

**Goleta Valley Community Plan Update
Goleta Vision Committee**

January 25, 2006 6:30 pm – 9:30 pm
County Board of Supervisors Conference Room
County Administration Building 4th Floor
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara

Final Meeting Notes

Participants:		Convened by Supervisor
Ted Adams	Eva Inbar	Susan Rose
Michael Brown	Valerie Olson	County Staff Support:
Brian Caird	James Richard	Terri Maus;
Gary Earle	Tim Schmidt	John McInnes;
Tish Gainey		Rosie Dyeste
Susan Grgich	Brian Fahnestock (unable to	George Amoon
Lauren Hanson	attend)	
Hal Hill		Facilitator: John Jostes

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

John McInnes, Director of Comprehensive Planning called the meeting to order and made brief introductory remarks, introducing his staff, the staff of the County Executive Office and the facilitator, John Jostes. John Jostes then gave a very brief overview of the evening's agenda and introduced 2nd District Supervisor Susan Rose.

2. Welcoming Remarks by Supervisor Rose

Supervisor Rose expressed her appreciation to the thirteen members of the Vision Committee and noted that she had received over 50 applications to serve on the committee. She indicated that there were a large number of very qualified applicants and that her choice of committee members was based upon balancing geographical diversity, broad backgrounds and skills, constituent experiences organizational affiliations and other factors that she hoped would contribute to a well informed, motivated, creative and diverse set of stakeholder representatives.

3. Participant Introductions

John Jostes then provided an opportunity for committee members to introduce themselves.

4. Process Overview

John Jostes noted that this first meeting of the Committee was designed as a "meet and greet" opportunity for committee members to learn about each other and gather more details about the process. He handed out an organizational flowchart that provided a graphic representation of the relationship of the Committee to other aspects of County government,

the general public and the decision makers. John reviewed the basic approach of the process including small group working meetings held on weekday evenings, complimented by larger Saturday workshops where broader public involvement would be encouraged. He noted that each meeting would seek to arrive at tentative agreements that would be assembled over time into a framework recommendation that would be ultimately refined and adopted by a consensus (unanimity) of the group. He also indicated that the consensus recommendations of the committee would be utilized by County staff to develop the language of the Community Plan Update (CPU) and that the CPU would then be submitted to the Planning Commission along with their recommendations for consideration and adoption/recommendation of the Plan. He also handed out a list of tentative meeting and workshop dates and discussion topics and walked the group through the meetings scheduled for February, March and April of 2006.

The discussion then turned to the review and adoption of ground rules to serve as terms of engagement for the group to use in their day-to-day discussions and decision making. Each of the ten paragraphs dealing with 'Basic Conduct and Decision Making' and revised as needed to obtain a consensus of the group to move forward. Questions were raised regarding the nature and formality of voting and assurances were provided to clarify that while voting was not a preferred decision making structure, that voting was inherent in the achievement of consensus decisions. Clarifications were also offered to indicate that the decision making rules applied only to the Advisory Committee itself.

Discussions also took place regarding the desirability of getting information well in advance of the meeting, including receiving e-mails at least 24 hours prior to meetings where substantive information was being discussed.

Regarding Participation and observation by the public, a number of members were concerned that the preliminary language was too pre-emptive of public comment. Revisions were added to this paragraph of the ground rules to make it clear that the public would have an opportunity to address the as committee at each of its meetings and workshops. The group also asked that the facilitator develop speaker guidelines to be included on agendas to provide general guidance to the public.

In addressing the ground rules related to Participant Roles, several committee members had concerns about the wording within paragraph 5, Public statements. The draft language was deleted from the ground rules and the facilitator was directed to return to the group with new language which would more accurately reflect the intent to encourage behaviors that would build trust and minimize unnecessary surprises.

ACTION ITEM: *After a thorough discussion and revisions to the Ground Rules, the facilitator reviewed the suggested language changes (see attached) and the committee adopted, by consensus, a revised set of ground rules with the intent of formally signing them at the next meeting.*

5. Group Discussion and Dialogue

The group then turned its focus to three focus questions designed to highlight expectations, concerns and community values. Committee members offered the following thoughts.

- a. What are your initial expectations – what do you hope to accomplish?
 - Build trust
 - Develop visitor centers in parks to allow kids to get better acquainted with nature
 - Share affordable housing ideas with the committee
 - Develop a framework that represents a wide range of contributions and values
 - Become educated about what a community plan does and how it works
 - Make contributions to the planning effort
 - Act as an advisory group and come up with the best community guidelines for the community
 - Determine how(?) much affordable housing can be supported by the community
 - Need to find a way to shorten people's commutes from home to work
 - Become educated and protect the environment
 - Learn from what others have done in other areas
 - Develop a community plan that can serve as a model for what others can do
 - Goleta valley can be someplace that is really wonderful
 - Accomplish a vision that reflects the majority of the people that live in the area
 - Need to accommodate the quality of life of those who currently live here more than the quality of life for those who are yet to come here
 - Develop a plan that the community and their elected officials will adopt
 - Preserve agriculture
 - Improve the traffic situation
 - Would like the committee to come up with something that is bigger than their own individual contributions
 - Identify solutions to some of the problems
 - Set a positive example and make something better happen than what's going on now
 - Make good friends around the table
 - Address emergency services and crisis management issues

