

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Meeting Minutes
June 4, 2001
Revised June 18, 2001**

Interest Group:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Allison Rolfe	San Diego Audubon
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Lee Vance	Building Industry Association
Reed Morgan	American Institute of Architects
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Carl Teyssier	Ramona
Charlene Ayers	
Chris Anderson	Ramona Chamber of Commerce
Constance Clover	Alliance
David Shibley	
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Gary Wynn	North County GE&LS Association
Harlan Lowe	Ramona
Janet Anderson	Sierra Club
Jerry McLees	Sweetwater Authority
Joan Kearney	
Joe Klasen	Potrero
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Michael Thometz	Merit
Pat Flanagan	SDNHM
Paul Gebert	San Diego County Water Authority
Peng Tan	
Ruth Potter	LWVSDCO

County:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary L. Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Aaron Barling (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Gisela Hernandez (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

a) Board of Supervisors Hearing Update

- ❖ **Proposal made at the June 18, 2001 Interest Group meeting:** E. Bruvold proposed that the minutes eliminate the details concerning the Board of Supervisor's motion and only indicate that an update on the motion was presented.

b) Minutes

- A. Rolfe had stated that P. Pryde had wanted to insert the following in his statement at the top of page 7 (bullet from page 6): "never intended for 94 west of Jamul not to be widened but these areas are all west of the County Water Authority line.
- E. Bowlby stated that he had would like the statement (2nd to last bullet on page 7) to read as "the changes that are being made to concept D was not sending a clear message to the Board. And that the other proposals had details that we were readily trying to exclude from concept D."

c) Project Schedule & Next Steps

- K. Scarborough had asked the group whether they would like to see the maps prior to being ran through SANDAG's black box or afterwards. D. Silver responded with the desire to see the maps as soon as possible or at the earliest point in time. A. Stehly had asked what the difference was and G. Pryor explained costs (\$11,000) and time it takes to go to SANDAG. G. Pryor had also added that if the groups were to see the maps prior to being run, the group can identify whether their concepts match and disagreements can be resolved earlier. The group had agreed to see the maps prior to being run. E. Bowlby was concerned over not seeing the impacts to which G. Pryor replied that the group would see the map afterwards as well.
- I. Holler announced that during the month of June, staff will be going out to the Community Planning and Sponsor Group meetings to begin work on the Community Plan texts.
- D. Silver thought that a different land use map based on the concepts would be helpful and had asked how the pilot planning in Ramona was progressing. I. Holler stated that as of May 30, the department was evaluating it.
- K. Scarborough stated that the Interest Group was not the only source of input (4 criteria) in addition, letters from the public were being utilized as input as well as Steering Committee comments. D. Silver requested clarification in that he had thought that the consultants were going to base the maps on the four criteria so that the new maps reflect the concepts.
- L. Vance wanted to know where the Steering Committee was at and requested an update. G. Pryor explained that we have groups on both sides where some do not want to participate, in that they do not want changes made, and others are still willing to participate. He added that the consultants have the information and will do the maps and then show them to both groups to fix the changes. L. Vance commented that it is pretty clear that a comprehensive update of the general plan is necessary and that it is not a possibility for a group to opt out.

d) Public Comment

- K. Scarborough modified when public comments are to take place – comments will be taken during the meeting when an action is taken and general comments will remain at the end. There was considerable concern to having comments at the beginning of the meeting since there was not enough to comment on and after the meeting since people leave. Comment length will be limited to 2 minutes each.

e) Update on Gap Analysis

- Tom Oberbauer (Environmental Resource Manager, MSCP) gave a presentation on its status and commented on how it fits in with the MSCP plan. Based on the handout given by K. Messer at the May 21 Interest Group meeting, T. Oberbauer stated that they

are doing everything under #1 as it is folded within MSCP and the General Plan 2020 process. Information regarding vegetation communities by appropriate tiers and predicted species distribution model is all being included into the process that General Plan 2020 is doing. Slight modifications are on the second item which talks about meeting with biological experts, is what MSCP does, however it takes specific modeling because MSCP and the general plan process are different.

