

**Steering Committee Minutes
June 28, 2008**

Steering Committee Members

Mark Price	Alpine
Abby King	Borrego Springs
Judy Haldeman	Borrego Springs
Bev Esry	Campo/Lake Morena
Harry Christianson	Fallbrook
James Russell	Fallbrook
Robert Frey	Hidden Meadows
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Joe Chism	Pala-Pauma
Vern Denham	Pine Valley
Carl Meyer	Potrero
Rua Petty	Rainbow
Helene Radzik	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Lora Lowes	Spring Valley
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Oliver Smith	Valley Center

Planning Commission

Bryan Woods, Planning Commissioner

Staff

Devon Muto, Chief
Bob Citrano, Planner III
Eric Lardy, DPLU Staff
Jimmy Wong, DPLU Staff
Christine Wang, DPLU Staff
Woodie Teshler, PBS&J
Kim Howlett, PBS&J

Public

Charlene Ayers	Ranters Roost
Doug Paul	Star Ranch
Gene Vick	Campo
H. Palmer	Twin Oaks
Parke Troutman	
Randy Lenac	H.O.P.E.
Rich Voller	CLMRG
Sachiko Kohatsu	District 3 – Supervisor
Tom Weber	Slater-Price
	Borrego Springs

Meeting Commenced at 9:05 a.m.

I. Introductions

Mr. Woods called the meeting to order and asked the group to introduce themselves; the group went around the table and introduced themselves.

II. **Action Item:** Approve minutes from April 26, 2008 Steering Committee Meeting.

Mr. Woods stated that there are some minutes for the group to look at, and asked for comments or motions for the April 26, 2008 Minutes.

Mr. Phillips commented that his statement on Page 5 paragraph 4 is written incorrectly and that the correct statement he made was that the Commercial, Industrial and Residential areas in VDO have a D designator.

Mr. Woods reminded the committee that if there is multiple representatives from one Community Group that they only receive one vote.

Phillips: Motion to Approve Steering Committee Minutes from April 26, 2008, with correction on Page 5.

Jones: Second

Motion Passes 12-0-3

III. Announcements/Project Updates

Mr. Woods commented that we have a long agenda and that we would like to keep it moving. He then turned the meeting over to Devon for the Project Updates.

Mr. Muto reminded the Group that the Notice of Preparation concluded last month, and that the 33 comment letters are available on the website, along with the letters from 2002. He informed the group that we presented a progress report to the Planning Commission at the end of this May, and that a similar report to the Board of Supervisors at the end of July. Additionally, Mr. Muto stated that all of the General Plan Update elements are in technical review, that we hope to have this process completed within the next month, compile the documents and have a complete Draft General Plan that will be brought back to the Steering Committee for review. Furthermore he explained that the Existing Conditions section of the Environmental Impact Report is drafted, analysis on the EIR has begun and that LeAnn Carmichael is going to be performing a different role in the Department by working on the Multiple Species Conservation Plan.

Mr. Muto asked if there were any general comments on the project announcements and there were none.

IV. Presentation of Community Plan Template and Process

Mr. Woods introduced PBS&J and asked Mr. Muto to go over the Community Plan Strategy and Draft Community Plan Template. Mr. Muto explained to the group that one of the handouts is the Draft Community Plan Update Strategy, which explains the process for updating the community plans in time to get the Environmental Impact Report out for Public Review. He reviewed the three options described in the handout; (1) a primarily staff driven process with staff revising the community/subregional plans and to address any problems with consistency, and (2) mostly the same as the first option, but will provide the opportunity for Community Planning and Sponsor Groups to insert a few additional changes. Lastly he described that option three would be a community driven update, where the community groups would prepare updates to the Community Plans. He explained that Staff would have limited assistance available to assist in doing the work, mainly in the form of Geographic Information Systems and meeting attendance, however that the work would be mostly completed by the Community Groups.

