

**General Plan 2020  
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes  
September 10, 2002**

---

**Interest Group Committee:**

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
David Younkman	National Wildlife Federation ( <i>Note: unauthorized alternate</i> )
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Phil Pryde	SD Audubon
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

**Public at Large:**

Brent McDonald	Caltrans – District 11 – Planning
Carol Leone	
Charlene Ayers	
Chris Anderson	SDAR & Ramona CPG
Chris Morrow	
Dr. Starkey	
D. Pallinger	Ramona
Dave Shibley	
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
George S. Woodhead	Tecate Community Chamber of Commerce
J. Tanalski	Valley Center
Jeanne Pagett	
Joseph Tiscareno	
Lisa Haws	Viejas
Lynne Baker	EHL
Mark Price	
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Thometz	
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Richard Nowicki	
Ron Pennock	ECCC
Scott Molloy	Molloy Engineering & Analysis
Tom Ward	Manzanita

**County Staff:**

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

### **Agenda Item I: Logistics –**

a-d) Minutes for May 28; June 11; July 9; and August 5, 2002

- Bowlby requested an addition be made to the July 9<sup>th</sup> minutes (pp. 3, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet). Bowlby stated that his comment was supported by Tom Harron and requested his support be reflected in the minutes. Adams requested that the tape be reviewed for accuracy on this statement. Harron did not speak to Bowlby's comment.
- **Motion:** May 28, June 11, and July 9 minutes approved unanimously.
- Bowlby corrected Silver's comment on the August 5<sup>th</sup> minutes (pp. 2, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet under Agenda Item II). Believed Silver was referring to the preliminary distribution map's population estimate and should read 670,000 and not 660,000. Silver was not in attendance at the time and the revision and motion to approve was tabled pending his arrival.

e) Update on Interest Group Membership

- Scarborough mentioned that submittals received have been sent to the DCAO for approvals.

### **Agenda Item II: TDR Update –**

- Holler stated that case studies have been sent out to appraisers who looked at the value of the land based on proposed changes. Staff has received a draft report which needs to be analyzed and will then be shared with Rick Pruetz.
- Stehly mentioned that the next "tools" sub-committee will be held prior to the next Interest Group meeting at 10:30 am.
- Bowlby asked if the County contracted a consultant. Holler replied no, that staff had asked some of the appraisers in the Assessors office to assist us.

### **Agenda Item III: Tribal Lands Update –**

Scarborough stated that there have been discussions on ramifications of our independent sovereign nations within this county. Mentioned that two things have happened: 1) A new tribal gaming report has come out and 2) there is a bill on the Governor's desk.

a) Executive Summary of Tribal Gaming Report

- Holler mentioned that the handout included excerpts from the draft report and that the full report is available in draft form and out for comments. The excerpts handed out show an inventory of the existing tribes and the impacts on roadway segments and LOS (table E-1). Pointed out the four columns to look at: Baseline LOS, Near Term Cumulative LOS, Buildout LOS, and Cumulative Buildout LOS.
- Whalen affirmed that the report only includes tribal info and pointed out that there is a buildout level of E already on tribal lands regardless of what the County is doing. Holler agreed.
- Scarborough asked if the traffic numbers running now includes this information. Holler agreed.
- Adams asked what the formula was for determining the LOS. Pryor replied they used the SANDAG traffic generation models throughout and that they had to draw some assumptions but the same assumptions were used throughout the entire study.
- Tabb asked what is proposed to deal with the impacts casinos create if they are not paying for their fair share. Pryor responded that negotiations are going on between the County and most of the tribes with regards to their participation in terms of the impacts on some of those roads. Some of them have already entered into agreements with the County. Tabb asked if there has been any on 76. Pryor did not know.
- Chantal Saipe, County Tribal Liaison, mentioned that Rincon, San Pasqual, and Pauma have gone into agreement. The State is working on providing information that will be included in the report. Caltrans still has to determine the impacts and the tribes' fair share of those impacts, however, to determine the impacts, you need to have a project. There is no doubt that with the type of revenue gaming generates, there will be significant money spent in building gaming related facilities.
- Whalen asked if she is optimistic that things are going to work out with the tribes. Saipe replied that she is. These impacts affect the tribal members themselves and their homes, their businesses, and their customers so they have been willing to work with the County on road issues because it affects

access for their customers and meets their needs as well. Added that they also need to have good PR and the impression she received is that the tribes want to do the right thing.

