

DRAFT  
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, July 29, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM  
at the former “Leadership Institute”, 2354 Garden Road, Monterey

Those present: Gwen Miller, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Tom Rowley, Brian Finegan, Christopher Bunn Jr., Jay Brown, Mike Caplin, Tom Carvey, Juan Uranga, Nancy Isakson, Christine Kemp, Aaron Johnson, Kurt Gollnick, Shari Damon and Bob Perkins

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)  
Public comment: none
- II) Approval of agenda for July 29, 2004  
Public comment: none  
Add: meeting places for August, added under VI a
- III) Approval of minutes from July 15, 2004 and July 22, 2004  
Minutes of July 15, 2004 have not yet been distributed. Approval of minutes of July 22, 2004 m/s/c.
- IV) Review and complete the final versions of the Circulation, Public Services and Administration elements
  - A) Administration: Aaron Johnson led the group through the handout distributed on July 22, 2004. Christine Kemp tracked changes.
    - i) LUAC’s: Discussion of the role of the LUAC’s. Christine Kemp read a definition that met with approval.
    - ii) Director of Planning and Building Inspection: Strike the word “minor” in two places.
    - iii) Discussion about the Board of Supervisors being the final authority in all land use matters.
    - iv) Discussion of the composition of Planning Commission. Industry representation is needed.
    - v) References to the Big Sur Multi-agency not required in this section. Strike.
    - vi) Strike reference to public resources code.
    - vii) AD-1.3
      - (1) Kurt Gollnick and subcommittee will work on defining the roles of the Planning Commission and the Ag Advisory Committee.
      - (2) Role of permit staff: discussion of the differentiation of roles and responsibilities of County staff in the permit process.
    - viii) AD-2: Amendments to the General Plan
      - (1) Discussion on how often the GP should be amended. Suggestions:
        - (a) 2 year limit on amendments is too long, makes the plan unresponsive.
        - (b) Include language for an annual review of the plan.
        - (c) Include language that the plan should be amended on an as-needed basis.
        - (d) M/s/c to strike AD-2.1 and add a comment. Christine Kemp will bring a suggested comment next week.
      - (2) AD-3: Countywide Funding Program
        - (a) AD-3.1: Five-year Capital Improvement Program: the County has a CIP, but it is not funded. Leave as is in GPU3. Strike 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, leave the rest as is.

- (i) Two different appendices in General Plan:
  - 1. Implementation Plan: the County had no money for implementation.
  - 2. Capital Improvements Plan: this may be workable.
  - 3. Discussion on the level of public participation.
- (b) AD-3.2: Christine and Aaron will work on this section. Since Aaron will be out of town, deferred for 2 weeks.
- (c) AD-3.3: Strike entire policy
- (d) AD-3.4: Setting priorities. Strike entire policy. See 3.1.
- (e) AD-3.5: Inventories of public facilities: as is in GPU3
- (f) AD-3.6: Christine Kemp tracked changes to this section.
- (g) AD-3.7: Christine Kemp tracked changes to this section.
- (h) AD-3.8: Include RG definition of “fair share.” Mike Caplin moved to include “Nexus Requirements” in the title, which had been stricken in GPU3. This section needs to be rewritten in the light of RG “fair share” definition and Government code 66000.
- (i) AD-3.9: Public Participation in Improvement Selection and Financing: Strike “improvement selection and financing” and leave “Public Participation.”
- (j) AD-3.10: Impact on Affordable Housing: Deferred until next week so that Alfred Diaz-Infante can comment on this section.
- (k) AD-3.11: Annual Capital Improvement Reporting: strike
- (l) AD-3.12: Timing of Development: strike. Should be timing of infrastructure.
  - (i) compare with PS-1.2b
- (m) AD-3.13: Operation and Maintenance:
- (n) AD-4: Budget and County Operations: strike entire section
- (o) AD-5: Annual GP reporting: there is nothing in the 1982 plan that requires annual reporting.
- (p) Work ended at AD-5.

