

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Meeting Minutes
July 9, 2001**

Interest Group:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Erik Bruvold	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Michael Johnson	American Institute of Architects
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon

Public at Large:

Barbara Lind	
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
Chris Anderson	Ramona Chamber of Commerce
David Shibley	
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Jan Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Janet Anderson	Sierra Club
Jeanne Pagett	
Jerry McLees	Sweetwater Authority
Lynne Baker	Endangered Habitats League
Michael Thometz	Merit
Pat Flanagan	SDNHM
Ron Pennock	
Sally Westbrook	Ramona Chamber of Commerce
Scott Molloy	J. Whalen Assoc.
Troy Murphey	Sweetwater Authority

County:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary L. Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Gisela Hernandez (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Announcement –

Phil Pryde had welcomed the San Diego Association of Realtors and their representative Liz Higgins. The Realtors are the newest Interest Group Committee member. An environmental group is still in the process of being selected.

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

a) Minutes

- P. Pryde stated that his comment on farming and soil were incorrect. His correct comments are as follows: “only 5% of farms are on prime soil and farming in San Diego County is not prime soil dependent” (page 3).
- E. Bowlby made corrections to the minutes on behalf of Al Stehly. E. Bowlby’s notes indicate that Al Stehly said that the Farm Bureau is not asking for exemption from the Endangered Species Act.
- E. Bowlby indicated that the response given by Tom Harron in regards to what development rights are is not included in the minutes. T. Harron’s answer was that, “rights vest when you pull a building permit and spend substantial money and reliance upon it”.
- **Action:** Approval of minutes by general consensus.

b) Tools Workshop 7/14 (1st in series)

- The subcommittee on the tools workshop has indicated that in order for the group to reach their GP2020 vision, they must address various types of tools. One of these tools is the Transfer Development Rights (TDRs).
- A tools workshop is scheduled for this Saturday. This is first in a series of workshops addressing various different tools. Rick Pruetz will present and discuss TDRs.
- Both the Interest Group and Steering Committee have been invited to attend the workshop.
- There was request by Interest Group members to schedule R. Pruetz for the Interest Group’s meeting on Monday, tape record and/or broadcast the workshop through County Television. County staff will look into broadcasting the workshop, but it will be tape-recorded.
- The Tools Workshop with Rick Pruetz will take place on Saturday, July 14, 2001. It will take place from 9:00am – 12:00pm in the Ruffin Rd. Hearing Room.

Agenda Item III: Finalize Concepts Criteria (remaining holds) –

- There are still four holds in the criteria.
- The group will use the transportation workshop update in order to lead into the concepts criteria holds.

Agenda Item IV: Transportation/Transit –

a) Update on 6/23 Workshop -

- NCTD and County Transit presented on Transit First, Fast Forward and the County Transportation System. They informed the audience on existing services and service by territory.
- Alan Hoffman discussed the correlation between what is on the ground today and the County’s future transit and service. Possibilities of a “Purple Car” system.
- This system is an extension from MTDB’s service areas that would go into identified pick-up zones within the county. The purple car would then link the established zone to MTDB’s system.
- Using densities that can support the service would identify the pick-up zone within the County.
- How much density does it take to support having a transit stop?

- How does transportation and density begin to interface?
- The workshop helped begin identifying criteria by which nodes would be established.
- There are draft notes on the Transit Presentation posted on the web.

