

**Steering Committee Minutes
October 25, 2008**

Steering Committee Members

Margarette Morgan	Bonsall
Donna Tisdale	Boulevard
Bev Esry	Campo/Lake Morena
Mary Manning	Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/ Granite Hills
Jim Russell	Fallbrook
Harry Christianson	Fallbrook
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Fritz Stumpges	Pala-Pauma
Lucille Goodman	Pine Valley
Vern Denham	Pine Valley
Carl Meyer	Potrero
Bud Swanson	Rainbow
Helene Radzik	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Lora Lowes	Spring Valley
Liz Stonehouse	Sweetwater
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Ann Quinley	Valley Center

Staff

Devon Muto, Chief
Bob Citrano, DPLU Staff
Eric Lardy, DPLU Staff
Jimmy Wong, DPLU Staff

Public

Charlene Ayers	Ranters Roost	Tom Weber	
Ron White	Land Owner – Jamul	Andy Washburn	Valley Center
Hank Palmer	Twin Oaks	Jon Rilling	Land Owner
Sandra Farrell	Twin Oaks		

Meeting Commenced at 9:03 a.m.

I. Introductions

Mr. Muto called the meeting to order and thanked the group for coming. Bryan Woods was not able to attend due to a breakdown in communication.

Mr. Muto announced that progress on the Draft General Plan is going well and will be discussed later in the meeting, and added that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is well under way, that it is going to be a large document and that the goal is to have the draft EIR available for public review mid-2009. He informed the group that staff has not had significant progress on the Conservation Subdivision Program, but would like to prepare revisions to the ordinance and bring it back to the Committee in 2009 for review with the intent of the Steering Committee motion. He also noted that the Interest Group is going to review the Conservation Subdivision at their next meeting, the same that was presented in August.

Mr. Muto reminded that the first Community Plan submittal was due at the end of September, informed them that staff received 12 submissions and really appreciate the effort. He noted that the next due date is at the end of this month for the Draft Goals, Policies, and other revisions to community plans that will go forward concurrent with the General Plan Update. He mentioned that many groups have asked for extensions or additional time and let the group know that staff will try to work with late submissions to put them into the project if they can, but if staff can not it will go into the parallel "Phase Two" track and get adopted as soon as possible. Ms. Jones asked what the department will use for discretionary project reviews during the period between the General Plan Update is adopted and the new community plans are adopted. Mr. Muto responded that staff use the existing community plans that will be edited consistency with GP Update. Ms. Morgan asked when the revisions will be given out to the communities and Mr. Muto responded that we are looking at early 2009. She followed up by asking when a new Community Plan would be adopted following the General Plan Update adoption and Mr. Muto replied that we would like to take them within a few months after the General Plan Update is adopted.

Mr. Phillips stated that he does not know how many other people are in the same position that Valle De Oro is but that they gave DPLU their updated plan several years ago and after Mr. Muto came on board he promised that we would look at it and tell them if there was any heartburn that needed to be resolved. He also said that there were two significant changes that he wanted to put in the Community Plan based of the new Goals and Policies related to clustering, but that he has a problem hearing that he has five days to submit his Community Plan when he has not received anything from DPLU.

Mr. Muto stated that this is not the intent, and this is the timeframe that was provided in June, adding that we have the Valle De Oro Draft, are reviewing it and will be providing comments in early 2009. Mr. Muto added that if there are any problems, staff will continue working the communities on the plans. Mr. Phillips said that his plan must be processed with the General Plan Update. He stated that we implied that there would be some timely response on what was submitted. He asked for clarification that we will accept the communities' input after they have a public hearing and still keep them on the schedule. Mr. Muto confirmed this and asked the group to let him know if they have any questions on the schedule.

Ms. Morgan asked if those groups who submitted three years ago are having their plans reviewed, Mr. Muto replied that they are if the communities would like that. Ms. Morgan confirmed that Bonsall would like us to review what they submitted in the past.

Mr. Meyer noted that Potrero will meet every deadline, but asked if his group looked at the background and made some changes can they go ahead and make revisions to it. Mr. Muto said that is ok, adding that groups can continue working on it and putting the pieces together.

Mr. Muto stated that staff developed a file sharing system to facilitate communications between community planning and sponsor groups, which was suggested at one of the community plan workshops. He intruded Mr. Lardy to present the tool that has been developed and is available. Mr. Lardy explained the Community Plan Dropbox as a way to transfer large files, share them with each other and referred them to the available handouts. He also asked that anyone with further questions talk to him after the meeting, or contact him by e-mail or phone. Mr. Muto added that the department is looking into this and other ways to increase communication with the communities and community groups.