- G. Piro commented that it would help to have the preserve maps done after the distribution maps are completed. T. Oberbauer replied that it was done for 2020.
- K. Messer commented that they did not want the County's broader interest of preserving its natural resources to be neglected in favor of some future, more detailed analysis. Their concern is that this kind of mapping should be done integral with GP2020 and so they are not asking for a detailed distribution but rather for the important resources. T. Oberbauer replied with that it was information included in #1.
- K. Messer asked if the group will have the item in #3 which T. Oberbauer said they would, however he feels that the main concern should be to have critical linkages which overlaps quite a bit with #2.
- T. Oberbauer stated that MSCP works with the specific needs of endangered species and they will not be able to do that for all the species in the County for GP2020. When they had met with their science advisors, a question came up regarding a preliminary map based on the modeling. It was their impression that there may be corridor areas that may not have "sensitive habitat but important habitat" which they will not know until they run individual models for specific models they are trying to get coverage for under MSCP.
- L. Vance asked County Counsel if there was any reason to be concerned, from a liability standpoint, that we basically have one-third of the County under MSCP at that level of detail of scientific review and two-thirds of the County, not under MSCP and other levels of scientific review. T. Harron responded with that it is of concern, however, we will have the best information we can for environmental impacts and there does need to be a cut off somewhere.
- K. Scarborough noted that with the level of questions and comments that the IG would have Tom Oberbauer back and have a full agenda item on MSCP.

Introduction –

K. Scarborough introduced Jonathan Smulian from Wallace, Roberts & Todd, the consultants for GP2020.

Agenda Item III: Agriculture/Open Space Resource Areas –

- Handout was given out – *2020 Plan Interest Committee Presentation on Agriculture*
- E. Larson began the presentation by speaking of the on-the-ground situation of agriculture today in the County to make sure there is a basic understanding of the profile of the agriculture in the County.
- The committee's agreement to look at TDRs and PDRs certainly satisfy some of their concerns with farm valuation but at the same time, it does not alleviate the needs or capacity to create small farms as we are a small farm County.
- Pointed out that 75% of farmers are over the age of 50 and 51% are over 60 so that by 2020, it becomes obvious that most farms are going to change hands and it becomes a question of whether they will remain farms or change in its usage.
- Pointed out that land accounts for 79% of all assets so it basically becomes farmers' 401K, as such, there is a need for farm equity protection.
- Stated that a huge selling point of TDRs is that if the development rights are sold off of property, we will have for the first time in San Diego County farmland actually being sold for the value of farmland so that we are creating the capacity for ongoing generational change.
- E. Bowlby asked for a breakdown of acreage, 10 acres and below, 10 acres and over, and acres larger than 50. 4200 farms are below 10 acres.
- K. Messer stated that we need some more details on aspects of this, i.e. a lot of these ornamentals are grown in the unincorporated areas so a lot of the crop value is in the unincorporated area and so the concern lies in allowing small parcels in areas where we would

not have allowed them. She added that we need to look at the historical trend and parcelization. A. Stehly commented that we are the only county that has not pushed agriculture out.

- A. Elias asked what makes a farm, a farm in which E. Larson replied that it is derived from farm income.
- A. Stehly said that the Farm Bureau would like to remove *open space* from the title and replace it with “resource areas” because to them, “open space” conotates public land, public ownership, public trespass, which they dislike. Would like to add in concept A, to permit the creation of new parcels for farms as small as 10 acres when water supply, topography and climate can be shown to support agricultural use because we still need small farms since we are growing east. Same changes to concept B and the same change, with a different minimum, 40 acres, to concept D.
- J. Whalen asked that the Farm Bureau include in their presentation, the reusing of domestic water, once cleaned, for agricultural use. A. Stehly said that the vast majority of reclaimed water is unusable because it is too salty, which applies to well water as well, and it is too expensive for farmers to purchase desalinated water.
- A. Stehly announced that the Farm Bureau endorses TDRs and PDRs fully. D. Silver responded with that the group needs to talk all these things through. He added that we also need to acknowledge that there is no way to differentiate residential use and small farms. Built into this, concept B has a semi-rural category which already is meant to be small farm areas. Looking at concept B, there is a lot of capacity for new farms so he is asking the group to look closely at concept B.
- G. Piro generally supports the motion of the Farm Bureau because there is no mechanism for mitigating for farm losses and so these tools will help agriculture to continue. K. Messer added that TDRs have the potential for preserving farms in the County.
- K. Messer stated that though agriculture is good, it should not get exempted from planning because it has bad impacts as it is consumptive and requires resources.
- T. Barker Commented that agriculture is becoming more “industrial” in look, with greenhouses and other structures. Agricultural uses in the “open space” category of Concept A should be predominately fields and orchards, not structures. The term “open space should be retained to describe the landscape.
- No motion will be taken today, as further discussion will continue at the June 18th meeting.
- **Public comment:**
 - ⇒ Dave Shibley – Feels that not having a realtor speak is a problem. Stated that the group needs to think of 60 or 70 years down the road because agricultural land will not stay the same.
 - ⇒ Dutch Van Dierendonck – Concerned that the discussion has not included the equine industry and feels that the group needs to consider it.
 - ⇒ Peng Tan – Concerned about TDRs and that there is no true representative of landowners present at the meeting. B. Tabb replied that he was the representative.
 - ⇒ Ruth Potter – There is a need to recognize that most of the public land is habitat and it needs to be protected.

