

**Steering Committee Minutes  
April 26, 2008**

**Steering Committee Members**

Abby King	Borrego Springs
Bill Collins	Borrego Springs
Donna Tisdale	Boulevard
Bev Esry	Campo/Lake Morena
Jack Vandover	Crest/Dehesa/Granite Hills/ Harbison Canyon
Harry Christianson	Fallbrook
Robert Frey	Hidden Meadows
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura
Jack Shelver	Julian
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Joe Chisolm	Pala-Pauma
Vern Denham	Pine Valley
Carl Meyer	Potrero
Rua Petty	Rainbow
Helene Radzik	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Liz Stonehouse	Sweetwater
Steve Stonehouse	Sweetwater
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Oliver Smith	Valley Center

**Planning Commission**

Bryan Woods, Planning Commissioner

**Staff**

Devon Muto, Chief  
LeAnn Carmichael, Planning Manager  
Bob Citrano, Planner III  
Eric Lardy, DPLU Staff  
Jimmy Wong, DPLU Staff  
Claudia Anzures, County Counsel  
Woody Teshler, PBS&J  
Kim Howlett, PBS&J

**Public**

Charlene Ayers	Ranters Roost
Doug Paul	
H. Palmer	Twin Oaks
Larry Johnson	Campo/Lake Morena
William L Crawley IV	Potrero

Meeting Commenced at 9:05 a.m.

## I. Introductions

Mr. Woods called the meeting to order and asked that all of the Steering Committee Members give introductions. Following introductions Mr. Muto gave appreciation to the Steering Committee members for attending a meeting on a Saturday morning, and to his staff for their preparations.

Mr. Woods reminded the committee that those Planning and Sponsor Groups who have two representatives at the table only receive one vote.

Mr. Woods asked Kim Howlett and Woody Teshler with PBS&J to introduce themselves. Mr. Howlett introduced himself as the Project Manager for the General Plan Update and Mr. Teshler introduced himself as a Principle Planner with the company. Mr. Teshler explained that he will be working on planning aspects of the project and Mr. Howlett will be working on the environmental portions.

## II. **Action Item:** Approve minutes from February 2, 2008, March 1, 2008, March 15, 2008 and March 22, 2008 Steering Committee Meetings.

Mr. Woods acknowledged that there were minutes tabled from the last few meetings and asked the group for any comments on them. Mr. Phillips commented that the minutes are not as thorough as they have been in the past.

**Phillips: Motion to Approve Minutes from February 2, 2008, March 1, 2008, March 15, 2008 and March 22, 2008 Steering Committee Meetings.**

**Tisdale: Second**

**Motion Passes 20-0-0**

## III. Announcements/Project Updates

Mr. Woods turned the meeting over to Mr. Muto, who described accomplishments on the General Plan Update since September. Those accomplishments include; nine Steering Committee and Interest Group Meetings, Staff giving updates to each Community Planning and Sponsor Group, distribution of announcements on a monthly basis, preparation of a comprehensive schedule and workplan, execution of the contract with PBS&J, external review on two of six draft elements with the remainder expected to go forward shortly, completed map alternatives that are undergoing modeling, initial work on the Environmental Impact Report started, and that the project is on schedule. Mr. Muto also informed the group that staff is planning on going to the Planning Commission on May 30<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Woods asked if there were any questions on the announcements or on the project. Ms Esry asked if legal lots are going to remain legal lots even if the land use designation

changes and if Major Use Permits are still going to exist with the General Plan Update. Mr. Muto replied yes to both questions.

Ms. Jones asked to clarify that the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was dated April 28<sup>th</sup> and will be released on that date, Mr. Muto responded yes it will to be released on Monday April 28<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. R. Smith commented that the website has gone through some changes and that he encountered some broken links. Mr. Lardy replied that the website did go through a transition, and that staff has been working on it. He stated that if people see any specific broken links they should send us an E-mail. Mr. Muto added to please only send links on our website, because the entire County of San Diego site received an overhaul and there are many broken links. Mr. R. Smith also asked if the information handed out today was going to be on the website. Mr. Muto responded that it would not be put on the website, but that we could send out the Land Use Element by E-mail and we can talk about the community plans later.

