

**General Plan 2020 Steering Committee Meeting
April 20, 2002 – Minutes**

Attendees:

Mark Price	Alpine
Chuck Davis	Bonsall
Margarette Morgan	Bonsall
Duane Bright	Borrego Springs
Richard Whitaker	Boulevard
Tim McMaster	Crest-Dehesa
Kathy Goddard	Cuyamaca
John Elliot	Descanso
Jo Ellen Hucker	Descanso
Jim Russell	Fallbrook
Thomas Francl	Hidden Meadows
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/ Dulzura
Richard Hensle	Lakeside
Randy Lenac	Lake Morena/ Campo
Joe Chisholm	Pala Pauma
Bill Huskey	Pine Valley
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Jim Anderson	Rainbow
Jesse Valentine	Rainbow
Dutch van Dierendonck	Ramona
John Ferguson	Spring Valley
Richard Stringham	Tecate
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Sandra Farrell	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Larry Glavinic	Valley Center

Visitors:

Jan Van Dierendonck	Ramona Grasslands
Charlene Ayers	Public
Deborah Moy	Public

Planning Commissioners:

Bryan Woods

Staff:

Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Timothy Popejoy (DPLU)

Neal LaMontagne (DPLU)
Dahvia Locke-Rubinstein (DPLU)

Meeting commenced at 9:18 a.m.

Prior to the official commencement of the meeting, a DRAFT Regional Structure Map and Regional Land Use Map were exhibited for attendees to view. At the beginning of the meeting, Commissioner Bryan Woods emphasized that the Regional Land Use Distribution Map was a “work-in-progress”. He explained that staff has digitized this map and the community-level land use distribution maps, as well as provided population numbers, for the Planning Groups to review and offer comments.

B. Woods also spoke to the issue of why the Interest Group is still meeting. He indicated that the IGC has simply been slower in getting through this process. He also confirmed that when the IGC has completed their work on the Goals and Policies, the Steering Committee will have an opportunity to review and to provide input on these. Woods then turned the floor over to T. Popejoy who provided some brief background on the GP2020 community outreach process to date.

T. Popejoy explained that the community outreach process to revise and update the Community Plans was initiated in June of 2001. He indicated that most groups have made significant progress on their Community Plans, as over two hundred workshops, subcommittee meetings, subgroup meetings, etc., have been held in the communities since that time. To date, the focus for the groups has been on updating the Community Plan portion of the General Plan.

B. Woods stated that the goals of this meeting are to look at the Draft Land Use Distribution map and to help group members to understand the process for refining the map to the point that groups are comfortable, including setting public meetings.

J. Ferguson asked when the Planning Groups will be able to obtain more detailed maps at the community level, since the scale of the present map is not particularly useful for the individual planning groups?

B. Woods responded that the maps are ready and that the process for distributing them will be laid out during the course of the day’s meeting.

J. Ferguson asked if Planning Groups would get to keep the maps.

B. Woods replied that this issue would also be addressed in the meeting.

J. Ferguson requested that the maps be made available to the Planning Groups in black and white with numbers, instead of colors, identifying the density in different areas to improve readability of the maps.

B. Woods promised that Gary or Ivan would address this issue in the meeting, though he anticipated that this would not be possible since the maps have already been produced.

First Agenda Item: Approval of January 12, 2001 Minutes.

J. Phillips commented that the Minutes do not represent what he was talking about at the previous meeting regarding the Urban Limit Line (page 8). Specifically, they do not accurately represent his communities’ serious concerns about the elimination of the concept of the Urban Limit Line. He also stated that the language used in the Minutes was not representative of the language actually used to express these concerns.

D. Locke-Rubinstein committed to call J. Phillips and work with him to rewrite his comments in the previous Minutes so that they would accurately reflect his concerns, as well as the language that he used to express them.

G. Hammers commented that Carl Meyer was incorrectly indicated as the representative for Potrero present at the January 12th meeting.

