

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
July 9, 2002**

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Phil Pryde	SD Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values

Public at Large:

Bob Pinnegar	SD Association of Realtors
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
Dave Shibley	
David Pallinger	Ramona
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Janet Anderson	Sierra Club
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Joseph Perring	
Lynne Baker	EHL
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Rich Cantillon	
Russ Hunt	Mooney & Associates
Scott Molloy	Molloy Engineering & Analysis

County Staff:

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

Non-Agenda Item: Proxy Votes –

- Tabb to Whalen; Chase to Gendron; Messer and Doyle to Silver.

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for June 11, 2002
 - No motion made.
- b) Clarification of Draft Revisions to Goals & Policies
 - Staff needed clarification on whether the policies proposed by Barker in conjunction with staff, approved by the group on June 11th, was to be included in the draft revisions to the Goals & Policies because Stedt had moved to retain the existing Circulation policies as approved on March 19th and stated his preference to retain the existing Circulation policies B through E over those that Barker had proposed. Scarborough tabled the discussion for clarification to the end of the meeting, dependent upon time.

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

- a) Safety, Policy B
 - Silver moved staff's recommendation as proposed on May 28th.
 - In explanation of why there was a different staff recommendation being proposed, Holler responded that the 1st and 3rd recommendation was similar to the previous recommendation with slight alterations. The 2nd recommendation was the only policy removed because the designation of the *high fire hazard areas* is really a county-wide designation as defined by SRAs, which could have an impact on all of the areas of the county where there are certainly ways to mitigate for that. Staff's concern was that it is too broad in its statement. Silver responded that perhaps we could use a term other than *high fire hazard area* that would not apply to the entire unincorporated area but gets to the point of what we are all talking about.
 - Bowlby stated that the original language insinuates that development will still happen but restricted to some degree and feels it can be refined to include the latest staff recommendation, proposing *New development shall be sited to reduce the threat of fire damage or loss of habitable structures and to allow efficient use of fire fighting resources during wildfires.*
 - Higgins had noted that the group had voted to delete policy B at the last meeting (May 28th). Scarborough responded that due to the controversy over this issue, it was being revisited. Higgins added that fire hazard areas are in the remote areas and the map restricts development. She asked how do you plan on restricting development when it is already restricted.
 - Coombs commented that there are gradations of fire hazards and suggested substituting the word with *highest* with the following parameters of available fire service and appropriate access. She proposed *Limit development in those areas of the highest fire hazard areas who do not have appropriate access and do not have a regular fire department depending on CDF.*
 - Adams stated that it is not that development should be restricted but rather the design that should be looked at carefully in terms of high fire areas. He suggested replacing *sited* with *designed* in the 2nd recommendation of the latest proposal. Harron responded that siting would be moving development near fire service and when you are talking about design, you are incorporating other things such as materials, which is two different things. Adams asked how the County today tackles this site issue. Holler responded that in the subdivision approval process, there is a fire buffer that is included when subdivision occurs. Part of the siting issue could be where the structure goes on the lot, siting the structure away from fire infringement. Added that this language could work in concert with the wildland interface standards.
 - Whalen asked what staff meant by *whenever feasible* since the County already has certain standards that address this. Holler responded that it is a recognition and that in every case, even though there may be an engineering solution that may not be appropriate or practical to build a secondary access, we also know that secondary access and connectivity is something we want to encourage in this process so that statement has enough room so as to not have a rigid application but still speak to the intent of the policy. Whalen added that there should be some element of

flexibility because if someone was able to provide secondary access, we should not have to over design the roads. He added that he was generally supportive of the latest recommendations.

