



**VENTURA COUNCIL
OF GOVERNMENTS**

MINUTES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

5:00 p.m.

City of Camarillo

Council Chambers

601 Carmen Drive, Camarillo, California 93010

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Holden called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m.

2. **FLAG SALUTE:** Member McDonald led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. **ROLL CALL:**

Member Jan McDonald	City of Camarillo
Member Steve Conaway	City of Fillmore
Member Tom Holden	City of Oxnard
Member Gabino Aguirre	City of Santa Paula
Member Paul Miller	City of Simi Valley
Member Maricela Morales	City of Port Hueneme
Member Tom Glancy	City of Thousand Oaks
Member Carl Morehouse	City of Ventura

Absent: Member Cities: Moorpark, Ojai and the County of Ventura

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

5. **BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:** Maricela Morales from Port Hueneme spoke introducing herself, and is on her second term on the City Council. Announced the 60th Anniversary of Port Hueneme's incorporation on Wednesday, March 19, 2008.

Member Morehouse spoke and thanked the Board for providing the opportunity to serve as the Chair and regretted missing out on the transition at the last meeting. He congratulated Mayor Holden on his new appointment.

6. **APPROVAL OF THE FINAL AGENDA:** Motion to approve by Member Miller, seconded by Member Morales.

7. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

A. **Workplan Update:** Motion and a second by Member McDonald and Morehouse respectively.

8. ORDER OF BUSINESS

- A. **2040 Population, Housing Units and Employment Forecasts:** Ms. Varnado indicated that a link went out with this agenda and Nancy Settle was present to introduce the (County) staff who worked on this report. She reiterated that this motion was to accept draft Decapolis and Vacant Land Study reports; and 2) Adopt “General Plans Capacity” Forecast of 1,002,433 Ventura County residents in the year 2040 as the preferred forecast for planning purposes, including Census Tract forecasts.

This report was funded by SCAG in its 2006 - 2007 work program for \$79,000. The last forecast was adopted in the year 2000.

Nancy Settle, Ventura County Planning Division, was present with staff that worked on the 2040 Forecast. It was approximately a year and a half to two-year effort. A brief overview and how it was done, as well as some future projects, including VCTC future contracts, with SCAG through VCTC, that are called the Transportation and Leadership Program, that staff would be working on shortly and the other was a Biological Analysis and Land Use Recommendations, which would affect the County’s unincorporated areas. Nancy indicated that she would be happy to provide those when ready.

Kim Hocking spoke and thanked Simon Choy of SCAG in the contributions he made as far as educating others in the dynamics of demographic forecasting and to Nancy Settle for her support and the CCPA members of the County over the last two years and the authors—Chris Williamson of Oxnard, who wrote the Decapolis Report and Debby Millais, who wrote the Vacant Land Study.

Last Fall 2006, via SCAG, a questionnaire was received from the DOF that they were about to begin their 2050 Forecast and they asked the planners about future demographic factors, such as: ethnicity; in-migration; age cohorts, etc. At that time, the planners hadn’t any information to respond back with--no knowledge or opinion. SCAG finished their 2050 Forecast, which was a 39% increase to the year 2040 versus Ventura County’s 25% increase. Mr. Hocking further indicated that had they had the information they had at this time, the difference in percentages would not have been so out of kilter. It became prudent for this group of planners to become efficient and to be on the top of the situation.

Points of discussion were:

- The first professionally based forecast that the planners had ever done in Ventura County since 1978, which went to the year 2005, was only off by 4.8%;
- He believed the current project would live up to those expectations barring a depression or war, etc.;
- Process used was done through the CCPA, comprised of all the Planning Directors in the County and met every month to review, and last month the

CCPA ratified the compilation of information for this meeting, of which there were two parts of the 2040 Forecast—Part 1: is the Decapolis, authored by Chris Williamson, Senior Planner, Oxnard, and Part 2: Authored by Debby Millais, Ventura County Planning, which is called the Vacant Land Study, an update of a study done in 2001; and

- CCPA recommended that the day the VCOG Board adopted the Forecast, the one developed as the VCOG Forecast, that was covered at the end of the report and labeled *Forecast # 3* at the beginning of the report.

At this time, Mr. Hocking introduced Chris Williamson, who was to be followed by Ms. Millais. Mr. Williamson provided PowerPoint presentation “VCOG 2040 Population Projection / Forecast,” which included each of the 10 cities in the County’s general plan capacity projection (#3) and also the recommended forecasts. There was not a standardized methodology that everyone followed for that particular projection. Those numbers for each of the cities would go back to the individual planning officials who reached those numbers.