Lastly, Mr. Muto announced that the Department has been looking at many of the recommended implementation measures from the Department of Planning and Land Use's Organizational Study, and is implementing them through the Service First Initiative. He explained that one of the primary recommendations from the report was that the department needs to concentrate more on customer service. He said that the department was looking to hold a meeting with the community planning and sponsor group chairs on either November 8th or 15th. The group took a straw poll and determined that a majority of the group would be able to attend on November 15th. Mr. Muto told the group that that they would send out the available information and meeting confirmation at a later date.

Mr. Denham asked if there are any surprise meetings in December and Mr. Muto responded that we want to talk about future meetings, but that we were not looking to have any other meetings until January 2009.

Mr. Meyer asked that since the Service First Program goal is to provide better service to the customers, who were the customers. Mr. Muto responded that the customers are the public, applicants, and community members.

Mr. Phillips said that Mr. Meyer asked a good question and noted that attempts in the past to focus on Customer Service did not focus enough on the communities. He stated that the only focus he needs to see in the program is that the community planning groups, elected by their communities, are number one on the list of customers. Mr. Muto stated that these are good points and that it is good to remind the department and Board of Supervisors of that, but added that there were recommendations in the Report to increase coordination with the community planning groups. Ms. Jones asked if there were recommendations to increase communication and noted that she sees a complete breakdown in communication between the community groups and planners. Mr. Russell commented that since Eric Gibson took over as director he has received many more phone calls from planners on projects. Ms. Jones noted that that Mr. Russell was correct, but noted the planners change on projects often and often the new planners do not know the project or community. Ms. Morgan commented that often there is no continuity with the

staff, who sometimes have never even been to the project site. Mr. Muto replied that one of the recommendations was to work on maintaining project planners throughout a project.

Ms. Stonehouse stated that her communities' problem is that the information is given to the planning group after the time for comments has passed. Mr. Muto said these are good comments and asked the group to hold most of them when they are going to have the most impact, at the Service First Initiative meeting.

II. **Action Item:** Approve minutes from August 23, 2008 Steering Committee Meeting.

Mr. Muto moved approval of minutes from the August 23, 2008 Steering Committee meeting.

Mr. Phillips reminded the Committee that he has been complimentary on the minutes in the past, and will start by moving approval of these because he did not find anything that did not represent the context of what happened at the meeting, but has a request. Mr. Phillips stated the minutes appear to be written by one person and not edit checked, and are sometimes confusing due to the errors. Mr. Phillips requested that the minutes receive a good review from at least one person.

Phillips: Move Approval
Stonehouse: Second
15-0-4

III. Review of Draft Public Road Standards

Mr. Muto turned the meeting over to Bob Goralka, the County Traffic Engineer. Mr. Goralka gave a quick overview on the Draft Public Road Standards. He informed the Committee that one of the main goals of the new Road Standards is to put in the more flexible road classifications developed with the General Plan Update, adding that the goal is to have these developed so they can be used for public and private projects. He stated that they also added language that is a little less restrictive for guard rail requirements.

Mr. Goralka informed the group that DPW is asking for comments by November 14th, and based upon those comments could go to the Board of Supervisors as early as December or January, but if there are more extensive comments, then February or March.

Ms. Tisdale commented that out in the rural area there are problems with requiring asphalt curbs and with a new development wanting to put in sidewalks, curbs, and gutters. Mr. Goralka replied that he would like to see the specific instances to see if there is something DPW can do to address the issue. Mr. Russell commented that this is addressed on page 27, by allowing more flexibility.

Ms. Moran stated that the Road Standards appear to be for only urban areas, and asked if there are going to be rural standards. Mr. Goralka commented that DPW is developing one set of standards that would cover both areas, he also said that they would like to address specific issues in community specific community development right of way standards.

Mr. Russell commended Mr. Goralka for the work DPW has done and said that he thinks most of the edits Fallbrook requested were put in the document. He commented that the paved shoulder areas on page 11 are not needed in the rural areas; stating that he would like to see a way to waive this requirement. Mr. Goralka said that in a case like that they would have to go to the Board of Supervisors to restrict parking, but he would like to take a look and see how they addressed this in the road classifications. Mr. Russell also commented that the table on page 10 should have a footnote to address how the level of service can be addressed by operational improvements such as relieving pressure points at intersections, rather than expanding the road width. Mr. Goralka said he has no problem putting a sentence as a footnote.

