

DRAFT  
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, June 24, 2004  
12:00 – 5:00 PM  
at the former Leadership Institute  
2354 Garden Road, Monterey

Those present: Juan Uranga, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Tom Rowley, Chris Steinbruner, Brian Finegan, Tom Carvey, Sig Christierson, Jay Brown, Nancy Isakson, Luann Meador, Mike Caplin, Sheryl McKenzie, Aaron Johnson, Chris Bunn, Ralph Riva and Pete Scudder

Visitors: Christopher Bunn, Jr.

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)  
Public comment: none  
Meeting called to order at 12:22 PM
- II) Approval of agenda for June 24, 2004  
Public comment: none  
No changes. Approved as emailed m/s/c
- III) Approval of minutes from June 17, 2004  
Public comment: none  
No changes. Approved as emailed m/s/c
- IV) Health and Safety Element
  - A) Geologic Hazards  
Aaron Johnson distributed a handout of the changes in the Geologic Hazards section from last week's meeting. The hazards identification sequence has been re-organized, so that 4.6 had been moved up to 4.4. The sequence is: (1) to identify geologic hazards through the County-adopted maps such as HS-3.6 (2) Relate these identifications to policy HS-4.3. Discussion about relevance of the County maps, which haven't been adopted by the State of California. Use the wording, "State maps deemed to be County maps."

The affirmative duty of identification is the County's. County personnel would look on the County maps, and if they see that a project lies in a hazard zone, then 4.4 indicates that in a hazard zone, a geotechnical study required. For CEQA purposes, this would initiate mitigation measures. This also gives the applicant the opportunity to show that the project is not in a hazard zone.

A new policy, HS-4.5 has been inserted having to do with high hazard areas along faults.

Delete GPU3 section HS-4.6; delete GPU3 HS-4.7.

HS-4.1: to carry out the County's statutory obligation to identify hazard areas. Discussion of whether it would be appropriate to have a geologic study at this point.

HS-4.2: GIS system as illustrated on following maps. Discussion of 1982 plan and GPU3 maps. The 1982 plan shows areas of high hazard, while the GPU3 shows both moderate and high hazard areas. These areas appear to be very similar on the corresponding maps.

Suggestion that the County should have a public hearing to adopt the state-approved maps. By general plan requirements, the County must have these maps in the general plan, showing earthquake fault zones, liquefaction, and landslide susceptibility.

Discussion about the 4 maps that have to do with earthquakes and their specific relevance to a particular project. It appears that any project would be subject to identification on all 4 maps. The 1982 plan has maps for Landslide and erosion index (c.f. GPU3's HS-5), seismic index, showing active, potentially active faults (c.f. GPU3's HS-3); potential seismic hazards (Tsunami, recent alluvium, unstable deposits).

The criteria in the 1982 plan are very clear, while the GPU3 criteria are vague.

Tom Rowley said that JCP is a company that identifies the seismic hazard for new properties for a cost of about \$60.00. This is a requirement for real estate sales.

Aaron Johnson spoke to the state geologist who said that the state's mapping project will encompass Monterey County in about 4 years.

Requirements for general plan maps are (1) fault zones (2) hazards (ground shaking, liquefaction, landslide).

Suggestion to de-couple the maps from the plan language. Motion failed.

County shall adopt maps to identify areas particularly susceptible to seismic hazards:

- Relatively high ground shaking
- Relatively high liquefaction
- Relatively high landslide danger

The policy from 1982 plan was read aloud, which makes reference to the County's 1975 Seismic Safety Plan. Motion to include this language in HS-4.3 failed. Insert in a separate policy called "County Geologic Hazard Zones". See 1982 plan, 15.1.1 m/s/c

The RG comment following HS-4.2S: Change "identified above" to "used in GPU3". m/s/c with this change.

HS-4.3: As per subcommittee recommendation, but strike reference to GPU3 maps. m/s/c

HS-4.4: in areas of identified high County or State geologic hazard zones, as identified on the Geologic Hazard maps GIS maps (Maps HS 3 through HS 6), as amended from time to time, site-specific geologic hazard....etc. m/s/c

Comment under 4.4 belongs under 4.6

HS-4.5: First paragraph: Use same language for identification as in HS-4.4. (identified high County or State geologic hazard zones, as identified on the Geologic Hazard maps....etc.). m/s/c. Delete bullets because of the new policy we put in.

HS-4.6: New section. Use identification sentence (identified high County or State geologic hazard zones, as identified on the Geologic Hazard maps), Motion to leave the word “habitable” failed. Insert the comment under the deleted HS-4.6

HS-4.7: delete as per subcommittee recommendation. Include comment.

New HS-4.7: As per subcommittee recommendation.

HS-4.8: As per subcommittee recommendation. Add that County will provide an index of the reports on file. Being subject to peer review helps to ensure that the reports will not be biased. Moved to add, “ The County shall maintain an index of reports, by location, which shall be available to applicants.” m/s/c

HS-4.9: Naturally-occurring asbestos: Strike reference to maps. Delete “if serpentinite or ultramafic rock is identified” at end of last sentence. m/s/c/

HS-4.10: Demonstration of Compliance: change “possible” to “feasible” in line 5.