- Silver stated that he would prefer to see the policy (2nd recommendation of May 28th proposal) say *Restrict development in very high fire hazard areas* but believes *where fire service is limited* is a very reasonable qualifier because it speaks to the safety and thus, makes this a reasonable compromise. Whalen commented that there are very few areas of very high hazard.
- Adams suggested *Provide road design flexibility for projects with secondary ingress/egress in high fire hazard areas* with the intent, that if you were to do a secondary entryway, you would have flexibility in the road design standards and not have to build the road as wide as you have to now.
- Silver commented that *where fire service is limited* is the key qualifier and did not understand what the issue was.
- Bowlby stated that due to the wide brush of semi-rural on the west side of CWA, it is critical to site the development so the term *sited* needs to be in the policy and Adams' suggestion avoids having to site development where it can be serviced in the event of fire. Scarborough clarified that Adams had only made reference to secondary ingress/egress and not siting.
- Stehly stated that what brings fire through these areas are the Santa Ana conditions so it is the design standards of the building that we need to work on and not where it is located.
- Carmichael added that we do have areas in the county that are fully served, seasonally served by CDF, areas that are volunteer, and areas that are not served so we do run the whole gamut in the county and basically the further east you get, the less service you have.
- Stedt commented that safety is not a siting issue but rather a design issue. Stated we need to deal with the design issue and is comfortable with Adams' language.
- Coombs saw all the issues as relevant, including design, and thought all the concepts should be melded together. Felt would be remiss if we did not deal with all the factors.
- **Motion:** Silver moved to approve: 1) *Whenever feasible, provide flexible secondary ingress/egress for residential development in high fire hazard areas*; 2) *Restrict development in very high fire hazard areas where fire service is limited*; and 3) *New development should be designed so as to reduce the threat of fire damage or loss of habitable structures and to allow efficient use of fire fighting resources*. Gendron seconded the motion.
- Stehly commented with regards to design, that these are all trumped by the uniform fire codes as plans are required to be approved by the local or regional fire department. Adding that insurance companies will not lend you money if your home is going to burn down. With regards to secondary access routes, homeowners do not die because they have enough time to get out the way they drive in every single day. Holler added that the county adopts uniform building codes and individual boards of fire districts also adopt them which have to be subsequently ratified by the Board. The County, as a courtesy for years, have sent building plans to fire districts for review.
- Whalen commented that some of the members feel that this is a pretext for no growth. Added that we are trying to recognize the realities of fire science so it is not where the home is but how it is designed.
- **Amendment:** Silver amended the 3rd proposal to *New development should be sited where adequate fire service exists and designed to reduce the threat of damage or loss to habitable structures*. Adams stated that development is being restricted to areas of fire service. Silver suggested *New development should be served by adequate fire service and designed....* Bowlby was concerned with the removal of *sited*. Silver offered *New development should be sited where it can be served by adequate fire service....* Gendron accepted the amendment. Holler had responded that staff cannot support this policy because it can be construed as a prohibition where services are not available but where currently can build today using other mitigation methods.
- Scarborough stated the Board does not need this group to come to consensus to have an opinion and if this group does not come to consensus, this group's voice becomes mute on the issue.
- Harron stated that you can maximize fire protection service by concentrating most of your development in the west but allowing occasional development to the east so he thinks you reach your goal but it does not result in total prohibition. We are trying to put most of the development where service is but at the same time, we do recognize there will be some, which will be relatively insignificant in numbers, that will still be allowed in the backcountry.
- **Amendment:** Adams did not feel Silver's motion addressed road design. Silver amended the 1st proposal to *Whenever feasible, provide flexible road standards for secondary ingress/egress for residential development in high fire hazard areas*. He altered the 2nd proposal, in light of Harron's comments, to *limit* instead of *restrict*. The 3rd proposal substituted *designed* for *sited*.

- **Motion:** Adams felt the 1st proposal needed word-smithing and offered *Whenever feasible, provide secondary ingress/egress with flexible road design standards for residential development in high fire hazard areas*. Silver did not accept the amendment and removed his motion for the 3rd proposal. Adams moved his language. Whalen seconded the motion.
- Barker asked staff why this policy is not supportable. Harron responded that there could be a situation where the fire department decides they need something and find that the general plan says flexible. Barker stated that the solution here may be to request some kind of standards for emergency access to be developed in an ordinance. Harron replied that we need minimum standards but if they are overloading the standards, we need some flexibility there. Identifying that a portion of this is more appropriate in ordinances, Scarborough stated that the group's direction to staff is similar to others in our goals and policies, putting that concept in ordinance form and to not head towards policy level, in order to accommodate staff's trepidation and concerns for flexibility in road standards. Adams did not agree. Holler stated that at this level, we are not going to get into design and turnouts for mitigation.
- **Vote:** *Whenever feasible, provide secondary ingress/egress with flexible road design standards for residential development in high fire hazard areas:* 10 – 4 – 2
- **Vote:** *Limit development in very high fire hazard areas where fire service is limited:* 8 – 7 – 1. Higgins objected to this vote and noted for the record that this vote was not called for as it was not put back on the table in an appropriate manner.
- **Vote:** *New development should be designed so as to reduce the threat of fire damage or loss of habitable structures and to allow efficient use of fire fighting resources:* 13 – 0 – 3

