

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2004**

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	SD Coalition for Transportation Choices
Chris Anderson	SD Association of Realtors
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Dave Shibley	Save Our Land Values
David Younkman	National Wildlife Federation
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Mike Thometz	Back Country Coalition
Phil Pryde	SD Audubon Society
Scott Thomas	American Institute of Architects
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Brice Bossler & associate	
Carol Leone	
Charlene Ayers	
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Ernest Barrera	Ramona Sentinel
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Karen Tucker	
Larry Glavinic	Valley Center CPG
Lynne Baker	EHL/Buena Vista Audubon
Mike Lange	
Ruth Potter	LWV
Todd Galarneau	McMillin
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth	East San Diego County Association of Realtors
Wallace Tucker	SD Coalition for Transportation Choices

County Staff:

Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Curt Gonzales (DPLU)
Larry Hofreiter (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

Holler stated that Karen Scarborough will no longer be the group facilitator because she has accepted a position with the State of California Resources Agency. Ivan informed the group that he will be the new group facilitator.

a) Minutes for January 20, 2004

- Shibley moved to approve the minutes for January 20, 2004. Minutes approved.

Ivan Holler acknowledged that Proposition A was defeated in the March 2004 election and invited comment or discussion from the group. There was no further discussion.

Agenda Item II: Continued Discussion on Equity Mechanisms

- Holler stated that the first step is to establish a framework for an equity mechanism program and the next step would be to discuss how an equity mechanism program would be funded. Holler suggested utilizing the bullet points to guide today's discussion but noted two concerns from last month's meeting: 1) trigger for eligibility requirements which was discussed at 1 du/10 acres or lower and 2) sign-up period or enrollment period.
- Shibley stated the bullet points were excellent, but the enrollment period is not needed. Essentially purchasing one of four things: 1) conservation easement, 2) agricultural easement, 3) historical easement or 4) density in the form of buying down density once priority areas have been established. Proposed having a 2-year time period for people to participate in an equity mechanism program under the existing General Plan in an effort to prevent people from signing up who have no intention of developing their land. Also suggested removing the word homogenous for both TDRs and PDRs, but particularly PDRs because the program should be more flexible and allow other opportunities. Holler replied that the reason it is there is because TDRs are very complex to administer and when you have a discrete area and the same number of units, it becomes simpler to administer. Shibley also said he did not like the limitation of 1 du/10 acres or lower. People do not understand the difference between purchasing land and establishing value. The only way to establish value is by a map and a development right; you are not comparing value, you are comparing units.
- Stehly defended an enrollment period. Proposed a series of enrollment periods that would open every 7 years where the bulk of enrollment will be at the front-end. Enrollment does not mean someone has committed to a project – it means they have committed to study a project. Opposes the process of doing a Tentative Map just to prove how many dwelling units a project can achieve. Shibley replied that the only way one gets paid is by establishing how many units. Stehly responded that when you purchase a property, you look at its potential outside of dwelling units such as an avocado grove. Shibley replied that the purpose of this program is to get densities out of the backcountry and you have to establish your value on the development right, and the analysis has to be based on units.
- Silver stated that we need to establish a revenue stream; we need to set up triggers or entry criteria. Asked what are you selling if you are in the system and getting equity; thinks we are selling a conservation easement. Asked the Farm Bureau if that is an acceptable equity – the ability to sell a conservation easement. Stehly replied that the farmer or landowner has in mind a number associated with the loss of density; it is acceptable only if the amount of money you are offering for a conservation easement is close to the number he has in mind. Silver thinks that the group has an open door to having a program that would use perhaps a conservation easement as the basis of transaction if the conservation easement is worth a certain amount.
- Stehly stated that he considers this an acquisition of land rights or property rights. Thinks there is agreement that it is the sale of "something" and that "something" takes the form of an easement. Supports an enrollment period because we do not know how much it will cost, and until we have a budget we cannot proceed with what we are trying to buy or sell. Thinks it is an interesting idea to have more than one enrollment period but there is no need not to have an enrollment period. Does not think it is a problem having an assessment organization, or any reason to have the County get overly

involved except as a clearinghouse. Thinks a TDR program done on a larger scale would be easier to do; once receiving areas are established the rest is not that tricky.

