

Minutes
21 August 2008

Call to Order

The General Plan Advisory Committee meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m. by Director **Susan Price** in the absence of Chairman **Colleen o' Sullivan**. **Susan** also reported that **Joan Carr** will be absent as well as **Travis Finch**.

Minutes

Approval of the minutes of 19 June and 17 July was postponed until they are available.

Correspondence

Director **Susan Price** read **Dave Cox's** resignation from the General Plan Advisory Committee.

Report from the Director of Natural Resources and Long-Range Planning

Director **Susan Price** reported that the ALUC contract was awarded to Tangella Corporation with a projected completion window of 18 months and asked **Kelli Gant** for an update. **Kelli** said work had begun, that plans were underway for a joint meeting with the Board of Supervisors and the Airport Land Use Compatibility folks.

Director **Susan Price** mentioned the two existing GPAC vacancies.

Susan reported that the Board of Supervisors approved the Vision Statement of GPAC on at the 5 August 2008 meeting and it would be posted to the GPAC website forthwith.

Director **Price** noted the change in the timeline for GPAC and stated that it would be discussed further under Item 6.

The county is holding budget hearings for 26, 27, and 28 August 2008 at 1:30 p.m. with a recommendation by the county auditor that no budget be awarded for revision of the General Plan. **Susan Price** requested as much attendance as possible by GPAC members, to support funding the work to be done. **Dero Forslund** mentioned that he had submitted a budget in support of continuing the work of GPAC so the Board of Supervisors would have two from which to choose. There was a brief discussion of

consequences involved with canceling the revision process.

In conclusion, **Susie** mentioned that the work on the website is ongoing. **Sandy Bechtold** mentioned that the website seemed inaccessible as the website domain name appears to be expired.

Public Comment

There was no comment from **Cedric Twilight**.

Revised General Plan Update Timeline

Susan Price summarized the original schedule of revision which showed a conclusion in 2011, including all environmental reports and zoning ordinance drafts with quarterly meetings. The Board of Supervisors recommended a shorter timeline, with the 8 elements to be completed by 2010 and the periodicity of meetings to be determined by GPAC, with the community plan updates, the EIRs and the zoning ordinances determined not to be the responsibility of this GPAC. The actual schedule of production will be tied to funding sources.

The Director read an email from the absent **Travis Finch**, expressing concern that the shortened timeframe, together with reduced funding, would jeopardize the quality of the general plan's revision and indeed, the continued existence of the committee.

Ross Burgess asked if **Susan Price** had devised a plan which would follow the new timeline and produce revisions in accordance with the dictates of the fiscal realities facing Trinity County. **Susie** said that while it is a challenge, it is possible, that the issue will be *consistency* within the elements, to guard against future litigation. **Sandy Bechtold** thought that elements such as Noise and Circulation might require less revision and therefore would free time for the more contentious elements. **Sandy** thought that ALUC completion would dictate when the Land-Use element could be worked on and that maybe the more static elements could be shuffled to the front of the schedule and gotten out of the way. She felt that the revised timeline was not an issue, that 36 months was the original charge and GPAC is 12 months into the process, with two years remaining.

Lyn Scott asked for the actual budget figure for GPAC; **Susie** responded that the entire figure was approximately \$240,000. **Ken McCoy** asked for clarification regarding assignment of personnel at the beginning of the project and how it now is. **Susie** discussed retirements and transfers and declared that it is now herself and an assistant.

Safety Element—draft, volunteer, etc.

Kelli Gant pointed out that if GPAC streamlined the plan itself, along the lines of the general plans of San Bernardino, Orange and others, and stripped out all Existing Conditions narratives and descriptions and have the top 3 or 4 issues per element and write goals and policies for those concerns, that it would make the document more pertinent. She felt that larger counties have had to do this as they are so large and have so many diverse issues that each one cannot be individually addressed in a General Plan. **Kelli** thought we should prioritize issues and define goals and policies for each. **Cedric Twight** endorsed the approach, as long as there was some defensible connection or authority that would pass muster during environmental review; that a more streamlined approach would let GPAC get on with it. **Carol Rogan** was concerned about implementation if the format were to change.