b) Node Criteria

- J. Whalen indicated that the workshop was a step closer to improving dialogue between the Interest Group and Steering Committee.
- E. Bowlby thinks the workshop was misleading because there is not a good distribution system in the metropolitan areas today. In order for the backcountry nodes to work, there needs to be a good distribution system in place today.
- D. Coombs pointed out that A. Hoffman indicated that sprawl couldn't be served in the backcountry. This underscores the need to provide some density in selected areas.
- G. Piro addressed the concept of transit. A. Hoffman does have a plan for the establishment of nodes in the future
- L. Higgins talked about MTDB's comment on the 18-25 dwelling units per acre for transit to be feasible. This is something for the group to keep in mind because it is a lot of density. Additionally, North County Transit district approved plan does not add any new surface areas other than what they have already planned. County transit system stated they were going to join MTDB by fall of 2001.
- E. Bowlby wanted to know the cost for the type of transit that A. Hoffman discussed.
- D. Coombs commented on government structure because we will have a better coordinated and funded government structure that will consolidate some of the currently separated entities.
- G. Piro responded to E. Bowlby's cost question in relation to flex trolley because you can build 10 times as many miles for the same dollar in comparison to the light rail.
- **Motion:** G. Piro motioned that the group recommend to the Board of Supervisors to support a nodal network system supported by land use, taking in consideration today's discussion, Hoffman's plan, MTDB, NCTD, Transit First Plan's, etc and for staff and consultants to propose and bring back recommendations to the group. Seconded by J. Whalen
- P. Pryde asked about the plan.
- G. Piro indicated that the plan's name is "Transit First Plan" and it has been endorsed by SANDAG, MTDB and NCTD. The Board has not taken a position on the plan.
- P. Pryde wanted a clarification on the motion. He did not hear Hoffman present a plan, but rather a concept.
- K. Scarborough clarified that plan is MTDB's Transit First goes for the incorporated part of the County. A. Hoffman's presentation introduced concepts for the unincorporated area and not a plan.
- K. Doyle said A. Hoffman's presentation was a conceptual vision and not yet a plan.
- L. Higgins is a member of the City's Advisory committee on Transportation. There are some meetings going on at this time in regards to this transit plan. The actual issues regarding this plan have not been fully supported. It is still a big work in progress. The cost is incredible reaching between 5 and 15 billion dollars.
- K. Doyle introduced the Regional Government Efficiency Commission.
- K. Scarborough indicated that there are various arenas in which transportation issues are being discussed.
- K. Scarborough asked G. Piro how he would articulate his vision of transportation taking A. Hoffman and any other plans and/or concepts out of the motion. How does this group want to encapsulate where we are headed with transportation and their required nodes in the unincorporated area.
- D. Silver supports G. Piro's motion because it is not a plan, but rather a strategy.
- E. Bruvold is uncomfortable with G. Piro's motion because not everyone was able to attend the workshop and because of the differences between the Transit 1st and the Hoffman plan. There is fundamental differences between the two plans (rail centric versus non-rail centric) and needs more information about both. The group must decide which plan they are supporting and be well informed.
- E. Bowlby thinks this motion is premature.