Mr. Muto explained that we have included a schedule in this handout, with draft documents by September and October 2008 in order for them to be included in the draft Environmental Review. He also described that Phase two is available for groups who are not able to meet the vigorous timeframe for the General Plan Update, and can have community plans being approved shortly after the General Plan is adopted. He explained that staff thinks options one and two are the best, unless the groups are close to being completed with the re-write. Lastly Mr. Muto explained the table on the last page of this handout is a draft proposal of what staff thinks each group is going to choose, reminding the committee that these are not final choices.

Mr. Price commented that he is most concerned with community involvement, not as much with target date, adding that according to I-1 a primary responsibility of the planning groups is participation in General Plan Update.

Price: Motion for Option Three to be used to make this process community driven and bottom up.

Lowes: Second

Mr. Russell asked to clarify the motion; does it prevent communities from choosing option one or two if they want to? Mr. Price stated that the intent for the motion is to adopt option three as the way to move forward. Mr. Woods explained that this may take away the opportunity for groups to choose option one or two. Mr. Price added that he thinks the way for this process to move forward is option three, as a bottom up process.

Mr. Phillips commented that he appreciates the need for a bottom up process, but that he thinks the motion should be limited to asking for a bottom up process in each community. Additionally he commented that he does not want Valle De Oro to use the template.

Mr. Woods asked that the group stick to subjects relating to the Motion, and Mr. Phillips stated that since option three will use the template it is related. Mr. Muto clarified that

eventually all of the Community Plans will use the template, but at this time the first and second options do not utilize it.

Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Price to table the motion until more questions are answered. Mr. Price said he can, as long as the second agrees and the motion is brought up again.

Price: Motion Tabled

Lowes: Second

Mr. Phillips asked who the CP/SG and Stakeholders in the handout are, Mr. Muto responded that CP/SG is the Community Planning and Sponsor groups and Stakeholders would be any interested party, including Community Groups, outside agencies, the public and industry representatives. Mr. Phillips commented that policy I-1 puts the development of community plans solely in the hands of the Planning Groups. He added that he does not know what the public reviews are going to be, believes it would be the start of endless reviews and that the Valle De Oro Community Plan has already been through public review nearly four years ago

Mr. Price asked to clarify that Mr. Phillips opposition to option three is that Valle De Oro has already completed updates in the spirit of option three, but does not want to be forced to change the Community Plan at this point. Mr. Phillips indicated this is the case and that they have already updated their Community Plan with the General Plan Update and a County Planner.

Mr. Frey reminded the group that there are about 50,000 people unrepresented in the North County Metro and would like to know how they will be addressed, especially since they are required to go from the option one listed to option three by a motion.

Mr. Russell commented that Fallbrook has already drafted the Fallbrook Community Plan, and can go through this effort again, but added that this is an intensive effort. He envisioned that staff was going to take Fallbrook's previous work and put it into the template

Mr. Woods said that he thinks option one is really taking the work already completed, putting it into the template format and having staff review it for legal consistency. Mr. Russell commented that he promised Fallbrook that they would have some level of review for the Community Plans in the future, and that he is not opposed to some level of review on his end.

Ms. Jones commented that some of the dilemma is the way these options are written, adding that each of the planning groups have gone through reviews of the existing community plan. She explained that the existing community plan is not what is going to be used as the base, but the reviews that took place 4 years ago can be used as the basis.

Mr. O. Smith commented that he thinks option three should be the default, and the groups can go to one or two if they chose. He added that he appreciates county help, and is unaware of if the group will need it or if they go off and do it ourselves.

Ms. Lowes asked if it is necessary to choose one option and be consistent with every group, Mr. Woods responded that each community plan has to be reviewed for consistency, which essentially is what option one is. Ms. Lowes added that that she sees that everything will be removed; Mr. Muto explained that only inconsistent items will be removed. Ms. Lowes commented that her view of inconsistent may be different from staff's view, and Mr. Muto explained that we will coordinate with the groups.

Ms. Esry commented that she is sure her community will want option three, and asked what the schedule is, if they are going to have a community planner and how quickly the subcommittees will need to be formed. Mr. Muto explained that option three is going to be community driven. He added that we can attend meetings and have our GIS section get data and maps, but since staff is working on the remainder of the General Plan their time is limited for much beyond that. Mr. Muto explained that this is why option three with the General Plan Update is a community driven process, and that staff will be more available following the General Plan Update.