Ross Burgess offered two approaches: one, to “ghost-write” the existing elements but correcting the gross inaccuracies previously discussed by the GPAC or two, adopt **Kelli’s** suggestion, thereby offering fewer opportunities for challenge or inconsistency but with the caveat that such a plan offers planners and regulatory bodies perhaps too much latitude in reviewing projects. **Cedric Twight** observed that planners do that anyway and that it is more important to have a responsible Board of Supervisors as the last ratifier. **Sandy Bechtold** thought it might be advantageous to people unfamiliar with the county to be able to go directly to the issue pertaining to their project instead of wading through pages of background and that implementation is a large question, whether in the streamlined version or the traditional version. **Kelli** said counties employing the streamlined approach used appendices to house background materials and mandated discussions like climate change.

Cedric Twight sought clarification of the implementation question which **Susan Price** answered by saying a general plan will seek an ordinance from the Board of Supervisors but it was that assertion that **Cedric** wanted defined, as he believes the issue comes down to funding. Too few law enforcement personnel will not increase without funding, regardless of implementation measures. **Carol Rogan** observed that the Safety Element devolves almost entirely upon implementation. **Cedric** was concerned that it is not the charter of GPAC to spend the county’s money, so perhaps implementation should not be included.

Susan Price said the discussion was off agenda. She said she somewhat concurred with the streamlined approach and would be generating a great deal of material which would need to be reviewed prior to each meeting. **Ross Burgess**

wanted to know if she would be the sole generator of documents. **Kelli** wanted to know what had prompted the pressure regarding a revised timeline; was it a financial interest or a desire not to have GPAC have to work more than 36 months? Susan observed that it was mostly budget. **Sandy** observed that the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors felt little progress had been made by GPAC and intended to provide some impetus toward producing some work product. **Carol** asked if we should put the Safety Element aside and concentrate on the Housing Element but **Susan** said the Safety Element was so close to completion that we should complete it and get it into circulation.

Ken McCoy said we should finish the Safety Element and then choose between **Kelli's** plan or **Ross'** "ghost-writing" revision, in the interests of the schedule, providing the Board of Supervisors votes to keep GPAC going. **Ross** observed that GPAC was no where near finishing the Safety Element due to the ongoing procedural conversations which dominate GPAC meetings.

Cedric asked whether the \$242,000 was available for each of the next two years and if so, GPAC should promptly craft the goals and policies of the General Plan and then solicit proposals from environmental companies for the balance of the task, thereby opening the net wider. He observed that GPAC has spent a year (and a year's budget) without producing anything, so perhaps the money could be better spent purchasing some of the product outside. **Susan** doubted that an RFP could be written effectively enough, and pointed out the discussion was moot because funding will be certain for only the next fiscal year. **Lyn Scott** observed that the delusion of hope is a wonderful thing.

Kelli Gant suggested that GPAC omit working on the community plans entirely as they take time from **Susan's** effort and that there may not be funds to do them anyway. **Kelli** is concerned that the communities might get all the way through the process and have a document which so lacking in requirements that it cannot be submitted for review and responsibility for that might be attributable to GPAC. Another tack, suggested by **Ross**, is that the Board of Supervisors appoint a smaller committee to concentrate on economic activity, revising the existing plan to be user-friendly rather than adverse, and reducing its scope significantly so that environmental review might not be necessary, and the burden of funding would be obviated. **Lyn Scott** asked what the revision cycle would be if the current revision were finished; **Susan** said there is no deadline other than that for the Housing Element, that any time would work.

Dero said he had asked County Counsel regarding the instance in which no revision to the General Plan was undertaken; counsel said our plan was so outdated it could not survive a legal challenge, so some update is mandatory.

Kelli commented that no GPAC members have time to attend the community meetings, including **Susan**, if we are to meet the revised timeline. **Carol Rogan** concurred. **Susan** asked for direction in informing the Board of Supervisors as to the sequence seen by GPAC with reference to the community plans. **Ross Burgess** moved that the community plans be tabled until after the whole General Plan revision has been through environmental review. The motion was seconded by **Dennis Corp**. It was discussed that the community plans could continue as they wished, but that GPAC would not be involved until after the environmental review of GPAC's General Plan revision. **Kelli** emphasized that **Susie** should not be bound to attend those community meetings and **Ken McCoy** said it would defeat the purpose of having **Susie** concentrate on the new timeline. **Ken** was also concerned that trailing the community plans would put them at least five years out. **Dero** thought it would be politic to notify the Planning Commission early and have GPAC begin work on the new timeline, going to the Board of Supervisors later. **Sandy** said that if the community plans were tabled, **Susan** is not obliged to attend their meetings as she is now. **Kelli** agreed, saying GPAC does not want **Susan's** attention further divided. **Ross** called for the question. The motion passed with a majority, **Bill Chambers** and **Ken McCoy** dissenting.