B. Woods replied that D. Locke-Rubinstein would review the Minutes, contact J. Phillips and make the requested changes.

MOTION: D. van Dierendonck moved to table the January 12, 2001 Minutes. M. Morgan seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Second Agenda Item: Draft Land Use Distribution Map review.

B. Woods turned the floor over to I. Holler to introduce and interpret the map- how it came to be, where it is at, and where it is going.

I. Holler explained that staff began the process of developing the new map still using the population numbers that were set by the communities and that were endorsed by the Board as overall population targets. This information and input from the Steering Group, members of the public, and the Interest Group, along with the Land Use Concepts, was synthesized together and graphically presented as the Regional Structure Map (map presented). He explained that the Structure Map does not have specific densities associated with the different areas, but it has *ranges* of densities associated with these categories (Core, Core Support, Semi-Rural, Rural). He pointed out that the cross-hatched areas represent SPAs that have been or are being implemented, the gray areas indicate Public lands of various kinds, and that the off-white areas represent the Tribal lands. He also pointed out the County Water Authority boundary and explained that this was used, roughly, as an East/ West or “Frontcountry”/ “Backcountry” divider in terms of service availability. Holler explained that the Regional Structure Map evolved into the Regional Land Use Map (map presented) in a “working copy” format. He stressed that all of the maps present are very much works in progress and that what we hope to do now is to take community-level versions of the Regional Land Use Map, still in a “working copy” stage, out to each of the communities and work with the communities and Community Planning Groups at this level. Further, out of sensitivity to some of the concerns that staff heard when we made our presentation to the Board of Supervisors on Wednesday (though we did not ask the Board for any kind of formal action, but only provided a recommendation and status report to the Board), we will not be taking the Working Copy of the Regional Land Use Map to the Board for presentation. We would rather that the first opportunity for folks to see it be here as a group here today. The first community-level presentations will be with you (the CPG chairs/ members) in your communities. He reiterated that we will not be taking the map to the Board because we will not be asking the Board to take any kind of an action on it.

G. Hammers asked what was the input as to what area got colored which color, because what is proposed is nothing like what his community put forward. He expressed his concern that his community is not being listened to. Hammers also stated his desire to have a copy of the Potrero map to bring out to his community, instead of having County staff come out to show the map. The community will not show up at meetings lead by County staff, as they are tired of all of the arguments. They have elected the Planning Group members to do a job and they want us to do the job. He explained further that the meetings become an exercise in futility when oppositional groups prevent anything from getting done. He requested that the County give the CPGs the maps, while recognizing that some communities have different situations than his community. He stated that he has a community that is not going to change the population of this county by more than a handful of people. Why have our community upset, when if staff would simply draw the colors that we’ve requested everyone would be happy and it would have no impact? Who told the consultants to put that shade of green (referring to Potrero on maps) where they put it against the desires of the community?

G. Pryor replied that “we did” (County staff did). When G. Hammers asked “Why?”, Pryor explained that the County has an obligation to the County as a total to look at what makes sense in terms of service provision, the roads, water requirements, the environment, and everything else.

G. Hammers stated that it doesn't "make sense". He indicated that there are forty acre minimum lot sizes (density) where most of the area is already in ten acre lots. It doesn't reflect the reality on the ground.

G. Pryor replied that he understood this. It doesn't prevent those lots from being built on, but it does basically begin to shift the growth inside the County Water Authority, which is one of the Goals and Policies that was set forth.

G. Hammers stated that this was arbitrary.

G. Pryor responded that it was not arbitrary. There is common sense and logic behind most of what this reflects.

B. Woods suggested that one of the issues that Potrero will have to grapple with is that their target population and their existing buildout are terribly separated issues and that they will have to make a choice as to which one they want to have.