Mr. Jemmot stated that he agrees with the comments on the rural and semi-rural areas, saying that his community has requested curbs and gutters not be used for years. He continued by stating one size does not fit all, requesting that the standards should address different areas with sections for rural and semi-Rural areas. Mr. Goralka said that he can add the rural curbing option in the document. Mr. Denham commented that most of the communities east of Alpine have no desire to have curbs, roadway lighting, or traffic signals but that some of the projects being processed do not have this desire in mind. He also said that in intersections on 55 mile zones they would like to increase the sight distance based on the speed people are traveling on the road. Mr. Goralka responded that the site distance is based upon the criteria of the road, speed and curve and that he would like to see the specifics of the projects he is referring to.

Mr. Stunges asked where he can go to look for the lighting standards; Mr. Goralka said that this is on page 31-32 of the Draft Road Standards and added that there are some specific special lighting districts and special requirements around the Palomar and Laguna Observatories. Mr. Stunges asked about general lighting and Mr. Muto responded that there is a Light Pollution Ordinance that the codes division enforces.

Ms. Morgan asked about the requirements for subdivisions in rural areas and lighting, and why there was a development that put in a light that seemed to have no purpose. Mr. Goralka asked for Ms. Morgan to send him an e-mail so he could talk with the Land Development staff and get back to her.

Ms. Tisdale commented that the Codes Division does not respond very well to protect dark skies. She cited a development project that is ongoing and that staff asked to charge \$150 an hour for a site visit with the Community. Mr. Goralka said that if it was a development project then the project should have been charged, but asked for the specifics in an e-mail so he could get back to her.

Mr. Anderson asked about the communication from DPW to the Planning Groups, and Mr. Goralka said that in a CIP project DPW will have questions and coordinate with a planning group if they are not answered in Community Design Right-of-way Standards. Mr. Goralka said that the project managers are generally sensitive in the backcountry with not including curbs and cutters, with exceptions in town centers, areas near a school, or areas that may need drainage. He also said that there is sensitivity if there are even a few pedestrians to at least have a graded pathway. Mr. Anderson followed up by saying he thinks there should be more latitude in projects, such as exceptions for rural areas. Mr. Goralka said that private road projects go out with the development/developer and that often in land development they do not have the specific design aspects until the conditioning stage with DPW. He added that this could be an area that

can be improved in the development process. Mr. Anderson added that increased communication is a key to this.

Mr. Phillips stated that in his experience his group receives a project from DPLU and acts on it based upon community interest, but does not know the road improvements until after their review, sometimes right before the hearing at the Planning Commissions. He said his biggest complaint is that DPW does not give comments on development in timely fashion so the communities can review and comment. Mr. Goralka stated that this is a good comment and something that can be improved. Mr. Phillips said that the problem is that there is a DPLU contact to call, but planning groups are not made aware of the DPW contact. He continued by stating that when he asks the DPLU planners about the road requirements they say it is not their job and accepts what DPW says without question. Mr. Phillips added that they have had projects destroyed because of these circumstances.

Mr. Phillips noted that his group reviewed the Draft Public Road Standards in excruciating detail and thinks this is a great effort. He suggested that Table 1 should include the number of travel lanes in each Road Classification. He also requested that the words “franchise utility” be specifically defined with the language he sent to not include radio transmission facilities in the right of way in front of houses. Mr. Goralka stated that he did not have a problem adding the language and noted that currently very few utilities have franchise agreements. Mr. Phillips noted that the language was drafted by a senior engineer from Sempra Energy.

Ms. Tisdale commented that another issue is fire access roads — when they are connected to a private road they can have problems by opening up a new community that has a road with no established maintenance.

Ms. Radzik said that she would like to see a mechanism put in place to allow for mediation between community groups, DPLU, and DPW. She asked if this would be more appropriately placed in the document or as a policy. Mr. Goralka stated that this can be put together and is worked out in the Service First presentation, but probably not appropriately placed in the Public Road Standards. Ms. Radzik responded that the system should be referenced in this document and the process should be amended to not waste staff and community.

Mr. Muto commented that these are good items to bring up at the Service First Initiative meeting, adding that Mr. Phillips should bring up his concerns on the disconnect between DPW and DPLU staff as well. Mr. Phillips added that there was a period of time when there was a regional planner assigned to each community that processed all the projects in a community, and that at that time DPLU had stronger say in issues dealing with road development. Mr. Phillips said that the engineering staff who designs the road should not be expected to know the character of each community, but that the planning staff should be expected to know this. Mr. Goralka said that these standards have more flexibility to address these type of issues and that increased communication earlier in the process will also help avoid problems.

