

DRAFT

Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Wednesday, March 18, 2004

12:00 – 5:00 PM

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

Those present: Gwen Miller, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Mike Johnston, Brian Finegan, Tom Carvey, Nancy Isakson, Rich Smith, Chris Bunn Sr., Bob Perkins, Jay Brown, Tom Rowley, Juan Uranga, Luann Meador, Mike Caplin, Christine Kemp, Sheryl McKenzie, Kurt Gollnick (12:30), Chris Bunn, Aaron Johnson (1:42)

Visitors from the public: Mary Mecartney, Christopher Bunn Jr., Rich Smith

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)
Public comment: Mary Mecartney said she had three comments.
- (1) Concerning the discussion about meeting at Plaza Hotel, Mary said there is no current picket line here, but they encourage people to attend union hotels.
 - (2) Speaking as in individual, not a UFW representative, Mary said the group has been talking about making presentations to various Planning Commissioners. She suggested that these meetings should be made public by inviting previous members of the Refinement Group (RG) and the public, to see what kind of comments might be made. Doing this would enlarge the audience, and they could hear more about the work that the RG has done.
 - (3) Concerning economic development, Mary made available a handout of her comments and said that she would appreciate comments on her draft comments. March 25th is her deadline.
- II) Approval of agenda for March 18, 2004
Public comment: none
Items to add to agenda will be moved to front, under IIIA,
- i) Biztech printing bill;
 - ii) Proposed meetings with individual Planning Commissioners;
 - iii) An e-mail message from Mike Caplin concerning the recently published Economic Impact Analysis (EIA).
 - There was discussion about hiring an economist expert to do a study on the EIA. Nancy Isakson and Sheryl McKenzie said they would look for someone highly respected to do the study.
 - There was discussion around the fact that although the current EIA is based on current cost and revenues of the County, the GPU should also take into account potential growth and its effect on economic development.
 - The current EIA is based on the 2002-03 County budget.

- The group decided to put this item on the agenda for next week. Identify people who could do the study and how much they would charge.
- The author of the EIA is Applied Development Economics, 2029 University Ave., Berkeley, CA 94704. www.adeusa.com.

iv) e-mail from Sheryl McKenzie re: overall strategy;

Bob Perkins moved, Alfred Diaz-Infante 2nd to approve agenda as amended.

III) Approval of minutes from March 10, 2004

Public comment: none

Approved as circulated.

IIIa) Additions to agenda:

- i) Biztech bill: \$100 from Kurt Gollnick; \$100 from Jay Brown; \$100 from Luann Meador; \$100 from Common Ground direct to Biztech. Brian Finegan sent \$75 directly to Biztech. Tom Carvey said that the web site is up-to-date. It was decided to make RG binders available to those that request them for \$15: Those desiring RG binders should contact Biztech directly.
- ii) Meetings with individual Planning Commission members:
Tom Carvey read the 2-27-04 e-mail to RG members, describing the RG members recommended to speak.

For the April 1, 2004 meeting 10:30 AM in Castroville with Cosme Padilla and Don Rochester, it was decided that the following people should make the presentations:

Ag: Jay Brown and Mike Johnston
Land Use: Brian Finegan and Luann Meador
Circulation: Tom Rowley
ERME: Mike Caplin
City/County: Mike Johnston
Water: Nancy Isakson

Tom Rowley said since the EIR comments are due by April 2nd, making the presentations could take away from the EIR comments.

To make the presentations more succinct, it was suggested to include the 100% Affordable Housing Overlay and wine corridors along with the Land Use Element.

For the Monday, April 29th meeting at 5:00 PM at the CHISPA office with Aurelio Salazar and Juan Sánchez, it was decided that the following people would make the presentations:

Ag: Mike Johnston and Jay Brown
Land Use: Brian Finegan, Alfred Diaz-Infante and Kurt Gollnick,
ERME: Brian Finegan

100%: Alfred Diaz-Infante and Juan Uranga (Juan will confirm)
Circulation: Kurt Gollnick
Water: Nancy Isakson

IV) Circulation Element

Public comment: none

A handout was distributed, with 2 paragraphs that Brian Finegan wrote about the concept of “fair share” and its relation to the Circulation Element. Another handout was distributed with a one page description from appendix B of GPU3 that relates to Circulation.

Last week’s work stopped at C-3.12 and then skipped to trails.