G. Hammers indicated that the County has the Potrero population target at 1500, while the community has the population target at 1525. If you change the colors the way that we want them, you still won't reach 1525. With twenty-five more people our community will be happy.

B. Woods responded that if you are going to go from Potrero's buildout as it exists today (based on existing parcelization) of 5100 and you're going to take it down to 1525, something has got to happen, something has got to give. The population target should be raised back up to 5100 and then the density that reflects the existing parcels.

G. Hammers reiterated that if the County does it their way, the population number comes out to 1500, and if it does it the way that the community of Potrero would like, the number is 1525. Our community is unhappy as hell and all you have to do is change some of the colors here where it is already in ten acre lots (or eight acre lots)- just a small change in colors. People aren't looking at the reality on ground and their upsetting the community.

B. Woods said that if the issue is going from 1500 to 1525 and it still stays within Goals and Policies and the parameters that we have in place, that is what you should bring that back to staff to make that change.

G. Hammers replied that they've brought it back to staff and it keeps getting ignored.

I. Holler responded to Hammers comments by stating that if all Hammers is truly talking about is a difference of twenty-five people, then Holler does not believe that there is an issue. But, what staff is looking at is, based on the designations that are there today results in a much higher potential buildout for that community. That is the real key issue that we need to work with the community on to develop an understanding, because it is not simply a matter of twenty-five folks.

G. Hammers replied that the fatal flaw is that there is not going to be one hundred percent buildout by 2020, anyway. We have forty- acre lots that are twenty years old that haven't been built yet. One hundred percent buildout just isn't going to happen.

B. Woods stated that the other issue that Hammers' is going to have to deal with is that it cannot have a fatal flaw because that will open the door for litigation and we are all going to lose. So, you need to sit down with staff and work things out. He reiterated that if Potrero wanted to have their community divided into ten-acre lots, then they would have to increase their population target to something closer to 5100. (He also indicated that we do not have the time to talk about each community in this level of detail at the present meeting.)

D. van Dierendonck offered a thought to help the conversation. He stated that whenever we all submitted our maps, we were pleased with them no matter how they were drawn because of our pride of authorship and pride of ownership. The problem is that there was an outside force involved, "SOLV" (Save Our Land

Values). That's what created the biggest problem. When that came in, they had three days of public input at which he was present. There were one hundred people a day that were yelling and screaming about how their property rights and their constitutional rights were being violated. The County stated that, "If we don't address this, we're going to end up in court and a decision by Counsel will be to throw it all out, go back and start all over again". So they threw out the Alternative 3 maps. Those are gone. What we have to do is come back with the densities that the County had rejected based on Census projections, the way its going to be in 2020 (we're actually talking about more like fifty years into the future) and come back with something that is going to be fair and defensible. So while it may not suit our particular communities (we're not getting everything we want in Ramona- no one is), we have to get into a position that's fair and defensible within the courts.

B. Woods added that this point is something that we will have to deal with. He stated that when we started the process, he remembered Gary's terms succinctly- the *defense* of the plans that you're going to have in your communities is the infrastructure, the EIR, and the commitment community by community that they can't come in and do these GPAs that we've had in the past. Part of that defense is that we build the infrastructure based on the population. It's built into the plan, though it may not actually happen that way.

G. Hammers stated that we've spent hours and hours studying our community to determine what makes sense. The community brings it back here and it is totally ignored. Folks who are unfamiliar with Potrero have made arbitrary decisions.

B. Woods responded that Hammers' community had not been ignored.

G. Hammers stated that the Interest Group had come to visit Potrero and that he had spent twenty minutes with them. They paid no attention to what was said and it shows in the map (those present).

D. van Dierendonck responded that the Interest Group did not draw the map.

G. Pryor explained that there is a different paradigm within which we are now working. When the Board took Alt. 3 off the table, they basically created the Interest Group, so there is a different grassroots level now. There is this group (S. C.) and there is the Interest Group. In terms of input, they both have equal standing. There are going to be differences of opinion. So, where you see changes on the map, there are two factors. We get to play "Solomon" at the staff level in some cases because if there is a difference of opinion between those two grassroots inputs, then we have to make a professional judgement, which is exactly what the Board directed us to do.