- G. Piro feels that in order to move GP2020 down the line, the group must support and follow something. He would like to see support of a transit 1st plan; at least in theory. The group needs to have a transportation plan.
- K. Scarborough indicated that the group is not there to discuss supporting any concept, they are there to establish the nodes in the unincorporated area as a network system.
- E. Bowlby indicated that any kind of transit service North of I-8 or East of I-15 requires a lot of linking and money. Spending for transportation needs to be prioritized, and this means that the spending should be in the metropolitan area.
- G. Piro asked if the current transit facilities would be used when doing the distribution analysis.
- G. Pryor answered that there is currently no systems in place. By determining where growth will go you can preclude transit in the future and make it an auto-dependent society. The real issue is whether you want to provide that alternate means. This means you will be looking at concentrations of population within walking distance or short park and ride type distance to where they can get to mass transit type facilities. Therefore, the real issue is whether you want to create a future society in the next twenty years that is totally auto-dependent or whether you want to start to move to the option of looking at distributing and concentrating that population to support a future transit network.
- G. Piro suggested that Gary Pryor's previous comments are what the group was looking for in a motion. They were looking for a motion that said that the plan would facilitate the future transit network.
- D. Coombs said that there is infrastructure that you can hook into now. These possible nodes are:
 - ⇒ Spring Valley with the new 125
 - ⇒ Lakeside (off the 67)
 - ⇒ Ramona
 - ⇒ Fallbrook has some potential
 - ⇒ Alpine
- L. Higgins wanted to know if a node is defined as a place where all systems can converge or is it a bus stop in Potrero?
- K. Scarborough answered by saying that a node is a concentrated core of density, mixed use of densities that would incorporate itself into an area where transportation would be an option and it would be used.
- L. Higgins clarified this is not limiting transportation in other areas. This process is only identifying where some nodes have to be located.
- G. Piro pointed out that nodes could be very small. The one square mile rule for a node only applies to an area that will have a full transportation system.
- E. Bowlby asked if this motion includes an increase in density in any of these locations?
- D. Silver answered yes, and explained that the density might already be there. This is an issue about distribution not population target.
- B. Tabb wanted to know why a node is not placed in every major off-ramp. He thinks that increasing the amount of nodes creates less auto dependency.
- K. Messer explained that a small number of nodes are needed in order to have good service. A. Hoffman suggested 5-6 nodes.
- The following are Phil Pryde's Criteria for Nodes
 1. Where transportation should go.
 2. Where transportation already exist.
 - ⇒ The group needs to bring closure to the discussion on nodes in order to continue with the agenda.
- E. Bruvold's suggestions on potential criteria for nodes:
 1. Topography is pedestrian friendly
 2. Current short term planning can be retrofitted to be pedestrian friendly
 3. Opportunity to link to broader networks
 4. Transit node should be in any major employment center in the county.
 5. Should go into current or planned SPA areas that can accommodate transit nodes.

- K. Messer added cost-benefit analysis for potential node criteria
- Stehly's thoughts on nodes are that they are a gathering place to get onto an expressway.
- E. Bruvold commented on the notion behind Transit 1st. Once people get into their cars, they are not going to stop and use public transportation. It is difficult to get people out of their cars once they get in.
- K. Messer indicated that because San Diego does not have a rapid transit system, people are unwilling to get out of their cars and use it. The group need to focus and locate potential transit nodes
- D. Silver suggested that county staff come back with some initial recommendations, which identify where the nodes should be. He supports a nodal network system that is supported by land use. The county should look into today's discussion on A. Hoffman and transit 1st before making recommendations.
- E. Bruvold is opposed because transit does not support land use.
- D. Coombs indicated that in the backcountry, nodes are made up of purple lines. Population needs to be concentrated in central areas and help preserve the backcountry. If the communities are taught about centralizing density and using nice design standards, high density it can be sold to the communities.
- K. Scarborough clarified that the group should use the 660,000 target population number when looking at population distribution.
- M. Johnson does not want to go on record in support of the six criteria, but rather in support of the general discussion.
- **Public comment:**
 - ⇒ Public transit is a public service. It is not always highly efficient, but highly effective.
 - ⇒ Ramona does not have the density to support a transit node, but can support a capillary system.
 - ⇒ There needs to be discussion of commercial and industrial areas. Alternative 3 maps should be utilized.
 - ⇒ Transportation nodes can also be used going in the opposite direction; it can be city going to the parks.
 - ⇒ Land use should not guide transportation.
- **Vote:**
 - ⇒ Favored: General consensus
 - ⇒ Opposed: 0
 - ⇒ Abstained: 1 (E. Bowlby)

Continuation of Agenda Item III: Finalize Concepts Criteria (remaining holds) –

- **Motion:** J. Whalen proposes to remove the hold on densities A, B and D and add PDRs/TDRs to concepts A and B. D. Silver seconded the motion.
- B. Tabb agrees because the density has to be pulled from somewhere; from the natural resource areas to the cores.
- P. Pryde wants to discuss densities before removing the holds.
- A. Stehly cannot support the motion based on the last portion of the discussion. The farm bureau will only support the plan if TDRs are used.
- D. Silver explains that removing the hold of densities allows the county's consultants to begin with the map creating process. If TDRs are shown not to work, we will reopen and begin the discussion. Moving forward today does not mean that the group supports the densities given in the concept criteria.
- A. Stehly can not support the motion is "D" is included.
- E. Bowlby can't support portion of the motion talking about TDRs because of the mention of density.
- G. Piro is concerned because there has not been enough time to discuss and look into. Therefore, he will abstain.