- Bowlby asked if there was transit or a shuttle service for patrons. Saipe responded of course and that each casino has a schedule for shuttles, which are geared towards the elderly.
- Chase asked if the meaning of each heading could be emailed – looking for the technical info from SANDAG (table E-1). Saipe responded that she is available for questions and can be reached at (619) 685-2542.
- Adams asked what the tribes' assessments were of the Senate Bill 1828 that deals with sacred grounds. Saipe stated she had not discussed that with the tribes.
- Pryde asked if it was the County's position, that construction that takes place off the reservation, must conform with all state requirements, including CEQA. Saipe responded that they have no choice and must conform.
- Scarborough mentioned that the full report is on the official County website ([www.sdcounty.ca.gov](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov)), the handout only includes excerpts, and that these impacts will be incorporated into the transportation numbers.

b) Burton Bill Update

- Holler stated that SB1828 is a bill that would essentially require tribal notification for any proposed project within 20 miles of the Native American reservation. It is also referred to as the Sacred Sites Bill. The maps passed around showed the potentially affected lands (shaded). This bill would essentially authorize a lead agency to issue a permit for a project with a potentially significant impact to a sacred site, only under one of the following circumstances:
  1. Agreed upon mitigation measures would be incorporated into a final EIR, meaning that the bill requires the lead agency to convene meetings with the tribes and, in some cases, the commission as the work on the EIR begins. Any agreements would then be incorporated into the final EIR. Or, the affected tribe accepts the proposed mitigation measures or fails to comment on those measures.
  2. The lead agency makes certain specified findings regarding mitigation or avoidance of impacts.
  3. If the lead agency determines that there is no legal or feasible way to accomplish the project without significant impact, that all feasible avoidance or mitigation measures have been incorporated, and that there is an overriding environmental, public health or safety reason for project approval.

States that this is the language right out of the bill, which is currently on the Governor's desk awaiting his signature.

- Scarborough stated the County is officially opposed to the bill. She mentioned that the entire county is essentially affected as shown on the map. She asked Harron if something like what we are proposing with the General Plan, if it were approved, have to be put on hold if the Governor were to sign the bill and then it was litigated on based on its constitutionality. Harron replied that it does not affect our General Plan process. She asked what would happen to future projects (assuming GP2020 goes through) while this bill is in court. Harron replied that we would still consider the bill a valid law and apply the procedure to the development and, presumably, some kind of agreement would be reached to allow the project to move forward. If the project does not like that agreement, it then might litigate, otherwise the project would just move forward as is.
- Whalen asked if there are criteria for determining what sacred sites are on the bill. Holler responded there are, however, some of those criteria are that the site would be included on an inventory of sacred sites that is maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission, which is not a public list. Or, a tribe might submit evidence to a lead agency that identifies the site as being sacred. So there may be sites that are not on any list but might be described in the future as having significance.

**Agenda Item IV: Ground Truthing –**

a) Presentation by East County Construction Council (ECCC)

- Whalen stated that the concern is the accurate understanding of the realities of the ground when planning. He added that when they did their joint comment letter, they used aerial photographs that had parcel lines over them for each community to see if something is built, which was really important to see. They used that to put together their map comments.

