

DRAFT
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP
Thursday, November 4, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM
at the former “Leadership Institute,” 2354 Garden Road, Monterey

Those present: Tom Rowley, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Christopher Bunn Jr., Gwendolyn Wells, Nick Lombardo, Aaron Johnson, Bob Perkins, Mike Caplin, Brian Finegan, Pete Scudder, Nancy Isakson, Kurt Gollnick, Sheri Damon, Tom Carvey, Christine Kemp, Chris Steinbruner, and Ralph Riva

Visitors: Alex Hulanicki

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)
Public comment: none
- II) Approval of agenda for November 4, 2004
Public comment: none
Meeting places under XI (A)
- III) Approval of minutes October 28, 2004
Deferred until next meeting
- IV) 1982 Plan Analysis (Chapter 1)
Public comment: none
See the attached 1982 Plan matrix for minutes.
- V) Coastal Element
- VI) Reports on presentations to the Board of Supervisors
Public comment: none
Nancy Isakson reported on the results of last week’s RG meeting. Nancy brought corrected copies of her own position paper, which were distributed to the group.

Brian Finegan gave an explanation of the purpose of the position papers.

Copies of a handout from Jay Brown entitled re: “Types of Species Protection in General Plan” were distributed. There was discussion of the letter and proposed changes.

Nancy Isakson distributed copies of her 2 revised position papers, revision #4, entitled “Water Supply Issues” and “Erosion and Water Quality Issues.” There was discussion of the changes to the papers.

m/s/c that Tom Carvey will send the finished position papers to the typist for formatting and consistency. There was discussion as to whether to bind all of them in one document. M/s/c to collate them into one document, but individual speakers will present individually.

Brian Finegan distributed copies of his position paper and tracked the changes during the discussion. No changes to “Ridgeline Development.”

Slopes: Brian's paragraph was compared with the 1982 Plan, Policy 3.2.2 and the (RG) LU-9.17 (A) on developing on slopes over 30%. There was discussion about the paragraph on slopes.

Viewshed: Discussion over the term "viewshed" and comparison with the RG term "designated common public viewing area."

Infrastructure concurrency: Discussion and m/s/c to include the RG definition of "concurrency."

Infrastructure financing: Brian will rewrite this paragraph for next week.

For next week, the position paper on Circulation will be circulated.

VII) Questions for the Board of Supervisors

Public comment: none

A new handout from Jay Brown, entitled "Environmental," was distributed, dated 11-3-04.

M/s/c to use the following paragraph as an introduction to the "Environmental" question.

"If so, what direction does the Board need to give to ensure that our economic base, agricultural viability, housing costs or property rights are not adversely affected by the inclusion of General Plan policies that extend protection beyond that required by state and federal law, e.g. providing protection for species not listed as threatened or endangered."

VIII) Review of the 12 Guiding Objectives Matrix

Public comment: none

Copies of the revised chart was distributed and approved. They will be sent to staff members with the cover letter.

IX) RG Maps:

Public comment: none

Discussion about references to maps in the RG work. Suggestion that the RG should provide the County with a statement that by making references to maps we're not endorsing certain maps, but noting the need for certain maps. Tom Rowley said that the County lacks the resources to update the maps, with the consequence that the maps become obsolete and are useless.

Tom Carvey will e-mail the master map list that the typist created several weeks ago.

X) Other Business

XI) Agenda building for next meeting

(a) added to agenda: discussion of meeting places and times for the rest of 2004. There will be a meeting on Nov. 18th at MCAR. There will not be an RG meeting on Nov. 25th.

XII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, November 11, 2004 from 12:00 to 5:00 p.m., at the new home of the Salinas Builders' Exchange, 20 Quail Run Circle, Suite A, Salinas

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
			<i>written.”</i>		
	10.3.2 The natural shoreline processes, including bluff erosion, sand transport, and tidal flushing, shall not be adversely altered by dredging, filling, or construction of shoreline structures.	2. County practice follows this policy <i>in an approximate fashion.</i>	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well</i>	c. Change policy <i>wording to allow for protection of coastal structures and lands.</i>	iv. Conservation
	<i>Objective</i> 10.4 Encourage oceanographic research in Monterey County.	1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely.</i>	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well</i>	a. No change in this policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i>	iv. Conservation
<i>II GOAL TO CONSERVE NATURAL HABITATS FOR NATIVE PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES AND TO PROMOTE PRESERVATION OF RARE AND ENDANGERED PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES.</i>	11.1.1 The California Native Plant Society shall be consulted and appropriate measures shall be taken to protect rare and endangered plant species and their habitats.	<u>Work began again at this point on 11-4-04.</u> 2. County practice follows this policy <i>in an approximate fashion.</i>	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well</i>	c. Change policy <i>wording to: apply only to listed threatened and endangered species.</i>	<u>iv. Conservtaion</u>
	11.1.3 Land uses shall be carefully controlled and waste discharges shall be prohibited in order to	1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely.</i>	Unknown	c. Change policy <i>wording to: Change wording from “Areas of Special Biological Significance”</i>	iv. Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	protect water quality in state designated Areas of Special Biological Significance.	<i>AND,</i> 4. County practices are governed by other jurisdictional bodies therefore County should not make it's own policy in this area. As of 1/1/05, the RWQCB will supersede local agencies.		to "State Water Quality Protection Areas." See comment to deleted Policy RG ER-1.1. Delete the words, "land uses shall be carefully controlled," and Change to be consistent with PRC Section 36710f	
	11.1.4 The outstanding features of natural areas identified by the California Natural Areas Coordinating Council and the Department of the Interior's Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service shall be carefully managed.	3. County practice does not follow this policy <i>i.e., does not have practice that addresses this policy</i>	E. Not Needed – <i>it is not used.</i>	e. Delete this policy; it is not used.	iv. Conservation
	11.2 Maintain and regularly update information regarding areas of particular environmental sensitivity or concern, and coordinate these efforts with the appropriate	3. County practice does not follow this policy <i>i.e., does not have practice that addresses this policy.</i> The maps are not updated regularly nor coordinated with other	D. Not Worked – <i>because the maps are not regularly updated or coordinated.</i>	a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably OK.</i>	iv. Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	resource agencies.	agencies.			
	<i>Objective</i> 11.2 Maintain and regularly update information regarding areas of particular environmental sensitivity or concern, and coordinate these efforts with the appropriate resource agencies.				
<i>12 GOAL TO ENCOURAGE THE CONSERVATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF THE COUNTY'S ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</i>	12.1.1 The County shall take such action as necessary to compile information on the location and significance of its archaeological resources so this information may be incorporated into the environmental or development review process.				
	12.1.2 The Archaeological Sensitivity Zones map shall be used, along with whatever other data is appropriate, to evaluate whether				