#### IV. Presentation and Distribution of Regional Land Use Element

Mr. Muto explained that a great deal of work occurred with the Land Use Element since it has been reviewed by the Steering Committee and Consultants, and that staff has prepared tools to help the review. He explained that we have distributed a summary of revisions, a strikeout/underline version and a clean version of the Draft Land Use Element and a lastly a copy of all comments received on the Draft Land Use Element.

Mr. Muto described that all of the Steering Committees comments were integrated into the document, about ninety percent of the other comments received were incorporated and that other changes occurred with the structure of the document. He also explained that there is going to be a 45 day review period and asked members let us know if the steering committee opinion was misrepresented. Mr. Muto described that the five major changes with the document were; (1) a reorganization of goals and policies with new sections, (2) formatting goals and policies to establish hierarchy, (3) reword of goals and policies to use active verbs, (4) incorporation of comments and (5) addressing community plans as part of the General Plan.

Mr. Denham asked how many interest group comments were incorporated into the document. Mr. Muto replied that only one Interest Group Member responded with written comments and that at the interest group meeting some of the members expressed that they would like to change the Village Limit Line wording, which was incorporated.

Mr. Phillips asked how many of the new policies came from the Steering Committee, Mr. Muto responded that the policies came from staff as an attempt to fill gaps in the document. Mr. Phillips indicated that it would take more then 45 days to review the change in organization and additional policies. Mr. Woods added that he is impressed with the organization and that he thinks staff has made it as easy as possible to review.

Ms. Esry asked if staff wanted comments from the entire planning group, and Mr. Woods confirmed that this is an open document subject to review and we are looking for planning group opinions on it. Mr. Muto added that we are going to send out the document electronically following the meeting, but that we are still in initial iterations of the document and really looking to for comments from the general public on future drafts.

Mr. Petty asked for clarification that when staff interspersed goals and policies some policies were added to support important goals, and Mr. Muto confirmed that.

Mr. Neirinckx commented that he appreciates efforts to make a complete document, but that he feels that a document that comes out endorsed from the committee needs to be from the from majority of the steering committee. He added that he does not wish to waste time by continually reviewing comments from other sources. Mr. Muto explained that we will be able to accommodate this in the future, but with the level of changes that were made since the last iteration it was not the appropriate time. He added that it would be beneficial for the Steering Committee to have a version that is similar to the staff version, that we did not make any changes that we thought would be in conflict with the steering committee and that the only members of the public who commented have been very involved in the General Plan Update Process.

Mr. Phillips commented that the Steering Committee is elected representatives from elected groups, and is the most representative group that is possible in the unincorporated County of San Diego. He added that the opinion of this group should not be diluted in any manner and that staff should be careful to not wear the committee out with too many overhauls of this document.

Mr. Jemmot stated that he agreed that the Steering Committee is important, but that they should be working towards a document that can be adopted. Mr. Woods commented that he supports what is being said, and that if this document ends up being 99% represented by the Steering Committee then the Steering Committee did its job. Mr. Jemmot added that good ideas can come from other sources and the Steering Committee should look at other comments, especially if they are in accordance with staff recommendations. Mr. Phillips added that the Steering Committee has always considered input from other groups.

Ms. Radzick asked how new information is going to be highlighted in this new review; Mr. Woods responded that there is a strikeout/underline version of the document and cross-reference table. Mr. Muto added that new policies are clearly labeled “new” and that other policies have the previous policy number immediately following it.

Mr. Muto explained status of community plans, how they are specifically described to be part of the General Plan in the land use element, and that we have tried to increase the influence of the community plans by adding policy language that clearly identifies those issues that will be discussed further in the Community Plans.