- Ron Pennock, ECCC, stated that the ECCC is a support group for the building of real estate industry in San Diego County. They have been involved in the 2020 process since Alt. 3 was developed and was the primary group looking at alternatives for the development of the Interest Group concept when Alt. 3 was not accepted. Stated the following concerns: 1) they realized that for any project to be successful, it must have the correct and proper foundation, which they felt, for the General Plan update, began on a concerning premise – with 800,000 new people coming into San Diego County, the County is planning for 18% of that population and yet, control over 80% of the land so the cities, who consider themselves already built, will be taking the remainder of the population; 2) they believed the population for each planning group area was allocated in a haphazardly manner – given the choice between taking 12,400 or 9,400 new people, the Alpine Planning Group would obviously take the lower number; and 3) the direction they saw the Interest Group heading with concepts A-D, downzoning most areas, when the ability to house 20% of the population was in question. Stated that they had to know what the real numbers were and what impacts the downzoned set of sites would have on the real numbers. They began with Alpine and also did maps for Lakeside, Valle de Oro, and Jamul, all with the same results. The numbers that could be accommodated at buildout under the current general plan were 1/3 to 1/2 the numbers projected. In Alpine, they show the real numbers are less than 3,400 and not 9,400 that the County is showing for that area. In Lakeside, they show about 1/2 of the projected population and in Valle de Oro, they state we will have less than 300 new homes in the next 20 years. Added that they have a foundation of a map that can be used to determine what impacts of the proposed changes in the general plan would have on each community.
- David Waitley explained how they did the mapping, what constraints were taken into consideration, and what results were determined. Stated that they wanted to determine what the existing general plan would provide for numbers. They developed maps that used both listed addresses and dwelling units in the county to determine how many existing units were built and had a group (about 8 people) of various land owners and residents of Alpine to determine direct knowledge of individual lots, so they could determine how many units could be built under the current general plan. He stated they came up with approximately 1,000 units, which represents optimistic numbers for Alpine since there are some controversial areas there – 180 units for Wrights Field.
- Mark Price, chair of the Alpine Planning Group, explained how the planning group proceeded with this information. Stated that this map helped them look at what they are actually dealing with in Alpine – what is on the ground and what they are capable of having on the ground. They had multiple meetings on the map and the group voted to reject the proposed County map that placed the additional population in areas of main arteries, which are at an LOS F, and voted unanimously to support the map based on this ground truthing effort.
- Adams asked if they could explain how they evaluated the land out there and what they formally used to determine the actual yield on any particular parcel. Pennock replied that their base was the SANGIS map of Alpine, divided into parcels and addresses. Stated they used parcelization, which was the vast difference from what the County used. There were natural constraints within each parcel that had an impact on the numbers so they consulted who they felt were the best experts on the constraints and came up with parcels that were either under built or parcels that were vacant. Then, by overlaying the current general plan, they identified what could be accommodated in a planning group area and what the constraints were under the current general plan. By adding all the numbers, they came up with a base number of units under the current general plan that could be built out. Added that their process was not a projection of what you are going to do there, as much as it was identifying what are your concepts going to have.
- Whalen asked if they used more of a parcel-by-parcel method and whether this was done on a community-by-community basis for a number of communities. Pennock replied that they had done three and a half communities: Alpine, Lakeside, Valle de Oro, and Jamul (mostly outside the CWA). Whalen asked if the conclusion, that the predicted capacity was short, was the same for all of these communities. Pennock affirmed this with the exception of Jamul, which was way short.
- Younkman asked for clarification on what the Alpine Planning Group adopted. Price responded that the planning group chose the map that reallocated where growth would go through the ground truthing efforts instead of the County's, which they felt was detrimental to the community. Pryor stated that that map is not the guide for growth and is not in effect at this point in time as it has not been approved by the Board. Added that it is the community's preference but staff still retains the ability to make an independent professional judgment on the planning group's recommendation. Price stated that the planning group is using that map as their guide.

- Messer stated that their quarrel is not with the population projections based on our new structure and asked if Price's group advocates the County taking a higher share of the projected population and in particular, east of the CWA. Price replied that the Alpine Planning Group, back in 1998, chose to go with the lower number and what the existing group is trying to do, is live with the determination made by that previous planning group and that number. Messer stated that we will not be able to use those numbers if the old structure was used. She asked if the planning group endorsed the idea that the county, east of CWA, take a higher share. Price replied that his planning group only discussed going east of CWA as it pertains to their planning group. In their particular community, they found that it makes sense to extend a little beyond the CWA eastward because of already existing development – the casino. Messer asked if the planning group addressed the issue of absorbing this margin number of the county with this existing pattern of sprawl. Price replied that they have addressed it and are willing to take the number that the previous planning group approved and they feel that the best way to place that 12,000 in Alpine, includes a certain percentage of them extending beyond the CWA.
- Stehly asked about how 2020 fits into ground truthing since they only compared the existing general plan. Pennock replied that proper information is required to have a good foundation, which he believes that information to be what exists on the ground today. They believed that by establishing the foundation of numbers on what could be built out on the current general plan, they could then determine the impacts that are coming from the new concepts. Stehly stated that you could not possibly go up if the current general plan gives you a buildout of 9,000 more units and you are assuming a downzone in the 2020 plan. Pennock replied that in Alpine, the numbers given were 9,400 new people in 20 years. Their analysis of the current general plan determined it will only hit 3,400, asking what are you going to do with the other 6,000 and if you are going to downzone from there, through concepts, rural village and so on. Stehly asked about increased density. Pennock replied that the village core gets increased density, for instance 29 du/ac in the downtown village core, and these communities do not want nor support village core concepts.

