

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
April 16, 2002
Revised April 30, 2002

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Lynne Baker	Endangered Habitats League
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values

Public at Large:

Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
Dave Shibley	
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Florence Sloane	SDCSD
Jeanne Pagett	
Jonathan Smulian	WRT Consultant
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Paul B. Etzel	SDSU/Astronomy
Ruth Potter	
Sachiko Kohatsu	County of San Diego

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Timothy Popejoy (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Brief Intro –

Scarborough stated that she was informed by County Counsel that she was not required to follow Robert's Rules of Order and would no longer be accepting motions to table discussion or action as it is an impediment to progress. If there is a concern with the motion on the table, it will be noted.

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for April 2, 2002
 - No changes made. Pryde moved to approve. Higgins seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.
- b) "Tools" Sub-committee Update
 - Stehly stated that the group did not meet today because they are awaiting a meeting with Rick Pruetz and the objective for meeting with Pruetz will be to see if the committee is moving in the right direction.

Agenda Item II: Process –

- Scarborough stated that she was hopeful in completing the Goals & Policies in order to review the map. This committee will be seeing the map on Thursday, April 18th and the Steering Committee will be reviewing it at their meeting on Saturday, April 20th. The map will be presented to the Board of Supervisors on Wednesday, April 24th, which is only to be intended as a progress report and no action is to be taken. Baker asked if this map was considered as staff's map since there are areas of disagreement that have not been resolved. Holler responded that it is not to be considered staff's map since it came from the structure map and was basically a synthesis of input from this group and the Steering Committee. He agreed that the group has stated there were areas of disagreement but this group also agreed to digitize the map.

Agenda Item III: Draft Revisions to the Goals & Policies –

- b) Conservation

Scarborough explained that she has been trying to accommodate those who request to discuss certain elements by not discussing them in their absence or late arrivals. Being informed by Chase of an expected late arrival, the group moved on to Conservation.

Conservation Goal:

- **Vote:** Scarborough requested a vote on the Conservation goal language that was considered at the previous meeting. Whalen moved to approve. Stedt seconded the motion. Motion passed 15 – 0 – 0.

Policy A:

- Pryde mentioned that areas of low percolation were just as important as areas with high percolation and felt it should be considered.
- Bowlby stated that this policy addresses a very narrow area of protection for our important groundwater basins and resources to say just the areas of high percolation. He recommended including all recharge areas for groundwater basins so as to replace *areas of high percolation* with *important areas of groundwater recharge*.
- **Motion:** Doyle moved his submitted recommendation: *Protect watersheds and groundwater recharge areas by avoiding the placement of pollution sources*. He explained that there is a difference between preserve and protect, there should be protection from all pollution sources rather than just potential sources, and that all areas of percolation should be protected rather than just areas of high percolation. Coombs seconded the motion.
- Stedt asked staff why they had not recommended any change. Holler responded that he believed the Steering Committee added the areas of high percolation because it was a particular concern for contamination of groundwater aquifers and by eliminating that, it would have a much broader potential application which he does not believe to be the intent of the Steering Committee.
- Doyle asked how the County identifies potential versus identifiable pollution sources. He feels that it does broaden the intent but by using *protect*, it changes the nuance as well.

