

# DRAFT

## Minutes

### GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, May 20, 2004

12:00 – 5:00 PM

At the Salinas Valley Builders' Exchange  
590-A Brunken Ave., Salinas

Those present: Jay Brown, Bob Perkins, Brian Finegan, Tom Carvey, Wendy Elliott, Brad Sullivan, Mike Caplin, Nancy Isakson, Kurt Gollnick, Rick Smith, Pete Scudder, Aaron Johnson,

Visitors: Mary Mecartney

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)  
Public comment: none
  
- II) Approval of agenda for May 20, 2004  
Public comment: none  
Additions to agenda: Nancy Isakson moved to include a follow up on GPU planning and how we want to proceed with the RG work product. It was agreed that our objective is to complete the 7 mandatory elements. Yet to be completed are Health and Safety and Definitions. It was agreed not to do the Administration, and Coastal plans at this time.  
Sections of Health and Safety:  
Sections completed: HS-1, HS-2, HS-3 (Fire Hazards)  
Sections not completed: HS-4, HS-5, HS-6  
Nancy Isakson moved that next week's agenda reflect just the elements that we will be working on. Mike Caplin suggested that if time permits, we should consider working on some of the Administrative policies.
  
- III) Approval of minutes from May 13, 2004  
Public comment: none  
Approved as e-mailed. m/s/c/u
  
- IV) Definitions section  
Public comment: none  
The group began work at the section under the letter "L," with a new handout dated May 20, 2004.  
Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC): back to subcommittee.  
Land Use Definition: as per subcommittee recommendation  
Land Use Plan (Coastal): as per subcommittee recommendation  
Landfill, Active: as per subcommittee recommendation  
Landfill, Closed: as per subcommittee recommendation

Landmark Trees: as per subcommittee recommendation. Also see RG ERME 2.13. There was discussion of the distinction between planted trees and native trees. Brian Finegan read the Big Sur plan that describes the landmark trees for the Big Sur area. There was discussion as to whether or not to use this policy county-wide. Worked was stopped at this point.

V) Reports from sub-committees

A) Finished Elements:

- i) Land Use (needs to be converted from GPU2 to GPU3)
- ii) Ag

There was discussion of RG Ag Commission recommendations. Luann Meador had asked for this item to be brought forward to be reconsidered. Refer back to RG Ag subcommittee. It was agreed to have this item placed on the agenda for next week.

- iii) ERME: no report
- iv) Circulation: no report

B) Elements in process:

i) Public Service: Water section

Mike Caplin handed out copies of a handout entitled “RG Public Services committee recommendations, 5/20/04.” Mike tracked the changes, and will send them to Brian Finegan.

Working from the handout, Mike led the group through the sections, PS-1.5 was referred back to committee and is just coming back. Mike Caplin led the discussion on this policy. The question is who would share costs and how they would be shared? See minutes from the 4-8-04 meeting during which PS-1.5 was discussed. There was discussion of about the relationship of PS-1.5 with Table PS-1.

Eliminate last sentence, replace with language from the footnotes of Table PS-1 as follows:

“The following developments will be exempted

- (1) the remodel /expansion of an existing residence;
- (2) the remodel/expansion of an existing non-residential use as long as the expansion is no more than fifty percent of the existing floor area;
- (3) construction of the first single-family home, on-site employee housing, caretaker unit, or small-scale neighborhood-serving commercial use on an existing legal lot of record.
- (4) Discussion as to how to list other types of units. (Additional units).

Mike Caplin will list the other types of units and will bring them back next week.

LU-5.1 Drainage: Discussion of drainage. Add “drainage” after “flow” in the third line. Add definition of threshold of significance. Mike will send this to Brian, Luann Meador and Tom. m/s/c/u

PS-1.6 This policy had already been completed by the group; the group checked the wording in Mike’s handout for accuracy. Brian Finegan suggested changes to line 7.

PS-10.6 already done. Reverse the order of the first two sentences.

Table PS-1 already done. Checked and approved.

ii) Definitions

C) Elements not yet started:

- i) Administration (Rich Smith and Aaron Johnson)
- ii) Coastal and Inland (Mike Caplin, Kurt Gollnick, Sheryl McKenzie and Nancy Isakson)
- iii) Economic Development (Rich Smith)
- iv) Noise

(1) Noise and air quality sections: Brian Finegan handed out copies of a the subcommittee work, entitled, "Goal HS-5 Noise." Brian led the discussion of the subcommittee work. The subcommittee work related their work to the state noise level guidelines.

Goal HS-5 Noise: as per subcommittee recommendation

HS-5.1: Development Controls: GPU3 defined residential neighborhoods as noise-sensitive land use, but they are not so designated in the state guidelines. See the tables attached to the back of today's handout. The state guidelines require the use of noise maps, and these maps were located in GPU3. The state guidelines say that element should examine road noise, railroad operations, etc. There was discussion concerning noise buffers and their role in protecting existing uses from noise as well as protecting new uses from already-existing noise. It was decided to use the terms "sound receptors" and "sound generators." Call the first policy "Noise sensitive receptors." The second policy could then be "Noise generators." This would be a new HS-5.2, entitled "Noise Generators." m/s/c/u

HS-5.2: see above

HS-5.3 (GPU3 HS-5.2): as per subcommittee recommendation

HS-5.3 (a): as per subcommittee recommendation

HS-5.3 (b): change "projects" to "noise receptors." Write a definition for "noise generator."