Mr. Meyer asked how the right of way width is determined and Mr. Goralka said that it is the total width of the travelway, pathways, parking area/shoulder and in some cases bikeways or trails. Mr. Meyer also asked if low impact development is addressed in the road standards and Mr. Goralka responded that DPW is considering the use of these with a technical paper and may do a pilot program in the future.

Mr. Denham commented that Old Highway 80 goes through 3 different road districts who maintain the road differently with asphalt or concrete, adding that it is a historic route and should be kept in close to its original condition. Mr. Goralka said that this is an issue that he has not addressed before and would like to look into how historic highways are maintained. Mr. Russell said modification procedures are discussed on page 49 and said that he would like to put the CPG in the second paragraph.

Ms. Radzik suggested that planning groups be given the ability to appeal the decision in Section 9 and that it be reworded to read the director “shall” consult CPGs, and remove the fire districts commenting. Mr. Goralka said he understands the comment and can see what they can do.

Mr. Palmer asked about circumstances that require pathways or bikeways and if they have established which roads need them. Mr. Goralka replied that that most cases are identified in the Bicycle Transportation Plan and the Community Trails Master Plan.

Mr. Muto asked if there were any more comments for Mr. Goralka. There was none, but Mr. Muto reminded them that the comments are due on November 14th. Mr. Muto thanked Mr. Goralka and there was a break at 10:37.

IV. Discussion of Draft General Plan Review Timeline

Mr. Muto called the meeting to order at 10:58. He informed the Committee that there is an internal version of the Draft General Plan and expect to have it released for review on November 14th. Mr. Muto said that we would like comments from community planning and sponsor groups by the end of January, giving them a 75 day review. Ms. Quinley asked if the document was going to be released on the website and Mr. Muto responded that it will be posted on the website, that an e-mail will be sent and that we will provide a CD and hard copy to each community planning group.

Mr. Phillips asked if there is going to be a strikeout underline version to see what changed from the previous version and that there were a lot of comments on the previous version. Mr. Muto said we can look back at the last Land Use Element version and can create a strikeout underline version. Mr. Phillips said he would like to see this.

Ms. Lowes asked if it is possible to get a hard copy. Mr. Muto responded yes, however that he would like to be kind to the forest; he said we would like to make one CD and one hard copy for each group. Ms. Jones, Ms. Lowes, Ms. Fisher, and Ms. Stonehouse requested that the document be sent to them, not the Chairs of their group.

Mr. Denham asked if the Jim Bennett groundwater report is going to be included. Mr. Muto replied that it is not done yet, but the groundwater study will go out in early next year, adding that at the very least it will go out with the EIR.

Ms. Jones asked if all the elements are in the draft General Plan, Mr. Muto confirmed that they are and let the Committee know that the number of elements is consolidated into the 7 required elements.

Mr. Russell asked for the link to the website. Mr. Muto informed him that we will send it out in an e-mail on November 14th. Mr. Meyer asked if the Conservation and Open Space Element has been revised from what is out today. Mr. Muto said that it is substantially different and more in line with the process DPLU uses today.

Ms. Jones asked if the consultant is writing the Environmental Impact Report based on the draft General Plan document, and Mr. Muto replied that they are.

Mr. Muto also provided the Committee with an updated handout of external technical reviewers of the GP Update.

Mr. Meyer asked how they will know what their input was. Mr. Muto said that would be to difficult identifying specific comments, but that the document is the end product of input from these groups that was carefully reviewed by staff. Mr. Stumpges asked how light pollution was addressed and reviewed. Mr. Muto stated that there was one technical reviewer for dark skies and they have also consulted the Palomar Observatory.

Mr. Muto said staff will provide a CD-ROM and hard copy on November 14th for review, along with a weblink with our general announcement, which has many names on it. Mr. Muto noted that we will provide only 60 days to the general public, but for the Steering Committee will have 75 days.

Mr. Muto asked the Committee if they wanted to have a meeting during the review period or have the meeting after comments are due. Ms. Jones said she wanted to have a meeting in January before the close of the review period and Mr. Phillips agreed. Ms. Radzik asked to have a meeting before the end of the year.

Mr. Muto said that it looks like January 10th will work for the meeting before the review period is over and wanted to know if the Committee wanted a January 31st meeting as well.

