

# DRAFT

## Minutes

### GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Wednesday, March 10, 2004

12:00 – 5:00 PM

At the Monterey Plaza Hotel and Spa, 400 Cannery Row, Monterey

Those present: Sheryl McKenzie, Nancy Isakson, Luann Meador, Tom Carvey, Brian Finegan, Mike Caplin, Kurt Gollnick, Jay Brown, Tom Rowley, Alfred Diaz-Infante (12:50), Christine Kemp (2:15), Pete Scudder (2:30).

Visitors: Christopher Bunn, Jr., Mary Mecartney

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)  
Public comment: Chris Bunn Jr. said that the public is watching and waiting.
  
- II) Approval of agenda for March 10, 2004  
Public comment: none  
Brian Finegan suggested adding water under V, E)  
Mike Caplin suggested adding a coastal subcommittee.  
Nancy Isakson, Sheryl McKenzie and Kurt Gollnick volunteered to be members of this subcommittee.  
Brian moved Water to 3a, between 3 and 4  
Main event today is Circulation  
Tom Carvey asked to talk about strategy subcommittee  
Nancy Isakson suggested talking about the RG binders (add V, M))  
Nancy still has the binders. They have not been delivered to the BoS yet.  
There is still an outstanding debt of \$435.00. Nancy said that this could be sent to Richard at Biztech.

The RG written work will be presented to the BoS by Tom Carvey.  
There was discussion about the cleaning up of the documents. Kurt Gollnick suggested that we have a professional do this. Tom Rowley said someone needs to take a critical look at the EIR

- III) Approval of minutes from March 4, 2004  
The minutes were not formally approved, as a quorum was not present.

- IIIa) Water:  
Nancy Isakson handed out a new document from the Water Subcommittee.  
PS-3.25: There is a new definition of water rights definition in the text box. The text box about water rights was changed as follows: to the last paragraph, change grammar to read, "In California, water rights are governed by the State Water Resources Control Board and/or the Courts."

In the 3<sup>rd</sup> line of the policy, the word “recognize,” should be moved below the fourth line. Nancy Isakson tracked changes to the document.

PS-4.5a: is a new addition. The capitalized words, such as “Clustered Subdivision” have definitions in the glossary. M/S/C as per subcommittee recommendation

Mike Caplin suggested that the introduction to each section should say what version of the GPU was used as a starting point for the RG work.

There was discussion over the various versions of the GPU that were used for revisions. For the ERME work, Mike Caplin accepted the County’s changes, so that there was no underlining or strikeouts, then began working.

The subcommittee submitted a new PS-4.9: m/s/c as per subcommittee recommendation

PS-4.10: m/s/c as per subcommittee recommendation

Mike Caplin asked to revisit PS-4.5a: include the “if can’t get “will serve” letter... The implication of this section is that if you’re not in a clustered subdivision, your only out is to connect to a public system. Mike suggested that 4.5a should say that if you’re in an area that is not served by a public system, there should be an alternative

PS-4.13: Maximum slopes for individual sewage disposal systems:

Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation with today’s changes.

PS-4.14: as per subcommittee recommendation

PS-4.12: Jay wants to look at grammar on the comment: minor change, to read, “At present, the County....then the rest of the sentence.

#### IV) Circulation Element

Kurt Gollnick handed out a new version of the Circulation Element, with page numbers. There was discussion about how the financial study on the GPU web site relates to Circulation Element.

The group stopped at C-1.5 last week.

C.1.3: use annual average daily traffic (AADT) bottom of page 15, rather than the term “”peak hour travel.” This goes into the box at the bottom of page 15, instead of “Average Daily Traffic.” Kurt’s changes are based on GPU3.

C-1.4: Kurt re-wrote this section as per the group’s suggestions last week. The group discussed the changes. Mike Caplin asked if we want to use the LOS as determinants. Subsection “b”.

Mike Caplin suggested moving 1.4 b. (6) to a separate subsection, named 1.4 c. Brian Finegan tracked the changes to this section. Fair Share Mitigation: where the applicable LOS standard cannot be met, projects that increase traffic ~~would be~~ shall be required to pay ~~only its~~ their Fair Share of the cost of the facilities required

to achieve the applicable LOS standard. Mitigation fees shall be deposited according to California Government code, etc.

Taking the place of the last sentence of 6, Mike Caplin suggested, “Where a project has contributed its fair share, the LOS shall not be considered as a factor when evaluating the approval of the project.” M/s/c

On b) (1), (2), etc. in 2,3, and 4, remove the phrase “first phase.”

There was discussion about tiering. In GPU3, LU-10.2, the tiered community areas are Fort Ord, Boronda, Pajaro, Castroville, etc. Sheryl McKenzie said that on page 60 in phasing in GPU3, there is a whole new section in which phasing has all been tied to circulation.

Brian Finegan said that not only are there are phase 1 and phase 2 *areas*, but there is also “phased *development*” that will take place within these already phased areas. This has apparently resulted from the joint PC and BoS meeting in which they endorsed the concept that endorsing LOS C would result in no development at all. Therefore, there is phasing of projects to avoid the problem of “no development.”

Performance standards: The group discussed adding language to C-1.5 b. (5) that would provide that AHO projects, pursuant to LU-10.1, provision of housing within AHO would be overriding concerns and not subject to CEQA. The language, “Shall be deemed an overriding consideration for purposes of CEQA” was suggested. The document was deferred until next week. The subcommittee and Brian Finegan will work on this language to be reviewed next week.

