

DRAFT

Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, November 13, 2003 at 1:00 p.m.

Leadership Institute Board Room

Those present:

Brian Finegan, Sheryl McKenzie, Luann Meador, Tom Carvey, Christine Gianascol, Kurt Gollnick, Mike Johnston, Juan Uranga, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Pete Scudder, Nancy Isakson, Ron Chesshire, Tom Rowley, Mike Caplin, Chris Bunn, Ralph Riva

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)
None
- II) Approval of agenda for November 13, 2003
Public comment: none
Agenda was approved unanimously
- III) Approval of minutes from November 6, 2003
Public comment: none
Minutes were approved unanimously
- IV) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)
Public comment: none
 - 1) Brian handed out a clean copy of the ERME, as adopted last week. Change “ass” to “as” on front page.
 - 2) There was discussion about the definition of critical habitat in the definition box on page 2,
 - a) Mike Caplin suggested that we quote the federal statute.
 - b) Mike J: box makes it more reader-friendly. Mike suggests a simplified statement and “see the glossary.”
 - c) Motion:
 - i) Mike adds, “CH is as defined by the Federal Endangered Species Act; for details, see the glossary.”
 - ii) Then add a comment that the exact definition should be added to the glossary.
 - iii) Carried
 - 3) Tree removal, page 4
 - a) Mike J said that we exempted tree removal on page 4, then under “comment” said that “Ag does not expect complete waiver of tree removal ordinances...etc.”
 - b) Nancy: the comments in the current handout were for RG working group, not for the PC.
 - c) Motion: Brian Finegan moved that we take out the comments.
 - i) Carried
 - 4) We got as far as ERME 2.7 last week. Using Brian Finegan’s redline version, the group moved on to p. 135
 - 5) ERME-2.8
 - a) The group decided to wait until the arrival of Bob Perkins for ERME 2.8.

- 6) ERME-2.9
 - a) Changed the notation at the end to “as defined in AG 1.1”
 - b) Discussion:
 - i) Make it clear when you’ve met the standard.
 - ii) Language to be added to the end of the existing 2.9 paragraph:
 - (1) Brian: “and provide for no net loss of the species.”
 - (2) Mike: “and shall be deemed adequate if there is no net loss in the species.”
 - iii) “No net loss” is defined in the glossary. Strike “natural plant communities.”
 - iv) Moved and Carried as above

- 7) ERME-2.10
 - a) Change title to “native vegetation” and remove the wording “natural plant communities.”
 - b) Discussion of what “endangered plants” means. Mike Caplin said it should say, “listed endangered species.”
 - c) Mike C: it looked like the Co was going to protect every species. Make it clear there’s a distinction between “native vegetation” and “endangered plants.”
 - d) Mike C read 2.10 from his version from his yellow highlighted version.
 - e) Motion: Pete Scudder moved that we adopt Mike Caplin’s version of the policy.
 - i) 2nd Mike C
 - ii) Mike J’s amendment: conclude 2.10 with, “all other forms of planted and cultivated native vegetation with the exception of plantings made for required mitigation purposes.”
 - iii) Carried
 - iv) Also insert Mike C’s comment at the end of 2.10

- 8) ERME-2.11
 - a) The group compared Brian Finegan’s and Mike Caplin’s versions.
 - b) There was discussion about how to measure the diameter of a tree.
 - c) Does the Co have a distinction about “landmark” oaks? Chris Bunn said look at the state law. Brian doesn’t think there’s a state law on tree removal. Kurt will find out what the state laws on landmark trees are. State law coming about thinning of the forest, especially after the fires in So Ca.
 - d) Motion: as read by Mike Caplin, using Brian’s language with additions.
 - i) Title as changed by Brian
 - ii) 2nd
 - iii) discussion:
 - (1) how many acorns would you have to plant?
 - (2) Does tree transplanting imply that the trees come from the same property?
 - (3) If acorns, the monitoring and a 50% survival rate.
 - (4) “up to 3:1 ratio”
 - iv) Carried
 - e) ERME-2.12
 - i) Change from 6” to 12” diameter, measured as smallest diameter from 2’ to 5’ above ground, as per Mike Caplin’s version.
 - ii) Mike would add at the end, “policy doesn’t apply to removal of trees to keep forest healthy in healthy condition.”
 - iii) Motion: adopt Brian’s policy with above additions.
 - iv) Carried
 - f) ERME-2.12b (New policy, to be inserted between ERME 2.12 and 2.13)