Trails, p. 31 of new handout.

C-9.4 on trails. The group discussed this section. Kurt Gollnick had previously recommended removing this in its entirety, but TAMC objects to removing trails entirely, as the idea of connectivity with bikes and horses throughout the county is part of the TAMC plan.

Accept the goal statement in the box as per subcommittee recommendation.

C-9.1. The subcommittee language reflects last week’s work. Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation.

C-9.2. Strike everything after “public parklands.” There is a federal plan for the De Anza trail which would run across farmlands in the Salinas Valley.

C-9.3: as per subcommittee recommendation

C-9.4: revised to buffer lands adjacent to public access. If a new trail is put in, the trail should provide the buffer. Adopted as per subcommittee recommendation with minor changes today. Mike Caplin said that a County agency must oversee the management of the trails.

C-9.5: Bob Perkins said that the language “county shall collaborate with other agencies,” is not useful, and opens the door for outside agencies to become involved. Brian Finegan recommended that at the top of p. 32, the rest of the policy with “the county shall collaborate....” should be stricken. Tom Rowley said that fiscal impacts need to be examined closely when building new trails, and that fiscal impacts should be an overriding consideration. Liability is a big financial consideration, along with safety, litter, policing, etc. Brian Finegan said that a statement like this should be in 9.3, since this is the plan for trails. It’s unlikely that fiscal responsibility would be the *overriding* concern, but it’s a material concern. Juan Uranga suggested language that approves the use of trails on public land. The goal reads: “encourage publicly accessible trails on public land and Community Areas.” Mike Caplin said that another effect of an increased number of trails is that

viewsheds from trails will also be excluded from building. The subcommittee will work on the language and bring it back.

C-9.6: new trail development: Bob Perkins: add the word “government” before “agencies.” Brian Finegan expressed concern over the federal plan for the De Anza trail. Strike everything prior to “the county shall seek.” m/s/c.

Mike Johnston and Kurt Gollnick were asked to bring language having to do with a “no net loss” or “no net addition” policy concerning trails. Mike Caplin: private land owners should not have to provide land for trails.

C-9.7: leave as is in GPU3.

From today’s handout: “Fair share” is a difficult phrase to define. Brian handed out a sheet, dated 3-18-04 with a definition of “fair share.” Mike Johnston: if building something new, you wouldn’t pay for existing deficiencies: the existing residents would pay that. This is the standard way of determining this. Adopted as per the definitions on the sheet.

Brian Finegan will send Tom Carvey an electronic copy of this handout.

Level of Service (LOS)

Alfred Diaz-Infante said that we want to make sure that people not only have housing, but also the services that are required. Intersections and road improvements are examples. We shouldn’t cut corners regarding infrastructure.

Alfred made a suggested addition to Policy C-1.4(b)(6). Exempt from LOS standards as defined in this policy.

Mike Johnston said that LOS can be used as a land use tool to prevent the building of housing. Brian: use this language to provide a basis of overriding concern for CEQA to build Affordable Housing.

Suggested addition to Policy LU-10.2- as per subcommittee recommendation

C-3.14: providing “paratransit.” Brian Finegan explained the term “Jittney,” likening it to a limo that runs the same route every day. Everyone pays a small amount. Accepted as is in GPU3.

C-3.17: GPU3 eliminated this section.

C-4 Compatible circulation systems: definition in the box:

Bob Perkins moved to eliminate the word “preserve.” Jay Brown 2nd. Mike Johnston insert “existing and planned” before “surrounding land uses.”

C-4.1: as per subcommittee recommendation, but add, “where feasible and appropriate” at the beginning of the sentence. Juan Uranga said that when trails language is looked at, use “where feasible and appropriate.”

C-4.2: Leave as is in GPU3

C-4.3: start sentence with “where feasible and appropriate.” Otherwise, leave as is in GPU3

C-4.4: as per subcommittee recommendation, but eliminate, “the county shall ensure” from the first sentence, so that the sentence begins, “The characteristics of rural roads should be distinct....” There was discussion over the second part of this section about whether the County should be responsible for supporting capacity projects. Mike Caplin said that the idea of using road capacity to preclude or limit the use of property is not valid; the way to do this is through zoning rather than road capacity. Brian Finegan said that the purpose of the paragraphs was not to reduce growth-inducing infrastructure, but to limit the County’s responsibility of fixing rural roads. The County should maintain roads that are safe and have adequate capacity. Kurt Gollnick suggested language about maintaining rural roads and capitalization. Brian said this section is about compatibility. What are rural roads supposed to be? Mike Johnston: “considered consistent with the need to support the transportation needs of the existing agricultural land.” Brian: Rural Centers, Rural Lands, Agriculture Lands, and Public lands are all included. Kurt will take this back to the subcommittee.

