



MEETING NOTES

DATE: September 7, 1999

ATTENDEES: *Committee Members*

Gene Frick	1 st Supervisorial District
Ed Sloman	2 nd Supervisorial District
Jerry Snell	2 nd Supervisorial District
Bill Cramer	3 rd Supervisorial District
Ed Kibbey	4 th Supervisorial District
Manny Sanchez	4 th Supervisorial District
Joe Richards	5 th Supervisorial District
Bill Warkentin	BIA
Robin Maloney-Rames	CA Department of Fish & Game
Greg Schook	City of Calimesa/Executive Board of WRCOG
Steve Mandoki	City of Murietta/Technical Advisory Committee of WRCOG
Kimberly Wilder	Community Access Center & CFILC
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Won Yoo	MSHCP Advisory Committee
Gary Wanszuk	MSHCP Advisory Committee
Barry Burnell	Riverside Property Owners Association
Bruce Colbert	Riverside Property Owners Association
Peter Kiriakos	Sierra Club
Daniel Brown	US Fish & Wildlife Service

County Staff

Jerry Jolliffe Riverside County TLMA

Consultant Team

Dick Ramella	The Planning Center
Al Bell	The Planning Center
Melani Smith	The Planning Center
Mel Placilla	Sverdrup Civil
Jim Henderson	Sverdrup Civil

AGENDA PACKAGE: Notes of August 3rd Meeting
 Committee Members Roster
 Draft Rules and Procedures
 Fundamental Values
 Vision Workshop Summary
 Vision Sample
 General Plan Geographic and Policy Structure

1) Call to Order

a) Jerry Jolliffe called the meeting to order.

2) Approval of Notes from August 3rd Meeting

a) The Committee approved the August 3 notes with one change. Kimberly Wilder should be attributed the request for a text-only version of the website instead of Donna Rhodes-Graham.

3) Committee Administration/Organization

a) Election of Chair/Vice Chair



General Plan Advisory Committee

- i) Though Jolliffe suggested that a Committee member, not County staff should chair the Committee, several members spoke in support of his nomination for reasons of time commitment and neutrality.
 - ii) A motion to name Jolliffe Chair of the Committee was made, seconded and passed by the Committee.
 - iii) Ed Kibbey volunteered to serve as Committee Vice Chair and Spokesperson representing the group with the Board of Supervisors.
- b) Approval of Rules of Procedure
- i) Schook questioned what would constitute a quorum of members required to pass a Committee vote. Jolliffe responded, and the Committee agreed, that a quorum would represent a majority of the full Committee. The provision in the draft Rules and Procedures requiring a two thirds majority will be revised accordingly.
 - ii) Alternate Committee members representing groups or organizations may participate in Committee votes, however Supervisor appointees to the Committee may not be represented by alternates. Names of not more than two alternates for each Committee member should be submitted to Jolliffe within two weeks.
 - iii) Sanchez questioned whether the present Committee membership, specifically the Farm Bureau, adequately represents the interests of agricultural workers. Perkins responded that the Farm Bureau represents a broad range of interests, however their focus is on owners and management. If further representation is needed of agricultural workers, the Supervisors may need to consider this issue. Sanchez was particularly concerned that the issue of affordable housing provision for agricultural workers is addressed. Jolliffe stated that farmworkers would be invited into the public outreach effort being conducted, as will other groups in the County.
 - iv) In response to a concern raised by Wilder, Jolliffe responded that representatives from groups or organizations might be replaced on the Committee if necessary.
 - v) Warkentin noted that administrative items could be voted on by the Committee as they arise, but that substantive policy issues may need to be tabled for a month to allow members adequate time to consider them and review them with their constituencies. Mel Placilla noted that the compressed nature of the schedule requires direction be given immediately on issues which are raised at meetings, even if no formal decision is reached or vote taken. Joe Richards suggested that convening subcommittees to work on particular issues that arise might expedite the decision-making process.
 - vi) Kibbey made a motion to revise the draft Rules and Procedures document as described and bring it back to the Committee for approval. Wilder seconded. Motion passed unopposed.
- c) Review of Action Items from August 3rd Meeting
- i) Jolliffe noted that he had consulted with the Board of Supervisors on the issue of the potential flexibility of the structure of the General Plan. Their feedback was that the structure is wide open, as long as it is responsive to the issues raised through the public participation process. A discussion ensued about the merits and disadvantages of changing the structure of the General Plan by adding elements. Frick and Kiriakos spoke in favor of adding elements to the Plan. Perkins and Burnell spoke against it. County staff recommends keeping the structure of the plan simple, by including only those elements which are required. The Planning Center will complete its General Plan structure and format document and review it with the Committee. Any Committee members recommending adding elements to the Plan should do so in writing. The Committee will vote on the Plan structure at an upcoming meeting. Should the structure of the Plan change, potential impacts on



The Planning Center's contract with the County could be determined at the review of their scope in November.