- Tabb asked why active farmland is not listed in the criteria. Holler replied that the discussion seemed to move away from that. Tabb thinks we should do what we can to limit the scope of the program because we are going to find that this is difficult to afford when we get to the revenue side of this.
- Shibley addressed his issue with the enrollment period – a lot of people will try to sign up if there is no criteria and if it does not cost anything. Stated that the whole purpose of the General Plan is to get the density out of the backcountry and the only way to do that is by doing a map.
- Silver addressed the distribution of revenue source. Prefers having the money go to farmers or ranchers or to some conservation properties without necessarily having to demonstrate a percent decline in value due to the general plan change. Asked if the Farm Bureau sees the equity mechanism affecting only farmers and ranchers or a broader range of property owners. Stehly responded that they want to keep it as broad as possible because every farmer wants to expand. Tentatively against just limiting it to active agriculture; giving them priority makes sense. If there is no loss in value or equity then that person should not enroll.
- Silver stated that the conservation side is interested in this program as a way to acquire property, in addition to facilitating the General Plan and furthering equity.
- Tabb stated for the record that there has to be a demonstrated loss in value.
- Messer stated that there are a lot of political compromises going on. The larger public benefit that is attached to this is that it buys political support for the General Plan and there is benefit in seeing that go through with a good map. Supports, to the extent possible, rolling in the habitat conservation program into this same program. Tabb asked if there is going to be political support for equity mechanisms to buy preservation lands. Messer replied that she thinks it is part of a package; there is little support for any of these separately.
- Whalen asked if the group was willing to consider changing the second to last bullet regarding the TDR program, limiting the percentage of change to the development receiving area, so that would be within a margin of error in the transportation modeling – you can only add 10% to a piece of property or some number like that, not 85%. Holler replied that staff has concerns over a mechanism to exceed the density shown on the General Plan. Whalen responded that we do not have buy-in from the community groups and one way to do that is to have increased flexibility.
- Shibley stated that it was his intent to extend it to MSCP Lands. But it is more than farmers and conservation easements; it is all those landowners out there and the only way you can define value is based on development rights.
- Baker stated two points: 1) keep the program as broad as possible in the long-term if we have an enrollment period since we are approaching a time of many ownership changes and 2) do not exclude potential to move things if there are options to move density from semi-rural.
- Shibley stated that we do not have money for people who enroll especially when they do not have any intention of developing; we need to set up priority areas.
- Tabb stated that he would like to limit the scope of this as it relates to the equity mechanism because it will be difficult to get revenue. There are other sources and ways of acquiring preservation lands. This should be about an equity mechanism for people who have been downzoned because of GP2020.
- Thometz stated that this should be a free-market thing. MSCP should not be involved. We need to concentrate this on moving the population out of the backcountry and into the city.
- Adams agreed with Thometz and added that we should not add unnecessary regulations. Uncomfortable with the idea of buying MSCP lands. Stated that the whole equity program should be no longer than the one page summary.
- Silver stated there are really two programs: 1) case-by-case TDR, e.g., an area such as Ramona in which property owners exchange densities and 2) a more systematic approach – a general equity mechanism on a regional basis, for those to meet certain eligibility criteria and enroll. First priority is getting a good general plan but wants to keep on the table, how we can pay for habitat lands. The property owners have to demonstrate a loss in value and perhaps demonstrate other criteria, and then they have the option to enroll in a PDR program. At this point, we have not specified what the PDR options are, other than to say it would result in an easement of some type. Objective is to lock-in the post-2020 zoning, the PRDE, but there is a question of how to appraise that. Thinks landowner should have the option to sell all of their development rights, except for the farmhouse.