Mr. Woods commented when he was working on the Community Plans back in Ramona it took over a year of intensive meetings. Additionally he stated that since many of the groups have already done it they should really just go through a consistency check.

Ms. Esry asked if they are going to receive copies of what DPLU considers their plan; Mr. Muto replied that we distributed what we have last time.

Mr. Price stated that he appreciates we are fleshing out the options, adding that the spirit of his motion was to remind everyone that the community plans should be community driven.

Mr. Woods commented that the issue is if you will make the cut for being with the General Plan Update, not if each community plan is going to be done. Mr. Price said that the perception is that this is a top down process. Mr. Woods commented that there is a point that we need to take this to completion.

Ms. Jones stated that staff is saying they don't have the resources to complete the community plans and are asking the community groups to complete them, concluding that it is very community driven. Mr. Russell reminded the committee that I-1 clearly states that if Staff and the Community Group disagree with staff, both options need to be taken to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Radzik asked which plan is going to be used by the county for Ramona, 87 plan or the plan that was developed around 2002 with Dahvia. She added that this is a point of contention with the Ramona Community Planning Group on which plan to start with.

Mr. Muto commented that this is a good example, the options (1) & (2) do we start with the 87 and do minimal work to make it consistent with the General Plan Update, or (3) do we start with the 2002 plan and bring it consistent with the General Plan Update. Furthermore, he explained that in Ramona it seems like they have a lot of work to go, and that may want to chose option one or two currently, with a parallel process to update the remainder of the

Community Plan. Mr. Muto further explained that communities like Valle De Oro have already completed the updated to their Community Plan, and are basically done with it.

Mr. Woods asked the group what the feeling is on the motion. Mr. Phillips stated that he does not want to do option three, would want to stay with option two and have conversations with staff on conformance. Mr. Petty commented that rainbow has been under option three to this point, and now would like to choose option two to get some dialog with staff.

Mr. Phillips asked that Mr. Price modify the motion, and Mr. Price indicated he would and that the spirit of his motion is to not lose the Communities right to assert themselves in the process. Mr. Price welcomed a substitute motion and Mr. Phillips commented that his substitute motion would be to address the principles, but add the tagline that if there is a difference between staff and community interpretation that they go to the Board of Supervisors as a separate item.

There were questions on the motion, and Mr. Woods commented that it is that each community chooses whichever option that fits them best, adding that we probably do not really need a motion at this point.

Mr. Price stated that he will remove his motion, following that he accomplished his goal to clearly state that the communities are in control of the Community Plan Process. Ms. Radsik asked for clarification on the parallel process and if her group should be using the 1987 plan for the first options and the 2002 revisions in the parallel process. Mr. Muto explained that if they want they can do that, or they also have the option of starting a parallel process with the 1987 plan. He emphasized that if the community plan edits are going to go forward with the General Plan Update they need to be ready by September 30, 2008. Mr. Woods added that groups that do not make the date will fall into the parallel process.

Ms Radzik asked about the parallel process and the EIR, and Mr. Muto explained that it will not be in the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report, but we will be able to use the General Plan EIR in the future with addendums. Mr. Russell asked about the timeframe for the second phase, Mr. Muto replied that we do not have a deadline and can look at batching them as they are ready. Ms. Radzik commented that she does not think Ramona will be able to get anything done comprehensively done by September.

Mr. Jemmot commented that his community wrote the community plan 16 years ago, at that point was told it was not formatted properly, then was told they would go with the General Plan Update and now are concerned that if they do not finish in three months they will not get it done for years. Mr. Muto replied that they are a unique situation because they do not have an existing plan, and we would like to get as much adopted for Twin Oaks Valley with the General Plan Update as possible. Mr. Jemmot asked about consistency in the Community Plans, that this is a bottom up process and would like to know what the consistency entails. Mr. Muto replied that we need to correct blatant inconsistencies within the General Plan, adding that the City of San Diego updated their General Plan and found the Community Plans were all consistent.