Ross Burgess moved to adopt **Kelli Gant's** suggestion and set Goals and Policies for the General Plan revision, keeping Current Conditions references to a minimum for each of the elements. **Lyn Scott** seconded the motion. **Carol Rogan** wanted to know how comprehensive the references should be and **Ross** answered that they needed to be brief. **Greg Simmons** said careful definitions needed to be attached to both goals and policies as well as different writing styles. Policies will be more objective, goals more subjective, more of the spirit described in the Vision Statement. **Ross** amended and **Lyn** seconded the motion to include *objectives*, goals and policies in the original motion. There was discussion as to whether objectives and implementation were synonymous; Director **Price** suggested goals, policies, objectives and implementation suited the General Plan better. **Dero** pointed out that the zoning ordinances are the implementation phase, but **Kelli** argued that the streamlined county plans set forth goals, policies and *strictly* defined objectives, all to guide the documentation that will ensue from the revised General

Plan. **Ken McCoy** asked for further clarification of *objectives* and **Susan** said an adequate definition had been provided in an earlier meeting. **Ross** clarified his position saying there was little use in listing objectives the county could not obtain; **Kelli** rejoined that setting the bar too low was also a disservice to the county's future. **Carol Rogan** thought goals and objectives were the same and **Susan** said not all the terms should be used. **Ross** and **Kelli** agreed that a goal should not be tied to a specific objective, to be used as a minimum, or quota, or other limiting factor.

Greg Simmons reiterated that a goal is a general statement of direction, of vision of the future; that an objective begins to define what it is to be done, who does it, when is to be done. Goals should stay away from committing the county to doubling the amount of law enforcement that exists today or mandating community water systems in two decades, but must remain general. **Ross** thought objectives could *promote* subjects like economic growth or housing without being limiting. **Sandy** expressed concern that without disclaimer language, benign-sounding concepts like "negative redevelopment" are sometimes a front for imminent domain or land-use changes not popular with large groups of residents.

Kelli hoped the motion would pass, that GPAC would still exist next week and by the September meeting we could apply the new format, work on the terms and get work products effectively scheduled. **Ross** interjected that if GPAC prevails, that **Susan** could have the changes expressed in the motion in place for the September meeting. **Ken McCoy** summarized the discussion to conclude that the current 80-page Safety Element might condense to a single page or two, plus the ten pages or so of goals and policies. **Susan** concurred and reread the motion as ". . . goals, policies and objectives, with minimal reference to existing conditions for each element" . . . and after another short discussion, called for the question. The motion passed unanimously.

Referring to the revised GPAC timeline, **Susan** asked for guidance on how GPAC wished the paper to appear. **Kelli** said to display the Community Plans directly *after* the item, *Final* and before the item *Environmental Review*. There was discussion about assigning a date to these activities but the consensus felt "post June 2010" was sufficient, that GPAC's responsibility does not encompass the Community Plans nor Zoning or Subdivision ordinances. **Greg Simmons** recommended dividing the page into thirds, with the first 5 Elements (July 08 through June 09) being first, then the remaining 3 Elements (July 09 through June 10) being second, followed by *Final* being post June 10, with the thirds set off by dashed lines.

Kelli Gant asked if there were a state requirement to have Community Plans; **Susan Price** said no and **Dero** reminded the GPAC that the Board of Supervisors had consented to particular Community Plans but that he felt they had to be preceded by the General Plan's revision.

Susan asked if GPAC wished to continue monthly meetings; there was consensus to remain with monthly meetings.

Safety Element—draft

Ross Burgess suggested that discussion of the Safety Element be postponed to the next meeting as he had extensive comments to this draft and wished to see tonight's actions incorporated.

