



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 JULY 8, 2010

PRESENT Foley, West, Montoya, Moore, Noble, Roemer, Saxton, Tobias

ABSENT: Brunnemann, Felice, French, Gatto, Ortega, Rajkovich, Schneider

STAFF: Assistant Director of Planning (ADoP) Byron Turner, Assistant County Counsel (ACC) Barbara Thompson

The regular meeting commenced at 6:14 p.m.

6:00 PM ~ CALL TO ORDER

Also present at the meeting were Larry Mintier and Dan Amsden of the General Plan Update (GPU) consultant Mintier Harnish.

Chair Foley expressed appreciation for the interest in the GPU by the Board of Supervisors and the supervisorial candidates present this evening. No members of the public spoke or requested to speak during general public comment time.

ADoP Turner gave Staff announcements. He noted that the Planning Commission on the previous evening had received the presentation on transferable development credits (TDC) that the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) had received on April 29, 2010. The presentation was well received, and Staff had committed to presenting a draft TDC ordinance in August, though the Planning Commission had recommended not defining sending and receiving areas in the ordinance's drafting's short time frame and that the GPAC should discuss those areas' definitions. Turner also noted the coming July 27 GPU progress report to the Board. Chair Foley asked whether the TDC work was within the scope of the Mintier Harnish contract; Turner responded that this would have to be discussed and that TDC would require identifying appropriate locations for overlay zoning.

AGENDA

1. Approving the minutes of June 3, 2010.

Ms. Saxton moved to approve the minutes of June 3, 2010. Mr. Tobias seconded. Ms. Montoya commented on the "cluster village" mentioned during the discussion of Guiding Principles; Mr. Tobias, Vice Chair West, and Mr. Noble described the concept in brief. and the motion passed 8-0.

2. Update on the AMBAG Blueprint and its relationship to the General Plan Update.

Dan Amsden referred the Committee to a PowerPoint presentation regarding the meeting's topics and gave a GPU process update, including the Background Report, the Opportunities and Constraints Report, and upcoming public workshops.

Amsden continued and described the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) Blueprint process, including its purpose of identifying a growth scenario that could reduce automobile travel and its role in transportation planning in the AMBAG region. Chair Foley expressed his concern that San Benito County's plan aligned more with the AMBAG region than with Santa Clara County and that county's region, despite San Benito County traffic headed northward to Santa Clara County. Amsden noted that this was part of the difficulty of regional planning, that Santa Clara County is part of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) while San Benito County is part of AMBAG, and that the regional plans should be coordinated. Larry Minter referred to examples of the Sacramento region and Southern California, and he said that protocols exist for coordination among councils of governments (COGs), with impetus at the State level for funding Blueprint programs like AMBAG's. Ms. Moore asked about whether other jurisdictions are involved in this process; Amsden said some might not be involved but that he was not aware. Mintier gave further thoughts on similar efforts, on the

degree to which they are accepted by local governments, on their voluntary nature, and on their role in transportation funding.

Amsden continued, describing materials available from AMBAG and workshops AMBAG held in May and June. He highlighted travel-to-work data for Hollister and San Juan Bautista residents as well as an AMBAG map illustrating this data. He noted 71 percent of Hollister residents work outside Hollister. Vice Chair West and Chair Foley remarked about the high number of commuters, 40 percent, who commute to what the data slide identified as "All Other Locations"; Amsden explained that a very large number of commuters commute very to more distant locations than the short list shown on the data slide, and he compared this situation to that of Tracy, where commuters would also commute very far. Mr. Noble added that some smaller destinations were not mentioned on the data slide and would probably account for much of the 40 percent.

3. Discussing Countywide constraints, issues, and opportunities.

Amsden spoke on the Opportunities and Constraints Report. He explained the meaning of physical, regulatory, and policy constraints, how they were identified, and how they could be used in identifying areas where changes should and should not occur. Chair Foley remarked that constrained areas shown in the sample map from San Joaquin County appeared to identify very little unconstrained land, and Mr. Tobias described how delineating constrained areas and choosing between tighter and looser definitions of constraint could become contentious. Amsden said that such a map would be just of multiple factors to consider. Ms. Moore asked about the level of precision in the data used in the maps and whether an issue on a large parcel would result in identifying the entire large parcel, and not just the area of the issue, as constrained. Amsden explained that some data is at the parcel level while some is more detailed, and Mintier gave the examples of Williamson Act contracts as constraints affecting entire parcels and of slopes as constraints independent of parcels. Amsden gave further examples of the airport zone as independent of parcels and conservation easements as affecting entire parcels. Mr. Roemer added that greater precision could result in too little usable information and balance is needed between greater detail and less detail. Mintier gave further explanation of the data's limitations and how the data should be used. Vice Chair West remarked that the GPU's scope looks beyond the duration of a Williamson Act contract; Amsden responded that this process regards a Williamson Act contract as a "lower constraint," and he and Mr. West discussed how policy could be made to reflect nonrenewals of Williamson Act contracts.

4. Discussing the General Plan alternatives process.

Amsden introduced the presentation on the alternatives process and turned it over to Mintier, who spoke about the process as a time to convert previous broad-level activities, such as the Guiding Principles and the Background Report, into narrow-focus alternatives. Mintier described how future GPAC meetings would address alternatives. Ms. Saxton asked about what kinds of alternatives to expect, such as those based on level of growth. Mintier answered with the next presentation slide and explained the steps of the alternative process—preparing the alternatives, comparing the alternatives, public review of alternatives, and final decision. One alternative is no change, extending current policy through the coming 25 years, he said. The alternatives would be based three "anchors"—a 25-year planning horizon, population growth of at most AMBAG's projected unincorporated County figure of 27,000 people, and the Vision and Guiding Principles. Mintier and Amsden restated that population would be treated as a controlled variable, with other non-controlled variables accounting for the differences among the alternatives, and they clarified for Mr. Roemer that the alternatives would be using AMBAG's population-projection number but would not necessarily use AMBAG's spatial distribution model. Amsden clarified that the alternatives would achieve the Vision and Guiding Principles and the population target but through different spatial arrangements. Discussion followed on AMBAG's population projection and the methods use to create it, as well as Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

Mintier continued describing the alternatives process by stating additional factors, such as agricultural preservation, economic development, and livability, that could be used to develop alternatives. Discussion of the factors followed. Mr. Tobias suggested proximity to transportation corridors as a factor. Ms. Saxton expressed concern on land use and impacts to property values. Discussion also took place on jobs–housing balance, which was suggested to be its own, separate category. Mintier suggested that no one alternative produced by the process might be the perfect alternative and that a hybrid of alternatives could be chosen. Amsden also suggested housing densities as a factor, ranging from historical, status-quo densities extrapolated into the future to medium-high or high densities.

Ms. Moore raised the topic of the Board of Supervisors and Hollister City Council's possible reduction of local traffic impact fees on housing. ADoP Turner explained the possible action, including reducing expected level-of-service on local roads to allow for reduced fees. Discussion followed on the implications of such an action and how it could interact with the GPU.

5. Adoption of regular meeting schedule for remainder of 2010 calendar year.

Discussion took place on the schedule. Mr. Noble moved to adopt the schedule, and Mr. Tobias seconded. The motion passed 8–0. Discussion took place on the frequency of GPAC meetings and on scheduling community workshops. An opportunity for public comment was offered; Phil Fortino spoke on the importance of considering jobs in the GPU and subsequent benefits to livability, walkability, and local traffic.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m. to the regular meeting of September 2, 2010.