

DRAFT
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, September 16, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM
at the Salinas Chamber of Commerce, 119 E. Alisal St., Salinas

Those present: Gwen Miller, Bob Perkins, Rick Smith, Mike Caplin, Christine Kemp, Nancy Isakson, Norm Kolpin, Tom Carvey, Jay Brown, Chris Steinbruner, Shari Damon

Visitors: Scott Hennessy

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

- II) Approval of agenda for September 16, 2004
Public comment: none
Introductions were made
Additions to the agenda:
 - 1. Status of finished RG work added as IV.A.1.
 - 2. Update from Scott Hennessy on the status of the County’s work added as IV.A.2.
 - 3. Update on the “Community GPU” meetings: added after approval of minutes as III.A

- III) Approval of minutes of August 26, 2004, September 2, 2004 and September 9, 2004
Public comment: none
Minutes approved as e-mailed and posted to web site.
 - A. Rick Smith attended the meeting, held at All Saints. The theme of the meeting was Land Use and Housing. There was a presentation by Terry Watts to the entire group, and they then broke up into smaller groups to discuss prepared matrices of land use and housing issues. One part of the discussion had to do with limiting the size of houses that can be built, with the suggestion that the LUAC’s would develop criteria for the appropriate house size for their area.

- IV) Reports from sub-committees
Public comment: none

A) Status of Finished Elements:

Name of Element	Final Approval by RG	Finished by typist	Distributed to RG Subcom for Proofing	Final-Final approval	Executive Summary
Land Use	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Done
Ag	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Done
ERME	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Done
Circulation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Done
Public Service	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Done
Health and Safety	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Done
Definitions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Done
Administration	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Done

Coastal	No	No	No	No	Not done
Housing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Done

Coastal is not done, but is not a required element.

1. Added to agenda:

Word processing of RG work:

The typist has completed work on all the elements and executive summaries. Discussion about how many hard copies to make of the finished work. Decided to make 35 complete sets of hard copies, to be distributed as follows: 18 for RG members, 5 to Supervisors, 5 to Planning Dept. staff, 5 for County Dept. heads, 2 for County legal staff. CD-ROMS will also be prepared of the complete set of RG work, to be delivered along with the hard copies.

Decided to send each of the Monterey County mayors a set of executive summaries and a CD-ROM of the RG work. Nancy Isakson will write a cover letter for the mayors' packets to be brought before the group next week for discussion.

Mike Caplin suggested that we combine all the various elements into one .pdf file to facilitate computer word searches.

2. Added to agenda:

Update from Scott Hennessy on County staff's work.

Scott Hennessy said that County staff is working on the 1982 plan.

Scott said that the County is dealing with the following important issues: Slope, ridgeline development, native vegetation, minimum parcel size, water supply, erosion and water quality, circulation, concurrency of infrastructure, ag land classification (including whether we need an ag element), housing and financing of infrastructure.

Scott said that in the last RG meeting he attended, there was a discussion about the 12 Guiding Objectives. It was agreed to include this item in next week's agenda. Scott said that to be fair, everyone will have a chance to present their issues.

B) Other items:

V) 1982 Plan Analysis (Chapter 1):

See minutes on the following matrix pages (pages 4-7 of this document). Bold print indicates the language that decided upon by the group.

Discussion over the fact that some "objectives" do not have "policies." The group's original intent had been to not cover the objectives. Decided to cover only those objectives that don't have policies. Jay Brown will add these objectives to the current matrix.

VI) Agenda building for next meeting

To add

1. Prepare discussion points about 12 Guiding Objectives
2. Discuss preparation for the BOS meeting in October.

VII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, September 23, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM at the Monterey County Herald, 8 Upper Ragsdale, Monterey

1982 General Plan – Chapter 1 Natural Resources 9/02/04

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
<i>1 GOAL TO RETAIN THE CHARACTER AND NATURAL BEAUTY OF MONTEREY</i>	1.1.1 Open space land use designations shall be used, as needed for compliance with the goals, objectives, and policies of this Plan.	"O" districts under title 21. Zoning. Scenic easements. Scenic easements are used to enforce 30% slopes, etc. Discussion of "O" districts. Located the "O" districts on the 1982 map, update dated 1999.	Has not worked. Open space is not listed in the 1982 plan. There is no "open space" text in the 1982 plan in the Land Use section, nor in the maps.	There are currently no policies. Discussion of whether or not this policy is needed. There is confusion of "open space" designation with scenic easements, Williamson Acts. Open space can be achieved through other means: Williamson Act, scenic easements.	Open Space
Notes, 9/9/04 Required 7 Elements: Land use Circulation Housing Conservation Open space Noise Safety	1.1.2 Open space land use designations shall be used as needed to preserve the physical and natural features contributing to the County's outstanding natural beauty.	Same comments as above.	Same comments as above.	Same comments as above.	Same comments as above.