There was a short break and then **Kelli Gant** suggested that GPAC decide which are the top four or five safety issues facing the county and start working on the goals and policies affecting them. Fire and law enforcement are already known. **Ken McCoy** thought dams, and dam inundation were insignificant and did not need to be included but **Susan** said we needed to include the mandated things; **Ross Burgess** declared emergency medical services was of greater priority and should be in third position. GPAC members thought flood, dams and dam inundation could be made into one item. The issue of global warming and how much effort had to be devoted to it was discussed with **Susan** suggesting that it merely be woven into the text in several elements. **Susan** cautioned that when the state begins to require CEQA it becomes evident where the emphasis needs to be. *Fire*, followed by *Security*, then *Emergency Medical Services*, *Flood and Inundation*, were selected to begin the element. **Susan** mentioned again that items like earthquake and air quality would also have to be included. **Kelli** suggested an *Other* category where Airport Safety and all other topics could be grouped. **Ken McCoy** remembered that **Susan** had earlier stated that the county was obliged only to update the housing element and perhaps GPAC should complete that element and be done. **Carol Rogan** agreed that an *Other* item could contain hazardous materials, asbestos, etc. GPAC's consensus was to keep the itemized list short and only briefly discuss subordinate issues in *Other*.

Cedric Twilight thought Air Quality was an umbrella topic for all the aspects of Fire, but GPAC disagreed. **Ross Burgess** worried that this would lessen the importance of fuel reduction and better forest management. **Lyn Scott** pointed out that the health risk from fire was a byproduct of fire, where the property destruction caused by fire was the result of that fire. **Kelli** further defended the designation of Fire so that encouragement

could be given the County to support volunteer fire departments and fire-safe policies and so forth.

Ross and **Ken** wanted to know if this was sufficient discussion to give Director **Price** material to work on; and what could GPAC expect to see at the September meeting? **Susan Price** said she would collapse the current Existing Conditions down to the bare essentials under the four topics discussed and then list the goals and policies for each. **Ken** thought most of GPAC wanted little background, maybe some introductory material only and **Ross** thought perhaps background could be written after goals and policies were defined, as support for same. **Ross Burgess** and **Dero Forslund** reminded GPAC that policies and goals should reference documents from other jurisdictions rather than incorporate them as the GPAC revision has to survive the updating of those external materials. **Ross Burgess** changed his mind and said no document should be referenced unless it better the position of the county through its General Plan.

Susan said she would prepare the abbreviated existing conditions, goals and policies and, implementation. **Ross** objected, saying GPAC was not at that point but **Susan** defended the notion, saying it would give GPAC a basis from which to work. **Kelli Gant** thought we should agendaize for the next meeting, definitions of the terms to be employed for policies, goals and implementation. **Susan** revisited the background question again, little or none? **Sandy** and **Ross** spoke for none, believing it can be added later. **Susan** said she might be compelled to include something and GPAC conceded some background might be acceptable if mandated.

Carol Rogan asked if the outstanding minutes could be considered once, when all were caught up. **Ross Burgess** suggested that we schedule a meeting for 25 September 2008 to accommodate **Susan's** attendance at a global warming conference and still have work product. After some lively discussion, **Ken McCoy** moved to hold a special meeting 25 September 2008; **Ross Burgess** seconded and the motion passed with a voice vote.

Next Meeting/Agenda Items

Susan Price set the Safety Element draft first (**Ken McCoy** checked to be sure it would not include a geology section) and **Kelli** said her two points were to review the entire safety element draft, and introduce our own definitions of terms to apply to policies and goals. There was discussion about the order of these topics. **Susan** said she would present material for GPAC's consideration in goals and policies. **Ken McCoy** asked for the outstanding minutes to be included on the agenda.

Adjournment

Director Susan Price adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

SANDY BECHTOLD
Secretary to the GPAC

Members present:

Sandy Bechtold; Ross Burgess; Bill Chambers;
Dennis Corp; Kelli Gant; Ken McCoy; Carol Rogan; Lyn
Scott; Greg Simmons.

Members absent: Joan Carr; Travis Finch; Bryan Taylor.

Staff present: Susan Price, Dero Forslund

Guests: Cedric Twilight