Mr. Russell asked about the 5 areas that are going to be addressed and if staff is going to write them. Mr. Muto responded that most of them have existing plans today and they are all in Option 1.

Ms. King asked about Borrego Springs being part of the Subregional Plan, it was replied that Sponsor Group Areas will be part of a Subregional Plan, with chapters for each Sponsor Group Area. Mr. Meyer asked if the Subregional Plan needs to be consistent, Mr. Muto responded that anytime the General Plan is are talking about the area it must be consistent.

Mr. Denham stated that there are going to be inconsistencies between areas that are groundwater dependant, and that there are many places that are without representation are acres of vacant land. He asked if it makes sense to move some boundaries to they are not unrepresented anymore. Mr. Muto responded that we have proposed the question to many community groups, and are moving forward with non controversial boundary changes.

Additionally, Mr. Denham commented that there are things in the Central Mountain Community Plan that speak to Descanso or Cuyamaca as well as Pine Valley, and asked if it will remain the same. Mr. Muto responded that they will remain a Central Mountain Community Plan, with Pine Valley having a chapter in it.

Ms. Fisher asked if everything in the sub region needs to be constant, and Mr. Muto clarified that everything has to be consistent within the General Plan but that Community Planning/Sponsor Group Areas in a sub region can deal with the communities in different manners.

Mr. Woods commented that the questions that are being asked now are workshop questions, and that we should start to go with general questions. Mr. Christianson asked questions regarding the Community Plans allowed to be more specific and allowing special area maps. Mr. Muto replied that this is getting into the template and responded that the Community Plans can have guidance in special areas on what should be included in the zoning.

Mr. Woods said this is a good time to discuss the template, and asked Mr. Teshar of PBS&J to explain the template. Mr. Teshar commented that he is glad he is present to hear the discussion. He explained the community Plan Template as a way to have a consistent approach to the community plans, making them more useful for anyone reading the documents. He added that there are items in the template that may not apply to each community, but the header can remain if in the future that section would be needed.

Mr. Teshar explained that that consistency does not require that Fallbrook be consistent with its neighboring communities, but that if there is a Regional Policy to preserve 100% of Riparian corridor you can not have a community plan policy to preserve 50% of the Riparian corridor. He then gave an overview of the Community Plan Template sections, adding that there is going to be a subsequent meeting where the groups can give a more detailed educational process.

Mr. Woods asked about the workshop, when is it going to occur, how long they will last and who will be invited. Mr. Teshler replied that the intent is to have the workshops quickly, and have it open to as many community group members and members of the public as possible. He also added that the idea is to have workbooks that are able to be passed around to those who are not able to make it to the workshop.

Mr. O. Smith asked if the template is going to be available electronically so they can begin to paste the documents together, Mr. Teshler indicated it will be available in a CD and by other means.

Mr. R. Smith asked when the electronic copy of the template is going to be available, Mr. Muto replied that it depends how much time is available for review from the Steering Committee. He explained that our schedule gives the committee 30 days for review, and then allows for staff about a month to have the workshops on August 30th.

Mr. Phillips stated that he does not think Valle De Oro will be interested in the template. He added that it includes items that are not necessary in the Community Plan Template in using the plan to defend the Goals and Policies, and that they could lead to conflict. Mr. Phillips explained that he does not feel that the plan requires an Issue, Goal, Policy and Implementation Measure. Mr. Phillips also indicated that he feels the document is written for a jurisdiction with police powers, not for a Planning Group using it to advise the Board of Supervisors. He commented that he would like the document to be succinct, not include blank headings and not be for PR purposes. Lastly Mr. Phillips commented that that the public process and reasons for updating the community plan sections are unnecessary.

Mr. Woods asked Mr. Teshler to respond to some of the questions, and Mr. Teshler explained that the Issue, Goal, Policy and Implementation approach are required under the state guidelines and are useful as a way to tie goals into community issues. Mr. Teshler further explained that this format is being set up so someone who is looking at the plans will be able to look at the county plan, and then review the pertinent Community Plan. Additionally, Mr. Teshler stated that it is important state how policies are going to be carried out with the implementation. When it was explained to him that today it is a three letter character, Mr. Teshler agreed that it could continue to be in the same type of form.