C-4.5: Luann Meador said that this section isn’t has a reference to a new section in GPU3, section LU-6.3, that restricts the meaning of C-4.5. Nancy Isakson said that since LU-6.3 doesn’t appear in the RG version of Land Use Element, the reference to it here could be eliminated. Strike last sentence, otherwise as per subcommittee recommendation.

Luann said that the paragraph limiting capacity projects appears in the new GPU3 policies in LU-1.3; 5.8; 3.7; 6.4; 7.4. Strike last sentence in 4.5

LU-4.6: Emergency Access: Leave as is in GPU3. Mike Caplin referred to the CPOA language, which encourages the uses of turnouts, etc. Bob: emergency access with turnouts, etc. Include the language that specifically describes what the expectations are.

Public comment from Rick Smith: who has the responsibility of developing the “emergency roadway connections”? Jay Brown said that Health and Safety 1.6 describes a similar situation. In order to get efficiency, you develop additional roadways. In HS-1.6 and HS-3.10, the language “where feasible and appropriate” should be added. The subcommittee will bring language next week.

C-4.7: Strike the land descriptions, otherwise as per subcommittee recommendation

Goal C-5: Increase transit system ridership

After discussion about “ridership”, m/s/c to change the word to “efficiency.”

C-5.1: Leave as is in GPU3. After “cost-effective,” insert “and would increase transportation efficiency.” Otherwise, leave as is in GPU3.

C-5.2: Leave as is in GPU3

C-5.3: insert, “where feasible and appropriate,” otherwise leave as is in GPU3

C-5.4: Leave as is in GPU3

C-5.5: Leave as is in GPU3

C-5.6: Leave as is in GPU3

C-5.7: Leave as is in GPU3

C-5.8: add definition that a “large residential is >25 units.

C-5.9: eliminate >25,000 sq. ft. and just say 50 employees.

Goal C-6: Rail: Deferred to next week.

Goal C-7: Parking: require suitable parking for residential, commercial, industrial, etc.

7.1: discussion of the relative virtues of impervious surfaces. What about a broken fuel line that injects fuel directly into the ground. The new buzz word is “pervious surfaces.” Strike after “parking design,” but include last sentence.

7.2: change “shall” to “may” in 1st sentence, change “may” to “shall” in last sentence. Otherwise, leave as is in GPU3

7.3: change “shall” to “may” in 1st sentence and last sentence. Otherwise, leave as is in GPU3

7.4: change “encourage” to “support.” Otherwise, leave as is in GPU3

Goal C-8: Goal:

There was discussion about the meaning of the last part of sentence, sounding as through the County owns airport facilities, which it doesn’t. Bob suggested, “Provide for the needs of existing County airport facilities while anticipating and mitigating impacts to the surrounding land uses and the environment.”

C-8.1: The Airport land use commission shall develop a plan for CALUP consistent with the State Aeronautics Board.

There was discussion of future meeting places: Tom Carvey said that the Carpenters’ Hall at Fort Ord is available, as is the MCAR office. Gwen Miller suggested scheduling meetings in Salinas as well as Fort Ord and the peninsula.

Kurt Gollnick will e-mail the latest circulation document to Tom Carvey for posting on the web site.

- V) Reports from sub-committees
 - A) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)
 - B) Transportation
 - C) Land Use

- D) City/County Agreements
 - E) Public Service
 - F) Update of GPU process: see III (a) above
 - G) Update of EIR: Deadline for written comments on EIR is April 2nd. CEQA says that decisions must be based on fact and expert testimony, not on personal fears and opinions. These require reasoned, good faith analysis.
 - H) Strategy: 3 Planning Commissioners said that they were not receiving specific comments, but only generalities. The RG has given them over 300 pages of specific comments. Tom Carvey will write a letter to be signed by the RG members next week, reiterating the RG binder cover letter. Those present at the meeting today gave their permission to have their names listed.
 - 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 25, 2004, at the Monterey County Leadership Institute, 2354 Garden Road, Monterey