V) Definitions section

Nancy Isakson distributed a definitions section beginning with the letter “U” and another section of the “R” definitions.

Nancy led the discussion on the “R” section.

**R**

**Rapid bus service:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Rare, ~~threatened or endangered~~ species:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Real-cost pricing:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Recycled/Reclaimed water:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Redevelopment project area:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Regional housing needs plan/share:** change “and” to “or” and “need” to “needs.”

**Remodeling of existing structure:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Replacement of structures:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Response time:** as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Rezoning:** strike “rezoning means”. Otherwise as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Ridgeline development:** Include the language “That would create a silhouette against the sky.” This was compared with RG ERME 9.5. Moved to remove “other potential impact.” m/s/c

**Right-of-way:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Right-to-farm notice:** As per subcommittee recommendation. There is currently a county right-to-farm ordinance, but no notice is required. Discussion about whether the “right-to-farm” language should appear on deeds. If it only exists on the deed it may be forgotten. Change “aims to make aware” to “inform.”

**Right-to-farm ordinance:** As per subcommittee recommendation.  
The “R” section is complete.

U, beginning with “use, legal non-conforming”

**Use, legal non-conforming:** strike first 4 words. Otherwise, as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Use permit:** strike “A use permit is” As per subcommittee recommendation.

V

**Vehicle miles traveled (VMT):** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Vertical access:** delete as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Viable:** The definition presented by the subcommittee was taken from the 1982 plan. There was discussion over the lack of financial/economic sustainability wording in the definition. Referred to subcommittee until next week.

**Visitor farm:** under “f,” insert “emphasizing products grown within....”

Under “a,” add displays, and other educational activities”

B no change

C no change

D no change

E overnight farm stays on-site.

**Visitor-serving facility:** insert “primarily” otherwise as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Visual access:** not used in GPU3; strike as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Volume to capacity ratio:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

W

**Walkable community:** not used in RG work. Strike.

**Wastewater:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Water associations:** not used in GPU3; strike as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Water credits:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Water management agencies:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Water purveyor:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Water quality:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Water rights:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Water service:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Water supply:** As per subcommittee recommendation. Discussion about including “domestic water supply.”

**Water transfer:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Water wait list:** As per subcommittee recommendation. Add apostrophe in “County’s allocation” in 6<sup>th</sup> line.

**Watershed:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Well:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Wetlands:** As per subcommittee recommendation. Discussion about the breadth of the definition. Mike Caplin read a very specific definition of wetlands from the California Fish and Game Commission. Mike will bring a complete definition next week.

**Wildfire:** not used in GPU3; strike as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Wildland areas:** not used in GPU3; strike as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Williamson Act:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Winery:** Accept the language without the subcommittee's strikeouts and underlines; otherwise as per subcommittee recommendation. Language compared with the definitions from the language used in the RG winery corridors.

**Winery, artisan:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Winery, full-scale:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Winery, adjunct uses:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Winery corridors:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

**Winery tasting facility:** Close quotes after "on or off winery premise"; otherwise as per subcommittee recommendation.

## **Z**

**Zero lot line:** not used in GPU3; strike as per subcommittee recommendation.

**Zoning districts:** As per subcommittee recommendation.

## VI) Reports from sub-committees

### A) Finished Elements:

- i) Land Use
- ii) Ag
- iii) ERME
- iv) Circulation
- v) Public Service

### B) Elements in process:

- i) Definitions
- ii) Health and Safety

### C) 1982 General Plan Organization Subcommittee Work

The Supervisors made it clear that they want an update of the 1982 plan. The orientation of the RG work with the 1982 plan is therefore important.

Jay handed out a chart to be used for correlating the RG work with the 1982 plan. This chart will be used by each subcommittee to correlate their work. In going from policies to ordinances, it is necessary to fit the policies to the goals. There are crossover policies from element to element. For example, the some issues are both in ERME and AG issues.

Title 21 is the main document concerning ordinances, but there are others, such as Title 12, Title 15, etc. See the County Planning and Building Department for the other ordinances. Grading, zoning, area plans, housing, and the new Housing Element are also there. Not all the county codes are posted. Genee Terada at the

County may be available to help in obtaining documents. Her phone is 755-5352; e-mail address [teradag@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:teradag@co.monterey.ca.us).

Jay will e-mail comparison chart to RG members.

Brian Finegan will e-mail a description of what the various "Titles" cover. There is a possibility of overlap with a number of the issues. These will have to be covered in a whole group so that all members can participate.

Several RG subcommittees are not on the list, such as city/county agreements and 100% affordable housing overlay.

D) Other items:

- i) Update of GPU process

VII) Agenda building for next meeting:

- Luann Meador suggested that Debbie Hale from TAMC come to an RG meeting and present the new TAMC program. Decision to invite Debbie to bring the presentation at 4:00 PM at a future meeting.
- Finish the definitions section
- Receive final mark up of geologic hazards
- Subcommittees should begin working on the comparison chart

VIII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, July 1, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM, at the Salinas Valley Builders' Exchange, 590-A Brunken Ave., Salinas