- b. What are your fears and concerns?
 - People need to be less concerned about legalities and more concerned about getting a plan developed and off the ground
 - Need to be careful in distinguishing between values and facts
 - With more density, can we evacuate in an emergency?
 - High density housing and illegal units
 - Protection of farmland
 - One single site accommodating all of the housing growth for the entire area
 - Adequacy of infrastructure
 - That the visioning committee gets distracted with site selection and fails to focus on the bigger picture
 - Site selection should come at the end, not in the beginning – this is a sequencing problem
 - Everything that is envisioned might not happen
 - Need good public participation
 - April deadline for preliminary housing sites is too soon
 - Can we change our views on housing sites after April?
 - Skewed information from the County
 - All of the hard work of the committee comes to naught
 - The County and the State need to listen to the committee's recommendations
 - Committee members make commitments too early, before we know more, making it difficult for the group to work together

- Keeping open minds throughout the process
 - No fear as long as we have good people on the team
 - Maintaining a team concept and frame of mind
 - Need to get beyond our limited views and into the big picture – avoid being narrow minded
 - Make it clear to the News Press that this is a diverse group – get a set of bios out
 - Don't want to have the views of the committee ignored
- c. What community values need to be reflected by the process and its outcomes?
- Sustainable development
 - Reasonable development
 - Good air quality and water quality
 - Family values, diverse families and kid friendly
 - Quality of life
 - Semi-rural character
 - Preservation of agriculture
 - Quality education
 - Bikeways
 - Compliance with existing zoning
 - Reduced traffic congestion
 - Ability to appeal all building projects
 - Cultural diversity
 - Goleta needs to be a place for working-class people
 - Density doesn't always equate to affordable housing
 - Environmental values – watersheds, water quality and open space
 - Need to feel people in government respect and are responsive to our values
 - Viewshed
 - Neighborhood compatibility

6. Question and Answer Session:

The Question and answer session was forgone and replaced with a brief opportunity to hear from members of the public who were in attendance. Approximately eight individuals addressed the Committee.

7. Next Steps and Adjourn

John Jostes reminded those present that the next meeting would be a Saturday Workshop scheduled for February 4th. The meeting location will be provided to the group as soon as it is determined.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Attachment A

**Goleta Vision Committee
Ground Rules / Terms of Engagement**

These ground rules are intended to serve as “terms of engagement” for the members of the Goleta Vision Committee (GVC). They are intended to compliment materials regarding GVC Roles and provide the basis for collaborative communication among stakeholders charged with building consensus on recommendations and/or agreements. They are also intended to serve as boundaries for fair and civil behavior and group decision making.

Basic Conduct and Decision Making:

1. **Problem Solving Approach:** Disagreements between participants will be regarded as problems to be solved rather than battles to be won.
2. **Decision-Making:** The advisory committee will strive to achieve its decisions by consensus. While straw polls may be taken to ascertain the general attitude of the group to a given issue or proposal, the group shall refrain from formal voting as a preferred decision making structure. In seeking consensus, each member has an obligation to articulate interests, propose alternatives, listen to proposals and build agreements by negotiating in good faith. In exchange, each member has the right to expect
 - a full articulation of agreement and areas of disagreement, if any;
 - an opportunity to revisit issues on grounds of substantial new information becoming available during the group’s deliberations.

When unable to support a consensus, a member has an obligation to demonstrate that the item at issue is a matter of such principle or importance that his or her constituents' interests would be substantially and adversely affected by the proposed decision. In addition, it is the responsibility of the dissenting party to: 1) state the reason(s) underlying their withholding of consent in sufficient detail, and 2) offer an alternative suggestion that seeks to satisfactorily address not only their concerns and interests, but also those of other members of the group as well.

3. **Integrity and Congruency:** Agreement to participate in this process carries with it a responsibility to uphold the integrity of the group decision-making process. This means that parties who vote in the affirmative on issues or packages agree to fully support the consensus decisions of the group.
4. **Clear and Timely Communication:** Every participant is responsible for communicating his or her position on issues under consideration. Each participant is also encouraged to clearly state their intentions and concerns at the earliest possible time in the course of the discussions.
5. **Information Sharing:** Relevant information can play an important role in the development of informed consent. At the same time, too much information or information of limited relevance can cause confusion and slow down the process. Where individual members wish to share written or printed information with the group as a whole, such information should be provided to the Facilitator at least 72 hours prior to any scheduled meeting to allow for duplication and/or distribution prior to the meeting.
6. **E-mail Communication:** Electronic communication shall be guided by the same general protocols for communication, problem solving and negotiation that are followed when the group is in general face-to-face sessions. All e-mail correspondence associated with group

Attachment A

deliberations shall be directed through a moderator or facilitator chosen by the group and provided to the GVC at least 24 hours in advance of meetings if possible.