- Tucker agreed with the idea of a free-market but not sure how far that can be taken. Unsure of the enrollment period; seems that as GP2020 comes into effect, everybody gets a certain amount of credit determined by the process, and it all runs with the land.
- Whalen suggested that *conservation* be removed from the third to last bullet to reflect the broader scope of property rights being looked at.
- Shibley reiterated that the only issue he has is with the enrollment period. Asked staff to address the 20- or 30-year waiting period and asked how that is an equity program. Pryor replied that it is still an equity program but there will be waiting periods so priorities will have to be set. Shibley agreed with priorities, reiterating his proposal of a two-year period – complete an application or be paid. Pryor replied that the problem with the proposal is that it advocates blowing the general plan in two years in which case, you would have nothing.
- Tabb stated that the conservation easement being used as compensation needs to be determined – whether it takes all of the density other than the existing home, or it is a quasi-conservation easement where the person can still develop the land. Thinks entire site should be conserved if you are going to get a conservation easement.
- Adams suggested bullet point 6 be rewritten to: *Priorities should be established for landowners who have filed for compensation*, to narrow the scope into what we are really trying to achieve here. MSCP is very important but it is not the role of this group.
- **Motion:** Messer disagreed, stating that what the group is trying to do is keep a political coalition together, to give our Supervisors something that gives them some comfort. Suggested doing something very general and then letting staff worry about how to proceed. Thinks the majority of the group can support the program assumptions without getting into more detail. Moved to endorse the program assumptions listed as the foundation for an Interest Group proposal.
- Tabb seconded the motion with a modification to bullet point 6. Messer disagreed, stating the County should prioritize areas based on public interest.
- Pryde asked about different types of easements. Thinks that underlying conservation easements need to be made clear. Pryor replied that it depends on how you draft the agricultural easement. If it is limited to an agricultural period, that becomes the only thing that can be done on that piece of property. The property owner can get out of agriculture but the County would have control over that easement since they paid for it, and the only thing that can be done is agriculture. Pryde asked about reverting it back to a conservation easement for reclamation work. Pryor replied that that is not a use—housing, industrial and agriculture are uses—and if it is used for anything, it would have to be agriculture. Harron added that an easement can cease to exist if the use ceases.
- Silver stated that the motion should be to endorse the program assumptions as the basis for the equity mechanism, realizing it is going to involve some changes and further refinement”.
- Tucker suggested not removing the word *conservation*, suggested replacing *homogeneous* with *similar*, and reiterated his issue with the enrollment period.
- Younkman stated that TDRs and PDRs are not distinguished and therefore, confusing. Concerned that the PDRs are limited in scope. Wants staff to come back with a clear description about TDR and PDR priorities. Also thinks we need to have some funding options for both TDRs and PDRs.
- Thometz stated that this is incomplete and does not support the motion. Adams agreed, stating concern over prioritization. Holler replied that this is a preliminary framework and prioritization will be addressed with this group; it was never intended to be here but rather as something that lies ahead.
- **Vote:** Endorse the program assumptions listed as the foundation for the Interest Group to continue development of an equity mechanism: 11 – 4 – 2

Agenda Item III: Traffic Modeling Overview –

- Holler stated that the Board directed staff to run a series of traffic models against different land use distributions. Since that time, staff has been working with SANDAG to generate the models and to run the analysis. In that time, our time and resources were also spent on the wildfires and Proposition A. Staff will present this information to the Board, as well as, a recommendation on a project to get started on an EIR. The following traffic runs were presented to the Interest Group (all runs use the same network):

- Existing Base Year 2000: Level of Service (LOS) map for year 2000, which is what is on the ground at that time. Used the existing on-the-ground roads plus projects in the Capital Improvement Program because they have dedicated funding associated with them. Shows what you might expect for the current year. See I-15 and I-5 at an LOS E or F, but improves closer to the Riverside border.
- Level of Service Map for the existing General Plan: There are a number of road segments, especially in the backcountry areas, that are at a failing level of service. Removed some local roads in the incorporated jurisdictions just for clarity but picked up freeways in incorporated jurisdictions for reference. Used the cities' general plans; there are some differences but they are very similar.
- Level of Service Map for the August 2003 Land Use Distribution scenario: Big difference between the August 2003 map and the Existing General Plan is that almost all of the failing roads in the backcountry do not exist on the August 2003 map. August 2003 has fewer impacts, as you might expect, than the existing General Plan.
- The models do take into account casino traffic and are included in these runs; impacts from gaming operations were modeled where we have that information (from latest tribal gaming report). Also, the model has accounted for the Jamul Casino because it is likely to be built.
- Messer stated that it looks as though there are fewer LOS E and F roads, even in the incorporated areas, when comparing the existing General Plan to the August 2003 map. Holler agreed that there are fewer LOS F roads in August 2003 compared to the existing General Plan. Pryor added that the reason this has happened is because we dropped the population on a plan that is population based. It is looking out 20 years in the future to see what growth may have to be accommodated. By doing that, it removed a lot of population out of the backcountry, as well as, redistributed it.
- Whalen asked about the LOS E and F in the backcountry. Holler replied that in Borrego, for example, there is still a significant amount of development potential that exists in the August 2003 map, even though the development potential was reduced. With the exception of the Tecate border, the only other place in the backcountry where this occurs appears to be caused by traffic between Boulevard and the Jamul Casino. In areas where we knew of a tribe's plans, information on tribal residential development was included. This information is in the Tribal Gaming Report.
- Holler stated that the August 2003 map reflects on-the-ground roads. This helps identify where the deficits are and the next step for us, which is essentially, to design a Circulation Element network that will match with whatever land use distribution we have.
- Thomas questioned the comparison since the existing General Plan is based on a larger population than GP2020. Asked if the existing General Plan would produce less deficient roads if the same population as GP2020 was used. Pryor replied that staff is showing what the impacts would be if we stayed with our existing General Plan and its distribution versus what has been developed in GP2020 by using a baseline (year 2000). The GP2020 population cannot be used on the existing General Plan because it is a parcel-based map, not population-based. Thomas asked if there was an assumption in GP2020 that factored in clustered developments, where people might be living closer to their jobs. Pryor replied that that cannot really be done but given an area that has a density attached to it, staff was able to allocate a certain percentage to roads, which would give a net yield of x amount. We could then assign that to the transportation network.
- Adams asked about cost differences between the various plans. Holler cautioned the group that these are order of magnitude numbers and that you cannot tell a cost associated with a road network until the road network has been designed. Thinks the comparison between the different distributions is important. Able to determine how many miles of roadways were operating at a deficit and determine the land miles required to improve the deficit. These were mostly road widenings, not a new road network. The existing General Plan number is about \$5.5 billion and the December and August maps were both about \$1.45 billion. Reiterated that what is important is the comparative; the actual numbers may float. The Board referrals was a separate scenario that ran about \$1.5 billion. There were a couple of other scenarios. One scenario included pipelined projects, which ended up being just over \$1.5 billion, which is very close to the referrals. The scenario, which included removal of the 80s and 160s, was \$1.67 billion and pre-FCI was \$1.9 billion.
- Shibley asked if this is going to be used as a growth management tool, where a project gets denied if it does not meet the level of service. Pryor replied that that is a policy question that has not been addressed. In essence this is a growth management plan but not necessarily because of built projects; there are other mechanisms to do that.