Mr. Phillips commented that right now each community plan is a section of the General Plan, such as Valle De Oro being Part 12, and asked if they will going to continue with this organization. Mr. Muto clarified that the Land Use Element describes the community plans as the part of the General Plan, but the document structure may vary with chapters or sections. Mr. Muto also noted a comment from Mr. Teshler, that no part of the General Plan has a lower standing then any other part. Ms. Jones commented that a separate section may seem to have a higher standing and should be considered.

Mr. Petty asked about the Village/Rural Village Boundaries and how they are going to be updated for each community, adding that his community is still working on it. Mr. Muto responded that the Village/Rural Village Boundary is something that should placed and further defined in the Community Plans.

Ms. Stonehouse commented that the Draft Sweetwater community plan has information that will need to be update, Mr. Muto asked that we hold off on community plan questions until that agenda item.

Mr. Denham asked the Steering Committee how communities handle not having a design review board. He gave an example of development selling off lots, and the end product could be multi-million homes next to manufactured housing. Mr. Phillips responded that if the zoning does not have the correct B or D then there is no control. He explained that in Valle De Oro the Planning Group is the design review and that the commercial, industrial and residential areas have a D Designator, getting them to design review, additionally he said that they have basic design standards in the community plan. Furthermore, he commented that having standards against manufactured housing would be difficult.

Mr. Muto concluded the summary of changes of the Draft Land Use element, and asked the Planning Groups to review and have comments by June 9<sup>th</sup> (45 days). He also offered to have a meeting in between the due date if the Steering Committee wanted to. Mr. Phillips asked that we wait for the review period to be over, then review this as a new document and obtain a Steering Committee acceptance or rejection.

Mr. O. Smith said that he recommends that 60 days is needed to allow each of the groups to go through two full meeting cycles and that the Planning Group can vote on the result.

Mr. Denham indicated that his group's next agenda is full and the following meeting will occur after June 9<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Esry commented that a meeting before the due date would be not needed.

Mr. Christianson commented that every group will have problems making the deadline due to the many changes, but does want to complement the way it was put together. He asked a question about a specific policy, LU-5.5 addressing large-format retail and where the 90,000 sq. ft requirement came from. He added that in the previous version it was 65,000 sq. ft. Mr. Muto replied that it was changed to 90,000 sq. ft. after we did research and decided that it was more commonly used and recommended by staff. Mr. Phillips

commented that we are not other jurisdictions. Mr. Christianson added that they are looking at this in the 3P project in Fallbrook and would like to retain 65,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Woods commented that he is not a fan of big box retail and its effect on smaller communities. Mr. O. Smith asked if anyplace in the unincorporated county was appropriate for big box retail. It was responded that there were places and Mr. O. Smith followed up that it might be appropriate to indicate which areas those are as an added protection to the smaller communities. Mr. Christianson said that he would prefer to remove the 90,000 sq. ft. requirement.

Mr. Woods said that he thinks in the community plans and zoning ordinance there is room for Floor area and Square feet ratios as a tool. Mr. Petty asked if the comment can be noted that the Steering Committee would not like this change to remain.

Mr. Muto stated that we will make note of this, but we wanted a number that was based on real life examples, adding that we can look at it again and will let you know if we think there is a problem. Mr. Woods added that maybe we can ask PBS&J to comment on this and Mr. Teshler indicated that there is a sliding scale based upon community character and that staff can re-examine that.

Mr. Phillips commented that as an urban fringe community they can see the effects of these things, and noted that a new town was built in the 1970s with big box stores. He also noted that the stores were not in a position to destroy a downtown because it was also accompanied by 30,000 people. Mr. Phillips added that 60,000 sq. ft. is acceptable for what is needed for a general purpose market, such as Ralph's, but 90,000 sq. ft is a large store with added amenities. Mr. Woods added that older big-box retail, such as the K-mart in Ramona, has a "sea of asphalt" at the entrance to the community, and Ms. Radzik commented that the K-mart also compromised the circulation by removing the two roadways.

Mr. Christianson commented that the 3p's project is an example of a new community of 2000 homes that needs neighborhood shopping and convenience, but one of the developers wants to put in a 160,000 sq ft shopping center. He commented that the development by itself is capable of putting in a new town center, and that he wants to continue to see policies that speak to retaining viability of existing town centers. Mr. Christianson also added that this site is a target of Smart Growth.