C-1.5: Setting Goals in Increase Roadway Efficiency:

There was discussion as to whether this section is a legal requirement. Brian asked if the County has jurisdiction over mobile emissions. Tom Rowley said that indirectly, in the sense of air quality, yes. There was discussion. Kurt said that he and Nancy would compare this section with the County Vehicle and Traffic Code Chapter 12.80. If this is not a legal requirement, it was suggested to strike C-1.5.

C-1.6: Safety Programs:

Leave as in GPU3.

C-1.7: Speed reduction:

Mike Caplin said that CPOA modified this from GPU2, as the concept of “where speeding occurs,” is ambiguous. The key to this is accident rates that are outside the norm, not rates of speed. Brian Finegan moved using CPOA language for the first two sentences, and then using the remainder. Christine Kemp suggested striking “narrower streets,” because in Chualar they have heard many complaints about the narrow streets: there is no place to park and fire engines can’t get through.

Nancy moves to leave all options in except “narrower streets.” m/s/c

C-1.8: no changes to the GPU3 language.

C-1.9: Road Abandonment:

This can be an issue in rural areas. If the county abandons a road, the owners shouldn't be impaired. There was discussion about the language, “Where the cost of maintaining the County road exceeds the benefit obtained from it...” Who decides this? Kurt mentioned that in some areas, it might be better to close a public road because of hunters, poachers and trespassers. Mike said that a “summary abandonment” should not be allowed. People should also be able to petition the County to abandon a road. Kurt will work on this and bring it back.

The last sentence of this section says that the County would examine the potential to convert abandoned roads to trails.

Goal C-2: Linking Land Use and Transportation

Luann Meador said that GPU3 has many new sections that link transportation to land use. Brian said that this is exactly what the staff was directed to do at the joint PC and BoS meeting. The group decided to use the same definition of “fair share,” that had been used in previous sections. The definition of “fair share” is that the development pays its “fair share,” as a mitigation, but that development should not be limited by a pre-existing deficient condition.

The group decided to call the goal, “Land Use and Transportation Coordination,” rather than “Linking Land Use and Transportation.” Nancy Isakson moved to change the definition to, “Manage land use and transportation planning within the unincorporated area as a coordinated program (strike “unified”).” m/s/c

C-2.1: Road Improvements: Leave as is in GPU3

C-2.2: Traffic Impact Studies:

a) Leave as is in GPU3

b) Leave as is in GPU3

The above sections should exclude single family dwellings, caretaker, senior citizen and guest houses.

Exclude from the above section: First single family residence on an existing lot of record and additional dwellings pursuant to policy LU-9.1 shall be exempt from this policies. m/s/c.

C-2.3: Traffic Sheds:

The subcommittee deleted this. They will add a comment as to why it is being deleted. The phrase “traffic shed” lacks a consistent definition.

C-2.4: Community Area Priorities: as per GPU3. Accept as in policy C-10.1

C-2.5: Community Plans and Road Improvements:

Lower levels of service may have to be accepted in certain areas. This language could back to C-1.4, as in “when you’ve paid your fair share, the deficits should not impede development. M/s/c as is.

C-2.6: Pedestrian and Transit-Oriented Development: as is in GPU3

C-2.7: as is in GPU3

C-2.8: Uncontrolled Access:

There was discussion about the prohibitive language used in this section. Change wording to “Access shall be allowed, where no feasible alternative exists.”

C-2.9: Preventing Strip Development:

Strike all.

C-2.10: Connectivity:

Cul-de-sacs would be eliminated in this section. Strike the second sentence that has to do with cul-de-sacs. Pete Scudder suggested adding “cul-de-sacs” to the “traffic calming measures” section.

Goal C-3: Facilitating Movement: Leave as is in GPU3

C-3.1: as per subcommittee recommendation

C-3.2:

add “...contribute their Fair Share to the implementation.” Include “single family resident” language from previous section.

Local/Commuter-Serving Movement:

C-3.5: Increase Vehicle Travel Efficiency:

Eliminate the wording “labor brokers.” Add, “This policy shall not be construed to limit development.” m/s/c

C-3.5 (should be 3.6): Facilities Trip Reduction Plan:

This is a policy that is in effect now. When an application is filed this must be taken into account, showing that the project includes bike racks, bus turn-outs, etc. There was discussion about a definition for what “Facilities Trip Reduction” means.

Truck Movement:

- C-3.6: Truck routes: Leave as is in GPU3
- C-3.7: Leave as is in GPU3
- C-3.8: Leave as is in GPU3
- C-3.9: Leave as is in GPU3
- C-3.10: insert "fair share"
- C-3.11: Truck traffic on rural roads: as is

Visitor Movement:

- C-3.12: Strike the last sentence
- C-3.13: Orienting Visitor Traffic:

- V) Reports from sub-committees
  - A) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)
  - B) Transportation
  - C) Land Use
  - D) City/County Agreements
  - E) Public Service
    - Nancy has some cleanup to do
  - F) Update of GPU process
  - G) Update of EIR
  - H) Strategy
  - I) Definitions
  - J) Key Concepts for each element
  - K) Refinement Group Core Values
- VI) Agenda building for next meeting:
- VII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, March 18, 2004, at the Monterey Plaza Hotel and Spa, 400 Cannery Row, Monterey