b) Staff analysis

- Holler stated that there are a couple of different issues going around – some of them are related to the proposed map and others are focused on what we are calling ground truthing. Essentially, the ground truthing efforts conducted by ECCC, as well as, the modeling efforts that DPLU has conducted, are based on a set of assumptions. ECCC did a survey on parcels in the community and made assumptions based on that survey, just like staff had done with the model. The difference is that staff is looking at the entire county and not parcels but we both make assumptions.
- Comparison of existing to existing – their assumptions included the following items: development of only single-family detached homes with lot sizes similar to historical surrounding patterns; did not assume further subdivision (could have assumed if rather large lot); looked at existing development layout pattern; considered community opposition; considered separate ownership of contiguous parcels; and they projected dwelling units based on what had been achieved using their past development experience. A yield number that is often cited is frequently shown as 30% less than what is on the map. We [staff] assumed that during the life cycle of this plan, further subdivision of larger lots may occur and considered the constraints when applying our process. We also project potential dwelling units, which is the density shown on the map, less the constraints. When we were originally running the numbers, because of the longevity of this project, we used 1997 base data and they used 2001 base data because they did a survey. When we went back and analyzed that difference that alone accounted for about a 14% difference, bringing the two numbers closer. In addition, they did point out something that we did not consider in how we structured the model and that was the use of a 15% slope constraint. We changed the model and now it is calculating that 15% slope constraint. Those are some differences in the assumptions that we and they have made but only on the numbers generated from the model.
- Scarborough asked for the total number of population of staff to ECCC on the existing to existing. Holler stated that we calculated about 24,000 people on the existing plan and theirs is approximately 19,000. As an example of the differences in assumptions, one 39 acre parcel that ran an analysis on, ECCC saw a possibility of 6 units and we saw about 18.
- Proposed plan – this new general plan contemplates uncoupling lot size from density. We did not assume that development of new lots would be similar to sizes that historically exist around it (opportunity to do clustering). Areas we did agree upon - neither assumed redevelopment on built land; assumed that where feasible, sewer would be available either through a combination of an onsite facility, packaging plant, or where plant capacity exists but infrastructure is needed, so we

did propose densities in areas where we anticipate sewer will be available and is not available today. One of the things that our predictive model does is calculate future dwelling units for us based on the working copy map and the resultant population of 670,000. The model calculated approximately 83,000 future dwelling units and by discounting it by 30%, assuming a 30% loss off the top, gives us 58,000 dwelling units. If we divide 58,000 by the number of building permits we issue every year, (we looked at the average number of building permits that we have issued for the past 12 years – you have a tail end of a boom, a bust cycle, and 1999 had volumes very near the boom of the late '80s, so we have that whole cycle) that is 2,750 building permits on an average (in actuality, we were conservative as some of those building permits did not have address locations but we plugged them in anyways recognizing that we may double count some of them because of that one piece of data missing). If then we assume we burn through building permits at an accelerated rate, that is if the County takes greater than 16% or 18% of the population, we go up to 3,250 permits a year as an average, which is 500 more per year and that gives us an 18 year supply. Again these are discounted numbers so we are already taking 30% off the top from what the model is calculating.