Agenda Item IV: Concept “D” Criteria –

- **Motion:** G. Piro acknowledged that he had placed the 3rd bullet under *Village Core* on hold and that he was fine with the 4.3 du/ac. He moved to remove the hold. A. Rolfe seconded the motion. General concensus was reached.
- E. Bowlby stated that the implementation tools attached to the concept did not belong and should be removed. He also was unhappy with the *restricted expansion of roads* since infrastructure is what drives growth patterns and requested to go back to P. Pryde’s orginal language. A. Elias retorted with the question of why the group would need to go back over this matter since it was voted on at the last meeting. She added that she did not think that the language should be there. G. Pryor added that he could not support the prior language because we need to balance the roads with infrastructure. He said that the land use should be done and then we should see what it does to the infrastructure but we already have the growth and so he will not be able to support it and suggests leaving the language as it is.
- A. Elias was generally concerned about making decisions and going back. D. Silver responded with that we do not always do everything right the first time. He added that the group did not need to table this and could rather acknowledge it and look at it later.

- E. Bowlby could not understand how we are going to handle sprawl east of the CWA line. G. Pryor responded with that it is not the roads you should be concerned with but rather what you put on the land. K. Scarborough mentioned again that the group will have a chance to look at the maps.
- **Public comment:** “Skip” – Feels that we should not hobble the funding because if we need roads, we need roads.
- **Vote:** E. Bowlby put forth the motion to have P. Pryde’s original language be re-instated.
 - ⇒ Favored: 4
 - ⇒ Opposed: 8
 - ⇒ Abstained: 1

Agenda Item V: “Tools” Update –

- The TDR technical subcommittee spoke via a teleconference call. K. Messer stated that because they were a subcommittee, they restricted themselves to finding structure to proceed. They felt that they needed the following: a succinct list to serve as an outline, a glossary of terms (D. Silver has created one), an example (many successful programs to choose from), and sources of information (looked at G. Piro’s bibliography from his “smart growth” document). She stated that the group should not limit themselves to these tools (TDRs and PDRs) and should identify critical issues.
- Next meeting/discussion is scheduled for Wednesday at 4:00 pm.
- **Motion:** G. Piro motioned that the group asks DPLU to have an expert come to the meeting. A. Stehly seconded the motion. It was decided that the group as a whole would decide on 2 to 3 consultants to submit to the department who will make the final decision.
- **Public comment:** D. Van Dierendonck asked whether it was possible for members of the Steering Committee to listen to the speaker. K. Scarborough responded that it was intended to be a joint meeting.
- **Vote:** All in favor.

Agenda Item VI: Public Comments –

- Dave Shibley – Wants acreage assigned to the gap analysis. Requests that the committee address the population distribution from 800,000 to 600,000 since the Board said to base the new map on the existing General Plan. Question regarding e-mail – says that he does not receive anything.
- Jerry McLees (Sweetwater Authority) – Suggests a water quality representative since the Board requested to add the realtors and another environmental representative to the group. Added that they would be pleased to participate.
- Scott Molloy – Did research on different TDRs.
 - ❖ **Correction made at the June 18, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting: Spelling of name.**
- Peng Tan – Asked what the critical mass number is to sustain a species because he feels that it is unnecessary to set aside so much land for species.

Announcements –

- The criterias and agriculture discussion will be finished at the next meeting, June 18.
- The meeting of July 2nd will be postponed to July 9th and the bi-weekly meetings will resume with the already scheduled July 16th meeting.

Next meeting –

Scheduled for Monday, June 18, 2001 in the County Administration Center, 7th floor tower, 12:15 pm - 2:45 pm.