- Coombs asked if staff checked with the Regional Quality Control Board for their baseline. Holler replied that he is familiar with the requirements of the permit and that the issue with this policy, as it is being proposed, is that it may be more related to a BMP than an overall policy statement.
- Adams stated that the proposal can be interpreted to not allow septic. Holler stated that it may be possible to read that out of the statement.
- Stehly mentioned that the manner in which a watershed is defined is by drawing a line all around the ridgeline, as far back as it can go, so basically everything in San Diego County is in one watershed or another. This policy, by putting in watershed, means every square inch of the County. Suggested taking out the *avoiding the placement* because by putting it in the policy, it will be the only thing we are mitigating. Feels *protect watersheds* is general enough.
- **Amendment:** Pryde stated that we want every square inch protected from pollution. Suggested *Protect watersheds and groundwater recharge areas from pollution*. Accepted by Doyle and Coombs.
- Bowlby asked what determined an area of high percolation vs. medium. Holler and Carmichael responded permeability of the soil and amount of rainfall. Bowlby feels the policies should be more specific and argued in favor of what staff had but to include *medium to high percolation*. The reason he speaks of the placement of these pollution sources in areas with groundwater basins is because the pollution sources adjacent to basins can contaminate the basin. In Lakeside, where they have industrial equipment storage next to a groundwater resource, can cause real problems and that is what he would like the policies to speak to avoid. Barker agreed a bit with Bowlby and stated that the proposed language does speak of protection but does not give any direction since it is not as specific.
- **Vote:** *Protect watersheds and groundwater recharge areas from pollution:* 14 – 0 – 1
- Pryde mentioned that every square inch of the County is in a watershed, a groundwater recharge basin, and has an approximation to water, so everyone needs to keep this in mind when making motions.

New Policy:

- **Motion:** Bowlby moved to add the policy: *Avoid the placement of sources of pollution in the vicinity of important groundwater basins*. Motion seconded.
- **Amendment:** Chase suggested splitting the language in policy A into a new policy, as Bowlby is attempting, but rather than creating new language, it should retain the language that the Steering Committee had. She offered *Avoid the placement of pollution sources in areas with high percolation*. Maker and seconder of the motion accepted. Stedt remarked that this is redundant and unnecessary.
- Doyle suggested amending the motion with his submitted recommendation on policy B, as he believes his recommended policy B gets to what Bowlby is trying to achieve in a new bullet. Barker concurred.
- Adams stated that the group was getting too specific and far into detail for what they are trying to achieve in this document. Specificity comes into play with codes and ordinances.
- Bowlby thinks Doyle's language is important but feels we need to speak to the placement of pollution sources as well. He does not agree that Doyle's language addresses the placement and wanted to vote on his motion before addressing policy B.
- Higgins stated that substance of high pollution sources cannot be placed in areas of high percolation as current regulations do not allow you to put any kind of a septic system in an area of high percolation. Pryor responded that often times, floodways and primarily floodplains, were used as junkyards or heavy industrial where you had potential pollution problems. The way this is worded now, policy A says that we are going to try to direct those high end polluters away from groundwater recharge areas and policy B speaks of having adequate groundwater, so the two policies focus on two different aspects.
- Gendron mentioned Gregory Canyon in Lakeside and the industrial in Tecate and emphasized that these are all areas that need to be protected and is not covered.
 - ❖ **Correction made on April 30, 2002:** Areas mentioned are Gregory Canyon in the San Luis Rey watershed, Lakeside has industrial in the San Diego River, and Tecate has industrial over the sole source aquifer of Tecate.
- Stedt feels that the current motion is redundant with policy A and does not agree with Doyle's amendment as policies A and B are different.
- **Amendment:** Bowlby amended the motion to revert back to the original language.
- **Vote:** *Avoid the placement of potential pollution sources in important groundwater recharge areas:* 8 – 7 – 0.

Policy B:

- **Motion:** Doyle moved his submitted recommendation.
- Pryde suggested adding *without promoting depletion*.

