

DRAFT
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, June 9, 2005, from 12:00 to 4:00 p.m.

at Carpenters' Local 605

751 Neeson Road, Marina

Those present:

- | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1) Pete Scudder, | 5) Ron Chesshire, | 10) Tom Carvey, |
| 2) Tom Rowley, | 6) Chris Steinbruner, | 11) Christopher Bunn Jr., |
| 3) Mike Caplin, | 7) Alfred Diaz-Infante, | 12) John Bridges, |
| 4) Tina Trujillo, | 8) Nancy Isakson, | |
| | 9) Brian Finegan, | |

Visitors: Michael Standaert

- I. Public comment period (for items not on the agenda)
Public comment: none
- II. Approval of agenda for June 9, 2005
Public comment: none
Change IV to "Housing and Economic Element"
Add "Coastal" to VI.
Approved with the above changes.
- III. Approval of minutes of May 19, 26 and June 2, 2005
Public comment: none
The minutes were unavailable.
- IV. Economic Element (changed to Housing and Economic Element)
Public comment: none
B. Finegan distributed copies of a comparison between the RG plan and the staff report.
Discussion on #7, 8 and 9 on the staff report.
#7 Accepted as stated.
#8: Concurrency: the staff report says that the RG plan does not address concurrency.
Discussion over the RG definition of concurrency. M. Caplin said that our definition required construction of infrastructure prior to certificate of occupancy, rather than before construction. R. Chessire said that housing projects are often phased and this affects the way the language reads. He said there should be an incremental build up of the infrastructure. N. Isakson said that RG PS-1.7 answers this question. RG policies are based on the RG definition of concurrency, but the staff hasn't yet defined concurrency. The Community Plan (CP) definition says, "when the impact occurs," which also makes sense. Definitions will come up on July 7, 2005.
#9: Discussion about secondary units and describing the full range thereof. The staff report has defined where secondary units can go: CA's and Specific Plans.

B. Finegan will take our comments, go back and rework the handout, and will e-mail the results to the RG members.

Economic Element:

C. Steinbruner said that the subcommittee met with Claude Hoover from the Agricultural Cluster group.

T. Rowley suggested naming the key issues and responding to them. This would eliminate the underlines, etc. The Preferred Project Policy (PPP) would be added. This would be simpler than rewriting what the OEDC has done.

B. Finegan: the subcommittee has already rewritten this in RG style.

N. Isakson said that the RG is doing 2 things: (1) commenting on the OEDC element and (2) recommending that they specifically adopt the PPP policy. We could format a response similar to the Housing staff recommendation, or recommend that they adopt the PPP and its job training policy.

M. Caplin suggested an executive summary setting forth the broad policy recommendations.

C. Steinbruner will prepare a sheet similar to the RG response to the staff report on the Housing Element, saying that this is a policy presented to the RG by the Building Trades Council, and that we support it.

R. Chesshire: under ED-3.1 (5) “scope of” doesn’t belong there. Not “consider” the effect, but “analyze” the effect.

The June 16, 2005 meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m. and last all day. They will finish Housing and then go the Economic Element.

Staff recommendation #2:

Implementation of the general plan provides special treatment.
RG plan has similar policies in AHO. RG LU-10.1, the AHO, has similar elements. M. Caplin suggested inserting the PPP policy in here. Special handling, not special treatment areas, which is entirely another subject. We support special handling, but should be as in RG LU-10.1(e).

#3: surcharge for tickets

Discussion of ticket surcharge. SCRAMP already pays for the wear and tear. Nothing in the policy says how this money would be used. It would apparently go into the general fund without a vote of the people.

#4: employer contribution to affordable housing

OEDC is against this, saying that it will drive business out of the area. N. Isakson: OEDC’s comments are good. Conclusion: support OEDC comments.

#5: Living wage

Discussion of the staff report. The OEDC comments are good. Similar to CP #2, which requires a living wage for developments (not on-going businesses) where county funds are expended. N. Isakson’s proposal: support the SVCC and OEDC’s comments.

#6: Big box

The staff report proposal was read aloud. Agreement that this kind of discussion doesn't belong in the GPU. Each community should decide for themselves what is best for their community.

Agreed-upon language: (1) Could sweep in a lot of businesses that have potential benefit to the community, (2) it is inappropriate to have a county-wide prohibition in a general plan (3) should be considered on a case by case basis.

- V. Promotion of RG work
Public comment: none
Joint RG panel discussion and breakfast June 22nd at MCAR. 8:00 a.m. with both Builders' Exchanges.
- VI. Preparation for Board hearings
Public comment: none
Admin, definitions and water on June 20th. No staff report yet. No RG meeting next week, so we won't have a chance to respond. Coastal may not come up on the 20th. Coastal will cover all the County coastal zones: North County, Big Sur, etc.: all the areas over which the Coastal Commission has jurisdiction.
- VII. Other business
No RG meeting next week, due to BOS study session. Coastal may be bumped by Definitions and Water.
- VIII. Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, June 16, 2005, 12:00 to 4:00 p.m., location TBA