HS-5.4 (GPU3 HS-5.3): Mitigation Measures: as per subcommittee recommendation

HS-5.5 (GPU3 HS-5.4): Significance thresholds: this section has to do with what noise levels are significant. Ldn is "day-night average level" a-weighted sound level during a 24 hour day, obtained after adding 10 db to the night sound level. CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level. Noise level is measured at the generator's property line. Change "noise-sensitive use" to "receptor."

HS-5.6: (GPU HS-5.5): The county struck 5.5. As per subcommittee recommendation

HS-5.5: Noise Impacts on Surrounding Land Uses: as per subcommittee recommendation

HS-5.6: Roadway Improvement Projects: as per subcommittee recommendation. Leave the box in, with the strikeout.

HS-5.7: Construction-related Noise: strike "shall," insert "may." Otherwise as per subcommittee recommendation.

HS-5.8: Residential Development Near Airports: as per subcommittee recommendation.

The Noise Element is done. Brian Finegan tracked the changes to subcommittee language.

## HS-6: Air Quality

HS-6 Air Quality. This page was e-mailed to RG members, and hard copies were handed out at the meeting. Goal: “to protect and maintain the air quality of Monterey County.” Changes to subcommittee language tracked by Brian Finegan.

HS-6.1: Land Use policies: as per subcommittee recommendation. Insert “air quality related.”

HS-6.2: Roadside Tree Program: Add: “to public road right-of-ways in Community Areas.” Otherwise as per subcommittee recommendation.

HS-6.3: Air Quality Plans: as per subcommittee recommendation

HS-6.4: Best Available Control Technology: move the last phrase to the beginning of the section, so that it would begin with, “To reduce air pollution emissions...” Brian read the sentence aloud and tracked changes.

HS-6.5: Industrial Facilities: move “in concert with the Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District,” to the beginning of the first sentence.

## Narrative for Health and Safety Element

Copies of the subcommittee re-write of the GPU3 narrative section were distributed, entitled, “Chapter VI. Health and Safety Element. The group read through the subcommittee work and approved the work as per subcommittee recommendation. Bob Perkins noted that in other sections, we had included the guiding objectives that pertained to the section in question. Brian Finegan said that GPU3 language says that that this element did not include the guiding objectives, as they do not specifically relate to this section.

## v) Safety

(1) Emergency management and response and man-made hazards: Jay Brown, Christine Kemp and Chris Bunn.

(2) Fire safety: Mike Caplin and Kurt Gollnick.

The group stopped at HS-3.6 (A) last week. This had been referred back to subcommittee last week. There was discussion about defensible space and what the parameters of such a space should be. It was proposed to strike the word “setback” and instead use the phrase “create a defensible zone or space.” Change the word “applicant” to “property owner.” m/s/c/u

HS-3.6 (b): There is already an RG definition for “defensible space.” Take out the words “30 feet” from the definition. Done.

HS-3.6 (c) delete in its entirety.

HS-3.7: The noticing of property owners who live in high fire hazard areas.

Brian: If new development doesn’t meet PS-1 standards, then the county shall require that the owner record such a notice. The exact wording was tracked by Mike Caplin.

HS-3.8: as per subcommittee recommendation

HS-3.9: Fire Prevention Programs: as per subcommittee recommendation

HS-3.10: Access: new access roads shall be constructed according to applicable policies of this plan.

HS-3.11: Defensible space: This policy was compared to HS-3.6 (a). Leave the first sentence, strike the rest.

HS-3.12: Minimum fire protection standards: leave as is in GPU3.  
Brian said that the box above is inaccurate, in that the State is also responsible for protecting natural resources, life, and property.

HS-3.13: Protecting Woodlands: A new section, added by the subcommittee. Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation.

(3) Water hazards: Sheryl McKenzie, Nancy Isakson, Pete Scudder and Brad Sullivan.

(4) Geologic hazards: Aaron Johnson and Bob Perkins.

D) Other items:

E) Update of GPU process:

Brad Sullivan reported on the Tuesday, May 17, 2004 Board of Supervisors' meeting. The staff report set proposed a time frame for moving forward with the plan. There was talk about continuing staff costs. Supervisor Johnsen moved to reject the staff report and asked them to return with alternatives. Her motion mentioned 3 things: (1) staff consider bringing in outside consultant (2) consider a general plan update of the 1982 plan with area plans (3) seek public input to staff for other options.

One proposal would be to use the *model or framework* of the 1982 plan with general policies and area plans to address localized issues. North County could have a plan that works for them, Carmel Valley with their own plan, Big Sur, etc.

F) Update of EIR

G) Coastal and Inland

VI) Agenda building for next meeting:

Public comment: none

Nancy Isakson moved to include a follow up on GPU planning and how we want to proceed with the RG work product. It was agreed that our objective is to complete the 7 mandatory elements

Luann Meador asked for the RG Ag Commission recommendations to be brought forward to be reconsidered.

VII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, May 27, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM At the Monterey County Association of Realtors office, 201-A Calle Del Oaks, Del Rey Oaks