- Adams commented we are setting the board so high that it is going to shut down development. Doyle explained that there is no intent to stop development and that his recommendations were taken, and somewhat modified, from Monterey County's General Plan, which he believes to be one of the best general plans in the state that he has looked at. He thinks that this is just another goal or policy trying to protect groundwater as we try to balance development with everything else. Adams asked whether this was a standard that the County can achieve.
- Stedt explained that *inherent capacity* is a problem because it is vague and unenforceable.
- Pryor stated that the current code looks at sustainability and is designed to ensure there is going to be a sustainable amount of water for the development project that is being proposed. Not sure of what the term inherent capacity is intended to mean but if that is what the intent is, then it is consistent with what we are doing currently. It is a different term so we need to define what we mean by inherent capacity. Suggested it simply say *Ensure capacity of groundwater resources to sustain proposed use*. What you are really asking about is the capacity and we do monitor the wells to make sure there is adequate recharge in a basin to accommodate growth.
- Stedt thinks we should not adopt policies without definitions. Doyle stated that he would consider omitting *inherent* after hearing more discussion.
- Whalen did not have a problem with the concept and suggested to add *in areas not served by imported water*.
- Pryde thinks the motion that Doyle introduced addresses both quality and quantity and thinks *depletion* should be in there. He commented on Whalen's suggestion, stating that there are lots of wells west of CWA, including commercial water companies so he did not recommend including Whalen's suggestion.
- Tabb commented that he does not want to restrict the use of groundwater and if it is depleted, it will recharge unless it is in a severe area.
- Coombs suggested *prohibit overdrafting*. Bowlby thinks overdrafting hurts water quality but it is degradation that we should be addressing.
- Lambron reiterated Whalen's suggestion stating that subdivisions should not be subject to this if they are not using groundwater.
- Stehly pointed out that degradation is happening everywhere in the county due to the increasing salinity in the groundwater so we have to be careful of unintended consequences here.
- Adams stated that he saw the way it was written to be inflexible, in that you would never be able to use the wells because it would be tapping into the inherent capacity.
- Baker stated that *inherent*, to her, assures you of its ability to recharge for needs.
- Pryde suggested *without promoting depletion, degradation, or increasing hazard*.
- Whalen suggested *in areas not using imported water, ensure the capacity of groundwater resources be sustained*.
- **Amendment:** Doyle suggested *In projects using groundwater resources, ensure the inherent capacity....* Feels that inherent is correct as the definition is functioning and natural, as long as it continues to recharge.
- **Amendment:** Harron stated that the water industry describes sustainable capacity and suggested a *sustainable capacity to serve proposed use....* Doyle accepted the amendment.
- Adams asked how do we define inherent. Pryor responded that we do it now by monitoring groundwater, which fluctuates but also have time where it recharges. The way it is written brings it back to current code.
- **Vote:** *In projects utilizing groundwater resources, ensure the sustainable capacity of groundwater resources to serve proposed use without promoting degradation or hazard: 14 – 1 – 0.*

Policy C:

- **Motion:** Stedt moved staff's recommendation stating he agreed with staff in that we should not reiterate county ordinance. Higgins seconded the motion.
- Barker suggested adding the language...in accordance with codes, policies, and ordinances.
- Adams asked how the County can minimize light emissions. Holler responded that the current ordinance's lighting zones limit output of light and spectrum.
- **Substitute Motion:** Pryde suggested the following, based on input from Barker, Coombs, and Gendron: *Ensure dark skies are protected, to conserve energy and to minimize light emissions that interfere with the operation of observatories and degrade community character.* Coombs seconded the motion.

- Holler requested that Paul Etzel (SDSU, Dept. of Astronomy) speak to the topic. Thinks issue is that energy is being misused. The problem we have with lighting does not have to do with observatories, but rather the type of light fixtures or light source on our dark skies, so using the right type of fixtures, generally supported by the ordinance now, is the issue.
- **Amendment:** Pryor suggested using Barker's language, modifying the goal into a policy and to have policies A through G directed to staff for when codes and ordinances are crafted. He recommended *An environment free of excessive lighting to conserve energy and to preserve the quality of astronomical observation, to minimize adverse effects upon wildlife, respect the character of the rural environment and to preserve cultural heritage.* In reference to Barker's language, he added that he was unsure as to how to enhance air quality and that promoting health and safety becomes redundant since that is the reason codes and ordinances are created. Pryde accepted the language.
- Doyle requested to put in a Lighting element. Pryor responded that the Board of Supervisors has directed staff to adopt the seven mandatory elements only so it is not possible.
- **Amendment:** Bowlby suggested adding *provide for or ensure.*
- **Vote:** *Ensure an environment free of excessive lighting to conserve energy and to preserve the quality of astronomical observation, to minimize adverse effects upon wildlife, respect the character of the rural environment and to preserve cultural heritage.* Does not include action on policies A through G: 15 – 0 – 0.