Mr. Teshler described the public review section, how it is in place to document the required public input in the plan. Furthermore he explained that many other sections in the plan are useful so that anyone picking up the document will know how it's going to be implemented and used. He also commented that by law a jurisdiction is required to track the General Plan.

Ms. Jones asked for clarification on the tracking of the General Plan, and Mr. Woods commented that that an important component. Mr. Teshler explained that a jurisdiction is required to give an annual report, although it is not done by many jurisdictions, to the California Department of Housing and Community Development and Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Mr. Marks asked if each community is supposed to produce the document and Mr. Teshler replied that it is the Counties responsibility.

Mr. Woods asked for more questions and Mr. R. Smith commented that he disagreed with Mr. Phillips to some extent. He stated that the Lakeside Community Plan is outdated and that most people do utilize it, adding that he would like to get the CD with the template and is ok with the fact that he does not have to use sections that are not pertinent and has no comments.

Mr. O. Smith commented that he disagrees with Mr. Phillips and thinks these sections are a good placeholder. He added that this template is a good way to review every issue to see where holes may be, and in leaving the section “not applicable” it states that it has been reviewed and decided it does not apply.

Mr. Petty commented that it would be hard to have comments without the workshop, and that the sooner the better for the workshop. He commented that Rainbow is almost ready to start plugging things into the template. Mr. Woods commented that he would like to see when the workshop is going to be available

Mr. Jones asked for clarification on why each goal requires an issue. Mr. Teshar explained that each goal does not require an issue, that many goals can be tied to the same issue, but added that it is important to tie goals to an issue. Mr. Meyer asked what happens if the issue is not valid, and Mr. Teshar replied that each issue must be valid.

Mr. Christianson asked if those areas that are “not applicable” in the community plan automatically look to the General Plan Policies in that subject, and Mr. Teshar explained that yes the Community Plan is the opportunity to be more specific than the General Plan. Mr. Petty asked for clarification that this the opportunity to become more restrictive than the General Plan and it was confirmed that it is.

Mr. Chism asked that if a community would like design standards they should talk about wanting that in the Community Plan, and asked if it is appropriate to talk about protecting agriculture in the Community Plan. Mr. Muto replied yes to both questions, adding that there is agriculture discussed in the General Plan, so if they want to be more specific to types or other aspects on agriculture in the community.

Mr. Denham commented that east of Descanso there are five 5 planning and sponsor groups, adding that most of them are going to be putting this into subcommittee form. He suggested the Staff and PBS&J go out to the groups instead of them coming down to town. Mr. Teshar commented that if directed by client then they can and Mr. Muto indicated that County Staff will be available to attend meetings and that he can talk with PBS&J.

Mr. Marks commented that he supports the template, adding it does not tell the communities what to say, merely gives them a format to say it in. He added that he would like the workshop sooner rather than later. Ms. Radzik commented that getting many communities together would be prudent, and offered the Ramona Community Center for a workshop. She also commented that she would like some specificity on relationship with other communities, not only looking at each community as an island.

Ms. Esry commented that she is sure her community is going to request option three, but does not think they are going to make the schedule for going forward with the General Plan Update. She asked what the disadvantage would be if they go with Phase Two, Mr. Muto explained that the perceived disadvantage is that the community plan does have the certainty of going forward with the General Plan. He added that his position is that phase two is a better option for communities, giving them more time to work on the document.

Mr. Woods called for a 10 minute break.

Mr. Woods called the meeting to order, and explained that the plan is to have three regional workshops by the end of July. Additionally he explained that the electronic copy of the Template will be available within a week. Ms. Lowes asked if the template will be available for Mac as well as PC and Mr. Teshler responded that we will make it available in any format required.

Mr. Marks asked if staff is assuming that the template will be used or if a motion is required from the group. Mr. Woods replied that we will not need a motion.