G. Hammers asked where the science was in this.

G. Pryor replied that if he put 5100 people in Potrero, that the cars that traveled out there would go through there go right back through Jack's (Phillips) district and everybody else's. All of the communities are linked together because of impacts on shared road systems, water systems, etc. There are limitations as to what an area can handle in terms of growth.

G. Hammers stated again that they are not asking for a capacity of 5100, but for a 1525 capacity. By placing a ten-acre lot designation where ten-acre lots already exist, it would get his community its' 1525 target and the community would be happy.

B. Woods responded that Hammers point was well taken and that he would have to put his desires in writing and work with staff from this point.

G. Hammers also expressed his frustration with being unable to get a copy of the map the previous week.

B. Woods stated that we're all going to be under the same constraints. At this point, Woods introduced L. Glavinic, who presented his "A Win/ Win Solution for GP2020" to the group (see handout submitted by L. Glavinic).

M. Morgan moved to table this topic (“A Win/ Win Solution for GP2020”) and bring it back at the next meeting after the group has an opportunity to read over the handout.

D. van Dierendonck attempted to second the motion. The group disagreed as to whether a formal motion had been made.

B. Woods determined that the topic would be tabled until the next meeting.

J. Ferguson stated that, though all of the S.C. members have separate interests, some of what was talked about with regard to Potrero may be of interest to all of the members, so he returned to that topic. He asked what methodology was being applied to come up with the roughly 5000 number and the approximately 1500 discussed with respect to Potrero.

G. Pryor answered that the original number was out of the Existing General Plan.

J. Ferguson asked if he was correct in understanding that Concepts and other parameters were not used to arrive at these numbers.

G. Pryor affirmed this.

J. Ferguson stated that, in this case, there really isn’t any argument. He clarified that with the application of the Concepts and all of the different tools that were applied, both staff and the community of Potrero arrived at approximately the same population but different land use “arrangements”.

G. Pryor replied that Hammer’s community set a population target (as did the other communities) and that is what staff has been working toward. That can be done through different configurations on the ground.

J. Ferguson asked if the County is doing the same thing to determine target population as the communities that are looking at current zoning and calculating average persons based on lot size, etc.

G. Pryor stated that the County is using density.

G. Hammers explained the process by which the Potrero community had calculated their target number, including counting lots and using the current growth rate to determine whether there were enough lots to sustain this growth rate. They determined that this growth rate was not sustainable. Hammers concluded that there was a lot of good science put into Potrero’s methodology.

J. Ferguson asked where the disagreement was. He stated that it sounds like, aside from the fact that the old target was bigger, the new target is smaller and appropriate and the County is saying that it is also appropriate. Where is the disagreement?

G. Hammers said that the County stood back and took broad brush strokes (on the map) instead of looking at the detail that the community looked at.

L. Carmichael stated that, in a nutshell, Potrero would like to retain the existing zoning (8 acres throughout area) which would result in approximately 4900 people at buildout.

G. Hammers indicated that there are a significant number of people in his community who would like that, but that is not the compromise that they worked out. The compromise resulted in a target population of 1525, after four years of the community wrestling with this issue. He then restated his initial concerns about the map.

B. Woods proposed that what Hammers was actually talking about was actually a property rights issue. If you want all of the lots to have the ten or eight-acre zoning, but you only want 1525 to develop, who is going to choose? A choice has got to be made- either you allow all of the same rights, legally, or you don’t. That is your challenge. He doesn’t think, legally, that a community can do this.