Mr. Jemmot commented that they were recently blessed with a mushroom farm as a by right use, and inquired the ability of FAR restrictions to help protect them from that in the future. Mr. Woods commented that he thinks so, and that FARs can be a tool that can be used to protect a community.

Mr. Chrism asked if there is a way to ensure that the transit center aspects of projects like the 3p project are not lost, but also not turned into large regional shopping centers.

Mr. Denham asked Mr. Muto to look at the Land Use matrix, and review the statement that High Impact Industrial is compatible with Rural Lands. Mr. Muto commented that it has to be compatible somewhere, he asked Ms. Carmichael that if we removed High Impact Industrial from Rural Lands would it create islands in the regional categories and LeAnn commented that she is not certain. Mr. Muto added that we can look into it.

Mr. Petty noted that there is high impact industrial is right next to a community on Rosemary's mountain. Mr. Woods responded that it is a major use permit, not a High Impact Land Use Designation. Ms. Tisdale also added that boulevard has the same case.

Mr. Muto asked that we conclude the land use element before a break. He asked that we would like to retain the 45 day period, but can provide exceptions on a case by case basis. Mr. O. Smith stated his concern that those comments that get an exception are not considered with the rest.

**O. Smith: Motion to recommend to staff to extend review period to 60 days (due on June 24<sup>th</sup>)**

**Denham: Second  
Motion Passes 19-0-1**

There was a short break and the meeting was called back to order by 10:40

## V. Presentation of Environmentally Superior Alternative

Mr. Woods called the meeting to order and introduced Ms. Carmichael who described the Environmentally Superior Alternative. She explained that the Environmental Superior map was developed as an alternative under the California Environmental Quality Act. She clarified that this is the fourth General Plan Update Alternative, along with the Draft Land Use, Referral and Hybrid Map. She explained that the map modeled out at 641,000 populations, was created closer to the original concepts from 2001.

Ms Carmichael explained the specific items that went into this map alternative, with broad changes taking Semi-Rural 10 to 20, Rural Lands 20 to 40 and the return of Rural Lands 160. Ms. Carmichael also informed the group that other specific changes were made including; the Road Network Planning Changes, the Housing Element Sites were included, that some Specific Plan Areas were altered and Cameron Corners was reduced to its previous conditions. Additionally the map considered groundwater issues, land in floodplains, mineral resource zones, multiple species conservation plan issues, fire response times and traffic issues.

Mr. Neirinckx asked where the population numbers came from and Ms. Carmichael asked Mr. Wong to explain the table. Mr. Wong explained the population summary, which is the total population at build out of the four mapping alternatives and the existing general plan. Mr. Muto added that the existing General Plan is based on the existing general plan and took out constraints using the same model as the other mapping alternatives. Mr. Neirinckx asked for more specific information and Ms. Carmichael

explained that some of the constraints are groundwater, steep slopes, wetlands, biology, public lands, open space. Mr. Neirinckx commented that he feels the number for Jamul/Dulzura is high and Mr. Woods commented that the number for Ramona was low. Ms. Radzik said that the 2002 number should be at least ten thousand higher in Ramona, and Mr. Woods commented that this information is what staff has to work with.

Ms. Carmichael added that each of the alternatives was run through the same model, so it can be used as a comparison. Mr. Meyer asked if the persons per household is three and Ms. Carmichael responded that it was a projection that is varied for each community.

Mr. Petty asked about the moratorium in rainbow valley because of high water. He thinks that this should be shown in the Environmentally Superior Alternative; Ms. Carmichael added that she would like to talk with Mr. Petty afterwards.

Ms. Tisdale commented that she thought Boulevard was 15,000 for the Existing General Plan and Ms. Carmichael commented that we will check the table.

Ms. Fisher asked if these are SANDAGs figures, adding that they have been wrong from the start of this process. Ms. Carmichael responded that they are part of the formula used in the population model. Mr. Muto added that the persons per household, vacancy rate and existing conditions numbers come from SANDAG, but the total population is based upon the General Plan Update Land Use Maps.

