

DRAFT
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, August 19, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM
at the Salinas Valley Builders' Exchange, 590-A Brunken Ave., Salinas

Those present: Nancy Isakson, Beverly Meamber, Brian Finegan, Tom Carvey, Rick Smith, Pete Scudder, Bob Perkins, Brian Finegan, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Tom Rowley, Juan Uranga, Mike Caplin, Jay Brown, Christine Kemp, Jim Bogart, Chris Bunn and Ralph Riva

Visitors: Larry Parsons, Christopher Bunn Jr.,

I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)
Public comment: none

II) Approval of agenda for August 19, 2004
Add: Web site cost: add under VIII c
Frequency of meetings under IX "future meeting schedule"

III) Approval of minutes from August 12, 2004
Approved as corrected: change spelling of Nancy McCullough

Brian Finegan read an invitation to the "Protect Housing, Farmland, Air and Water" meeting of August 21, 2004. Mike Caplin said that most of the signers on the invitation were in the original RG and that invitations have been extended to them to continue with the RG.

IV) Housing Element
Extra copies of the Housing Element were distributed by Alfred Diaz-Infante. Alfred also distributed a handout with a brief paragraph on H-1.4. Juan Uranga suggested putting the 2nd paragraph 1st. CCA feels that having to design affordable housing to conform with the existing neighborhood would give another reason not to build housing. Juan said that the design review process has been used to prevent the building of affordable housing to so an extent that the state legislature passed a law against doing this. m/s/c to move 2nd paragraph to top.

H-4.2: The title was changed last week to "diversification and affordability within Community Areas's (CA's)." Discussion about existing and new CA's.

County shall encourage densities and diverse housing types that will facilitate a mix of housing prices. Strike next sentence. Next sentence: strike "new," strike "Rancho San Juan and FORA."

H-4.1 Discussion of relationship to city/county agreements and whether the incorporation of those policies will direct all affordable housing to the CA's. Juan Uranga expressed the concerns that if housing adjacent to valley cities, it shouldn't just be the county that dictates to the cities, and that county should not site all the housing in the Salinas Valley and not direct housing to the Monterey Peninsula.

Bob Perkins suggested that the element should not include cross-references to GPU3. Better to insert the wording from H-8.1 at the end of H-4.2. Juan said that the city/county

relationship is very important and should be reflected in both sections. Nancy Isakson said that although Bob doesn't like the cross references, we could include the reference *and* the language. Mike Caplin suggested alleviating the problem by changing the titles so the reader knows what this relates to. Alfred moved to include the cross referencing. Jay Brown 2nd. Discussion about making the distinction between new and existing CA's and the excluding a single-family home on a legal lot of record. Nancy read the adopted language:

“this policy shall not apply to the first single-family residential dwelling and any allowed structure pursuant to policy LU-9.1 on an existing lot of record.” Use this language in both policies. m/s/c.

Discussion about relevance to subdivisions. A minor subdivision would be subject to the diversification and affordability policies. Leave 4.3 as proposed.

H-4.4 Inclusionary housing: leave as is in GPU3

H-4.5 Density bonus: the subcommittee added the double underlines. There was discussion about density bonuses and the current practice of obtaining them. There was agreement that base densities shouldn't be reduced, and that bonuses should be specified, using the state density rates. Agreement that the density bonus is supposed to be an incentive for builders. Add the following language at the end, after “d.”

“In implementing the density bonus, the county shall not reduce the base density below the zoning in effect at the time the application is submitted. The density bonus shall be 25% of the base density.” m/s/c.

Tom Rowley pointed out that the title says “ordinance.” M/s/c to strike the word “ordinance.” Discussion about titling the section “incentives for affordable housing.” M/s/c to change the title to “Density bonus incentives.”

H-4.6: Add the word “loan,” to read “grants and loans.” Strike “those working within the unincorporated area.” Otherwise as per subcommittee recommendation. Strike the text box.

Reference to H-9.1 in H-4.1 The language from 9.1 will appear in 4.7.

H-4.8: as is in GPU3. Change the last sentence to move “as feasible” to the middle of the sentence, to read, “maximum feasible amount of affordable housing.”

H-4.9: Strike

H-4.10: Clarify that the reference is to “market-rate housing.”

Goal H-5: As per subcommittee recommendation. Discussion about the form of “support.” Does this ask employers to produce housing, or is the County providing the funding? What is the implied subject of the sentence? Alfred: County should not mandate employers to provide housing, but should support those who voluntarily provide housing. Juan suggested language and changed were tracked by Alfred Diaz-Infante. m/s/c

H-5.1: Discussion over the definition of workforce housing.

H-5.2: added “and affordability of workforce housing.”

H-5.3: As per subcommittee recommendation.

H-5.4: leave as is in GPU3

Goal H-6: strike the nebulous concept about jobs/housing balance. Clarify that “housing allocation” relates to the state regional allocation, not something imposed by the County.” Discussion of how AMBAG allocation is derived. “Achieve the County’s state-mandated regional allocation.” Move to remove the entire section failed. Discussion of the relevance of the section: a problem area could be that if jobs are not forthcoming in South County, the result would be a housing freeze in that area. In other words, “if the jobs aren’t there, you can’t build housing.” Another point of view is that the policy is an affirmation that the county will, in fact, build housing. After much discussion, m/s/c to use the subcommittee language, but add, “to achieve the County’s state-mandated responsibility”

6.1 As per subcommittee recommendation.

6.2 As per subcommittee recommendation.

6.3 As per subcommittee recommendation.

H-7: As per subcommittee recommendation.