G. Pryor pointed out that there is another factor involved. The County has to plan for roads, utilities, etc., to fit with whatever density is put in an area. If we put in a higher density with the assumption that we'll never get there because we're growing slower, that means that we're going to be overbuilding roads, water, sewer, and everything else. The two have to be kept in balance. That's what we're trying to get accomplished with this task, because that's one of the biggest factors that we deal with everyday.

G. Hammers acknowledged this and stated that Potrero is only talking about some minor changes and placement of different colors in different areas.

G. Pryor replied that staff is willing to look at this and that we will be working with each community individually. This is a rough cut at this point in time. It is a starting point and staff knows that it's going to change.

The discussion proceeded in the same vein until B. Woods stated that the group would move on to other topics.

R. Lenac asked, in terms of modeling for roads and other facilities, what assumptions were made about areas within cities' Sphere of Influence.

G. Pryor answered that basically what we are using is what the Community Planning Groups and the Interest Group have given us in terms of growth. It may or may not line up with what the cities have looked at for Sphere of Influence.

R. Lenac asked if the cities have played any role in this process yet?

G. Pryor responded that the cities have not played a role to date, though the County has been in touch with them. At this point in time, the County's role is to fit together what the communities and the Interest Group are looking to do.

B. Woods added that he had spoken with the Chairman of the City Planning Commission in Chicago and had started a dialogue on this issue (how to reintegrate on the edges in the County).

Rick (public) asked two questions. First, what is the definition that staff is using for Lakeside in all of work to figure community population, etc. Is staff using Lakeside only, or is the County including Bostonia and Pepper Drive? Also, the gray areas shown as public land does not show a density. However, we do have public land with development rights that should be shown and taken into consideration.

G. Pryor requested further clarification of this and stated that staff will have to look at this, though parks and other public areas do not require densities.

B. Woods agreed with Rick's comments, but stated that individual issues need to be discussed individually with staff and submitted in the form of written public comments.

MOTION: R. Lenac moved to limit the discussion of individual communities to examples, for the purpose of the days' meeting, with the stipulation that communities are going to be able to get into details and that these will be seriously considered. M. Price seconded the motion. Motion passed with two opposed (J. Elliott & J. Ferguson). No abstentions.

R. Hensle responded to Rick's earlier question and indicated that the numbers in Lakeside do include the Pepper Drive/ Bostonia area.

D. Nierinckx commented that, countywide, those lands that are public in any way need to have a density since public lands do not always remain so and may get traded, becoming private.

L. Carmichael stated that the Land Use Element, when it is completed, will have some sort of mechanism to deal with lands that convert from public to private. Staff does not want to put a density on Public/ Semi-

Public for the purposes of the map because the model would then assign that density across the board to all of the public lands.

J. Elliott expressed concern that staff directs S.C. members to take their comments to the Steering Committee, yet members are told to take their concerns to staff when they attend the Steering Committee meetings. He stated further that the map is ninety percent inconsistent with his community's wishes. He asked that staff do something to at least recognize his community so that they have some representation, as opposed to the last two years when they have not had representation.

I. Holler responded that many of Descanso's concerns may be related to the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI).

J. Elliott agreed that this was the case to a degree. He stated that FCI is over in 2010 and that he would like the areas affected by FCI to have an underlying designation that would apply when FCI expires.

I. Holler explained that right now, staff's position is that the initiative is in effect and what we're proposing now needs to conform to the FCI.

J. Elliott interjected that this is the first time that he has heard this from staff. He indicated that FCI has always been an overlay and has not replaced the underlying zoning, as it will be taken off in 2010.

G. Pryor responded that staff is conforming with FCI because, in order to have a legally defensible document, staff is not going to go against a voter initiative and jeopardize the entire plan for all of the other communities. On legal advice, we're keeping the density the same as what the voters put in place. In ten years, when FCI is removed, we'll revisit effected lands to see what density would be appropriate. Once again, at this point in time, we are not going to do that based on legal advice.

