

DRAFT

Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, January 22, 2004, 12:00 – 5:00 PM

At the Monterey County Leadership Institute, Garden Road, Monterey

Those present: Brian Finegan, Mike Antle, Tom Carvey, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Gwen Miller, Nancy Isakson, Chris Bunn, Chris Steinbruner, Christine Kemp, Aaron Johnson

Visitors: Christopher Bunn, Jr.

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)
Public comment: none

- II) Approval of agenda for January 22, 2004
Public comment: none
Meeting place for next week: Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce
Nancy Isakson suggested expanded VI (g) to include discussion about a political action subcommittee

- III) Approval of minutes from January 15, 2004
Public comment: none
M/S/C approved as mailed.

- IV) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)
Public comment: none
Mike Caplin and Juan Uranga will submit language.

- V) Land use Element
Public comment: none
Procedural question: Tom Carvey asked whether we should begin using the new GPU 3. Given that GPU3 is in bill form and includes GPU2, the group decided to continue working from the GPU2 as of April 2003.
Christine Kemp led the discussion of Land Use, using the 12-4-03 document.
Christine has been updating this version with an updated version which she has distributed each week. The Land Use subcommittee met yesterday.

Two items were deferred: 5.1 and 5.7 Description of rural center on p. 72 (LU-5.3).

LU-5.2: Aaron Johnson suggested that Chualar could be included a Community Area.

LU-5.7: Christine said this is still a very difficult concept. Two prong approach: (1) an infrastructure and financing statement and (2) what impacts will there be from a

new standard subdivision, and then a more detailed engineering study of the needs. The funding mechanisms need to be identified (e.g. assessment, impact fee, exactions, grants, developer contributions, etc.) so that the developer would know in advance what he or she is expected to contribute. If the community then decides not to participate in the improvements, the developer would not be limited by their lack of cooperation.

Brian Finegan said that the wording, as recommended by subcommittee, is inconsistent with guiding objective #8 (new development won't take place if services become worse as a result). Nancy Isakson said that developers should be willing to pay their fair share and not negatively impact the existing services. There was discussion about infrastructure deficiencies. Since most of the infrastructure problems have already been identified, why should a potential developer have to identify problems, develop a plan, and hold a public hearing? It was suggested to include a statement to the effect that "since this information is already available, a new study is not required." Brian Finegan said that while infrastructure shortcomings are well known, the specifics and details of them are not known in every case, with respect to new development. Christine Kemp said that there is a lack of a definition of the parameters of the study, including such factors as (1) what, exactly, is being studied? (2) what is the geographical range of the study? For instance, if a developer were to build 5 units on the western edge of Prunedale, it wouldn't be necessary to study all of Prunedale. The group agreed that while the concept of this section is good, it should be referred to subcommittee for further language revision.

LU-6 (goal) P. 77 of 12-4-03 Land Use document: the words "preserve," "critical habitat," "small scale," were discussed. It was decided to substitute the language "natural resources and watershed protection."

LU-6.1: There was reference to LU-5.1 to check consistency. Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation with today's changes.

LU-6.2: There was reference to LU-5.2 to check consistency. Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation with today's changes.

LU-6.3: This policy was compared with LU-5.10. Gwen Miller pointed out that GPU3 adds the term "phasing." Add "mineral extraction operations," "farming and grazing, agricultural processing facilities," "recreational uses such as hunting." Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation with today's changes.

LU-6.4: This section contains references to the 40 acre minimum. Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation. There was discussion about the 40 acre minimum policy.

LU-6.5: The subcommittee will revisit this policy with respect to the definitions.

LU-6.6: also policy 9.14. Strike this policy in its entirety and add a comment explaining that this section is covered under Ag 1.4 and LU-9.14.

LU-6.7: There was discussion about the relationship between this policy and the mayors' recommendations. The mayors want to locate businesses within their city limits. It was decided to add "commercial businesses to meet the needs of that particular area." Add "small scale" in front of "general retail and service business." Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation with today's changes.

LU-6.8: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-6.9: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-6.10: Mike Caplin's letter suggested striking the last sentence. As per subcommittee recommendation, with today's changes. If we adopt the PS-1 table, then leave the language; if not, then strike the language.

LU-6.11: adopt the language of GPU3, but take out the word "public." Strike the reference to PS-1.