Subsequent to Chris Williamson’s presentation, questions were fielded from:

- Member Morales, who inquired as to DOF numbers, and asked how accurate those figures were, to which Mr. Williamson responded that DOF projections tended to rely on trends, which was also true of the state, but traditionally had looked at growth trends for the past 30 years and these numbers would continue and then be higher for counties that try to change their growth. The DOF’s accuracy was very good at the state level and historically had been within a couple of percentage points of the total state population, and were not very good with intra-county numbers, which they have admitted—low in some, especially in 1999-2000 they underestimated growth in the Sierra counties when there were a lot of people interested in living in the foothills of the Sierras. DOF overestimated growth in Ventura County and some other urban counties where households were getting smaller and the assumptions they used changed. The DOF’s assumptions were different and that was why they had a different number.
- Member McDonald asked if the numbers Mr. Williamson proposed that VCOG accept or adopt at this meeting were based on the General Plan numbers, and touched on SOAR a bit at this meeting. She inquired as to whether or not SOAR would be in place in 2050. Mr. Williamson responded that those figures would probably be in place until the next projection in 2015 or 2017 since it was close to the initial end of SOAR for most cities, the decision-makers and the public may have a different feel for the future. No one wanted to make that decision at this time, as the numbers tend to take on a life of their own when they go out to the public. The group did not want to bind a City Council to take on an expectation. Nancy Settle added that whether one looks at that number or not, one has to take into consideration whether or not the glass (figuratively) is going to fill out or up, and Ms. Millais’ presentation that followed would bring that to light. The SOAR boundaries will hit, but will they go up or out? Member McDonald added that when you **accept** or **adopt**--an important term to her, she

indicated that she would **accept** the report, but if you would ask her to **adopt**, that would mean she would be buying into it. It would take on a life of its own, and provided the example of where would Oxnard put its 277,000 people without encroaching on the greenbelts that separate the cities of Oxnard and Camarillo and she didn't know where these people were going to be put without that happening, so it was important to her to find out how that number was arrived at. She was not certain she wanted to **adopt** anything that would use a factor of SOAR's not being in place, or even imply that SOAR would be out of the picture.

- Mr. Williamson responded to Member McDonald's issues, and indicated that the group was purposefully silent on SOAR, not wanting to get into that on this type of document. The assumption was that this number of people under this projection would go somewhere and it could go outside SOAR—even now if the voters approved it.
- Chair Holden commented that the process that VCOG took in the RHNA process was apparent that most cities were more concerned about taking less than more and if VCOG were to hear from the Alliance too, they would talk about how everyone wanted their greenbelts and their green yards with single-family detached homes, and the reality was that VCOG was headed for a growth that was going to occur, and (rhetorically) “where's it going to go?” The numbers are not received as positive when talk of growing to 277,000, they're received from the perspective of there was a certain amount of growth and the RHNA numbers that VCOG assigned to each other, that were agreed on and would occur, and the idea that one city would take some of Oxnard's numbers, etc., simply meant that one cannot have it both ways. We can't have the large greenbelts and everything that we want to have, and low-density developments, and no vertical developments.
- Member Morehouse commented that he wanted to address Mayor McDonald's comment about adoption. This was SCAG funding that went through VCTC, and the County did the work and it's VCOG's task to give it their blessing. He asked, “The application of these numbers are for what?” “Why are we doing this?” The reason we **adopt** was because they were to be applied to something that had another implication, and asked if this assumption was correct. Nancy Settle responded that these numbers come back for SCAG's Forecast—and this was what the cities in Ventura County must do—SCAG must come back with this Forecast in order to comply with the regional transportation planning that goes on and all the lists of projects that each jurisdiction had within that jurisdiction. They create a forecast and you get that forecast whether or not you take any action on it. The last forecast that we had only allowed us to look at the numbers, as we did not have the funding to delve into that. It gets used there, and in the AQMP at the SCAG level, as well as at the County level and then it ultimately gets used by VCTC, and all those numbers are generated by SCAG without the opportunity to do what they have done there.
- Member Miller asked that on the Staff Report, second paragraph, it referred to Santa Paula, Camarillo and Oxnard City Councils in review of the numbers and stated that “action was not considered necessary for the rest”

and he was curious as to why not. Mr. Hocking responded that it would be best to take to the corresponding Planning Directors of those communities to decide whether they wanted to take to their Councils. They thought that the numbers were close enough to their General Plan that they were not a deviation that was large enough to take to those Cities' Councils. A number of the Cities' numbers were so tied into the General Plans that it was a "given."