Mr. Shelver asked where the 660,000 number came from, and Ms. Carmichael explained that when the General Plan Update first started we asked all the planning and sponsor groups for an estimate of the future and 660,000 became a good overall number that takes us into the 2020/2030 projection.

Ms. Esry asked of all the four alternatives which one was going to be closer to what is adopted and Ms. Carmichael stated that we could not say at this time.

Ms. Radzik asked how numbers that her community supports are going to be addressed, and if there is opportunity to change the end numbers. Mr. Muto responded that the numbers can be used to better understand land use alternatives, representing the land use maps. Ms. Radzik followed up with asking about areas that are being purchased for grassland and its effect on the population. She followed by asking where those people are going to live. Mr. Muto clarified that the population numbers are derived from the maps, and that we are not requiring that any community take any certain population number.

Mr. Woods commented that this is not a target number, and Ms. Radzik commented that this needs to be clearly stated. Mr. Petty also emphasized that the need to be clear about these numbers not being target numbers. Mr. Woods reminded the group that the zoning is on the ground, which limits the number.

Mr. Frey asked if the model accounts for timeshares, Ms. Carmichael responded that the traffic model does, but the population model does not. Ms. Jones commented that they would consider that a dwelling unit, and Mr. Woods agreed.

Mr. Denham commented that there is a large amount of unrepresented people in North County Metro and asked about them. Mr. Jemmot responded that that it is most of North County Metro, and is in the sphere of influence of the cities in North County.

Mr. Phillips commented that the group went through this before, and asked if these were the numbers that were approved by the board of supervisors, and Ms. Carmichael responded that these are the numbers that were based on the draft land use map and other numbers, but that at times there are some changes in the persons per household and vacancy rates. Mr. Phillips asked to confirm that these numbers are based upon the numbers developed by the groups. Ms. Carmichael explained that after those numbers were developed they amended the Draft Land Use Map to more reflect those numbers, and that was what was endorsed by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Meyer asked if a community can support the Environmentally Superior Map, and Ms. Carmichael responded yes.

## VI. Environmental Impact Report Notice of Preparation

Mr. Muto described that the next agenda item was the Environmental Impact Report Notice of Preparation (NOP), and this is actually the second NOP that has been prepared for the General Plan Update, but since work is really just beginning and so much time has passed we decided to have another NOP. He stated that the purpose of the NOP is to identify any issues that should be analyzed before work begins.

Ms. Jones asked if the new NOP incorporates comments from the pervious NOP and Mr. Muto says it does in a couple locations, but since it does not have a lot of detail and there were not many comments on the last NOP there were only a few changes. Mr. Muto followed up with that there is going to be a 30 day review period and a Public Scoping Meeting on May 15, in the DPLU Hearing Room.

Mr. Phillips commented that the period by law is a minimum of 30 days, and thinks that for a project of this size there should be at least 45-60 days. Mr. Chism asked if the tribal resort and casinos are going to be included in the General Plan, and Mr. Muto replied that existing facilities are going to be examined and planned expansions we are aware of will be examined as cumulative projects. Mr. Carmichael responded to Mr. Phillips's previous comment and that she would usually agree that 30 days is not enough time for some projects. She added that with the amount of issues that are already included in the EIR we do not expect that anyone is going to find an issue we are not previously covered.

Mr. Petty commented that he does not find water supply in the EIR NOP and Mr. Muto informed the group that it is under utilities and service systems.

## VII. Community Plans

Mr. Woods asked Mr. Muto to begin discussion of community plans. Mr. Muto reminded the group that at a previous Steering Committee meeting we talked about how we wanted to get back with the group and discuss community plans. He explained that we see the community plans as a critical component of the General Plan as a whole, and have asked PBS&J to look at a process for updating the community plans. Additionally he stated that updating them is outside of the budget for our contract with PBS&J, and that there is not enough staff resources to complete them all comprehensively before the General Plan Update is adopted.