- i) Healthy Woodlands proposal. Mike Caplin read from his version. Instead of “encourage” in the first line, say “Co shall not discourage” woodlands to be maintained in a healthy condition...etc.”
 - ii) Motion: 2.12b be approved as read
 - iii) 2nd
 - iv) discussion
 - v) carried
 - vi) The title shall be “Healthy Woodlands”

- 9) ERME-2.13 Landmark Trees
 - a) Brian read from glossary: > 24” measured 2’ above ground, or >100 years old, or ...
 - b) Nancy moves we wait to discuss this until Kurt’s research comes in.
 - c) Pete: keep same definition of measuring diameter: from smallest diameter, measured 2’ to 5’.
 - d) Bob Perkins: sounds like an extension of the County’s rights to private property. Relates to endangered species.
 - e) Tabled

- 10) Back to ERME-2.8 “Setbacks” with the arrival of Bob Perkins
 - a) Bob Perkins: Something is either critical habitat or it isn’t. But this says that if we can’t define it, there should be a setback. This takes more than was originally given.
 - b) Moved to delete this policy.
 - i) 2nd
 - ii) discussion: Christine: leave a note as to why we’re removing it.
 - iii) Mike C: this policy assumes that wetlands, vernal pools, need setback.
 - iv) Bob will write comment for the removal of this policy
 - v) Mike C: if a 100’ setback is required, you’d have to have 200’ bridges over every watershed.
 - vi) Carried

- 11) ERME-2.9 The group revisited ERME 2.9 (with the current discussion on 2.8, 2.9 makes no sense and was deleted.)
 - a) Chris Bunn: the setback issue is a line in the sand for the ag community.

- 12) ERME-2.14 Hazardous trees
 - a) Kurt moved we accept 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, and 2.17 as written
 - b) 2.18 changes from Kurt: change to read, “native and compatible species, shall be encouraged,” strike the rest (“utilize to max extent”).
 - i) Motion to pass (a) and (b) above
 - ii) 2nd
 - iii) Discussion:
 - (1) The County should help in weed management.
 - (2) Christine: add Mike’s comment as well.
 - iv) Carried

- 13) ERME-2.19
 - a) Motion: Nancy recommends we delete 2.19 because it would have significant effect on agriculture.
 - b) 2nd.
 - c) carried

- V) Land use Element
Not addressed due to lack of time.

- VI) Reports from sub-committees
Public comment: none
 - A) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME): covered during today's meeting.
 - B) Water: The subcommittee met this week, will meet again on Monday, 11/17/03. They will be prepared after the Land Use Element is discussed.
 - C) Transportation: The subcommittee hasn't yet met. Kurt Gollnick, Tom Rowley and Juan Uranga will meet next Thursday at 11:00 a.m., 11/20/03 at the Scheid Vineyard office.
 - D) Land Use: The subcommittee has met once and is ready to go after the ERME Element.
 - E) City/County Agreements: The subcommittee had a meeting today and did some more revision. They are ready to present. The policies were sent to Kurt Gollnick and Don Nucci because of agricultural ramifications. They are also waiting for feedback from the mayors.
 - F) Public Service: The subcommittee met today and will meet again on Thursday, 11/20/03 at 11:30 a.m. in the East Wing Conference Room.

- VII) Other items:
 - A) Brian Finegan said that the Ag Buffer meeting of Nov. 21st may be postponed. Check LAFCO website. If it happens, the meeting will take place at the Nutter Center in the afternoon.
 - B) The Planning Commission has delegated a subcommittee to suggest a format for the coming GPU hearings. There was discussion as to whether a meeting could be arranged between the RG and the Planning Commission meeting format subcommittee.
 - i) The RG subcommittee that would meet with the Planning Commission subcommittee is composed of Alfred Diaz-Infante, (alternate: Juan Uranga), Kurt Gollnick, Brian Finegan, and Tom Carvey

- VIII) Agenda building for next meeting
Public comment: none
ERME, subcommittee reports, Land Use on standby, update of GPU process.

- IX) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, November 20, 2003 at the East Wing Conference Room near Board of Supervisors Chambers, County Courthouse, Salinas