Goal H-8: As per subcommittee recommendation, but add current and future jobs. m/s/c

H-8.1: the county shall ~~explore~~ collaborate with the cities.

V) Administration Element: Christine Kemp distributed hard copies of the Administration Element.

Discussion about Kurt Gollnick’s handout last week, having to do with the Planning Commission (PC) composition and an Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC). Last week’s work ended at Goal AD-8 GIS.

AD-1.1: already completed

AD-1.2: definition needs revision. Nancy Isakson read the definition of PC from the definitions section. The PC is one of the appeal boards for land use decisions. All decision of the PC are appealable to the BOS.

In 1.2 d, discussion of the role of the Zoning Administrator/Hearing Officer (ZA). m/s/c to delete the definition of Hearing Officer in the Definitions section. The ZA approves permits, but shouldn’t also be the appeal person. m/s/c to add the language, “Decisions of the ZA shall be appealed to the BOS.”

New: minor subdivision committee: As per subcommittee recommendation, but add “shall be appealed to BOS.”

e) director of planning and building inspection department: strike “minor.”

f) land use advisory committee;

g) Big Sur Multi-agency Advisory Council: was created by County resolution to resolve conflicts and public review of agency projects in the Big Sur area.

AD-3.8: change “cost” to “fee” in the last sentence.

Add “AD-7.10.”

AD-8: Geographic Information Systems: As per subcommittee recommendation.
AD-8.3: Add that the maps should be made available to the public on the website at no charge.
Goal AD-9: Reduce Administrative costs and improve the planning and delivery County services by centralizing governance for similar County services or by coordinating service provision.
AD-9.1 “The county shall explore consolidation of County agencies that provide fire protection, waste water, when consolidation will improve County efficiency and quality and lower the cost of service where feasible and appropriate.”
AD-9.2: Master Plans: the county shall encourage other County agencies to develop....
Move to strike. m/s/c to strike.
Goal AD-10.1: Implementation Program: add, “Within a a reasonable time after the adoption of the General Plan, the County shall adopt an Implementation Program...” leave the remainder of the sentence, strike the last sentence and the text box.
AD-10.2: strike in its entirety.

Discussion about adding language that would hold the county and county employees accountable for their actions. Discussion of language from the State Civil Service Act.

AD-10: Implementation Program: Ensure clear understanding of the tasks, roles and schedules that are needed to achieve General Plan Guiding Objectives. Mike Caplin will bring language next week that will address this area.

VI) 1982 Plan Coordination

Tom Carvey e-mailed the 1982 plan policies and a matrix from Jay Brown to all RG members last week. Every subcommittee now has the 2 tools that they need to do the 1982 plan review. Jay gave a demonstration of how this should be done. Jay has already assigned all the policies to the various subcommittees, as in the e-mailed matrix.

RG members should have an electronic version of the 1982 plan, Brian’s policy extractions, and Jay’s matrix. The subcommittees should work among themselves on-line using these documents. Jay explained the use of the 56 page matrix. The subcommittees need use only that section that pertains to their subcommittee. Jay distributed hard copies of the matrix separated by subcommittee. Using the 2nd page of the matrix, Jay demonstrated how to complete the chart.

The subcommittees should be working on these, and bring them back as they are finished.

VII) Cover Letter for Transmittal of RG work

Discussion about the letter. Footnote added on page 2. Move next to last paragraph up. Include Coastal element. Tom Carvey will sign the letter as the secretary to the RG. Include the number of employees and members of organizations in the membership chart.

VIII) Reports from sub-committees

A) Status of Finished Elements: Each subcommittee reviewed the table below.

Ag element: Tom Carvey e-mailed a sequence of events in the status of the Ag element to members of the Ag subcommittee. General agreement that the typist’s version is correct. But the Administration Element’s discussion about the PC may impact the Ag Element. General agreement that with the exception of the AAC and PC, Ag is done.

ERME: This has not yet been read and approved by the subcommittee.

Public Service: Luann Meador has the subcommittee notes and should do the final proofing of the element.

Health and Safety: Nancy Isakson handed in the Water Hazards today, with the subcommittee's final markups.

Discussion about the chart in the agenda. The correct sequence of events should be: (1) Final approval; (2) finished by typist; (3) final approval by RG, (4) "Final-final."

Bob Perkins will proofread Geologic Hazards, Brian Finegan said that the Noise section is done. Mike Caplin will do Fire, Tom will notify Aaron do proofread Air Quality,

Chart as in agenda:

Name of Element	Finished by typist	Distributed to RG Subcom for Proofing	Final Approval by RG	Final-Final approval
Land Use	Yes	Yes	No/Yes	No/Yes
Ag	Yes	Yes	No	No
ERME	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Circulation	Yes	Yes	No/Yes	No
Public Service	Yes	Yes	No/Yes	No/Yes
Health and Safety	Yes	Yes	No	No
Definitions	Yes	Yes	Yes	No/1/2 yes
Administration	No	No	No	No
Coastal	No	No	No	No
Housing	No	No	Yes	No

Chart as amended during the meeting:

Name of Element	Final Approval by RG	Finished by typist	Distributed to RG Subcom for Proofing	Final-Final approval
Land Use	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ag	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
ERME	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Circulation	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Public Service	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health and Safety	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Definitions	Yes	Yes	Yes	½ Yes
Administration	No	No	No	No
Coastal	No	No	No	No
Housing	Yes	No	No	No

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

C) Other items:

- i) Update of GPU process
- ii) Prioritization of goals

IX) Agenda building for next meeting
Finish up PS and HS next week.

X) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, August 26, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM at the Monterey
County Association of Realtors' offices, 201-A Calle Del Oaks, Del Rey Oaks