- Holler presented a few case studies.
- Waitley made a few corrections: 1) they did take into consideration whatever zoning was in Alpine so the assumption that they had only looked at single family is incorrect – they took into consideration that there would be numbers in the current village core; 2) they did not exclude a property that had a single family home on it – they did take it into consideration if it was a 4 acre lot that had one acre zoning, they looked at it to determine what more they could get; and 3) they did not stay away from controversial properties, for instance, they had put 180 units on Wrights Field based on constraints and current zoning, that is the way ground truthing works out. Thinks that statistically Alpine, in the last ten years has been operating closer to 30% or 50% yield, not 70%. Added that he does not think subtracting 30% will give you the number. For example, a 20 acre parcel with one acre zoning, theoretically should yield 20 – one acre lots but thinks statistically, we are getting 5, 6, or 10 lots max. If the constraints are there, we may only be operating at a 30% or 50% yield based on current zoning. Pryor replied that that is the major difference because they had made an assumption that we did not use. Waitley is using the premise that because of constraints, your yield is going to drop by 50% or more, that is because you have two things working against you in the current Zoning Ordinance – 1) is the minimum lot size and 2) the avoidance of those things and because of the big lot size, you often lose yield that way. Under the current planning process taking place now, using a density base, if you have a density of 1 du/ac on a 20 acre parcel, you would be able to get a yield of 20 because you simply adjust the lot size and the design of the project to capture that yield, that is the difference in how you accommodate that growth.
- Tabb mentioned that the only caveat is sewer, which in certain areas, specifically Alpine, sewer becomes an issue.
- Adams clarified that the ECCC's point was that if the numbers really are not on the mark on the current general plan, then how can the numbers be on the mark with the attempt at a new general plan. Pennock affirmed this and stated their efforts were to determine the results of the concepts and policies on the community.
- Bowlby asked how many units were being proposed east of CWA. Pennock stated that their particular organization does not support concept D. Waitley responded that they did not have a particular number and instead provided a guideline on how to provide growth along that transportation corridor of I-8. Bowlby asked if they looked at the water availability for the number of units they were proposing for east of CWA. Price stated that for it to work, they would have to extend water and sewer. Mentioned that this density based zoning does not work in some communities like Alpine, that it does not work to shove people down to a ¼ acre lot. The only reason they are proposing development east of CWA is because it allows Alpine to maintain its character and take in the additional population but it is also an area that has been impacted by the casino.
- Bowlby asked for clarification on yield reduction on the distribution map. Pryor responded that staff did take environmental constraints into account when we came up with the population number. The issue here however, is if you have a lot size – one dwelling unit on a 4 acre parcel – we basically looked at that and said if you had 1 du/ac, we would assume that that lot could have been divided and have 4 houses on it rather than just one. Out of ground truthing, they said because of the minimum lot size, which was 2 acres, they only added one house so they have 2 houses on that 4 acres when we put 4 because with the decoupling of the lots, you can go to the smaller lot size and maintain the density and make better use of the land. That is the difference between the two

approaches being taken – we are looking at making more efficient use of the land that is going to be built on so that means you can stay away from the more sensitive habitat lands. Pryor added, in that approach, we were just talking density and did not factor in or talk about how it would apply if it had critical habitat on that parcel.

- Messer stated that this ground truthing was really an analysis of lot based planning and preferred it to be called a lot based analysis. Commented on the presentation stating that it seemed to be a bit local in its focus and did not address how we are to accommodate the population growth in the county. It is advocating the same kind of sprawl that we have seen lead to terrible level of service roads.
- Coombs suggested the need for a minimum density as another tool in addition to a maximum.