Policy D:

- **Motion:** Adams moved to change *preserve* to *protect* and add *significant*. Higgins seconded the motion.
- Doyle suggested using his recommendation. Stedt responded that he preferred Adam's proposal because he had an issue with the language of *manmade*. Whalen also commented that Doyle's recommendation goes farther than what it is intending to do.
- Gendron commented that she did not like *significant* because it is too subjective.
- Coombs suggested *preserve and restore where feasible* with Doyle's recommendation.
- Higgins asked for the definition of the current ordinance regarding cultural and historic resources. Carmichael responded that our Resource Protection Ordinance talks about, and does go to a significant level, which is where CEQA talks of cultural and historic resources. We recently, within the last two years, passed a Landmark Ordinance, which gets to what the County considers significant because we do consider more things significant than the state guidelines.
- Whalen stated that the recommendation is too broad and not detailed enough but was willing to work with the group to come to a policy that both sides can agree on.
- **Amendment:** Stedt offered *Encourage the preservation of cultural and archaeological resources and preserve and enhance, where feasible, historic resources of the County.*
- Adams was concerned that the second component is additional regulation. Added that this is a policy framework that heads towards existing ordinances.
- Baker felt that *encourage* weakens the policy and preferred to go back to *preserve*. Coombs agreed that the policy needs to begin with *preserve*.
- Stedt amended his recommendation to *preserve significant cultural....* Barker did not think *significant* was necessary for a policy statement. Tabb felt it needed to be included in order for the statement to be clear in its intent otherwise, it would mean everything. Stedt added that significant will be determined during the CEQA process which takes place after this. Adams accepted the amendment.
- **Vote:** *Preserve significant cultural and archaeological resources and preserve and enhance, where feasible, historic resources of San Diego County:* 11 – 3 – 1.

Policy E:

- Staff was asked why they had recommended deleting the policy. Holler replied that this policy was redundant with Land Use Goal II, E.
- **Motion:** Whalen moved to retain language and add *consistent with habitat conservation planning*. Stedt seconded the motion.
- Coombs stated that she did not care if the policy was redundant as the point needs to get through and does not agree with Whalen's addition.
- Doyle asked for clarification on Whalen's motion of whether it is limited to habitat conservation planning. Whalen responded that it is not limited.
- Pryde mentioned that *obtain* would be a better choice than *acquire*.

- Bowlby thinks Whalen's modification makes this sound like it is all about habitat areas. Thinks that it should be clear that we want to say that greenbelts and open space will be protected through other reasons and be established for reasons, besides habitat conservation.
- Chase suggested to change the language to *consistent with and in addition to* or *coordinated with or consistent with, but not limited to*.
- Whalen stated that *coordinate with* seems additive. Scarborough clarified that Whalen's intent was to be limited to habitat conservation.
- **Vote:** *Acquire, establish, and preserve a system of greenbelts and open space consistent with habitat conservation planning: 12 – 2 – 1.*

Agenda Item IV: Draft Preliminary Distribution Map –

- Holler mentioned we are going to the Board with a status report and are not asking for any action on the 24th. Will be presenting the draft land use map, which has been modeled for population and those numbers are in the Board letter. It is agenda item #3.
- Doyle asked where the discussion was of General Plan 2020 fitting into the new regional plan that SANDAG has announced. Holler responded that this is an update of where we are at. Doyle asked if there should be a discussion and coordination amongst the Interest Group and other groups. Scarborough noted the suggestion.

Agenda Item V: Status & Next Steps –

- Scarborough mentioned that Goals & Policies will be placed on the agenda for the 30th and that there was a proposal on the table to extend the meeting until the group is finished.

Agenda Item VI: Public Comments –

- Dave Shibley mentioned an article referring to Riverside County's mailout suggesting we do a similar mailout with a color brochure and that this committee should address the language placed in the notification. Staff responded that a brochure is intended to be mailed out to property owners. Bowlby stated he was interested in taking a look at the language.
- Paul Etzel thanked the group for trying to retain the quality of life.