- ii) Jolliffe will continue to explore obtaining access to County GIS data for Committee members.
- iii) Sverdrup will work directly with Kimberly Wilder to determine the requirements for a text-only version of the RCIP website.
- iv) Once the Committee determines that it does have a need for a web-based discussion forum, a private forum will be set up by Sverdrup.
- v) Per Warkentin's suggestion, Sverdrup will prepare a "web-access" manual for Committee members to facilitate use of the RCIP website and potential discussion forum.
- vi) Jolliffe is still determining the potential for follow-on public opinion survey work during the course of the project.
- vii) Jolliffe is still working on obtaining a list of approved development projects within the County for Committee members.

4) Review of Draft Vision Materials

- a) Comments on Fundamental Values/Edited Vision Workshop Summary
 - i) Maloney-Rames: More specific language related to protection, preservation and enhancement of native plants and animals.
 - ii) Silver: A guiding principle should be balancing flexibility in the Plan with stability. We need stability in the landscape of the County. Concerned about focus on new communities vs. redevelopment and infill of existing communities. Treatment of agricultural land is not proactive; reactive planning for its transition into other uses. Livable communities concepts are not featured enough. A systems approach to transportation is missing.
 - iii) Cramer: Riverside County has not been a natural setting for 150 years. Initial description in Values document should say that the County is made up of special communities with a unique economy and remarkable natural resources. Stating that ag lands can generically be used as buffers to other uses oversimplifies this issue. Points on pg. 3 of the Vision Workshop Summary related to ag lands are not clear. Market trends for ag lands referred to on pg. 5 are "flaky"; community based agricultural production is not real, niche farming is not significant. The Plan should only promote air quality rules which are backed by science.
 - iv) Wanczuk: Financing Mechanisms referred to on pg. 4 of the Vision Workshop Summary also should refer to habitat.
 - v) Hollingsworth: (representing Steve Corona) Points on pg. 3 of the Vision Workshop Summary related to ag lands are not clear. Buzzwords such as agricultural tourism, community based agricultural development, and niche farming were not raised by the public so should not be in the document. Vision for agriculture in the Plan should focus around strengthening its global competitiveness and therefore its positive economic impact on the County. Consideration should be given to creating agricultural enterprise zones in which dairies and egg production could occur—operations that are currently unpopular with neighbors.
 - vi) Yoo: Should clarify what financing mechanisms referred to on pg. 4 of Vision Workshop Summary refer to and what they do.
 - vii) Schook: Should reword language referring to "unplanned sprawl"—does "planned sprawl" exist as an alternative?
 - viii) Mandoki: New communities should be models for ways to provide, not just manage infrastructure.



- ix) Warkentin: The Vision statements are ambiguous, however this is not a shortcoming. Greenbelts mentioned are tools to solve a problem, not vision statements. Separation between communities should be the vision, greenbelts may be a tool used in the Plan. Livable communities concepts are included in pg. 3 of the Vision Workshop Summary though not explicitly called that. The Housing Element should address housing to meet the needs of all of the residents of the County, not just those requiring affordable housing.
- x) Metcalf: Open space definition is not clear. Because the public has expressed support for preserving open space this concept should be more clearly expressed. Are agricultural lands open space? They do provide some level of protection. Clarify how various types of open space will be protected reflecting the will of the public expressed in the survey.
- xi) Kiriakos: Vision Summary Document: pg. 2 is weak in reflecting the value of the environment beyond economic value. Should incorporate language referring to the unique ecosystems endemic to the Area, language that has meaning to environmentalists. Pg. 3 population growth – discussion should refer to city, county and regional cooperation on this issue. Ag bullets are unclear. Should discuss public support for agricultural lands preservation. Transportation discussion focuses on technology, not on modes. The conservation discussion is now primarily economic, should move The Case for Conservation up above financial value. Should promote joint use, housing affordability, jobs, clean industry, and quality of life.
- xii) Colbert: Transportation options section should explicitly refer to investment in the freeways. Should focus on reducing vehicle miles traveled *and* vehicle hours.
- xiii) Burnell: The vision incorporates a good focus on open space and greenbelts. Remember that the public wants multipurpose open space for recreation as well as conservation open space. The value of conservation should be recognized along with the economic cost of conservation. Jobs-housing balance is valuable as well and should be considered within the County in subareas; need to understand jobs regionally and subregionally.
- xiv) Crouse: Pg. 1 of the Vision Workshop Summary should incorporate a bullet related to intergovernmental cooperation. Pg. 2 should replace “new communities are models” with “our communities...”. Pg. 3 should refer to incentive-based livable communities. Community opportunities to chart their own future. Consistency with the cities should be a focus in land use and transportation issues. Air quality spillover effect should be clarified—into and within the County. Pg. 5 should expand reference to educational facilities to include community colleges and universities. Should be a reference to intergovernmental development approvals coordination. Intra and Inter County compacts should be referenced.
- xv) Wilder: Universal design for accessibility for all people. Should make this a part of the Plan, proactive, not reactive. It is cost effective and makes sense to build in universal design from the start. Should have greater emphasis on alternative forms of transportation.
- xvi) Richards: Noted the “natural setting” reference in the Fundamental Values paper. Pointed to the County’s long history of creating a man-made setting – mining, agriculture, etc. This is not a pristine, undeveloped area, and developed areas are not going to revert to being natural. Vision concepts need to incorporate focus on Rural Lifestyle addressing the significant population in the County that lives on rural 5-10 acre lots.