#### **Agenda Item V: Introduction to Standards –**

- Carmichael mentioned that early on in the project, the Steering Committee was tasked with developing standards to help guide where the development would go and to help with the initial population modeling parameters. Resource standards are necessary to help guide at a project specific level because a General Plan really cannot get that detailed. For example, many of the floodplains in the county of San Diego are not mapped, neither by FEMA nor the County. We may go ahead at a general plan level, put an appropriate density that would reflect the constraints but since many of the floodplains are not mapped in the county, once you get on a project site, that is when you see the smaller floodplains that are not mapped – the stream channels, etc. So the General Plan does not reflect that constraint that would be noticed at a detailed project level and that is especially true with floodplains and wetlands, like vernal pools. The Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) contains the existing standards we go by today for floodways, floodplains, wetlands, slope, and sensitive biological communities outside of the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP). The Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO) contains the existing standards within the MSCP areas. The Steering Committee proposed the standards for GP2020 a few years ago and we expect them to be modified as we go through this process. In January 2001, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) did endorse the standards as seen in the handout as a starting point, which also contain other standards for parks, libraries, and roads.
- Floodplains – In the existing RPO, there are no habitable structures allowed in floodways. The existing standard for floodplains (100 year floodplain), you end up setting back 15% of the floodway width, which is determined by a 10 year storm – so if your floodway is 100 ft. wide, you have a 15 ft. setback that you could then elevate the structure being put in. The caveat in the RPO is if you actually have riparian habitat or endangered species or other things than just floodplain that come into play, then your ability to encroach into the floodplain can get reduced but that is the existing standard. The proposed standard from the Steering Committee is 100% protection in the floodplain and you would also have a 100% yield reduction in density. Right now you have no yield reduction in theory, however in practicality, there are other things that come into play that cause a reduction if your entire site was nearly in a floodplain or something like that. It is unlikely that you would be able to move all of your units off that today as you would end up reducing yield due to septic or any number of other things. So the proposal is 100% avoidance and yield reduction and they have a caveat in there that you would do that unless there is a taking. If an ordinance were to be approved at that level, you would have to have some provision that a person was entirely within a floodplain, they would still have the ability to build with a legal lot.
- Steep Slope – The existing steep slope standard in the RPO sets limits on density. If you are over 25% slope then you have a 50% reduction in density, if it is over 50% slope, you have a 75% density reduction – in other words, if you have a one acre density to start and you are over 25% slope, you would have 2 acres (in this case of the existing general plan, it would be lot size) and if you were over 50% you would have 4 acres. The village and semi-rural categories are what is actually proposed to be slope dependent. The current Steering Committee proposals also included slope dependent village core densities but last month, the Steering Committee reviewed this new proposal and reduced the village core slope dependency. So in essence, if you are inside a village core and have steep slopes, you have the higher density put on that is intended to not have a density reduction; the village core is where we want to see the growth occur and not have a density reduction.
- Stedt asked if the Steering Committee standards were used when doing the population model. Carmichael affirmed this, stating that since these were previously proposed by the Steering

Committee, those were in the existing population model and we will have to model by that. If there are further changes made by this group, we will have to reconcile the two groups and modify our model to reflect that. In all cases, once you get into the rural lands categories or even the 1 per 10 ac in the semi-rural, all of those constraints and density reductions drop off – the feeling is that once you are at that low of density, the avoidance issue is taken care of.

- **Wetlands** – Similar to the existing RPO, the current standard is no grading, filling, construction or placement of structures in wetlands and for anyone who has done a development proposal, we kind of do a no net loss kind of thing on wetlands. What is also proposed is a no net loss of wetland acreage, function or value and a density reduction as proposed by the Steering Committee.
- **Biological Resources** – We do not have a proposal from the Steering Committee, however the BOS did tell us to put some standards together for biological resources so we can have a consistent standard county-wide. Today the existing RPO talks about having equal or better mitigation ratios for sensitive resources but it does not go into very detailed ratios. The existing BMO does cover that within the MSCP areas so the Board told us to, in essence, pattern the biological standards in the BMO, looking at the different tiers. Those are similar to MSCP today. Things to note – once we have a full set of standards, we can go further in our discussion with the Planning Commission and the Board and eventually these would then result in ordinance changes. The RPO would change and we would look at other types of implementing ordinances that would need to be changed to reflect whatever we get consensus on and go forward with.
- Whalen stated that he is opposed to the Steering Committee position. Asked under what circumstances would we be able to build in hilly areas and wanted to focus our thinking on physical danger as opposed to arbitrary reduction.
- Stedt stated that he did not think there is any necessity to have slope reductions and that additional slope reduction complicates the process and has a tendency to reduce a density based plan to a lot based plan.
- Silver and Messer agreed that the group needs to think of the outcomes and the objective of the plan and stated that these standards should be discussed carefully.

#### **Agenda Item VI: Process –**

##### a) Status & Next Steps

- Steep slopes will be discussed at the next meeting. Pryor asked the group to think about why the steep slope were originally created before the next meeting.
- An interim Interest Group map will be runned and staff should be contacted if you are interested in viewing the “builders” map.

#### **Agenda Item VII: Public Comments –**

- Dutch Van Dierendonck stated that he is looking forward to a closer meeting of the minds and an exercise of the interaction of thoughts because these are not cast in bronze but rather things that concerned the Steering Committee and was something that should have been addressed at the earliest possible time.
- Dave Shibley commented on Indian gaming.