J. Elliott said that this approach is ignoring both the community wishes and the Board direction.

G. Pryor replied that this approach did not ignore Board direction.

J. Elliott insisted that the Board direction was to go back to the communities for re-evaluation in 2008. This is not what is going to happen.

G. Pryor suggested that Elliott submitted this as one of his comments from his community. Then it will become a part of the record and the Board will decide which way they want to go.

B. Woods added that the voter initiative takes precedent and the Board says not to talk about it until 2008. We can't have inconsistency. He agreed that Elliott's comments need to be taken to the Board, though they may not have the tools to satisfy his concern until 2008.

J. Elliott suggested the creation of an FCI overlay.

B. Woods encouraged Elliott to talk with Diane Jacobs about this issue.

M. Price concurred with the idea of specifying underlying zoning that would go into effect on public lands that become private. More specifically, he stated that he would like to see definition of what that public land is (for example, areas that are shown as public and are actually held by a land trust). Also, he agreed with Ferguson on the FCI issue. He proposed a motion that County Counsel be asked why there cannot be some sort of prescribed underlying zoning, with the caveat that this would go into effect only at the time that FCI sunsets. That seems to be something that would satisfy the needs of the folks in the backcountry.

G. Pryor committed to take this issue to County Counsel and to get an opinion as to if, in fact, it is possible to do this. The group contemplated making a motion on this issue, but ultimately agreed to accept Pryor's word on this as long as it was clearly presented in the Minutes.

J. Phillips stated that the Public/ Semi-Public designation was being used inappropriately in his Planning Area and may be in others. It has been applied to golf courses in areas that were previously agricultural preserves. It is being applied to areas of private ownership (i.e., golf courses) with no definition of what Public/ Semi-Public actually means. Instead of Public/ Semi-Public, we probably need an "Open Space" designation as a tool in our toolbox instead of using Public/ Semi-Public in some areas. Public/ Semi-Public is also being applied to areas that have been designated open space in certain areas. Over the years, these areas get "lost" in the Public/ Semi-Public designation and are sold into private ownership. In the case of golf courses, these are absolutely owned by private enterprise (HOAs) and in some cases are owned by people who do not even live in this country, let alone the County. He said that he was very concerned about the Public/ Semi-Public designation. While there are a lot of areas where this is very appropriate, but he does not want to see areas that we have designated as "Impact Sensitive" (which has a whole set of meanings separate of Public/ Semi-Public) changed to Public/ Semi-Public. He has not seen a definition of "Public/ Semi-Public" that he would be comfortable replacing "Impact Sensitive". A lot of the golf courses are in river flood plains. His community has had some problems with the underlying density issue because, in some cases, it causes people to buy land on speculation.

G. Pryor acknowledged that there are some areas on the map that probably need to be re-thought as to how they are classified on the map.

J. Phillips asked I. Holler if the maps had been presented to the Interest Group.

I. Holler stated that the "Working Copy" of the Regional Land Use Distribution had not been presented formally to the Interest Group. It has been presented to members of the Interest Group, but not to the group as a whole.

J. Phillips asked if this was a "secret meeting" that was not open to the public.

G. Pryor stated that it was not a meeting and that it was as informal as someone like Phillips walking in and requesting to see the map.

J. Phillips stated that he understood that the public was barred from a meeting at which the map was presented.

I. Holler clarified that members of the Interest Group came in and wanted an opportunity to review the map. In response to Phillips further inquiry, he stated that it was never presented to a quorum of the IGC members.

G. Pryor stated that staff has had two or three folks from the IGC in at a time, just as we have had this many members of the S.C. in and look at the maps. The maps are available to the public anytime that they want to look at them.