b) Safety, Policy E

- **Motion:** Silver moved staff's recommendation. Coombs seconded the motion.
- Adams stated that he cannot support the motion because he thinks it should be rewritten that there is an acknowledgement in the general plan that new development will conform with the mandates set forth by the Water Quality Control Board to conform with the municipal stormwater permit as it will change. He proposed *New development will conform to the municipal stormwater permit*.
- Harron stated that we decided our position would be cooperative and what we did in our permit was to agree to include in our general plan division to deal with stormwater and this is what we think we need to do to satisfy the permit. Added that he looked at the permit language itself and drafted it in a way that would be consistent and give the most flexibility. Adams asked if the municipal permit were to change in anyway, would you not be locked in to what is said here even though the permit may change. Harron responded that this is a policy statement and the actual stormwater ordinance is where you would really see the change as to how we carry out the cautions and that we probably would not change this.
- Whalen asked what if the Board is faced with making a decision on a general plan that is inconsistent with their own legal press. Harron responded that we would bring back the stormwater ordinance to the Board and probably take out some requirements and there would be very specific amendments to the stormwater ordinance. Whalen asked Carmichael what we can do to the general plan language itself to reflect that kind of an outcome. Carmichael replied that we would not be at approval stage if it is mid next year for this so we can change this until the Board approves it.
- **Amendment:** Harron suggested adding to the end, *consistent with the stormwater permit*. Silver stated he would modify his motion.
- Stedt felt the policy was too specific and suggested *New development should minimize stormwater impacts so that significant downstream erosion or flooding caused by such development is prevented, consistent with the stormwater permit*. Harron stated that we wanted to build in the ability of the authority and then go past the ordinances that will further these projects. If there is an opportunity there for infiltration, we would like some authority in the general plan so we can follow up with some kind of implementing ordinance.
- Silver asked if we add this language at the end and we end up with a permit that is weak in some ways, does this prohibit the County from maintaining those high standards. Harron responded that it does not as further protection is not inconsistent with the permit, it is just not required by the permit.
- **Vote:** 8 – 7 – 1
- Scarborough stated that we are not calling Goals & Policies closed due to Chase's request to address several goals and policies, which we will discuss when she is present.

Agenda Item III: Working Copy Distribution Map –

Overview

- Scarborough stated that community groups have seen this map in detail and their comment time closed June 28th. This group has a month to review this and we have an extensive equity mechanism toolbox to discuss, which is key to the implementation of this map. Holler mentioned that he had met with Rick Pruetz and went over his letter that he had submitted (handed out at a previous meeting). Stated that the first step for us was to do an analysis of four or five specific parcels (probably 3 in the backcountry and 2 inside the CWA boundary). We would do an analysis of development potential at the general plan level with constraints, for existing and proposed. Then work with an appraiser, experienced in those areas, to see if he can set a value on those proposed changes and come back to this group with a report in about 4 – 6 weeks.
- Carmichael gave a brief overview of the Working Copy Distribution Map. She mentioned the structure map, which was the basis for creating the more detailed land use distribution map that is still a draft/working copy map. The detailed map is what we have been getting public comments on at the workshops and open houses. In the creation of this, we utilized the input from both advisory groups (Interest Group and Steering Committee) – looked at Board endorsed concepts, overall population target of 660,000, the Interest Group's guiding principles, the draft community planning/sponsor group goals and policies (been working on since last June), existing land uses, parcelization, rooftops, and various constraints that we've talked about before. All along we have been talking about shifting "roofs" westward towards services – our existing general plan has 60% of future growth within the CWA and 40% outside of CWA, the proposal is 80% of future growth within the CWA and 20% outside, so we have achieved the basic shift in population but you are still going to have future population growth in these areas because there are large land masses that have existing parcelization. As mentioned, we have received numerous input from the public and we are continuing to receive input, which will be given to the community planning/sponsor groups for their comments and be reviewed by staff individually to be analyzed for recommendations. This will take place over the next month and a half and hopefully, we will receive the Interest Group's input during that month and a half, so we have a long way to go before getting the map to a position to model it for traffic and again, see the results of population once we make modifications. The map will be back after the modeling for additional comments.