- Member Miller inquired as to the comfort level of Simi staff that they did not feel the need to come to the Council for review. Ms. Settle and Mr. Hocking confirmed in the affirmative.
- Mr. Hocking further stated that VCTC was gearing up its Transportation Forecasting Model and were glad to have these actual census track levels approved by this board; otherwise, they would have done the same thing—hired a consultant to figure out somehow what to use. The other practical use would be the next time the County would do a General Plan; they would use those numbers as well. These were the numbers that were authorized by the regional body (VCOG) to use, and that had been the history in the County.
- Member Morales inquired as to what would be a significant difference in percentage. For example, 15.5 – 15.7% was not a significant difference, but between 15.5 and 20%, that's seems a significant difference. Mr. Williamson replied that there was error around every number and that he would not worry about 3 or 4% differences as they were basically the same number in the year 2020 and the year 2040, 7 – 8% was close enough to be the same number in the entire process. 10% was beginning to be in that gray area—something had changed between those two projections. Ms. Morales replied that when one considers the longer life spans and injects those into these numbers that it represented a huge difference. Mr. Williamson responded that there was one note of caution in the assumption that was somewhat misleading in that the only way to do it in the computer was to say that people are living 30% longer, beginning in 2005. It inflated the numbers in the early years because you would expect increased numbers in life spans to occur gradually, and thus the numbers were somewhat overstated for 2020. It was a gradual trend. For 2040, 35 years ago, life spans were 10% shorter.
- Member Holden commented that all the projections and variables trying to fit into the puzzle were to make sure of accuracy and having used just straight birth and death rates, without the in-migration—even the lowest project is 979,000. As a body, if VCOG doesn't plan for transportation as cities in a county, and one city takes more, one less, transportation still has to be accounted for, as well as housing and jobs, and it was his opinion that the County would be better off for it. Although VCOG may not like the news, it begs to be planned for.
- Member Conaway commented that he didn't see this report as a mandate to achieve this forecast and adopt at this meeting; rather, good information to help VCOG work together on a regional basis to solve some of their forthcoming issues.

Mr. Hocking mentioned that Supervisor Bennett's office had some concerns with Paragraph 1 on Page 25 and asked for clarification to the way it was written which was discussed with Debra Varnado prior to the meeting. All agreed that the paragraph would be rewritten, presented to the Board of Supervisors on Tuesday and re-inserted into VCOG's next packet in the old and corrected versions.

Debby Millais presented the ***Vacant Land Study***, an update of the 2002 Vacant Land Study. Methodology used was that of taking the 2002 vacant land inventory from that and updated from the extent she could from her own personal knowledge and distributed around to the 10 cities to have them knock out land that had been developed and to update to 2008. One difference in this study than in the 2002 Study was the inclusion of the unincorporated County. The original addressed only the 10 cities.

To add clarity, Debby indicated that her study addressed to 2035, while Chris's to 2040.

Member Morehouse commented that at SCAG on March 6, 2008, the Regional Council adopted a growth forecast. He hoped for a larger interest in participation in SCAG activities with VCOG members.

Member Holden inquired as to why VCOG wasn't part of the process and why they weren't involved in the process. He asked why typically that wouldn't have been brought to the board as part of the process and why it wasn't discussed prior to Member Morehouse's going down to SCAG last week.

Ms. Varnado indicated that it did come to VCOG in the form of the RTP on a couple of different occasions. The RTP was brought before the board.

Member Morehouse concurred that it was in that form but not in that specific forecast.

Ms. Varnado added that the numbers that were in the Forecast were local numbers that were submitted by the local jurisdictions.

Member McDonald motioned to adopt, Member Glancy seconded, approved unanimously by voice vote.

- B. **Update on VCOG/Ventura County Civic Alliance (VCCA) "Compact for a Sustainable Ventura County" Project:** Ms. Varnado provided information that SCAG was experiencing budget problems and therefore made decisions to not fund the sub-regional projects, which would affect Phase II of this project that was authorized to submit the application to SCAG. VCOG could look for other options

or leave it as is. Member Holden suggested bringing options back at a future meeting.

Rebecca Evans provided Phase I report and indicated that as of a couple of weeks ago, was listed as a project to move forward for funding and it was the only sub-region new project that was moving forward. They were impressed with the work on Phase I and interested in working in Ventura County and then the funding situation broke.

Fregonese Calthorpe produced the printed report that was provided to all in their meeting packet. VCCA would like to set up presentations as well as the local compact process with the local City Councils.

This report was based on SCAG's 2035 Forecast. A compact is how you might want to deal with what is forecasted to occur. The basis for the information on a compact is contained within the Phase I: A Compact for a Sustainable Ventura County.

Ms. Evans wanted to know of VCOG members interested in participating further in the VCCA process.