J. Phillips expressed that he has a pretty good working relationship with his community Planner. He said that he had requested a couple of copies of the map for Valle de Oro from his Planner as soon as it was developed so that the Planning Group could look at it and see if it was what his community and staff all had agreed to when they sat down in meetings a year ago. He has been told "No", but that the S.C. members would see it first. He stated that he was really concerned that a group of people who generally don't even live in the County (the IGC) got together and did a "truth check" on this map from their point of view. He was bothered because this is not the process that he was told would occur. If staff is going to share the map with the IGC members, he believes that the CPG members should leave here today with a map. He stated that when the County posts information about the General Plan update and community meetings where staff will be bringing the map, folks will get the impression that everything is going to change and this will upset a lot of people. He does not want that to happen unless it needs to. He wants to be able to know that what staff comes out to present really represents what his community thought was going to happen.

G. Pryor said that J. Phillips can come in and look at the maps anytime.

J. Phillips replied that he cannot review the map in the County environment. He wants to take it home and review it with professionals.

G. Pryor said that we had done that before (Alt. 3) and it blew apart. He restated that staff will come out to the Planning Groups and the maps may be reviewed then. In the past (Alt. 3), everyone assumed that the map was a final version, but this is a work in progress. The County wants input, but we have to manage what we hear and see to get it into the process because we are dealing with so many different points of view.

J. Phillips stated that he was concerned that the IGC may be steering this process and that it was not a grassroots process, as intended.

G. Pryor and B. Woods reminded the group that the new direction of the Board was for the IGC and the S. C. to have equal standing.

B. Woods pointed out that the IGC is looking at what is west of the Urban Limit Line- they are looking at limits within each density category and every community member here sets those actual designations in their community. The IGC does not deal with communities individually. That is the difference between the two groups and where you still have the control to make recommendations for your community.

J. Phillips stated that something has to be given to the Board to show the plans for each community done by that community as well as staff's proposed plan for that community. The Board, then, can decide which plan to use.

J. Ferguson requested that we move forward with the presentation of the map and the proposed process.

T. Popejoy began to explain the process as staff sees it now. He provided the caveat that what he was going to describe was a general framework for how staff sees the process working, but each community is different in its needs and staff will need to work on an appropriate approach for each community. As discussed, the upcoming Board hearing would include a status report and would serve as the kick-off date for the public review period for the review related to the map. This public review period is anticipated to take six to eight weeks with a specific starting and ending point (ending in June). Each Planning and Sponsor Group will be given the opportunity to come in and preview the map. In each community, we will hold a minimum of two meetings. The first being a workshop including a presentation by staff, including a status report, discussion of regional concepts, etc. The maps will be presented and explained at the community scale and we'll also have the regional and structure maps available. We will also lay out the process for public input at these meetings. We are asking for all comments in writing and we will put a window on the period for receiving comments. Following the workshop, we are going to hold at least one open house in each community, at which staff will be available to spend time one on one discussing the map. Popejoy also stated that comments would be reviewed by staff and the CPGs (process to be determined) in July and that appropriate changes would be made to the maps. At this point, in August or September, transportation modeling would be done and other changes may be made based on the results. In October or November, staff would be returning to the communities and CPGs seeking endorsement on the revised product.

J. Ferguson asked when staff will put maps in the hands of the C.P.G members.

G. Pryor answered that he was not sure that we would be able to do this based on what happened when this was done with Alt. 3, when folks thought they were looking at a final map and "all hell broke loose". He said that he would possibly reconsider this if he thinks that this won't happen again. Upon further requests of the same nature, Pryor stated that staff would come out to the community and that staff would possibly leave a map with the CPG.

L. Glavinic requested that staff create a flow chart showing where we are in the GP2020 process and where we are going for the sake of the CPG members and the communities.

Staff accepted the request.

M. Price returned to the topic of the previous public input process with Alt. 3. He stated that “all hell broke loose” because Alt. 3 did not reflect what the communities wanted. The sooner the CPGs get the maps, the sooner we can get over this problem. He also brought up Transfer of Development Rights (TDR), asking how these will apply in areas where most of the large parcels that may go to 1 du/ 40 ac. are owned by just a few different owners. He requested an answer to this question at some point in time, as this will make a big difference in his community.

