

DRAFT
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, July 20, 2006

At the SPECIAL TIME of 1:00 to 5:00 p.m.

at the Monterey County Association of Realtors (MCAR)
201 Calle del Oaks, Del Rey Oaks

Those present: Micheal Talia, Nancy Isakson, Tom Carvey, Bob Perkins, Mike Caplin, Christopher Bunn Jr., Tom Rowley, Sheryl McKenzie, Sheri Damon, Darlene Din, Aaron Johnson,

- I. Public comment period (for items not on the agenda)
Public comment: none
- II. Approval of agenda for July 20, 2006
Public comment: none
Agenda approved as e-mailed
- III. Approval of minutes of May 4 and July 13, 2006
May 4th minutes were not available. Minutes of July 13, 2006 were approved with corrections.
- IV. GPU4 issues from constituent groups
T. Carvey e-mailed the matrices developed by M. Caplin and N. Isakson earlier in the week. These matrices were approved.

S. McKenzie highlighted OS-1.10, p. 81 of GPU4 and figure 33. Decided to add this to the list of issues. Executive summary said they would add a map, but no map is there.

A. Determine top ten issues
There was discussion of “widows and orphans” list. These are issues already approved by the RG. RG will take umbrella approach and include all the groups’ issues.

Discussion of having a “top ten” list or a more complete list. N. Isakson said that the group decided last week to use the more complete list. It was decided last week to separate the lists into two lists, one having to do with policies in which GPU4 language varies from BOS direction and the other having to do with policies in which the RG differs from GPU4 policies.

Decision to create new titles for the matrices, describing (1) the GPU4 policy language (2) the BOS direction given during study sessions and (3) comments from the RG perspective.

B. Perkins suggested the wording “discrepancies” in which staff missed what the BOS said, “differences” in which RG differs from GPU4, and “widows and orphans.”

M. Caplin made a motion to come back next week with another list. m/s/c.

In order to distinguish the two matrices, they were numbered as follows:

#1 means that RG language varies from BOS direction.

#2 means that GPU4 language varies from BOS direction or was never considered.

A matrix from MCAR was distributed and discussed.

Discussion of LU-1.18, decision to add to #2 list. m/s/c

LU-2.10: re: accessory dwelling unit. Discussion about this policy and possible conflict with state law. Relationship of area plans, community plans and specific plans.

OS-1.10: add to list #2.

OS-5.14: BOS direction on 5/14/06 was to delete. Add to list #2.

OS-3.5: slope issue. OS-3.5 talks about “existing lots of record”; what happens to new lots? Discussion.

S-3.1: Drainage. How will they know what mitigation measures will be needed?

PS-1.11: Parks

Farm Bureau list of widows and orphans:

OS-5.14 add to list #2

C-4.1: rights-of-way. Farm Bureau will add this to their list, but not to RG list.

OS-1.12: routine and ongoing

PS-2.2 monitoring of ground water supply. The added word is residential. Add to list #2. The BOS did direct this.

PS-2.7: Already on list #1, page 4.

AG-1.5 Already on list #2.

AG-4: wine corridor: already on list #1.

Definitions:

Critical watershed
Development

CPOA list:

OS-1.1(b): page 81 in GPU4. This policy language was added in totality. Revisit this issue with rationale.

OS-9.2: Already on list #2

S-2.12 on page 101. Already on list #2.

S-4.32 Already on list #2

S. McKenzie made copies of the recommendations of the AAC for the Wine Corridor Plan. These were discussed.

B. Extract issues from "Definitions" section of GPU4
Tabled

V. Review Process for GPU4

Chair Isakson said that copies of the Planning Commission schedule were available. The PC will have to issue a written report before Oct. 18th. It is expected that the DEIR will be released on July 31st; comment period will end Sept. 15th, final DEIR October 20th.

LUACs will have to supply written comments by 9/27.

VI. Community General Plan Initiative

VII. Area plan consistency

Discussion of how the new area plans differ from the old. Discussion of RG area plan subcommittees and assignments, as follows:

Cachagua: N. Isakson

Central Salinas Valley: B. Perkins, C. Bunn Jr., A. Johnson

Greater Monterey: S. McKenzie, R. Chesshire, T. Rowley. They said their work is complete.

Carmel Valley: N. Isakson, B. Finegan, J. Bridges

Greater Salinas: B. Perkins, C. Steinbruner, A. Johnson, A. Diaz-Infante

No. Monterey County: S. McKenzie, C. Kemp, C. Steinbruner

So. County: R. Moitoso, B. Perkins, C. Bunn Jr.

Toro: K. Gollnick, C. Kemp, B. Finegan

Ag and winery corridor: B. Perkins, N. Isakson, K. Gollnick

T. Carvey will e-mail these subcommittees to be ready to discuss the area plans and develop matrices.

VIII. Promotion of RG work

IX. Other business

X. Adjournment to Thursday, July 27, 2006, location TBA