



SAN BENITO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tim Foley Jim West Eric Brunnemann Damon Felice Jessica French Robert Gatto Vicki Montoya Joan Moore Jason Noble Antonio Ortega George Rajkovich David Roemer Jan Saxton Franz Schneider Tom Tobias

County Administration Building – Board of Supervisor Chambers, 481 Fourth Street, Hollister, California

MINUTES FEBRUARY 24, 2010

PRESENT: Foley, West, Brunnemann, Gatto, Montoya, Moore, Noble, Roemer, Saxton, Schneider, Tobias

ABSENT: Felice, French, Ortega, Rajkovich

STAFF: Director of Planning (DoP) Art Henriques, Assistant Director of Planning (ADoP) Byron Turner, Associate Planner (AP) Michael Kelly, Deputy County Counsel (DCC) Shirley Murphy

The special meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m.

DISCUSSION

1. Review of General Plan Update status and provide comments

In addition to Committee members and Planning and Counsel staff, County Supervisors Margie Barrios and Anthony Botelho, the Board of Supervisors ad hoc General Plan Update (GPU) subcommittee, were present. Also present was Larry Mintier from the GPU's consulting firm Mintier Harnish.

DoP Henriques introduced Larry Mintier and described GPAC and its members' roles for the Supervisors.

Supervisor Botelho thanked the Committee and spoke on the importance of communication between the Committee and the Board. He talked about the budget and its limits, and he requested that the Committee review General Plan policy, share their knowledge and ideas, and consider new zoning opportunities. Mr. Botelho also spoke of a need for more communication between the consultant and the Committee. He also requested quarterly reports from the Committee to assist the staff report to the Board. He also recommended that the GPAC consider a subcommittee process to help get work done.

Supervisor Barrios stated how the Board values the Committee and its work. She suggested ideas including establishing a highways subcommittee and looking into highway-industrial opportunities. Ms. Barrios invited the Committee's communication both through Planning Staff and directly to the Board.

The Committee offered their comments. Chair Foley talked of the learning curve that Committee membership demanded. Mr. Noble spoke on the hindrance of action during an earlier meeting as a result of the Committee's by-laws, and he asked for consideration of a modification of the rule requiring for all motions a majority vote by all Committee members, and instead to be just those in attendance.

Chair Foley requested for the next meeting the areas in which people have expressed interest for forming subcommittees, which could meet with staff, do work, and report back. DoP Henriques mentioned the GPU background report, and a subcommittee could focus on chapters from that document as well as specific Elements. Mr. Schneider noted that goals and policies should be addressed first, before maps are drawn, and he suggested that the General Plan Land Use Element constitutes the majority of the General Plan and should be the basis for breaking down tasks. Mr. Gatto expressed interest in using the projects currently being studied by Planning as a starting point, which, as he confirmed, meant studying the vicinities of projects and not the projects themselves.

DoP Henriques and Mintier confirmed for Chair Foley that subcommittees could meet between GPAC meetings. Mr. Schneider suggested holding two to three subcommittee meetings to review existing policies and goals in the current General Plan to revise or delete, and he further suggested addressing goals and objectives before other steps. Designated for this review subcommittee were Mr. Schneider, Ms. Moore, Mr. Roemer, and Mr. Noble, with an

invitation for any others as appropriate. Mr. Schneider expressed disappointment that the Committee had only accomplished composing a vision statement for the GPU in a year and a half of the Committee's existence. A meeting between the review subcommittee and Staff was scheduled for the following day.

Supervisor Barrios noted that attention to existing proposals in the County should focus on patterns, not on the specific projects. Mr. Gatto expressed that proposed projects could serve as signals of where attention is needed. Mr. Roemer stated he wanted to see updates from Caltrans. Ms. Saxton stated information like this should be in the Background Report, which the Committee hadn't received yet.

Mintier distributed a GPU project timeline handout, and he talked about the project's current status and upcoming steps like opportunities/challenges and alternatives. He provided a second handout on project status, and he spoke on the background report's status and on the project budget. The third handout he passed out, which the Committee had also received in December 2009, showed possible future agenda items for the GPAC and when they could happen. Supervisor Botelho asked about whether project alternatives are generated from GPAC input; Mintier responded that they are generated in coordination with the GPAC, and he further explained how his firm and subconsultants would work on this. A fourth handout from Mintier showed which California counties were also updating their General Plans and at what costs. Mr. Schneider asked about why Butte County's estimated cost was higher than Los Angeles County's, and Mintier responded that Los Angeles County's is based on how it is scoped and on its lower level of detail. Mintier further explained that \$1 million is an approximate usual cost, which comes mainly from the time involved in the project and from the environmental impact report (EIR). He confirmed that smaller jurisdictions' updates generally involve higher per-capita costs than larger jurisdictions'.

Mr. Gatto noted that, if the Committee delays, the Committee could create extra or duplicate work for the consultant, and the Committee should look at alternatives quickly. Mintier noted that the project timeline needs adjustment, including that required to reflect Board of Supervisors action on an environmental consultant for the GPU, which would be hopefully forthcoming. Ms. Saxton recalled that the proposal-inclusion criteria took three GPAC meetings for the Committee to come to a decision, and she asked whether the Committee is slowing the process. Mintier responded that, no, his firm has been working on background items. Mr. Schneider suggested that Phase 7 (Draft Goals and Policies Report) should precede Phase 4 (Alternatives) and that not doing so was counter to his experience in this kind of activity.; Mintier responded that he believes that this is a systematic process that gathers all the issues together at one time to inform all the General Plan Elements as a whole in order to address the "big picture," While updating piece-by-piece causes a lack of coherence among the Elements, he said, the way this process is being done has worked well in his experience forty times before, he said. ~~Mintier responded that different ways exist of performing this kind of update, but he would not recommend that sequencing typically.~~

Supervisors Botelho and Barrios thanked everyone for their time. Chair Foley invited public comment, which elicited no response. DoP Henriques restated that the review subcommittee would meet at 11 a.m. the next day, and Committee attendance would be limited to seven members.

A brief discussion took place on the next GPAC meeting, and 6 p.m., March 18, 2010, was the chosen date and time.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Michael Kelly, Associate Planner. Attest: Art Henriques, Director of Planning.