

# DRAFT

## Minutes

### GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, March 4, 2004

12:00 – 5:00 PM

At the Monterey County Leadership Institute, 2354 Garden Road, Monterey

Those present: Juan Uranga, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Tom Rowley, Sheryl McKenzie, Gwen Miller, Nancy Isakson, Brian Finegan, Jay Brown, Mike Caplin, Kurt Gollnick, Tom Carvey (1:30), Ralph Riva (2:00)

Visitors: Mary Mecartney, Christopher Bunn Jr.,

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)  
Public comment: none
- II) Approval of agenda for March 4, 2004  
Public comment: none  
M/S/C to adopt agenda as e-mailed
- III) Approval of minutes from February 26, 2004  
Public comment: none  
M/S/C to adopt minutes as e-mailed
- IV) Circulation Element  
Kurt Gollnick distributed the Circulation Subcommittee's version of the Circulation Element, printed in color and based on a download of the County's "GPU3." Kurt also handed out colored maps from GPU3.

Mike Caplin said that the automatic tracking feature can cause problems in printing. Kurt said that in the document he distributed, yellow is the color for County changes and blue is the color for the RG subcommittee changes. Kurt will e-mail Tom Carvey an electronic version of the printed document. Kurt said that the County made very significant improvements from GPU2 to GPU3.

Kurt said that many groups had worked with TAMC on developing a list of projects. At one point they went to Sacramento to meet with the CTC. This effort was successful, and money that would have been lost came to Monterey County for the Prunedale Improvement Project (PIP). The priorities established have been retained, and they are: the PIP, Airport Blvd. interchange, Salinas Road/Highway One interchange, Hwy 156 widening and the Prunedale by-pass. TAMC has been working with the County staff, which has incorporated this information into the GPU.

Tom Rowley said that looking at the list of TAMC regional road improvement on page 10 matches the large map that was handed out today (C-2). The map is crucial to understanding the document. Kurt has someone who is very good at mapping and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) who will go over the maps.

Tom Rowley said that in comparing the funding and seeing the TAMC plan (see C-10), there is a very short list of funding. The idea is to come up with more funding. The listed projects are 10 year programs, which is a relatively short term. Tom said that neither of the 2 previous ballot measures for road improvement funding have received the 2/3 vote necessary, and that there has been only one significant project since 1986. We should therefore work to make the goals achievable.

Kurt Gollnick led a group discussion starting on page 1 of the handout, with the blue comments in the introduction. Kurt said that the key to sustainable growth depends on City/County Agreements. Nancy Isakson noted that much of the introduction has been retained and asked Kurt if this were purposeful. Kurt said yes.

Change to the bottom of page 1, “Permitting growth ~~in advance of~~ concurrent with infrastructure capacity.... M/S/C

Kurt said that GPU3 says that no development can take place if it will result in a Level of Service (LOS) D, even in cases where the previous condition was LOS F. Brian Finegan said that this would seem to fly in the face of common sense. Mike Caplin said that as in the Land Use Element, we should apply the concept of banking the fair share portion of the developer fees until the community votes to support the improvements. Juan Uranga said that the City of Salinas was able to do this with the Boronda and Laurel overpasses. This type of concept prevents projects being stymied for lack of funding.

Under “Key Concepts,” page 3, Brian Finegan suggested inserting as a key concept “Become a self-help county.”

There was discussion about page 4 of the handout concerning having a road system that will accommodate new development. Brian Finegan said that the regulatory load increases because developers would have to address 3 areas: (1) within community areas, (2) regional networks that connect the Community Areas to cities and other locations throughout Monterey County, and (3) other local roads surrounding the Community Areas. Alfred Diaz-Infante noted that this could be far-reaching; instead of just correcting one area, must do them all. Brian said that TAMC’s program shows projects, estimated costs, and how much change is due to local and non-local sources. County fees would then be additional to TAMC development fees.

It was noted that if a program isn't in place to satisfy the transportation requirement, there can be no development. Brian couldn't find a reference to a program that would satisfy this.

There will be 3 layers of fees: (1) a city fee, which already exists in some places, (2) a TAMC fee of \$9,500, and (3) now a *county* fee. These fees would stack up, but would not pay for identical projects. This becomes extremely complex, as, for instance, the city and TAMC have to agree on who pays for what project. STIP money has been impounded by the state government and isn't available.

Mike Caplin said that roads used to be the responsibility of the government, but the shift is now going to those that buy houses. Juan Uranga said that the shift is that the state is taking money from local government. Juan said that it would seem to be incongruous to present the 3 tiered funding concept during a time of disappearing local revenue.