Mr. Russell asked if the workshops will be open to the public and Mr. Muto replied that they would be open to subcommittee members of the planning group and to the public. Mr. Woods suggested that if this is open to the public they should keep participation primarily with the Planning Group members and have the public speak after the meeting.

Mr. Petty commented that the meeting may have to be noticed for compliance with the Brown Act. Mr. Muto indicated we can consult with council on the appropriate noticing format.

Mr. Russell stated that he will have to publish an agenda if there is going to be a quorum. Ms. Esry asked if it would be a problem if they are not going to have a meeting until late July. Mr. Woods responded that it depends how much the groups would like to fast track the process, offering that they are able to hold a special meeting.

Mr. Muto then explained that this is what we are looking at, and that we will be in contact with the groups on the scheduling of the meetings. There was discussion on the noticing requirements and Mr. Muto responded that we will look into the brown act requirements with County Counsel.

V. Presentation of Conservation Subdivision Program

Mr. Woods turned the meeting over to Mr. Muto who went to explain the Conservation Subdivision Proposal. Mr. Muto explained the intent of the Conservation Subdivision Proposal is to provide flexibility to protect resources without sacrificing the communities. He explained that ways to do this are; requiring protection of resources, decoupling lot sizes from density, use of planned residential developments and use of lot area averaging. He emphasized that these are target minimum lot sizes, and added that lot size is not the only aspect of community character, which can include set backs, landscaping, architecture and

height of buildings. When asked when comments are to be submitted, Mr. Muto replied that we would like them in one month.

Mr. Phillips asked if there would be a Steering Committee Position, and Mr. Muto replied that they may take one. Mr. R. Smith commented that Lakeside does not support the conservation subdivision proposal, believes there are sufficient regulations on the matter and noted that the Steering Committee has on record a position to reject the concept.

Mr. Russell commented that lot size is not only lines on a map, but that it is the state of mind of the people living there, and added that the Conservation Subdivision is a great way to conserve large scale agriculture. Additionally he comments on the Planned Residential Development section on page 5; that PRDs are a useful tool, but only because they require superior amenities and if that requirement is removed then it is not work. Lastly he commented that these kinds of subdivisions can keep agriculture in use.

Mr. Denham had a question the minimum lot sizes for Rural Lands 80, and asked why the minimum lot sizes can be 5-10 acres. Mr. Muto replied that someone would need to have 160 acres to subdivide in RL-80, but that the two lots could be 5-10 acre size and the remainder of the property preserved in open space.

Ms. Radzik commented that lines on a map can become 3,000 homes, and asked if they can comment on specific portions of this proposal to add or remove. Mr. Muto Replied that they can comment on specific components or the entire components.

Mr. Phillips commented that he agrees with Mr. R. Smith that the Committee has reviewed these documents before, and then gave comments that after reading the proposal it is not significantly different then what was proposed before. He expressed his concern that the concept is going to be addressed countywide, and that the conservation easements will not be preserved in perpetuity. Mr. Woods replied that County Counsel informed the group a few meetings ago that a Conservation Easement is the best form of protection that we have. Mr. Phillips added that the easements could be on private lots, continuing that private landowners eventually try and remove the easements. He stated that he discussed with a representative from EHL and this conservation subdivision proposal was not what they were expecting.

Furthermore, Mr. Phillips explained that the proposal is automatically a 25% density increase, and that in his opinion the reduced lot sizes will cause extensions of sewer service and proliferation of small package treatment plants. He commented that the usable Open Space requirements are too small, and that the Lot Area Averaging premise is incorrect. He mentioned that floodplains are not protected in this proposal and summarized that he thinks it is better to disperse homes on 20, 60 and 80 acres then to cluster homes along the attempt.

Phillips: Motion to reject the concept of disassociating normally expected minimum lot sizes (the Zone Box) from General Plan Densities, or by-right clustering by any means. Further, I suggest we find the proposed minimum parcel sizes to be too small to ever be compatible in Semi-Rural and Rural Communities, and the proposed open space preservation methods to be unacceptable for preservation in perpetuity.

