

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
May 28, 2002
Revised June 11, 2002

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Allison Rolfe	San Diego Audubon Society
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Mike Stepner	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Foundation
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association

Public at Large:

Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Lynne Baker	EHL
Parke Troutman	UCSD
David Younkman	NWF
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Charlene Ayers	
Jeanne Pagett	

County Staff:

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

Agenda Item I: Logistics

a) Minutes for May 14, 2002.

- Scarborough: Changes or additions to the minutes of meeting 5.14.02. Adding staff recommendations to Board of Supervisors regarding designations of 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres east of the County Water Authority versus 1 DU/ 80 acres and 160 acres. Adding expansion of MSCP into the unincorporated areas. Bowlby requests changes regarding the right to farm ordinance: adding list of complaints and statistics of residential areas near farms in support of designated agricultural areas. Strike out “not fairly shared” from the Public facilities goal. Bowlby recommends changing “public facilities should be coordinated” to “shall be coordinated” in bullet #4 in Policies A-A4.
 - ❖ **Correction made at the June 11, 2002 meeting:** Bowlby had reiterated his concerns over revisions he had asked to be made to the April 30th minutes and was waiting for these changes to be made correctly. He felt his comments were not reflected correctly in the May 14th minutes when he had first mentioned this issue. He felt the discussion regarding 40 acre lot sizes east of the CWA line should have been noted, as well as, the conversation between Adams and Silver regarding MSCP (as recorded).
- Changes to attendance: Pryde was representing Doyle, and his vote was accounted for. Noted that Whalen had BIA proxy. For 5.28.02, Adams has Higgins proxy, Doyle has Coombs proxy, Chase has Gendrons' proxy, Stepner is also representing AIA.
- Add motion for A-10 by Silver and Messer at the end of minutes for 5.14.02. It was on the table before 5.14.02 meeting adjourned.
- Stedt recommends that minutes should reflect name of the mover of the motion and the one who seconds the motion.
- Doyle makes motion to approve the changes to the minutes, Adams seconds it.

Agenda Item II: Draft Revisions

- Proposal for A-10 Public Facilities is continued. Silver motioned, Messer seconded “protection of natural open space shall be coordinated with development and phased as appropriate.” Whalen mentions if done properly, developers will establish open space that is phased with development. Pryor states open space is not a public facility compared to parks and fire service; it would fit better into conservation or open space. Whalen says open space is part of a package of a developer's project instead of something done separately. Doyle states it as green infrastructure. Stedt agrees with Pryor and doesn't see open space as an infrastructure system like parks and libraries. Messer believes the County should recognize open space as a complex system that requires thoughtful planning and protection. Tabb doesn't think it should be labeled infrastructure and should not be under public facility. Pryor states in the General Plan, all policies are equal and there is no hierarchy, but put the policy where it sounds the best. Pryor mentions the closer staff stays to the state guidelines, then the more defensible document they will have in the long run, and believes proposal is in the wrong place. Silver suggests language; in A-4 take out “or” and replace with “and.” Suggestion to move A-10 to Open Space so that it would become goal 1, policy E. Chase believes ownership determines use- if public ownership, then it becomes a public facility. Chase offers an amendment to allow protection of natural open space and linkages. Stedt supports motion as is. Doyle recognizes that open space is part of the public trust and important in seeing the big picture. Pryor states that open space is not a public improvement, and is not population based. Adams responds to Chase's proposal by noting New Policy M, moved to Open Space Policy B. Tabb suggests interest group listens to staff recommendations. Proposal is “protection of natural open space shall be coordinated with development and, as appropriate, phased.” **Vote is passed, 17-0-1** (Bowlby abstains).
- Scarborough asks for staff explanation on new policy “Long range plans for public facilities and utilities should be consistent with the County's Land Use Element. Carmichael explains that this policy refers to small, independent districts. This was a message from the Steering Committee to the small districts. Harron states that some districts may know more about future development by talking to developers and look to outside sources other than the County's General Plan for guidance and information. Debate over language; Carmichael mentions districts don't usually disclose long range planning and capital improvement projects. Stedt feels this should not be in

the General Plan. Adams says policy should be taken out. Messer feels policy is constructive and would offend Steering Committee if it was removed, but would like staff and Counsel's opinion. Pryor explains the steering committee has debated language for months; the public utilities that the County owns or maintains needs to follow the land use patterns. Stepner feels the policy should be left in. Bowlby would like to reword the policy. Pryor says districts shouldn't have used the General Plan because there is no land use distribution; instead they relied on SANDAG's population distribution to determine their utilities, which won't happen in the General Plan update. Bowlby suggests "expansion of public facilities and utilities shall be consistent with the County's land use element." Silver would like to move, citing this is not the most important policy. Rolfe suggests a policy to deal with County districts and another one for independent districts; Pryor disagrees because it puts the County on the defensive and to encourage consistency. Silver motions for existing text, Tabb seconds motion. Whalen does not support motion. Scarborough notes there is a split staff decision, which usually results in a split vote. Harron insists that the policy has no teeth, and no one will heed it. Tabb acknowledges Harron's statement, but feels it is a good policy. Van Dierendonck uses Ramona's Water District to illustrate public facility needs, feels it should be left in. Rolfe questions if "should" weakens statement. Bowlby note if vote fails, the original policy still remains. **Vote passes 9-8-1** and remains "Long range plans for public facilities and utilities should be consistent with the County's Land Use Element."