LU-6.12: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-6.13: strike as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-7 (goal): promote the long-term ~~conservation of productive and potentially productive~~ of productive agriculture and other resource lands,

LU-7.1: add viticulture and ag processing. The definition of Ag Processing Facility should include wineries. Include processing facilities. Strike the words "pockets of." as per subcommittee recommendation, with today's changes.

Nancy Isakson suggested the formation of a committee to work on the Definitions section. There are references to definitions that are critical.

LU-7.2: This should be an information box, not a policy. Strike the words "current"

LU-7.3: There was discussion about TDR's. Brian Finegan said that this is something that either can or cannot be used. Aaron Johnson presented TDR language and distributed a hand out with the language. Aaron said he is more and more convinced that it is a reasonable approach. Change the title to "Agriculture Viability Programs," rather than "Agriculture *Conservation* Program." Chris Bunn asked whether this really helps ag viability, in that instead of making money by farming, farmers would be making money by selling land. It was decided to leave the TDR's and strike PDR's.

LU-7.4: same as 6.10

LU-7.5: This policy also presents the 40 acre minimum. There was reference back to LU- 6.4. Christine Kemp suggested setting up a new range from 20 to 160. Brian Finegan said that current zoning in ag lands is 40 acres, according to the 1982 GPU. Aaron Johnson proposed an exception saying that a one to forty acre lot for accessory agricultural processing and support facilities. As per subcommittee recommendation, with today's changes.

LU-7.6: as per subcommittee

LU-7.7: There was a great deal of discussion over this section. One house is permitted, and 2 other houses, but only if they're related to agricultural use. Deed restrictions would apply if the land is no longer used for ag. It was decided to go back to 7.5 and add "farm worker" and farm employee housing," then add these as (k) and (j) on the list. Christine Kemp will take this policy back to the subcommittee for more work.

LU-7.8: Family member lots. These exist both the 1982 General Plan and its ordinances. The current ordinance says you can create a 1 acre *minimum* plot on ag land for member of the family. Sub (A) is in the current document (family members must earn a substantial part of their income from the property). There was discussion over whether an owner could get financing with a deed restriction. Although this has been in the current plan for 30 years, this sort of case is a rarity. Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation.

LU-7.9: Bed and breakfast: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-7.10: same as 6.7.

LU-7.11: also in current (1982) plan. Strike the entire policy.

LU-7.12: as per subcommittee recommendation with today's changes. Take out the "low intensity." Also matches GPU3.

LU-7.13: as per subcommittee recommendation. Instead of County shall "provide," County shall "allow." The GPU3 language is acceptable. Include "ag processing."

LU-7.14: A key policy, revised in GPU3. Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation.

LU-7.15: It was decided to defer this policy until viticulturists provide their opinions.

LU-7.16: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-8 (goal): Encourage proper planning of public lands so that uses on public lands are compatible with the environment of the area, and with existing and planned uses on adjacent privately owned lands.

LU8.1: Mike Caplin's letter suggested that this may belong in 8.3 better than here. As per subcommittee.

LU-8.2: as per subcommittee recommendation (GPU3 in agreement).

LU-8.3: include the Caplin language here about "future use" of the public land. Christine wrote the corrected language from today.

LU-9 Major land groups: General Land user provisions.

LU-9.1: "Secondary" dwellings has been renamed "Principal" dwellings. This section needs a lot of work, and the new title changes the entire idea.

LU-9.2: density exclusions: Approved as per subcommittee recommendation, but rephrase to align with new state code. Call this "secondary units" instead of "caretaker units" and other names.

LU-9.3: Farmworker housing. The definitions in the glossary are in conflict from the stated policy because they use both terms in this policy. Create a separate "Farmworker" policy.

- VI) Reports from sub-committees
 - A) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)
 - B) Water
 - C) Transportation
 - D) Land Use
 - E) City/County Agreements
 - F) Public Service
 - G) Update of GPU process

- VII) Agenda building for next meeting
 - A) Request from Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce to review the Refinement Group's work to this date for possible endorsement.
 - i) I was decided that the RG should supply clean copies of the completed work to the SVCC and others who wish to review this work for possible endorsement.

- VIII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, January 29, 2004, location to be announced. (Leadership Institute is not available for this date.) Tom Carvey said that the Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce conference room is available on this date. He will confirm and e-mail notification to RG members and interested parties.