Jemmott: Second

Mr. Woods asked for discussion, but first allowed Mr. Muto to clarify some of items in question. Mr. Muto reminded the group that he understands that the Steering Committee has a position, but that there are a number of stakeholders in this process whose support is contingent on the Conservation Subdivision Program. He continued by stating at some point the decision is going to go to the Board of Supervisors weather to implement the Conservation Subdivision proposal and if not do they still want to adopt the General Plan Update.

Mr. Woods commented that he would like to see where the existing tools that are in place today for the last 5 years would balance out against what the proposed guidelines would create. Mr. Phillips commented that doing away with minimum lot sizes is the flaw with this proposal. Mr. Russell asked if Mr. Woods is going to ask for the study and when it would be ready. Mr. Woods commented that he is going to ask for it to get a better feel of this proposal.

Mr. Muto reminded the group that one of the main objectives of the General Plan Update, endorsed by the Board of Supervisors is to decouple lot sizes, Mr. Phillips commented that he does not agree.

Mr. Petty asked if the Conservation Subdivion Proposal will defeat the General Plan Update and mentioned that he does not think it will.

Mr. Meyer commented that he thinks the way to protect agriculture is by zoning 20 acre and up parcel sizes. He offered that the group should ask for an interim zoning to protect the natural resources.

Ms. Radzik asked if Conservation Subdivisions are legally required to be part of the General Plan Update, and Mr. Woods responded it is not. Mr. Russell commented that the reason there is no agriculture zoning is because early on we said there is no piece of property that is inappropriate for agriculture use. Additionally he stated that agriculture is the 5th largest industry in the county and it should be protected, he also stated that agriculture zoning does not work.

Mr. Meyer asked for an example why agriculture zoning does not work. Mr. Russell responded that agriculture is not open space; it is a business, and that if there is no profit then there will be no agriculture. He also commented that he does not know if all the things Mr. Phillips said were true.

Mr. Woods stated that there is a motion on the floor and that he has to leave. Mr. Russell said that he would like to see the study and review the program again. Mr. Woods said this topic has not been decided today.

Russell: Motion to table the item
Chism: Second

Mr Russell commented that the group can ignore the proposal and hope it goes away, but that it will not. Mr. Woods stated that he agrees and needs to better understand it, adding that there should be a voice from the Steering Committee on how the Conservation Subdivisions are implemented.

Mr. Radzik reminded the group that once there is a motion to table there is no more discussion.

Motion Passes 11-5-0

Mr. Phillips commented that his motion was not to reject conservation subdivisions; it was to reject de-coupling the minimum parcel sizes. Mr. Petty commented that the group already has a position of proposing this concept, thinks that that should be taken back that until another motion changes that then we oppose the concept. Mr. Chism commented that he has the same concerns as Mr. Phillips, but he would like to find a way to make it work.

Mr. Muto stated that we would like comments on the Conservation Subdivisions in a month, and we will be back in two months with more information tentatively scheduled on August 23rd.

Mr. Woods excused himself at 11:55.

VI. Comments on Draft Land Use Element (April 26, 2008)

Mr. Muto commented that there a few things to deal with remaining, and explained that the staff proposal is to take Land Use Comments, put them in the document and provide it back to the Steering Committee for review. Mr. Phillips commented that there needs to be a Steering Committee Position on this document. Mr. Denham stated that they did not make written comments because they expected time to review the document as a committee.

Mr. Marks suggested an additional meeting to review the Land Use Element in 30 days. Mr. Muto took a poll to come back in 30 days and discussed the document as it stands today, and about 13 members indicated they would like to hold an additional meeting. Mr. Muto stated that a meeting will be held in about a month.

VII. Public Comment (Non-Agenda)

Mr. Palmer asked if the population estimate remains unchanged if the conservation subdivision proposal is adopted, Mr. Muto replied yes it remains unchanged.

Ms. Ayers asked if staff anticipates any more SPAs, like in Valley Center, being added to finance a road. Mr. Muto answered that we do not, and asked for any more public comment.

Mr. Muto adjourned the meeting and informed the group announcements will go out for the next meeting.