V) Reports from sub-committees

A) Finished Elements:

- i) Land Use
- ii) Ag
- iii) ERME: Mike Caplin distributed a handout containing cleaned up versions of several ERME policies, and led the group through a review of them.
  - (1) Heading under part 2 on first page, TOC, goal ER-2 used to read “Open space...” Mike moved to change the title to “Conservation of Natural Resources.” M/s/c
  - (2) On TOC, Maps section indicates deletions.
  - (3) Table on 5-4 indicates deletions
  - (4) Policy ER-1.3: those policies that were deleted are indicated on the chart so that there will be no confusion.
  - (5) Page 5-18: there is narrative under ER-4. M/s/c to remove the narrative.
  - (6) Page 5-25: sentence at end of policy said “common viewing public area means...” this should make reference to the definition in the Definitions section. Strike the sentence beginning, “common public viewing area means...”
  - (7) Capitalize the “d” in “Designated Common Public Viewing Areas” (DCPVA).
  - (8) Page 5-27: before ER-10 there used to be a title called “Open Space or Conservation of Social and Cultural Resources.” Mike moved to strike “Open Space.” m/s/c to approve.
  - (9) Comment on deleted 10.3: change to “would have created...” next comment the same thing.
  - (10) ERME is done. Mike will send the clean version of ERME to Tom Carvey.
- iv) Circulation

- v) Public Service: Nancy Isakson will e-mail the Public Services “Water” section to Tom Carvey.
- vi) Health and Safety Element

B) Elements in process:

- i) Definitions: Nancy Isakson handed out a one page sheet of definitions to be changed or added to the Definitions section. Nancy led the group through these definitions.
  - (1) Designated Common Public Viewing Area (DCPVA): discussion as to whether to leave the first phrase, “a Designated public area such as...” Suggested to not specify the particular areas. Discussion on how to deal with huge viewsheds created from public parks located on high elevations.
    - (a) M/s/c to capitalize “Scenic Highways” to indicate it is a defined term.
    - (b) Both the state and County can officially designate scenic highways. See RG ER 9.14.
    - (c) One alternative: use current Title 21 definition which says that a Common Public Viewing Area (CPVA) is a public area such as public street or public park from which the general public can view an area, etc.
    - (d) Mike read from the RG ER-9.2, which is very specific and describes how visible impacts can be mitigated. Includes artificial berming, etc.
    - (e) Mike: the critical viewshed in Big Sur is off limits to building on the basis that masses of people use the highway. This would be middle ground between (1) the legislative process of designating areas and (2) a list of potential viewing areas. Viewshed protection would then depend on the amount of people using a given area.
    - (f) Juan Uranga moved to use the definition Nancy handed out, but make reference to the number of people that use the area. M/s/c.
  - (2) Public viewshed: m/s/c as per subcommittee recommendation.
  - (3) Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC): Add “to” before “advise” in the 3<sup>rd</sup> line down. Otherwise, as per subcommittee recommendation.
  - (4) Noise Generator: As per subcommittee recommendation.
  - (5) Noise Receptor: As per subcommittee recommendation.
  - (6) Viable: As per subcommittee recommendation.
  - (7) Gwen Miller said that we need a definition for “native and non-native trees.”
  - (8) Mike Caplin will bring definitions for shoreline access, maritime chaparral, and non-native species. Defensible space needs a definition.
  - (9) Nancy will send the Definitions section to Tom Carvey and the typist.
  - (10) Mike Caplin distributed a handout containing a detailed definition of Maritime Chaparral.
    - (a) The definition should allow a land owner to know where the maritime chaparral is located on his or her property.
    - (b) M/s/c to use the third paragraph on page 1 of Mike’s handout, beginning, “forms of wooly leaf manzanita....”

C) 1982 General Plan Organization Subcommittee Work

D) Report on word processing and final clean version of RG work

Elements still needing to be cleaned up in final form: definitions, administration, coastal, and housing.

Alfred Diaz-Infante reported that the Housing subcommittee has been meeting and has another meeting scheduled for Monday. They’re focusing on policies only. Discussion about whether or not to include narrative. The County, of course, has already adopted this element. The 100% Affordable Housing Overlay that was previously approved by the RG

early on will be included. For agenda for next week, highlight Housing and Coastal, and probably Administration.

- E) Other items:
  - i) Update of GPU process
  - ii) Prioritization of goals
  
- VI) Agenda building for next meeting:
  - A) Discussion of meeting places for August:
    - i) Aug 5 and 12 at SVBE; Aug 12 and 28 at MCAR.
  - B) For agenda for next week, highlight Housing and Coastal, and probably Administration.
  - C) Press release when RG releases its final documents
  - D) The Landwatch GPU meetings will begin on August 21, 2004.
  - E) As for final RG work, the final cleaned up versions will be e-mailed to the various subcommittees for proofreading.
  
- VII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, August 5, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM, at the Salinas Valley Builders' Exchange, 590-A Brunken Ave., Salinas.