D. van Dierendonck stated that he has been at all of the IGC meetings and the map has never been presented at the IGC. Staff did say that the map was a *draft*. He indicated that staff has been helpful to date and that we have got to begin trusting at some point. He stated that he was willing to continue to work with staff to create a fair and defensible plan.

J. Horton stated that Aaron Barling had called the map a “*preliminary draft map*” and that this should be written on the map.

He stated that staff needs to trust the CPG chairs to make sure that there is somebody with the map to explain it.

G. Pryor said that staff will change the writing on the maps to reflect their status as works in progress.

Questions as to whether or not the Interest Group had seen the map continued. Additional requests for Planning and Sponsor Group copies of the map were made by D. Bright and B. Huskey. The discussion returned to the Board of Supervisor’s process and the possibility of some communities bringing two separate options (CPG and staff) to the Board.

M. Price stated that there is a fundamental problem with elected CPG chairs having to “beg” for more time with the map, etc. The concern should be with having a map out there that is not supported by the CPGs.

M. Morgan asked if the traffic modeling that would be done on the map would cause some major flaws.

G. Pryor answered that this is possible. Staff will have to look at the roads and make some decisions.

M. Morgan asked if, by having limited the circulation possibilities through their Community Plan, would there be a conflict with what the CPG wants once the modeling was completed.

G. Pryor stated that this could well be the case, such as in Alpine where the CPG has chosen to accept an LOS F on Main Street instead of widening or diverting the road.

B. Woods requested that the group only comment on the process so that staff could take input and act on that input.

At this point, J. Ferguson suggested that the group set a date for another meeting during the public review process, if needed. A tentative date for the next meeting was set for June 1st or June 8th.

Break 11:28 a.m. to view map. The meeting reconvened at 11:38 a.m.

B. Woods announced that G. Pryor had decided that staff is going to send out a Planner to the first meeting of that each Planning Group requests (if they request a preview) to go over and discuss the map, the fact that it is a work in progress, and to define everything that is on it. The Planner will also discuss how the recommendations were made. Planning Groups may choose the form for the first meeting, but then they will be left with a map. Because of the challenges with Alt. 3, staff requested that CPG members make sure to communicate that the map is a work in progress that is subject to change. Woods stated that the maps are based on sound planning principles, though there may be some changes that may be made. He also reiterated that comments must be in writing and that forms would be available (optional).

Public comments were taken at 11:45 a.m.

Charlene Ayers (public) commented that she had a different experience with the Interest Group meetings than was conveyed earlier. She stated that she thought that there were other meetings discussed to which the public was not invited.

Joe Ellen Hucker thanked the County for offering to make maps available. She said that this would make the CPG members' jobs much more doable.

A representative from the Palomar Observatory responded to Ayers comment by sharing that, as a member of the public attending the IGC meetings, LeAnn Carmichael had invited him to come and see the map at the meeting today.

J. Chisholm asked where the Community Plan text writing would come into this process.

G. Pryor responded that the key right now is to get the land use distribution on the map.

R. Lenac recapped the process that had been discussed for the sake of the group. He restated that:

- a) Community Planners would contact their respective CPGs for an optional preview meeting;
- b) A Workshop would be held including a staff presentation;
- c) An informal Open House would be held with staff available to answer questions;
- d) All input must be submitted in writing;
- e) All input will be formally reviewed by staff and returned to the CPGs.

Rick (public) asked if the Indian Reservations and other areas (Public/ Semi-Public) would be taken into account in the transportation modeling.

G. Pryor responded that they would.

M. Price asked how the County could know what the tribes planned to do on the Reservations?

G. Pryor acknowledged the difficulty of communicating with the tribes, as we are like separate countries.

B. Woods offered concluding statement.

Meeting commenced at 11:55 a.m.