Member Aguirre commented that we must consider partnering with organizations such as the Civic Alliance that are ready to do the work and provide the input that VCOG needs to make in regional decisions. He felt it would be an error on the part of VCOG to not continue to participate—VCOG needs to keep its hand on that pulse so that VCOG can make better decisions.

Member Morehouse thanked Rebecca and the Civic Alliance.

Member McDonald suggested exploring ways to find funding sources.

Chair Holden would like to see a process that creates a report that integrates electeds and policy makers. Chair Holden suggested that it be moved forward as an Agenda Item to seek possible funding options in Phase II. Chair Holden inquired as to how VCOG wanted to participate at the level of VCOG in the Alliance as appointed members, and felt it would go a long way to separate the entities, as was discussed in the past meetings.

- C. **2008 VCOG Annual Meeting:** June 26 at the Topa Tower Club in Oxnard, and the Speaker would be CSUCI President, Dr. Rush.
- D. **FY 2008/09:** Recommended increase for the coming Fiscal Year of \$13,000, which would cover administrative compensation for Assistant Staff, as well as support by the City of Santa Paula, and included an increase for the contingency plan for things such as the Graffiti Summit in December—a task that there was no budget for. The fund balance would be depleted by the end of June 30, 2008.

Member Glancy motioned to approve and Member Morales seconded, received unanimously.

9. **AGENCY REPORTS:**

- A. **Southern California Association of Governments:** Debra Varnado reported that Linda Jones from SCAG had to leave the meeting early, but wanted to extend an invitation to VCOG for some upcoming conferences: 1) March 20, 2008, Regional Transit Conference which was to be held in downtown L. A., and 2) 8th Annual Regional Housing Conference, to be held in May 2008 in Riverside.

Member Morehouse commented that under the leadership of Hasan Ikhata SCAG would be trying to get some sub-offices out to make better connections.

- B. **Ventura County Transportation Commission:** Mary Travers from VCTC indicated that Darren Kettle, their new Executive Director, had to leave the meeting for another commitment, but he would back at the next meeting. The California Transportation Commission was going to provide about \$30 million for Rice Road. SCAG advised unofficially that it would not be getting any OWP funds in the upcoming year, but hoped that sub-regional reps would convince them how modest VCTC's requests were, compared to monoliths such as Orange County and put a few thousand dollars into Ventura County. At the Commission's meeting March 7, 2008, they authorized funding to hire a consultant to put together a funding enhancement study—such as a local sales tax; congestion pricing (i.e., toll roads), etc.

- C. **League of California Cities:** None.

Member Morehouse spoke about SB 375, Steinberg RE Land Use and Transportation. This would force the hand of Land Use and Transportation. The League of CA Cities would continue to battle Steinberg on this issue.

- D. **Other Agencies:** None.

10. **INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT:** Debra Varnado reported that SCAG's RTP comment period ended on February 19, 2008, and was on schedule to adopt in April, and was responding to comments of which they received many. VCTC did submit comments on behalf of Ventura County and were basically related to the Rice Road Extension and change of name for the Transit System. The adoption of the RCP was delayed to October 2008. The Planning Directors would be reviewing documents and coming back to VCOG with comments. SCAG was expecting a loss of \$5 million in OWP funding this year and into the next fiscal year. They will start to focus on their core activities, including the RTP, RCP and the Compact Blueprint. Increased costs were heightened for staff over the last four years and thus there would be cutbacks and would not be funding additional projects—sub-regional or staff itself. SCAG had a large commitment to fund healthcare for retirees so it was necessary to pre-fund that and they lost both federal and non-federal grants.

A working group was pulled together for the Graffiti Ordinance to progress the work that started in December. That group met, and was comprised of all of the cities as well as the county. The first meeting was held on February 6, 2008 and in attendance were seven of the 10 cities, plus a Supervisor's District. The elements of a Countywide Ordinance were pulled together as well as a framework, to be taken back to the individual cities to make a decision as to what they would want inside an ordinance and from there would be handed to the attorneys for the actual preparation of the ordinance.

11. **REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

Member McDonald commented that she would like to offer would be to have Camarillo Planning staff come to VCOG to come to talk about a Redevelopment Project, and that is one of the ways they will meet their RHNA numbers is through the redevelopment of a very large shopping center into a mixed use project and to discuss the process they went through in developing the specific plan and the zone change to help plant the seeds and to show how some are meeting those requirements to grow within their cities. Their City Manager is on board with having the staff come to share with each other how cities are handling it.

Member Morehouse commented that both Propositions 98 & 99 have qualified regarding eminent domain.

12. **ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting adjourned at 7:12 p.m. to May 8, 2008 at Camarillo City Hall.