Ms. Morgan said that we should tentatively schedule a meeting for January 31st, and decide on the 10th if a meeting is needed. Mr. Muto suggested that on January 10 the Committee can discuss the concerns and on the January 31st can see if they want to develop a Steering Committee Position. The Committee agreed to take this approach.

Mr. Muto asked the committee to talk about future agenda topics and see if there was any specific topic that they wanted to discuss. He said that Mr. Meyer had brought up some issues in the past.

Ms. Tisdale said that there are renewable energy projects that are going into the backcountry, including examining energy parks and that she would like to have a discussion. Mr. Muto said that they could have a general discussion and can look at bringing someone from the outside to present information.

Ms. Jones said there were discussions about Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) in the past but has never resolution on it. Mr. Muto said it has been discussed in the past and the staff strategy is to have a Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program for agricultural properties. Mr. Smith said it should be discussed more, and Mr. Russell said he has not seen a staff position. Mr. Muto explained that staff presented this in 2004 to the Board of Supervisors and also stated at the progress report hearing that the only equity mechanism we are working on is a PDR for

agricultural uses with the farm program, not with the General Plan Update. Mr. Russell asked about the report that was commissioned a year ago and how there a position before the report is finalized. Mr. Muto clarified that the direction was to put something together, and that is what they are doing with the farm program. He added that the position is also that we are not working on other TDR/PDR programs. Mr. Russell asked if it is in the General Plan, and Mr. Muto said that the PDR program is encouraged.

Ms. Radzik stated that she would like to discuss water delivery and if it is assumed, where it is going to come from and how much it is going to cost. Ms. Morgan asked about water restrictions in January, a potential building moratorium and how this is going to be addressed with property owners and water rights. Ms. Radzik asked if we can get water representatives to attend.

Ms. Lowes stated that she has been attending the density bonus meetings and would like to have a discussion of the program; she asked why it is not in the updated General Plan. Mr. Muto said it is discussed in the General Plan Housing Element, but that we are putting in the ordinance to conform to State law. Mr. Muto reminded the group that DPLU is also trying to take action to have the State law amended to not apply to rural areas.

Mr. Christianson said that there are standard subdivisions and major subdivisions, that sometimes the impacts of these are too large. He added that the 3Ps project (Campus Park in Fallbrook) includes condos that meet County standards, but that with 350 units it overwhelms the entire neighborhood. He commented that he would like these types of projects treated differently. Mr. Muto said that there are some policies that address this, but we can probably flesh it out more.

Ms. Ayers suggested that on sustainable energy she would like to hear from someone other than Sempra and suggested Bill Powers and Michael Shanes.

Mr. Muto said we will try to integrate these future topics into meetings as we have time.

Mr. Denham asked about the technical review handout, noting that a lot of the names are on the Interest Group. Mr. Muto responded that a few are, Eric Larson from the Farm Bureau and Tracy Morgan-Hollingsworth from the San Diego Realtors. Mr. Meyer asked how many registered lobbyists are on the interest group and Mr. Muto responded that he did not know. Mr. Smith asked if these people are locked in or if there is a way to change this, and commented that the Fire Districts Association and Fire Chiefs association are missing from the list, associations that worked heavy with the Board of Supervisors on Proposition 8. Mr. Muto said that our staff was involved in the preparation of the section, and said that the document will be released on November 14th so it can be reviewed by many associations at that point.

V. Public Comment

Mr. Muto asked if there is anyone from the public who had questions or if the committee had any off-agenda items that they wanted to bring up. Mr. Meyer asked how many people on the staff belong to the Association of Environmental Professionals and if is a conflict of interest. Mr. Muto said that there were probably about 10 in DPLU, and said that their mission statement says they are a professional organization that looks to understand CEQA and environmental regulation. Mr. Meyer said he read a position paper from the group and asked about relationships to the same type of people on the list. Mr. Muto said it was the same type of organization many

other professions have, and positions on issues from the group are not the same as the county. Ms. Quinley commented that almost every profession has these types of things, such as encouraging people to be interested in the field and be up to date with current research.

Mr. Palmer commented on the reorganization and defining the role of DPLU. He said he feels that the people in the Steering Committee are more than just the customers and the committee should be solicited about the role of the community groups and DPLU. Mr. Muto said that the firm Citygate received input from the community planning and sponsor groups during preparation of the report, and that DPLU developed the Service First Initiative from this report and will be presenting the strategy to this Committee to receive input.

Mr. Muto adjourned the meeting at 11:41