Questions

- Adams asked what the number of acres are in public vs. private lands and the number of units forecasted inside vs. outside of the CWA. He also asked if the group was going to see another map reflecting modifications since there was a map drafted but the group had not finished the goals and policies. Carmichael responded that staff will have to review the goals and policies when completing the next iteration. We have future population, which can be divided by 3 (east of CWA is 41,889 and west of CWA is 182,694) to get the number of units, roughly. Staff has the number of acres in public and private lands but was not available at this meeting and will be given later.
- Bowlby asked about the Indian Reservations and whether they are counted as public or private. Carmichael responded that they are excluded from our numbers because they are a nation.
- Stedt stated that the Board, in January 2001, endorsed certain standards that pertained to density reduction and wondered if the map's targeted population had taken into account all the mechanisms that the Board built in to the density reductions. Carmichael responded that the map already takes the density reductions into account for the numbers that were handed out. Holler added that the model takes into account the slope reduction so when you come forward to propose a project, you would do what you do today with the slope dependent categories and use the same density reductions in the same fashion today with the difference of the separation of the lot size. Stedt stated that he did not see the difference between the existing and proposed plan since today Multiple Rural Use is 1 du/4, 8, or 20 ac and now we say 1 du/4 ac but it is really 1 du/4, 8, or 16 ac. Carmichael responded that the difference between today's general plan and the proposal being lot size vs. density is really the difference, the lot design flexibility is built in with the density, which you do not have the rigid lot size requirement that is typical. Stedt replied that that is simply ordinance and can be done with a clustering policy that can be built into the general plan and feels that the current general plan is density based. Holler responded that the current plan is still tied to lot size.
- Whalen stated that he had heard from others that staff has said the County is not decoupling minimum lot size from density. Holler responded that our proposal is clearly to uncouple the minimum lot size requirement that exists today (i.e. 4, 8, or 20). It has similar lot size requirements

that go with the density and we are proposing to uncouple that. You are going to need a minimum lot size that will show up somewhere, i.e. if you are on septic, that minimum might be a 2 ac and sewer might be ¼ ac. Whalen also asked if the County is meeting their state requirement for affordable housing. Carmichael responded that that is one of the tests we will need to run but thinks we are okay on this matter since we have not taken away any higher density areas but rather added a few.

- Coombs stated that it was her understanding that the population figures do not show areas proposed for redevelopment so the figures are absent of population on the reservations and all of the areas proposed for redevelopment and increased density. Carmichael affirmed that the model does not count redevelopment areas. The reservation areas will be counted as far as the traffic modeling goes but does not count in our population figures.
- Adams asked how we are going to know if the numbers are going to fit here referring back to Stedt's question regarding minimum lot size and the 4, 8, or 20 category. Holler replied that the model looks at the slope and applies the density reduction formula based on the slope map so the number that the model spits out has those reductions built in even if the designation on the map is 1 du/4 ac, the model is calculating slope as it generates a population number and that has been done. Holler added that there is a whole series of constraints that are included in the model: public land, built (existing), floodplains, wetlands, roads, preserved lands, fault zones, FCI, slope, groundwater, and tier 1 habitat.
- Lambron stated he was still confused about the answer regarding minimum lot size. Holler replied that somewhere, we are going to have to have a minimum lot size that we set. It does not have to be consistent throughout the county nor should it be consistent throughout the county. We may in some areas end up with 6,000 sq. ft. as a minimum lot size which is equal to the 7.3 density, in other areas that are served on septic, we may end up with 1 or 2 ac as a minimum lot size. The main point is that they will be different than they are today in that if you are in the 4, 8, or 20 designation, you have lot size that is coupled with 4 ac, 8 ac, or 20 ac based on slope. Under this, if you are in the closest to the equivalent that we have, 4, 8 or 16, the minimum lot size might be 2 ac if there is septic or 1/3 ac if there is sewer. So while you still apply the same slope reduction formula, you have the opportunity to reconfigure a project so as to actually achieve those densities whereas today, you have real "goofy" looking maps to meet the requirement because they are coupled together. Lambron asked if you had a 40 ac parcel, under today's analysis you get 12 lots but after constraints, you get 3, would you end up with the possibility of more than the 3 under the new system because of this lot discussion just provided. Holler replied that you could.
- Adams asked how staff is addressing community groups that are opposing the proposed map. Holler replied that there are communities that are doing this but there are other communities that like the idea of clustering as it applies to their communities, so we are still in the process of working with the communities as we go through their plan text to tell them about different implementation techniques to implement the densities they see on the map today. Our intent is clearly to uncouple that minimum lot size requirement.
- Bowlby stated that the idea of decoupling minimum lot size should be something that the group needs to understand and know where it is in the goals and policies. Holler responded that there is a policy with language similar to *Clustering is encouraged*. Bowlby stated that looking at areas west of CWA, we would like to see some kind of requirement that there is a decoupling so we do not have 4 ac lot sizes inundated.

