

# MINUTES

## **GPAC Minutes**

*January 3, 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, Paul Smith, Terrienne Palmer, Lisa Pitts, Steve Whitten, Chris Plummer, Marlana Brown, Kim Ortamond

### **3.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes from December 6 meeting will be presented for approval at our next meeting.

### **4.0 PUBLIC COMMENTS**

A member of the audience Alma Fleck is new to town, as a risk and asset manager she feels that it is important to have well written policies in place, stops arguments and waste of time. She commends the GPAC and is impressed with how committee is working. She was surprised at recent City Council meeting and the decision of the change in leadership.

### **5.0 ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

The GPAC decided by consent to postpone the elections till after approval by the city council for a extension of time.

### **6.0 DISCUSSIONITEMS**

#### **a) Discussion of the additional time needed for the GPAC to complete its review of the draft General Plan (number of meetings, time frame, potential costs and Hogle-Ireland participation)**

Pat Flanagan – Pat reviewed calendar with GPAC members. Discussion about how long and options were also discussed. The GPAC determined that they are committed to meeting the deadline including weekends as needed to complete the plan. Steve Whitten inquired about the GPAC's purview regarding the Downtown Specific Plan. Staff informed the GPAC that it is within the purview because the GPAC would review the plan to make sure that it is consistent with the General Plan and EIR. Also the GPAC would need to make sure that the EIR is readable to the lay person. "the average citizen should be able to understand the document".

Pat inquired with staff that if the GPAC finds an issue in the Draft Environmental Impact Report do we just notate the problem. Staff informed the GPAC that is what the GPAC should do.

Chris Plummer feels that the plan proposed by Pat is too short of a timeline and that maybe we should request even more time. Pat Flanagan has a plan to create focus groups and break the task up. The current fear of many of the GPAC is that the City Council may not allow us the time. Steve Whitten feels that July is just too far away and would like the GPAC to consider working weekends to have it completed in April or May. Staff informed the GPAC that as we get further down the timeline, that the documents in the Technical Reports are becoming outdated. Chris proposed the idea that we go to the City Council and tell them that if an element is not completed by the schedule, that we will work on the following Saturday to finish it up.

Motion by Chris Plummer to request that the GPAC timeline be extended through July 25<sup>th</sup>, if that is too much time then Mid May, and last option is for the City Council to give us a deadline. Lisa Pitts Seconds.

Discussion:

Paul Smith feels that the July timeline is consistent with the GPACs duty to do a good job. Paul inquired if we can attend a meeting remotely (via telephone or internet). Staff said yes that would work. The majority of GPAC members present voted yes with one descending vote.

Addressing the language on the Draft Schedule, Steve feels that we need more positive language about why we are requesting the time. Steve reiterated that the General Plan can be amended 4 times per year and that optional elements can also be amended. Steve also feels that language addressing that the General Plan is a Blueprint for the future development and some things to look for are Goals Policies and Procedures.

Paul Smith wrote the following language and the GPAC felt that this should be included in the document to the city council regarding our request for an extension of time. "The GPAC is requesting an extension of time to assure the City Council, and our public constituency that the plan will effectively deal with the many economic and other challenges we face in our unique desert environment. Without this extension, we feel that we cannot make that assurance to you or our public."

Lisa Pitts brought up the subject of how often Hogle Ireland should be at the meetings. Staff recommended that we decrease the time between when we discuss an issue and its discussion with Hogle Ireland. Have HI at each meeting. Lisa feels that we should reconnect with Hogle Ireland about the previous elements and ask the needed questions to move forward.

Motion by Chris Plummer to have Hogle Ireland at our next meeting and then at the end of each element which equals 8 meetings. Second by Terrienne Palmer.  
Consensus among the GPAC on this request.

Lisa Pitts will update the Tentative draft schedule, GPAC members will email Lisa if they have any weekends that they are not available.

#### **b) Committee member Tasks**

Marlana Brown requests that comments about elements are sent out before the meetings so that members of the GPAC have time to review them.

#### **c) Circulation Element**

Steve Whitten requested that the GPAC finish up the Circulation Element. Pat Flanagan said that she had a number of questions that remain about the Circulation Element and would like input from Hogle Ireland prior to finishing that element. The GPAC decided to move the Circulation Element to next week and request Hogle Irelands presence at the meeting.

#### **d) Conservation and Open Space Element**

Pat Flanagan is confused by the symbols used in the draft General Plan. Pat would like a Sustainability Element to be included in the General Plan, but would also like to understand how some of the symbols apply to sustainability. Pat would like to be able to track the AB 32 legislation throughout the document. Stephanie (public) says that sustainability needs to be throughout the elements as far as circulation, land use and the like. Pat feels that some symbols coincided with AB 32 and suggested removal of all symbols to decrease confusion. Paul Smith said that there are a lot of things that are defined as sustainability, the endangered species and desert tortoise to name two and that current legislation requires mitigation of those species in the city or near the city, in an area that the genetic specifics of that species are to a similar to where they are moving from. Lisa commented, why don't we suggest the addition of another symbol to track AB32.

Pat Flanagan distributed a document about the Conservation and Open Space Element. The GPAC discussed portions of the document and suggested to wording and paragraph changes to aid the mission of changing the setting and context which the GPAC found inaccurate and incomplete.

Pat feels that in goal CO1 that "permanently Protected Open Space" is not valid. Suggested change the language to be plain and simple and she used the Apple Valley General Plan to assist in the revision

The GPAC discussed also the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and West Mojave Plans in an effort to better understand the current situation and its impacts on the GPAC. Staff advised the GPAC that using terms like "shall" creates a mandate and the GPAC may want to consider that when making suggested changes. Paul informed the GPAC that the impact of not having a plan is on development activity in the city. With no plan, each development must get their own plan done and that clogs up the development process. By creating a local plan the cost is spread across the entire area and developers could refer to the plan in the future. The problem is that keeping such a plan as was being discussed by the GPAC could be costly. This is a way that if the city was interested in purchasing lands in the wildlife corridors to use federal money to do so. Paul feels that we should get further input about the West Mojave Plan, Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. Due to the late hour, further discussion was postponed to a future time.

## **6.0 ADJOURN**

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