- xvii) Kibbey: Noted that the vision does not incorporate an intention to address the shortage of affordable housing in the County and the negative impact that jurisdictional regulations have on its development.
- xviii) Sanchez: Migrant workers should be addressed in the participation discussion in fundamental values. Employment should address hospitality sector employment. Agricultural lands need to be able to expand in some areas as they are contracting in others due to development pressure. The County should not blindly follow cities' lead in order to ensure consistency in land use and development policies, particularly when city land use policies de-emphasize affordable housing.
- xix) Frick: Growth may not equal prosperity. Should refer to the contribution the aged and disabled populations can make to the County if given the opportunity. Information transfer should be a value – government to citizen, citizen to citizen, etc. Quality management should be a fundamental value. Should define terms, have accountability, and establish measures of success. Need to define concepts such as sprawl so that progress toward eliminating it can be measured. Should refer to water quality and quantity. County should step up to a higher standard of development review and approval. Growth should only be allowed to occur when infrastructure is in place to support it. Vision should recognize that a State University may come into the Temecula Valley area. In participation section should refer to people, not citizens.
- xx) Brown: Should incorporate the purpose statement from the MSHCP as a value. Should focus on education about native plants and animals and their habitat as part of the vision.
- b) Vision Sample Discussion – should the Plan Vision ultimately take the form of bullet points or a narrative?
 - i) Though one Member spoke strongly in favor of bullet points, and one in favor of the narrative form, the majority of the group seemed satisfied with Bell's suggestion to use both forms. Narratives describing the central messages under each vision topic will be developed followed by bullet points summarizing the key ideas.

5) General Plan Geographic and Policy Structure

- a) Bell reviewed The Planning Center's draft geographic and policy structure for the General Plan. Comments were as follows:
 - i) Frick: A "Regionwide" category should be added above the "Countywide" category, since analysis must take in issues which transcend County borders. The General Plan structure should be made understandable to the citizen, not just the planners. General Plan should also incorporate a report on where we have been in implementation of programs and policies in the past. Ramella responded that the planned Implementation Program for the Plan will do this, and that the draft Program will be reviewed with the Committee.
 - ii) Warkentin: What is the Multipurpose Open Space Plan? Bell explained that it was the tie-in with the MSHCP in the General Plan. Warkentin also suggested that a protocol for dealing with property straddling Area Plan boundaries should be developed. Bell responded that the General Plan manual which is to be developed as part of this project will do this.
 - iii) Crouse: Benchmarks should be incorporated into the Plan.
 - iv) Kiriakos: Reiterated that the issue of floodplain management should be addressed in the Plan.



6) Area Plans Status Report

Item was deferred until next meeting when Area Plan boundaries are finalized.

7) Coordination Reports

a) MSHCP

i) Wanczuk: On August 9th the Advisory Committee forwarded a Proposal to the Resource Agencies for conservation of an additional 40,000-120,000 acres of private land in the County. 40,000 of those acres would have to be acquired. 164 species would be covered within this conservation area. A response is expected from the Agencies on September 9 at the next MSHCP Advisory Committee meeting in the basement of the County Administrative Center.

b) CETAP

i) Henderson: Subcommittee meetings were held last week regarding Macro Land Use scenarios and traffic modeling.

c) Frick requested that the Committee be put on the mailing list for CETAP and MSHCP meeting notes.

8) Public Comment

No comments were made.

9) Action Summary

a) Revise Committee Rules and Procedures document – The Planning Center.

b) GIS layer access follow up – Jolliffe.

c) Text-only RCIP website coordination – Sverdrup/Community Access Center.

d) Public survey follow up – Jolliffe.

e) List of County approved development projects – Jolliffe.

f) General Plan Structure – The Planning Center to complete proposed structure document including number and names of proposed elements; Committee members to make suggestions for additional Plan elements in writing to Jolliffe.

g) Redraft of Fundamental Values and Vision Summary Statements: The Planning Center.

h) CETAP and MSHCP Meeting Notes distribution to the General Plan Advisory Committee – Jolliffe.

10) Adjournment

Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday October 5, 1999.