Mr. Muto asked the group for input on how to update the community plans, and informed the group that the process we were considering was to work with PBS&J, develop a template and guidelines for the community plans, and then proceed with updating the plans. He commented that it may have to be a two phase process, one to make them consistent with the General Plan Update, and one to increase the amount of information in the community plans. Mr. Muto also informed the group that if staff is primarily doing the updates then we will not be able to update all of the Community Plans at one time, forcing us to put together a phasing process.

Ms. Jones commented that initially this is how the community plans were set-up, and it can work if there are enough community members who can volunteer their time. She also noted that previously staff had assisted in assembling different sections of documents.

Ms. Fisher commented that Jacumba is listed as not started in the community plan table, but stated that Jacumba has done work on the community plan and asked how that is affecting their community. Mr. Muto said that we would like to explain that handout, and asked Mr. Lardy to explain what information was prepared and distributing after compiling information from the community files.

Mr. Lardy explained that we have handed out a table that looks at what work was done since 2001 and the status of each community plan. He explained that each plan was ranked from a “drafted document” to “not started”, and that we would like everyone to check the draft plan that was distributed and to let us know if any records are different. Mr. Muto added that the purpose of this exercise was to get everyone on the same page and asked Ms. Fisher to talk with us afterwards so we can get on the same page.

Mr. Phillips commented that he may be unique, but that at the beginning of this process they did a strikeout underline of the community plan and had it reviewed by the public. He added that this is what the Valle De Oro community will have as their community plan and wants it to be adopted with the General Plan. Mr. Phillips added that as he reviews the General Plan he debates to keep it consistent with his community plan.

Ms. Jones commented that having the community plans consistent with the General Plan emphasizes the need to have the Community Plans completed before the General Plan is adopted, adding that there may be a need to readdress the regional goals and policies.

Mr. Phillips added that he is concerned that aspects of his community plan will not be included if the process is extended. Mr. Phillips also stated that the community plan has to have the same weight as the General Plan for use in a public hearing.

Mr. Muto stated that we agree, that Valle De Oro is farther ahead than many other communities and that we need to decide upon an approach to complete the remaining plans. Mr. Chism stated then he agrees with the previous statements and that since the community plan is more important to the communities, putting them after the general plan could end up with them not being completed at all. Mr. Woods commented that it might require a great deal of work from the Planning and Sponsor Groups in a short time. Furthermore, Mr. Chism stated that he thinks this is one of the only places a community has to define itself, and that he remembers that last time they spent a large amount of time arguing with staff over the community plan. He added that he would like to avoid a one size fits all approach.

Mr. Woods said he agrees and thinks the template can be used and adapted for each community. Ms. Jones commented that she thinks that the communities should submit a plan, and then have staff highlight the conflicts and review them with the groups.

Mr. Phillips stated that his community does not want a template, and that they have had a community plan in existence since 1978. Mr. Woods said he will not dispute that but that there may be ways to make the plan more legally defensible. Ms. Jones clarified that the template will be the formatting and typographical structure so each of the community plans can have the same subjects in the same place.

Mr. Jemmot commented that he thinks having consistency in the plans will be helpful to staff. Ms. Phillips stated that they can work with a template if it does not change the integrity of the plan.

Mr. Christian stated that his community is fine with a template, he noted that in 2002 there was work done on the Fallbrook community plan, and commented that there needs to be a way to tie the community plans and General Plans together. Mr. Woods noted that he agrees.

Mr. Petty noted that since Rainbow has been through this and has kept their new members up to speed on the community plans he does not expect it to take his community long to complete the document.

Ms. Jones stated that out of 12 communities in San Dieguito about half of them have submitted drafts. Mr. Jemmot commented that Twin Oaks wrote a community plan 15

years ago and has been trying to get it adopted since that time; he noted that they would be eager to apply their document to the template and have a community plan.

Ms. Esry commented that what they have been given is the Community Character Statement, and asked if this is what the community plan will be. Mr. Muto explained that that is what we have for the Campo/Lake Morena community and the actual community plan will be more comprehensive. When asked when the template will be prepared, Mr. Muto commented that this is the first step; however we can get PBS&J working on the template as soon as possible.