Kurt said that "traffic shed" concept opens up the impacts to a much larger area.

There was discussion about reduction of fees for affordable housing.

Brian Finegan said that the TAMC program doesn't provide funding for *county* roads.

Kurt pointed out GPU3 insists on LOS C to be maintained if development is to take place. He said that in order for development to keep pace with growth, we may have to be willing to accept a lower level of service. Jay Brown said that other funding mechanisms will have to come into play for the areas whose LOS is already bad. Brian Finegan said that LOS C is fine if people are willing to pay for it and that people should vote with their pocket books for the LOS they want; if people aren't willing to pay for LOS C, it should be taken off the table.

Nancy suggested that we work with the policies first, and then come back to revisit the introduction.

Mike Caplin said that traffic in general is a nebulous concept: it's more of an art than a science. Measuring LOS is measured at the peak day, at the peak hour of the day. Brian said that Mike Cling had suggested using the "average peak hour" as a measure AADT (AADT = average annual daily trips). M/S/C that the subcommittee will change the measurement of LOS to the "average annual peak hour traffic."

Mike Caplin says that LOS E is the one that moves the most number of cars down the road in the shortest amount of time. Tom Rowley said this depends on the capacity of the road.

Goals and policies: p. 18

Part 2: Goals and Policies

Policy C-1.1: change “in conjunction with” to “in consultation with.” Strike “policies of the.”

Policy C-1.2: what does “context sensitive” mean? Deferred until there is a definition of “functional roadway classification and design.”

The group compared table C-4 with page 19 and the language in C-1.2. Juan proposed eliminating the speed limit column and simply say that will conform to state law.

Traffic shed language moved from C-1.3 to 2.3. M/S/C

C-1.4: Roadway monitoring program:

Change “shall” to “may.” The county wants to *assign* an ADT volume, representing functional capacity, for each road segment based on the functional classification of the road, as well as capacity analyses consistent with principles in the Highway Capacity Manual. Table C-4 should not be used as a regulatory standard.

a) comes out—remove this

b) insert “average” before “peak hour.” Include the language “upon issuance of the certificate of occupancy to the last sentence, to take the place of “concurrent with the.”

c) Invert wording in first sentence, so it starts with “If needed....”

C-1.5: Performance Standards:

There was a discussion about the terms involved in this section.

V) Reports from sub-committees

A) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)

B) Transportation

C) Land Use

D) City/County Agreements

E) Public Service

Public Service:

PS-4.12

PS-4.13: Maximum slopes for individual sewage disposal systems:

Mike Caplin read the section from the Big Sur plan: p. 434 Big Sur policy:

PS-6 says on sites wastewater drain fields on slopes shall not apply to Big Sur planning area. Nearly the totality of the land in Big Sur exceeds 30%. May be allowed on slopes over 30% where no alternative exists.

Application to PS-4.13: Brian Finegan suggested adding that “if no other feasible site exists,” you can have a drain field on a slope over 30%. There was discussion about how to continue with this section. Sheryl McKenzie and Nancy Isakson will bring this back to subcommittee.

PS-4.14: Alternative Sewage Disposal System:

The subcommittee had deleted this section, but after discussion, the group felt that this needs to be worked on. Part of this discussion had to do with the County having to establish ordinances that would regulate alternative sewage disposal systems. Mike Caplin said there is a significant new system called an infusion system—a different type of drain field. This type of system is allowed in other counties, but not Monterey County. Brian suggested “Alternative individual sewage disposal systems that meet the requirement of the Regional Water Quality Control Board may be allowed subject to approval of the County Director of Environmental Health,” and then concluding with the last sentence of the existing language. M/S/C

PS:4.15: Minimum lot size: minimum lot size for on-site septic system

There are other entities that have standards. The Dept of Environmental Health existing standards and criteria that must be met.

F) Update of GPU process: see H) below

G) Update of EIR: no report

H) Strategy

PC hearings:

The group looked at the binder with the RG work. Binders will also be made for the County Supervisors. Mike Caplin said that the documents still need further printing refinement. They should be printed on both sides of the page next time.

The theme for the March 11, 2004 Planning Commission hearing is “Quality of Life.” There should be good representation from the Refinement Group and groups supporting the RG work. Tom will e-mail everyone on the RG to have the RG members contact their groups.

I) Definitions: no report

Key Concepts for each element: Under “Key Concepts,” page 3, Brian Finegan suggested inserting as a key concept “Become a self-help county.”

J) Refinement Group Core Values: no report

VI) Agenda building for next meeting:

VII) Adjournment to meeting of Wednesday, March 10, 2004, at the Monterey Plaza Hotel and Spa, 400 Cannery Row, Monterey