

MINUTES

GPAC Minutes

February 7, 2011

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Pat Flanagan at 6:01 p.m.

2.0 ROLL CALL

In attendance

Pat Flanagan(Vice Chair), Marlana Brown, Nelson Muniz, Jeff Ohlfs, Terrienne Palmer, Lisa Pitts, Chris Plummer, Steve Whitten,

3.0 ELECTION OF OFFICERS

3.1 Chair—Nominate Pat Flanagan by Terrienne Palmer. Second by Jeff Ohlfs. Vote 5-1-1

3.2 Vice- Chair – Nominate Steve Whitten by Chris Plummer. Second by Terrienne Palmer Vote 7-0

4.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 November 29, 2010

4.2 December 6, 2010

4.3 January 3, 2011

Steve Whitten moves to accept all minutes. Chris Plummer second.

Unanimous vote of GPAC.

5.0 PUBLIC COMMENTS

Almut Fleck made a suggestion that the GPAC refer to chair as chair vs chairman creating a more gender neutral set of minutes.

6.0 DISCUSSIONITEMS

a) Conservation/Open Space Element

i) GPAC Comments entitled "Conservation/Open Space – Suggested Changes"

Steve Whitten (Vice- Chair)—Questioned a comment that Pat Flanagan(Chair) made at the joint meeting about the current open space element and its merits. Suggested that the GPAC, could update the two chapters (5 and 6) of the current general plan rather than trying to reinvent the draft version. Pat replied that she feels it is a much more readable plan and that the current plan is clearer and related to Twentynine Palms.

Staff read email from Hogle Ireland related to _____

Staff made copies of the current General Plan for the GPAC members to look at for the next scheduled GPAC meeting.

Chris Plummer made a suggestion that the GPAC may wish to consider breaking into groups and become "expert" on that goal. Pat agrees, for example Kim Ortamond talked to Chancy from the water company and is very knowledgeable about the water element. Steve (Vice Chair) did not like this idea.

Chris Plummer in reference to the current general plan and that there is no mention of solar or wind, and the GPAC has hit its stride with the draft plan. Steve Whitten feels that the GPAC should not fix what is not broken. Staff commented that the EIR was created based on the narrative documents and that some tweaking would be needed otherwise you run the risk of straying too far from the two documents and the EIR will not support it. If the EIR is not supported by the narrative documents then it would mean a new EIR which would then need to be re-circulated, and a new review period and more time. This is not suggested.

Pat(Chair)—suggested that members of the GPAC and Public look at AridLID.org website for information about low impact design and that is where a number of communities in arid climates are "moving toward" to green the infrastructure of the area. There are a number of principles that the GPAC could add as suggestions in the open space conservation element. Chancy(Public-Water Board) says it might come up in the Water discussion. Staff requested link for record. The link is <http://www.aridlid.org/>

Chris Plummer made the suggestion that the GPAC continue to look at Conservation Open Space.

Pat (Chair) made comment that the city does not have any permanently protected open space so reference to it is not appropriate. The current General Plan gives an inventory of open space. Ultimately it is suggested by the GPAC that CO1 related to permanently protected open space be revised.

Pat (Chair) The purpose statement for the Open Space Element is weak. It lacks discussion of the natural elements of Twentynine Palms. Chris, there is no identification of resources that should be preserved. GPAC recommends that this is rewritten for better language and more general reference to species and areas.

Purpose is to protect the natural environment. Jeff if the city wants to set parks or historic areas, why are we trying to hamstring the city? What is important locally may not be at a higher level.

Lisa suggested we create a comment specific to the West Mojave Plan similar to the documents created for Land Use and Circulation. Steve (Vice Chair) Suggested language related to the city develop a plan to protect the... Marlana may consider a local plan until such time as it is passed.

The GPAC then made a number of suggested changes to the "GPAC Member Draft General Plan and Draft EIR from Pat Flanagan" document.

CO 10 Comment (formatting issue) in our comment prior to sending to Hogle Ireland. GPAC agrees that this needs a complete revision.

CO 11 Eliminate the comments at the bottom of page 2.

CO 15 In discussion of biological resources, the GPAC recommends, that examples should be used to make it more area specific. Steve Dout(Public) stated that the language implies lack of habitats. The desert is "not less" than another place. It should be noted that the habitats are fragile and unique though. It should also be stated that the biological resources are valued by the community. Pat mentioned she could come up with language related to this.

Page 16 background information. Steve (vice Chair) suggested revision to include language about mitigating for development. "The presence of...species" generally requires mitigation. The GPAC did not disagree.

CO 18 Pat suggested it needs a complete rewrite. Steve agreed, commenting that this section should be reviewed, revised and edited by a professional biologist. Terrienne added a biologist with experience in arid environments, maybe even more specific to the Mojave Desert Ecosystem.

CO 1.2 suggested addition to language to include following state and federal laws related to threatened and or endangered species.

CO1.3 Pat commented that 1.3 and 1.11 should be just 1.11 no net loss no place to mitigate. If they are not combined, then Marlana suggests that they be closer in order to each other. Ultimately the GPAC feels that the CO 1.11 language about no net loss should be eliminated.

CO 1.6 discussed various aspects of this policy. It is confusing and if it is not rewritten to include city owned sensitive habitat, then the GPAC recommends it be eliminated.

CO 1.7 Suggest to revise wording to make better sense and eliminate redundancy. See suggested language in comment document.

CO 1.8 Steve Dout (Public), suggested eliminating the word minimum, as that is all people will do. Chris agrees. Also the city does not have a native plant ordinance, much guidance is needed to really make CO 1.8 have sustainability and impact on the city.

CO 1.9 GPAC recommends, this policy be eliminated. It does not differ significantly from 1.8

CO 1.10 Jeff was confused with Pats comment. Pat says that there is a lack of discussion in the EIR about . PAT lack of discussion in EIR about hydrology of the city especially with discussion of the fault and mitigation measures which effect wildlife movement. Lisa suggested we add a new section that deals with our comments about hydrology. Generally speaking, the GPAC comment on the potential hydrology issue is currently too long and vague and it needs to be addressed. This will be looked at again at the next meeting.

BOLD ISSUES HERE...

b) Environmental Impact Report
i) Supporting EIR Technical Reports

c) Schedule of Future Meeting Dates

Discussion was lead by Steve(Vice Chair) about future meeting dates. After a brief discussion, it looks like the GPAC will just set the next couple meetings at each meeting we have rather than being strapped to any schedule, Saturdays are definitely optional. So next meeting is Feb 28th, March 7th, and March 21st. Items for the agenda should include, Open Space and Recreation on the next agenda.

7.0 GPAC MEMBER COMMENTS

NONE

8.0 ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn was made at 9:04 passed by consent.