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	1.1.3 Landowners shall be encouraged voluntarily to restrict the development potential of property through grants of conservation easements, Williamson Act contracts, or other appropriate protections in areas designated for open space uses such as agriculture and resource conservation.	Currently, this is not a voluntary process; scenic and conservation easements are required as conditions of approval.	It has worked, but has not been voluntary.	Reinforce the voluntary nature of the policy.	Open Space

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
<i>2 GOAL TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONSERVATION, UTILIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTY'S MINERAL RESOURCES IN KEEPING WITH SOUND CONSERVATION PRACTICES AND TECHNIQUES</i>	2.1.1 The County shall work in conjunction with the State Division of Mines and Geology to inventory lands containing valuable mineral deposits and identify on- and off-site land uses that would be incompatible with mineral extraction activities.	Discussion began here on 9-16-04. Questions: 1. Does the County currently work with the State Division of Mines and Geology? 2. Has the County identified on- and off-site land uses that would be incompatible with mineral extraction activities?	Current practice is working.	Modify the policy to be consistent with current practice to the extent permissible by state law. Mike moved to use the same answers for 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 and 2.2.1. m/s/c to do so.	Land Use, Conservation element.
Notes: Bold print indicates the language that decided upon by the group.	2.1.2 The County shall designate land use categories which will protect potentially significant mineral deposits from land uses which would permanently preclude mineral extraction.	Shows up on 1982 map of land use. Current land use zonings were reviewed. (e.g. mineral extraction is an allowed use under industrial zoning). M/s/c to use the language: The County has designated mineral extraction areas on the 1982 General Plan map and allows mineral extraction in various zoning designations.	Current practice has worked as implemented, but would not work if literally applied.	Modify the policy to be consistent with current practice to the extent permissible by state law.	Land Use, Conservation.

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	2.2.1 Existing mining operations shall be inventoried and off-site incompatible land uses identified.	<p>This is an inventory of existing mining operations.</p> <p>Same language as 2.1.2 for each column.</p> <p>M/s/c to use the language: The County has designated mineral extraction areas on the 1982 General Plan map and allows mineral extraction in various zoning designations.</p>	Current practice has worked as implemented, but would not work if literally applied.	Modify the policy to be consistent with current practice to the extent permissible by state law.	Land Use, Conservation.
	2.2.2 The County shall designate land use categories which will protect existing mining operations from incompatible land uses.	<p>M/s/c to use the language: The County has designated mineral extraction areas on the 1982 General Plan map and allows mineral extraction in various zoning designations.</p>	Current practice has worked as implemented, but would not work if literally applied.	<p>The County shall develop a buffer policy addressing the above 5 points below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purpose: protect existing use 2. New use provides buffer 3. New use maintains buffer 4. Terminate when no longer needed 5. Include a broad category of specifics and minimum requirements to avoid conflict of uses. <p>Also see RG AG-1.4</p>	Land use, conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	2.3.1 A mining and reclamation plan shall be required for all proposed mineral extraction operations.	The policy states the current practice.	Has worked	No change necessary	Land Use, Conservation
	2.3.2 Mining operators shall be required to furnish the County with all information needed to make an environmental assessment of the proposed mineral extraction operation.	The policy states the current practice.	Has worked	No change necessary	Land use, conservation
<i>3 GOAL TO PROMOTE THE CONSERVATION OF SOILS AS A VALUABLE NATURAL RESOURCE.</i>	3.1.1 Erosion control procedures shall be established and enforced for all private and public construction and grading projects.	The policy states the current practice.	Has worked.	No change necessary	Conversation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	3.1.2 The County shall support and encourage existing special district, state, and federal soil conservation and restoration programs within its borders.	County currently coordinates and cooperates with various agencies.	Not needed	Discussion: Nancy Isakson said that RG policy has been that where there is existing state and federal law, the County should not create new regulations. Since there is existing law, the County should not create more. Delete the policy because this is already covered by state and federal law.	Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	3.1.3 In the absence of more detailed site specific studies, determinations of soil suitability for particular land uses shall be made according to the Soil Conservation Service's Soil Survey of Monterey County.	The policy states the current practice.	Has worked	Update the reference to the Soil Conservation Service's Survey to a more accurate survey if one exists.	Conservation
	3.2.1 A slope map shall be produced to identify areas in the County where slope poses severe constraints for particular land uses.	County has prepared maps to exclude development on slopes exceeding 25/30%.	Has not worked as applied; would work if implemented as written.	This policy should focus on preventing erosion and not limiting land use. Policy should be rewritten to read: 3.2.1 A slope map shall be produced to identify areas in the County where slope poses risk of severe soil erosion.	Conservation
	3.2.2 Lands having a prevailing slope above 30% shall require adequate special erosion control and construction techniques.	With rare exceptions Current practice is to preclude development and require conservation easements on land over 25/30%.	Has not worked as applied, but would work if implemented as written.	Implement the policy as written. Allow development on slopes over 30% as stated in the policy.	Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	3.2.3 Lands having a high erosion potential as identified in the Soil Survey shall require adequate erosion control methods for agricultural uses.	<p>In part, current practice has been implemented through Title 21.</p> <p>Agreed to revisit this policy again next week.</p>	Current policy has not been uniformly applied or enforced.	<p>For new uses, lands identified as having a high erosion potential as identified in the soil survey shall require erosion control methods for new or expanded uses. The soil survey map should be updated.</p> <p>Change this policy to read “for new or expanded ag uses.”</p> <p>Existing ag erosion control issues are addressed through the RWQCB and revise Title 21 to deal solely with lands with high erosion potential rather than blanket slope percentage prohibitions.</p> <p>Work stopped at this point on 9-16-04.</p>	Conservation