

**Attendees:**

George Vanek Alpine  
❖ **Revision made at the August 25, 2001 Steering Committee meeting:** Addition of George Vanek's name to the attendees list.

Chuck Davis	Bonsall
Tom Weber	Borrego Springs
Richard Whitaher	Boulevard
Bill Bretz	Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills
Kathy Goddard	Cuyamaca
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura
John Horton	Julian
Gene Helsel	Julian
Randy Lenac	Lake Morena/Campo
Gordon Shackelford	Lakeside
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Curtis Nicolaisen	Rainbow
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Carol Angus	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Larry Aguilar	Spring Valley
John Ferguson	Spring Valley
Louis Schooler	Tecate
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro

**Visitors**

Larry Paris	Rancho Santa Fe Association
Laura Houle	East San Diego County Assn. of Realtors
Jim Bowen	Fallbrook
Sandra Farrell	Twin Oaks
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Mary Allison	Lakeside (USDRIC)
Janis Shackelford	Lakeside
Jan Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Joan Kearney	Ramona
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Howard Blackson	DPLU

**Planning Commissioners:**

Bryan Woods  
Michael Beck

**County:**

Gary Pryor (DPLU)  
Ivan Holler (DPLU)  
Tom Harron (County Counsel)  
Karen Scarborough (DPLU)  
Leann Carmichael (DPLU)  
Neal LaMontagne (DPLU)  
Michelle Yip (DPLU)  
Dave Martin (DPLU)

Meeting commenced at 9:00 am

**First Agenda Item: Approval of March 24, 2001 Minutes**

Gordon Shackelford of Lakeside requested that the March 24, 2001 minutes reflect the Committee members' concerns with the draft regional concepts, particularly the potential threat to established communities such as Lakeside. The minutes will be changed to include the concerns.

**Second Agenda Item: Update on Interest Group Committee**

Karen Scarborough presented the principles of the Interest Group's vision which was a general trend or consensus of the group. The following principles were discussed as a *General Plan 2020* approach:

1. Facilities based
2. Rural preservation areas
3. Targeted development areas
4. Clustering
5. Rural design standards
6. Implementation through Purchase of Development Rights (PDRs), Transfer Development Rights (TDRs) and other mechanisms
7. Preserve sensitive biological spaces
8. Respect community character

Discussion evolved around the existing conflicts of interest that need to be disclosed and the overall relevance of the Interest Group Committee with regards to the Steering Committee. County Counsel stated the relevance of the Interest Group Committee's update which was supported by members of the Steering Committee who believed that it becomes necessary for the Steering Committee to listen to the Interest Group Committee, otherwise they will be given more clout.

**Third Agenda Item: Reintegration of Community Plan Texts**

Gary Pryor gave an overview of the Community Plan Matrix which showed the criteria and examples from existing Community Plans in their different boxes. Gary stated that it was a matter of what belongs in the right box. Specific plans will be a separate part of the process as an implementing tool and can be left in the General Plan if it is carried out and/or built out. Overall, each community should be clearly identified as a chapter. By looking at the Community Plans, we need to make a decision about whether it belongs at the regional level in that it applies to everybody and whether there are statements in the document that the community needs to look at.

A discussion about clustering arose with regards to whether there could be tools put in for an area to avoid clustering. County Counsel stated that it was possible either by identifying the area and putting parameters in or by tailoring the zoning to the area. This brought about the suggestion of a separate zoning ordinance for each community and the amount of work and effort that would be required in revising the Community Plans. There was concern that SPAs will lose regulations and standards, but it was stated that old SPAs will not be thrown out and new SPAs will have a density already set. County Counsel had stated that the general plan is constitution and everything after that is supplemental. There was concern over omitting unnecessary and redundant statements in Community Plans with regards to the consultants omitting statements that may not necessarily be unnecessary or redundant to the community. There was general concern over restructuring Community plans and a suggestion was made to do a strikeout/underline revision when modifying the plans.

**Fourth Agenda Item: Additional Items or Comments**

A revised version of the Population Summary was handed out. This version included the preliminary 2000 Census numbers from SANDAG.

An announcement was made regarding the Alan Hoffman presentation being held on Wednesday, May 16, 2001 between 10:00 am – 12:00 pm in the PERB room (COC Annex, Suite B). He will be sharing his view of mass transit.

A request for a copy of the progress report sent to the Board of Supervisors was made. A revised status report will be sent to the Planning/Sponsor Group chairpersons.

There was a question regarding what communities do with the plans that come up while GP2020 is in the progress of adoption.

A timeline of major tasks will be mailed out.

Meeting concluded at 11:05 am