Comments

- Higgins felt that each member of this group should have a copy of the draft map and current general plan map. Stated that she has been asking about the housing affordability issue and feels it is time to start dealing with that and would like to see where that housing is going to be placed. Holler suggested that copies be made available to the professional societies, environmentalists, and development interests as one copy is in possession of each of the planning and sponsor groups. Scarborough stated that she would prefer that staff make copies available after modifications are made because the map should not be disseminated in such a draft stage.
- Silver stated that several of the environmental interests went to DPLU to see the map and looked at the community level as well. They had agreed that they would try to accommodate the growth within the villages and in the semi-rural, not extend the estate lot development but rather intensify where we already have development. Also stated the group made a strong statement about community separation and basically looked east and west of CWA and decided we need to keep that countryside very scenic and beautiful. Originally, on July 9, 2001, the committee adopted a set

of concepts that talked about natural resource areas, now called rural, where they thought there should be 1 du/40 ac west of CWA and 1 du/80 and 160 ac east of CWA. That was later somewhat revised on November 5, 2001, which said that east of CWA would be predominantly 1 du/80 and 160 ac but have some 1 du/40 ac, west of CWA was revised to be both 1 du/20 and 40 ac. They looked at the rural to see how those densities matched up and whether it met the entire committee's collective vision, talking about moving density west, focusing growth in the livable, higher density country towns, and using an equity mechanism like TDRs to clear out excessive density in the rural areas. Asking if there were discrepancies from the committee's collective vision and this proposed map, they felt staff did a good job, however, the group came up with about 24 areas of discrepancies. First, they mainly looked at existing parcelization and many times, were locked in ending up at the higher end of the spectrum – wanting 1 du/40 ac but having no choice than 1 du/20 ac due to existing parcelization. There were other places they felt the density assigned clearly should have been at the lower end (1/80 instead of 1/40 and 1/40 instead of 1/20) based on existing level of parcelization and the committee's collective vision of having real open space community separators and a beautiful scenic countryside. There were other areas where they thought it was a judgment call as there was a mixture of parcelization, which could have gone either way. In total, they found about 24 areas of discrepancies between this map and the committee's vision. The next step they took was to look at which of the 24 really matter so they looked at land use factors, community separation, adjacency to infrastructure, adjoining land uses – whatever land use factors they thought were appropriate. They then took those 24 areas and prioritized them into two tiers of ones they thought of as areas they find a clear discrepancy between the adopted Interest Group criteria and draft map and one where they find that the recommended changes would substantially advance adopted Interest Group policies. Their purpose here was to not put anything new on the table but to simply advance what the committee has already collectively adopted. Silver proceeded with a handout on what was just said and displayed an overlay of the 24 areas. Stated that about 2/3 are in the high priority and 8 are in the second tier. He noted that, consistent with the committee's principles, any change is contingent upon the equity mechanism and also understands that it is contingent upon the other parts of the vision, which are intensifications within existing village cores and semi rural. He went into the details of the overlay – black (recommends change to 1 du/10 ac); red (change to 1 du/20 ac); blue (1 du/40 ac); yellow (1 du/80 ac); green (1 du/160 ac). Added that there are two colored stars identifying priority – yellow indicates first priority and blue indicates second priority.