Mr. Phillips suggested that the Valle De Oro Community Plan be used as a base for the template. Mr. Denham asked about the Draft Pine Valley Community Plan that includes information on Cuyamaca and Descanso. Mr. Lardy replied that we can discuss specifics after the meeting but that it is possible that the information we have is ~~strikeout~~ underline on the Central Mountain Subregional Plan. Mr. Denham followed up that there are cases in his community that water is being taken out of the ground for a commercial use and asked what options the county has to limit that use in this Community Plan. Mr. Muto replied that we can ensure that the issues are discussed in the Draft Community Plan, but we do not know at this time.

Mr. O. Smith asked when the DPLU edits occurred in the draft Valley Center Community Plan, and Ms. Carmichael replied that those edits occurred back in 2002. Mr. Muto followed that this is to get on the same page, and if work has been done since that time asked that it be provided.

Mr. Shelver commented that this is the first time he has seen this community plan in one document, and asked if his group's task is going to be to review the document and make it up to date. Mr. Muto replied yes, but not at this time, adding that PBS&J is going to work on the template and prepare to give some guidance on the Community Plans.

Ms. Jones asked if there is a preliminary timeline for working on the community plans. Mr. Muto replied that we do not, but we do have an end date for the General Plan and would like it to go at the same time.

Mr. Stonehouse asked if we can get the updates sooner, and Mr. Muto replied that we are working on the template as soon as we can. Mr. Woods commented that it is in staff's best interest to move with the community plans as soon as possible. Ms. Stonehouse asked how the template will be distributed and Mr. Muto replied that we will send it electronically, have a hard copy and also have workshops to explain them.

Mr. Muto asked Mr. Teshler if he had anything he wanted to add. Mr. Teshler commented that it is good for him to be present and hear the comments from the group. He also explained that there are things they will be looking at to ensure that the community plans are consistent, adding that a Community Plan can be more restrictive than the General Plan, but not less.

Mr. Petty asked for clarification that there is 60 days to review the land use element, and if there is a problem with having the community plans not finished at that time. Mr. Muto responded that we can address these consistencies before it is approved by the board. Ms. Radzik asked if we are thinking of a broad timeframe for the community plans, and Mr. Muto confirmed.

Mr. Woods summarized the community plan discussion, stating that PBS&J is going to develop a template, that they are going to have a workshop to discuss the template and then the communities can work on the Community Plans from there. Mr. Muto added that if some communities do not think they have time to work on it there are some resources for staff to help, but that the resources are not enough to work on all of the Community Plans at one time. Ms. Jones suggested that staff sends out an occasional inquiry and keep them on track with the community plans.

## VIII. Public Comment (Non-Agenda)

Mr. Woods opened the floor for public comment. Mr. Johnson asked what the status of the potential compensation to property owners who are down zoned in this update. Mr. Muto replied that the equity mechanism the board endorsed was related to agriculture lands, and said that the PACE Program is being put together and in the next few months they expect to have a consultant contract.

Mr. Collins noted counsel informed the group a few months ago that conservation easements are not permanent. Ms. Carmichael responded that if there are three parties involved it is very difficult to vacate them. Mr. Muto added that they are not absolute, but it is the best tool that we have.

Mr. Chism commented that this farmland program that is out on the website is now out for public review, and added that this is a different program than what was discussed in the past. Mr. Muto confirmed this and added that it is important to understand that this is the only equity mechanism that was endorsed and is being pursued.

Ms. Ayers asked for clarification on the response that was given to Ms. Esry when she asked about existing legal lots receiving a less intensive designation and making them non-conforming. Mr. Muto clarified that lots in that situation would be non-conforming, but that it is a legal term and would not have an effect on the financing of those lots.

Mr. Woods asked for any more questions and Ms. Esry asked to confirm that there is no compensation planned for property owners who are receiving a reduction in density. Mr. Muto confirmed this.

Mr. Woods adjourned the meeting.