

CREST-DEHESA-GRANITE HILLS-HARBISON CANYON SUBREGIONAL
PLANNING GROUP. Minutes of the meeting on 3 October 2011.

Item 1. Chairman Wally Riggs called the meeting to order at 1910 hours, and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

- Planning Group members Bowen, Ulm, Slagill, Walls, Krickhahn, Riggs, Harris, Manning, Myrick, Hertel and Gabler were present, forming a quorum of 11.
- Planning Group members Vandover, Darsey and Bretz were absent.
- Approval of minutes of the meeting on 7 September 2011. These minutes were not available to the Planning Group members for their review and approval.
- There were no expense reimbursement requests.

Item 2. Announcements. Mary Manning announced that the Greater Alpine Fire Safe Council Rebate Program is available for Harbison Canyon residents.

< Bill Bretz joined the meeting at 1930 hours, and the quorum was increased to 12. >

Item 3. Open Forum followed by Group Forum. No one spoke at Open Forum. In the Group Forum, Lorrain Walls described details of the information and ideas for improved road and traffic safety provided by the Department of Public Works at the Dehesa Valley Community Council meeting on 19 September, including that the County depends on collected gasoline tax revenue for road improvement projects, and it currently receives only about 65% of the past peak of these revenues.

Wally Riggs described the functioning and effect of rumble strips installed in the road surface for alerting drivers that drive onto them, and that the cost to install rumble strips along the 15 miles of centerlines on Dehesa Road, Willow Glen Road, and Harbison Canyon Road is estimated at \$80,000.

Wally Riggs also reported he had submitted the Planning Group's letter of comments on the Sycuan Band's Fee-to-Trust application to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, that he had received a copy of the very detailed and lengthy letter of comments the County submitted, and that Sweetwater Authority also submitted a strong letter.

Item 4. Committee Reports. None.

Item 5. Private Project Proposal. None.

Item 6a. Public Project Proposal. Discussion and Action, Proposed Changes to Board Policy I-63 Guidelines for Processing Proposed Amendments to the County General Plan.

Bill Bretz reported that Jack Vandover and he attended the County's Board Policy I-63 Stakeholder Workshop on 22 September. County DPLU staff explained Policy I-63 background, led a discussion of the existing I-63 Policy, and then conducted a discussion of the pros and cons of various alternatives to the existing policy under consideration. Policy I-63 is the process by which the County determines if it wants to entertain and consider for approval an amendment to the General Plan that is initiated by a private request; a Plan Amendment Authorization (PAA) must be approved by the County to prior to the submitting of a General Plan amendment proposal; the PAA application and

approval process does not trigger a full CEQA review, but the subsequent complete General Plan Amendment application does, following the approval of the PAA; and this existing policy will expire on 31 December 2011 unless continued by action of the Board of Supervisors. The average cost to the County to process an application for a PAA is about \$15,000, and ranges from less than \$1000 to more than \$80,000 depending on the complexity of the proposal.

Alternatives under consideration include 1) status quo continuance of the existing Policy I-63; 2) adoption of a General Plan Update Version that incorporates the requirements for objective findings and possible regional study areas; 3) adoption of a Modified General Plan Update version with reduced requirements for objective findings and no requirement for regional study areas; 4) adoption of a process that reviews acceptability of a privately initiated General Plan amendment concurrent with application for the amendment; and 5) no review of any sort prior to accepting and processing a privately initiated amendment.

The County DPLU staff will prepare and make available a report summarizing concerns and comments gathered at the workshop and during the policy review process, along with a set of specific alternatives to the current Policy I-63, and a staff recommendation, 10 days prior to the scheduled 26 October hearing of this item by the Board of Supervisors. This report will include any Planning Group comments and/or recommendation of a specific alternative action that is submitted in time for DPLU review prior to preparation of documentation for the Board hearing.

Planning Group members discussed negative aspects of the County permitting process, without taking any specific action regarding alternatives for Policy I-63.

Item 6b. Public Project Proposal. Parkland Dedication Ordinance Priority List. Chairman Riggs engaged the Planning Group in a discussion of the annual request from the County Department of Parks and Recreation for an updated, prioritized list of projects the community wants carried out at each of its existing parks. He reminded the Group that new additional public County parkland cannot be acquired unless there is an organized group that is committed to its maintenance, and that proposed projects had to meet certain criteria to be eligible for PLDO funds. It is yet to be determined whether a project to develop a South Lane Master Plan qualifies as eligible. The 2010-2011 priority list did not include any projects that support active recreation programs, but such projects can be eligible and receive funding. Mary Manning would like a project to replace the electric lighting that was removed from the patio area of the Harbison Canyon Community Center at Ironsides Park, which could support active recreation there after dark; but she is not certain whether it is possible to have nighttime activities on the patio area, since Ironsides is a “dawn to dusk” park.

Chairman Riggs informed the group he would give Judy Bowen the details and documentation from the County for organizing a 2011-2012 Priority List, and that this would be an item on the agenda of the November meeting.

Item 7. Unfinished Business. None.

Item 8. New Business. None.

Item 9. Adjournment. Phil Hertel moved adjournment at 1955 hours. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted, William Bretz (Secretary)