- L. Carmichael looked at how concepts fit into the maps. In the CWA, it was apparent that there are not many 160 lots, but rather 20-acre lots. Areas East of the CWA have a lot of sprawl and the concept criterias will be more difficult to implement.
- D. Silver agrees with L. Carmichael, but also adds that TDRs might be applicable to existing parcels.
- **Amendment to the Motion:** D. Silver amends the motion by adding that it be contingent on A, B, and D. If TDRs/PDRs do not prove to be successful, there will be a re-evaluation of the densities in the concept criteria.
- **Public Comments:** The group should not be hesitant about upzoning in the village cores
- **Vote:**
 - ⇒ Favored: General Consensus
 - ⇒ Opposed: 0
 - ⇒ Abstained: 2 (E. Bowlby, G. Piro)

Agenda Item V: Process –

- a) Status & Next Steps
 - J. Whalen introduced the following steps:
 1. Keep Regional Categories, Use Existing Land Use Categories and apply designators with TDRs.
 2. Make changes to existing General Plan to make consistent.
 3. Reconcile inconsistencies in conflict between Goals and Policies and Concepts, and then add to new elements.
 4. Developments with TDR/PDR program
 5. Update distribution model.
 6. Fit sizing and capacity of existing and planned infrastructure and service.
 7. Apply biological mitigation ordinance (BMO) countywide and revise RPO to exclude biology.
 8. Community character design standards
 9. Develop criteria for updating the Community Plans based on size and urgency.
 10. Initiate pilot projects in key areas.
- c) Discussion
 - E. Bruvold feels that more comments on TDRs and PDRs are needed in order to make sure that there is still value.
 - **Amendment:** He adds that the next steps list should include a 9.5 and say, “examine tools and mechanisms to best ascertain potential for success.
 - K. Messer has problems with numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7. She is ok with numbers 8, 9 and 10.
 - P. Pryde suggests that “fairness” is a better word than “equity”.
 - D. Silver adds that this an issues list that will help the group move forward.
 - E. Bruvold likes it because it parallels tracks goals and mechanisms.
 - B. Tabb does not want to lose sight of clustering because of TDRs and PDRs.
 - D. Coombs is concerned with step number one because it accepts the old general plan. The group needs an open toolbox that can lead to a new plan.
 - J. Whalen used an analogy to state that the old plan still has good parts in it and can be used for the new plan.
 - K. Scarborough indicated that discussion on TDRs will occur in the near future. There should be a presentation on regional category designators.
 - D. Silver wants the consultants to come back with maps that have used the concepts as a foundation. He states that the motion should follow the following simultaneously:
 1. Discussion of J. Whalen’s “issues” or steps
 2. Begin discussion on TDRs, PDRs and other mechanisms.
 3. Start engine on mapping and have consultants return with drafts.
 - G. Piro cannot support starting on the maps until TDRs are further discussed.
 - **Public Comment:** D. Van Dierendonck is impressed with J. Whalen’s issues list. The list has a goal, purpose and direction.

- G. Piro agrees to beginning the maps if there is no preconceived population target.
- **Vote:**
 - ⇒ Favored: General Consensus
 - ⇒ Opposed: 0
 - ⇒ Abstained: 1, E. Bowlby

Update –

D. Coombs informed the group that the county tours might be self guided trips. She would like to see them done in early August

Next meeting –

Scheduled for Monday, July 16, 2001 in the County Administration Center, 7th floor tower, 12:15 pm - 2:45 pm.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.