- Stedt stated that what he sees missing from the mapping is that if you have done the modeling where you have taken in the density reduction formulas into the process, that needs to be translated onto the map because there is a misconception of what the yield is because the designation shows the division process. Feels that number needs to be on the map on a parcel by parcel basis in order to know the real yield. Appreciates that the map shows public land because it shows the gargantuan amount of public land that is already preserved which puts a lie to the issue of excessive amount of density east of the CWA.
- Whalen stated that the development interests do not see enough development in areas being proposed for development to make the equity mechanisms balance, to which only Alpine, County Islands, North County Metro, and Spring Valley have any increase above 10%. Added that it is hard to see how everything is going to go from the east to the west with such a small increase given the numbers and that they have obviously harped on the location of receiving areas from the get go. From their review, some areas have no depreciable change, i.e. Lakeside, which is an obvious place for densification. They asked for and have not seen yet where a potential future master plan community could be located, stating that it should obviously be located where there is the service to support it. Just to counterpart the downzoning in the backcountry, they are asking for less downzoning in the backcountry. Concerned about the casinos and their growth inducing effects. Added that one argument would be to take the casinos by the horn and say those should be the places where growth should be accommodated because it is going to happen whether you like it or not. They cannot tell when the population numbers were done and whether staff used existing parcels or gross areas to determine the population counts. In other words, parcelization pattern will suggest there will be one house per parcel but if you did it on a gross acreage basis, say 100 acres, whether it has one parcel per 100 acres or 20 parcels per 100 acres. The MSCP hardline areas are not shown and they were told that those areas would stay the same. Last comment is a combination of minimum lot size and the constraints of the actual land. It was his understanding and stated that he has heard several times that there will be no reduction in density due to natural resources such as wetlands, tier I habitat, and slope – talking about the Board of Supervisors

decision, saying that there will be no reduction in residential development due to the MSCP and in fact, this is what they see happening here is the other way to do it which will erode the support for the MSCP because it will be shown as double-dipping. The minimum lot sizes makes it a lot easier for [developers] to accommodate constraints when they know they have a lot of flexibility in lot size and all he has heard today is yes to this and yes to that. But in reality it has been their experience in Valley Center, for example, that people do not want to live on 2 acre lots, they want to live on ½ acre lots because they can get the same estate deal without squandering 1 ½ acres of land. Yet they are faced with doing these outrageous wastes of land when all we need to have is no minimum lot size and you deal with the realities caused by that.

- Higgins commented on the distribution map capacity and some of the targets listed on the population figures. Wondered how we are getting to those targets since some areas are being downzoned to some extent. Mentioned the Desert area is completely unrealistic and believes it impacts the number of housing, parcels, and population distribution. Questioned whether it is a possible figure to live with because they have obvious issues out there that would eliminate that projection, such as water.
- Pryde stated it seems that the water issue is going to become more major so he is putting water on the table as an issue
- Bowlby reiterated Liz's comment about each member having the opportunity to look at the map since we are talking about formulating comments by the 30th. Scarborough replied that she did not want this going out to the masses prior to modification but staff is willing to give one map to the interested factions (environmental, development, and professional interests). She reiterated that for the last two months, there has been a willingness from staff to walk everyone through the map. Holler added that there may be four factions because he was not sure where the Farm Bureau lied. Bowlby stated that one of the areas he is looking at is mostly the semi-rural. He does not want to see a lot of the parcels fall into a broad brush stroke because it is a sprawl category and wondered if he could have a parcelization map so he could pull together areas that make sense. Holler replied that the map would have to be at the 6' X 8' size. Mentioned that when we started this process, the population target was 660,000. With regards to Whalen's comment about having no receiving areas, the target is now 670,000 and Coombs mentioned that does not include the redevelopment totals and was wondering if there is any kind of projection of how much further up the population target for the unincorporated areas would be.
- Lambron commented on the groundtruthing issue and stated that he assumes staff has available some basis for how they came up with the numbers.

Agenda Item III: Process –

a) Status and Next Steps

- Scarborough stated that she would like to have staff look further in detail to validate Adam's question on Silver's map of unit counts and look to Whalen to see if he can finish his map. Next meeting will start off with a staff presentation of their review of the two maps and responses to comments today will be given first. Mentioned the group needs to be able to, by the end of that meeting, come to consensus and give direction to staff for modifying the map.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comments –

- Mike Thometz mentioned the water issue as being extremely serious. We are looking at a 40% reduction, which may affect the map. Mentioned at community meetings, owners are always talking about their property and feels that they are missing the bigger picture.
- Lynne Baker stated that the top three colors (general plan designations) are the only true affordable housing and would like to see more added to the map.
- Ron Pennock stated that the community planning and sponsor groups have rejected the map due to downzoning.