do enough immediately after the adoption of the plan to start to implement the general plan, however, he believes there is a window of two years or something like that after you do your adoption that you need to have your codes up to date.
- Adams mentioned that his industry has real concerns over the success and ability to perform a TDR program. Thinks there is still a long way to go in that regard as he has not seen any real program yet in which he could take back to his board.
- Higgins suggested that the breakout meetings be noticed so that those who are interested can attend. Scarborough replied that no action is taken at these breakout meetings and information from those meetings are disseminated at the noticed public meetings.
- Tucker asked for clarification on the alternatives to TDRs and whether staff was considering a city-based multi-track development, where you do more of what we consider the right thing than go on a faster track, with regards to development of a conservation footprint. Pryor replied that TDRs are on the table, which we need to fully explore, and we intend to take that forward as part of the package unless there is a change in terms of how everyone wants to approach that. The other approach is PDRs, purchase of development rights, which is very similar except that rather than buy fee title to the land, you basically buy the development rights off of it which stretches your limited resources much further. There are a couple of other options that we are beginning to explore but staff needs to find out how far we can go legally with some of the financing on some of these techniques before we can discuss them. With regards to development in the future, if we are looking at doing this correctly, the actual general plan itself will provide enough benefit so that we will not need to get into density bonuses and those types of things except in certain isolated incidences, for example, low-income housing. You may provide a density bonus in order to accommodate any special need.

There are appropriate places for density bonuses but they should be used with a high degree of discretion.

Agenda Item V: Public Comments –

- Mike Thometz: Asked if there will be a public comment period on the map before going to the Board. Holler responded that he expects staff will receive continued comments requesting changes before going to the Board. Scarborough added that whether the Interest Group decides to throw its lot into that map or not remains to be discussed and decided.
- Dave Shibley: Asked if the map will be available at the community level after the 1st of the year and how long the Interest Group is going to put off voting on standards. Holler replied that it is available at the community level. Scarborough replied that the group had chose to discuss standards at the breakout sessions and it will be brought back to the Interest Group meetings for motions and recommendations. Shibley asked if there is any possibility for people processing applications to be subject to a moratorium during that window of two years for the zoning update. Pryor responded that there is no need for a moratorium because we can still use the existing ordinances. It just means that we need to make some tweaks in order to keep processing projects but the new projects will ultimately have to conform to whatever the Board adopts.
- John Lamp: Stated that his property in Valle de Oro, was in an ag preserve and has been out of contract for about two years but because of the ag preserve, he ended up with A-20. Scott Molloy stated that Lamp was in an ag preserve, exited the contract, but while in contract, he was downzoned to 1du/20 ac, came out of the contract and is now at 1 du/10 ac. Pryor responded that staff has been in contact with Lamp and the planning group and are familiar with the situation but at this point, we are dealing with an individual's property that objects to the current density and we need to stick to the broader issue. Ultimately, the individual needs to deal with the planner and the planning group. Molloy stated that with the interest of being consistent with the concepts, goals, and ideas out of the Interest Group, it would be inconsistent to keep Valle de Oro's existing general plan in that Lamp's property is surrounded by 1 du/2 ac or 2 du/ac.
- Jerry Winter: Asked what staff plans on submitting to the Board and what actions we are expecting considering that Holler had mentioned that we will have ongoing changes through January. He also stated that Pryor had said that any development from March on has to be in accord with the new plan. Pryor replied that he had said that after the plan is adopted, which will take place after an environmental document is prepared. He added that the only things that will be going to the Board will be a map, the land use categories, and goals and policies. The Board will not be adopting anything at that meeting but rather give staff direction that what is being presented to them is within a comfort range that we can use for the project to proceed forward with the environmental documents and traffic studies so you will still be operating under the current codes and ordinances if you wish to bring a project forward. Winter added that he has a similar situation to Lamp in that he has a 20-acre parcel and is surrounded by smaller parcels and he is being downzoned.
- Ron Pennock: Trying to understand the process and what we are going to do with input in a couple of areas. Asked about the Dutra bill and whether we had numbers that coincide with the state housing element and if it is broken down by community plan areas. Pryor stated that we are aware of the bill and is not prepared to answer the question at this time. We know we have sufficient housing to meet the bill. Pennock asked about the commercial and industrial and when it will be plotted in. Holler replied that the commercial and industrial areas are shown on the map now and that is an area that we still need to discuss with the communities. Pennock asked about the economic impacts as far as downzoning. Pryor replied that CEQA does not require economic impact studies; the courts have already ruled on that.
- Dave Shibley: Asked what is going to happen between the period after the Board through adoption and whether people will be subject to the new guidelines before being fully adopted. Pryor replied that the department is prohibited from doing that because our responsibility is to enforce the current codes, ordinances, and policies of the Board. The Board has to take a formal action to adopt a plan or amend a new ordinance before the department can institute it. Shibley asked so the Board cannot take an action during the EIR to approve or adopt anything. Pryor responded that there is a circumstance in which the Board could, if they wished, pass a moratorium for up to two years and stop all growth and development till the plan is done. We have recommended against that, the Board has not asked us to bring anything forward to that, and we do not expect them to.