7. **Participation and Observation by Members of the Public:** All GVC meetings are open to the public and observers are welcome. Evening meetings of the GVC are meant to be working meetings focused on collaboratively developing a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the Community Plan Update. ~~As such, the meetings are not designed to be opportunities for soliciting input from the general public.~~ However, Members of the public will have an opportunity to address the Committee at some point during each meeting for a period of up to 2 minutes individually and 15 minutes in the aggregate. Members of the public are also encouraged to raise their concerns directly with GVC members before or after the meetings as well as during breaks to ensure that all issues of significant concern to the public are considered in the GVC's deliberations. Separate Saturday workshops are geared to soliciting a broader public dialogue where public input is encouraged. Members of the public are encouraged to submit written materials in advance of the meetings via the Facilitator.
8. **Absence when Decisions are Made:** When members cannot attend a meeting of the GVC, they should communicate their views to other members of the group prior to that meeting. Absence is interpreted as assent.
9. **If Consensus Cannot Be reached on the Final Recommendation:** If consensus cannot be reached on recommendations to the Planning Commission regarding the Community Plan Update, the GVC will forward a summary of their areas of agreement and areas of disagreement. In no case will there be a statement of what proportion of members were in favor or opposed to any provision on which there is continuing disagreement.
10. **Voluntary Participation:** Service on the GVC is voluntary. In the event of significant disagreements on substance or process, the GVC will decide, in consultation with the Facilitator, how best to move forward. For example, additional discussion may be needed to help understand unresolved concerns before proceeding further, or the group may benefit from working on creating additional options. If, after exhausting all other options, a GVC member feels that he or she cannot go along with a very strong consensus developed by the rest of the group, they have the option to withdraw as an official member of the Goleta Vision Committee

Participant Roles:

1. **Facilitator Roles:** The role of the facilitator is to assist the parties to reach a consensual agreement. This includes the preparation of notes, agendas, and other items which are designed to move the discussions toward resolution. The Facilitator will also hold in confidence any discussions with individual members unless specifically instructed otherwise.
2. **Comprehensive Planning's Roles:** The Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Planning serves as the convener of the Goleta Community Plan Update Vision Process, and the agency with the responsibility of writing the Community Plan Update. In this regard, it will rely on the recommendations of the Goleta Vision Committee to provide guidance in crafting a document that is responsive to neighborhood and community goals, conditions and aspirations.
3. **Group Roles & Responsibilities:** The following points are offered as examples of behavior consistent with constructive dialogue, mutual respect and a commitment to collaboration:

Attachment A

- Offer respect of different viewpoints and attention when others speak.
 - Share the responsibility of ensuring the success of the process and the quality of recommendations.
 - Make our best good faith effort to work towards reaching an agreement.
 - Represent the perspectives, concerns, and interests of agencies or constituencies whenever possible to ensure that agreements and recommendations developed by the group are acceptable to the organizations, agencies, or constituents being represented.
 - Ask questions of each other for clarification and mutual understanding.
 - Verify assumptions when necessary and avoid characterizing the motives of others.
 - Acknowledge and try to understand others' perspectives.
 - Stay focused on the task at hand and share airtime with others
 - Refrain from distracting others through side conversations; silence all cell phones during meetings.
 - Concentrate on the content of discussions and allow the Facilitator to focus on how to promote productive discussion.
 - Keep the group informed regarding constraints on decision-making authority within agencies or constituency groups.
 - Keep the Facilitator neutral.
4. **Ad Hoc Subcommittees:** When the advisory committee determines that a specific topic or agenda item requires a higher level of analysis and focus than allowed for during its meetings, it may appoint an Ad Hoc Subcommittee to address specific information needs, refine options or resolve differences of opinion outside of its regular meetings. Subcommittees are not empowered to make decisions in place of the group as a whole, but rather to frame and refine issues and information needs for resolution by the group. They should be composed of as few members as is necessary to accomplish the task it is charged with. In doing so, it may pull from resources within the group, from "Tier 2 Participants" or from the staffs of agencies participating in the process. Ad Hoc Subcommittees are "opportunistic" and "ephemeral" groups in that they exist only as long as it is necessary for them to accomplish their task.
5. **Public Statements:** ~~Participants agree to refrain from public criticism of the Goleta Vision Process without first bringing such concerns to the group and its facilitator for discussion.~~

Ted Adams	Lauren Hanson
Michael Brown	Harold 'Hal' Hill
Brian Caird	Eva Inbar
Gary Earle	Valerie Olson
Brian Fahnestock	James Richard
Tish Gainey	Tim Schmidt
Susan Grgich	Date: January 25, 2006