- Messer stated that her support will be lost if the 80s are removed. Thinks the removal of the 160s can be tolerated but not the 80s.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comment –

- Chase: Earth day is coming up; volunteer online or take a flyer.
- Heard that the level of service is getting better in urbanized communities. Asked if that is assuming SANDAG's proposed funding for various things, such as increasing transit money. Holler replied no; staff ran the on the ground network and projects in the County's CIP (dollars associated with that). The reason you see a slightly better LOS in the scenario is because there is a reduction in the overall population associated with that distribution. Pryor added that most of the traffic in the backcountry go into the city.
- If you have more population in the city, you are going to have to look at level of services in the cities. Asked how that translates into increased deficits in the cities. Asked if more restraint is put on the cities if the unincorporated area is already running at deficient levels of services. Holler replied that the cities, just like the County, will have to go through and identify funding mechanisms for infrastructure improvements. Question is too broad to get into specifics.
- Messer made an overly broad statement about how it improves the cities and it does not necessarily do that. Thinks it is contrary to what is being said because theoretically it improves but it is impacting the cities that have more of the population, and areas near the unincorporated areas and people who might be moving into the cities. Thinks the hope is that it will improve flow through those areas, but need to look at the big picture and at the deficit in the cities. Pryor replied that we have the big picture – this encompasses the cities' growth projections with the County's, but when we reduce population by 100,000, that improves the condition on the roads. They will not get better until somebody goes into the cities and starts developing a capital improvement program to fix the deficiencies.
- Larry Glavinic: Been attending SANDAG meetings and does not think of this as being so wonderful even though you are saving a lot of money because he thinks the system is close to breaking down. Thinks part of what needs to happen in GP2020 is to get to a point where it is ready to break down.
- Patrick Uriell: Also attended some of the SANDAG meetings. Asked if this is series 8 or 11. Carmichael replied series 10. Uriell responded that those are 24-hour counts, not peak hour counts, which means you have a 24-hour "F", meaning you cannot get home at 2 am. Study shows in Ramona that the smaller the lot, the more likely the owner/occupant is to commute; the higher commute rate and vehicle miles traveled is consistent with the size of the lot. In the new SANDAG figures, if you were to take backcountry residents and compress them in village centers, you would go from 12 ADT to an 8 ADT, just by the fact that they are now multi-family; that is a 50% savings in ADT just by redesigning your community into clustered village centers, which we have found on the ground is the opposite. When people get to multi-family they commute more, with more parties commuting more miles than you do on larger lots. Have entire neighborhoods on large lots, 80% of which do not commute and do not leave to go to work in the morning. And the hours of commute, the peak impact hours is much more drastic on your multi-family units than it is on your bigger lots. Assures that people in the backcountry communities will concur. So figures are really not that consistent with what is happening on the ground.
- Bowlby: At the last meeting, brought up the information that was provided to the proponents of Prop A regarding the applications for subdivisions that have been submitted, which are approaching 2,000. Wanted to see how that relates to what has been discussed regarding the pipeline and the impacts on these maps. Holler replied that there is not 2,000 applications; does not know what that number is since the number is not even close.