- Conservation: Doyle's proposed N-Q policies. Reading of policy N, explains definition of non-renewable energy sources as oil, coal, natural gas, and old-growth forests. Adams asks staff how they would implement this policy. Carmichael suggests "locating higher density and intensity uses in areas close to existing infrastructure, jobs, and public transportation, whenever feasible;" this is what can be done at a General Plan level. Stedt supports employment near population, instead of vice versa. Tabb supports statement, but feels it doesn't belong in General Plan. Adams also agrees it does not belong in the General Plan. Chase supports policy and feels it should stay. Stedt notes that he is familiar with General Plan amendments, and is concerned about broad statements. Messer agrees with Stedt, and feels it should be in land use element as a goal. Doyle feels energy usage needs to be taken into account in land use decision making, cites terrorism attacks of 9/11 to illustrate our dependence on foreign oil and to attempt to reduce our consumption of non-renewable energy. Tabb disagrees and doesn't think it belongs in the General Plan. Silver believes it is relevant to the General Plan, but should be rephrased as "Promote energy efficiency and renewable energy sources." Silver proposes it as a replacement, and/or keep Doyle's policy. Stedt supports Silver's motion, if it replaces original statement. Harron creates a scenario into the future where flexibility in the policy would be important. Holler states the policy serves to change things incrementally. Chase proposes replacing "promote." Messer wants clarification on existing best practices for energy efficiency; Stedt wants to replace "promote" with "consider." Adams opposes it because of ambiguity; Chase notes there is an insufficient supply of energy in the county. Motion for "Promote energy conservation, efficiency, and renewable energy sources" by Doyle, second by Chase. Whalen asks Counsel's opinion, Harron prefers the word "consider" instead of "promote." Motion for "Consider energy conservation and efficiency and renewable energy sources with the goal of reducing regional reliance on non-renewable energy sources" by Scarborough, seconded by Doyle. **Vote passes 12-5-1.**
- Discussion on policy O. Debate whether habitats are protected. Adams notes the habitat conservation plans would add another tier of bureaucracy to already existing laws. Whalen thinks the policy is inaccurate, and only several habitats are covered through MSCP; Stehly mentions a difference between habitat and occupied habitat; Harron notes separate jurisdictions between Federal and State legislation; Doyle wants to replace "ensure" with "pursue" and strike out "and their habitats." Silver supports Doyle's changes. Doyle changes to "provide for." Messer proposes "protect threatened and endangered species." Rolfe supports "provide." Stepner notes that Doyle's proposal is similar to Interest Group revisions of 4.30.02 policy H on page 8; Doyle had submitted proposal before revisions were made. Stedt wonders if the proposal weakens the General Plan; Harron replies no, and is not a new responsibility for the County. Whalen claims that the policy puts a burden on the jurisdiction not obligated to do the recovery; the County is not capable to handle the recovery of any species, and does not want the word "recovery." Vote for

policy as is with addition of “recovery”... **vote fails 6-11-2.** Motion by Doyle and second for policy O as typed without “recovery”... **vote fails 4-13-2.**

- Discussion on policy B. Motion by Doyle for a vote; Adams asks staff about groundwater recharge system; Holler refers to policies A and B on page 7 and comments about ordinances on water quality. Silver notes that A refers to pollution and B relates to projects utilizing ground water, while Doyle’s proposal refers to groundwater recharge systems and is grounds for a new policy. Adams reads CWA statistics; in 1997 groundwater supplied 2% of water consumption in the County; by 2015 it will become 5%. Tabb believes existing A and B are sufficient. Messer supports the policy and feels it addresses groundwater recharge areas. Whalen asks if Clean Water Act 401 covers this topic; Harron replies it refers to the quality of water. Messer proposes “encourage the appropriate protection of groundwater recharge areas.” **Vote passes 17-0.**
- Discussion on policy Q- Doyle decides not to raise it. Messer finds error in new policy on page 9; “conservation and promote and control their removal” becomes “and promote their control and removal.”

Agenda Item III: Process- Status and Next Steps

- Planning of the next interest group meetings, next meeting will be June 11 for an extended meeting to finish the goals and policies, with no meeting June 25, and to reconvene July 9.
- Holler briefs Interest Group on public workshops, and will continue into the first half of June. Carmichael comments on public input that is being received.
- Silver questions staff about TDR’s; Holler replies that the process is starting.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comments

- Comments to speed up TDR process, and requests for more information.
- Van Dierendonck mentions lack of knowledge about TDR’s and PDR’s on behalf of the planning groups. He appeals for help and information on the process.