



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 DECEMBER 2, 2010

PRESENT Foley, West, Felice, Gatto, Montoya, Moore, Noble, Rajkovich, Saxton, Tobias

ABSENT: Brunnemann, French, Ortega, Roemer, Schneider

STAFF: Director of Planning (DoP) Gary Armstrong, Assistant Director of Planning (ADoP) Byron Turner, County Counsel (CC) Matt Granger

The regular meeting commenced at 6 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. No general public comment was given.

AGENDA

1. Approve minutes from the October 7, 2010, meeting.

Mr. Tobias made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair West, to approve the minutes of October 7, 2010. The motion passed 10–0.

2. Discuss draft Alternatives Report.

Dan Amsden gave an updated timeline and status for the GPU. He also discussed the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments release of the *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area* (Blueprint) document. Chair Foley asked about San Benito County's participation in the Blueprint process; DoP Armstrong explained County Planning's involvement.

Amsden discussed the Alternatives Report and its contents, summarizing the alternatives. Ms. Saxton asked about how population projections translated into growth rate and expressed concern about a higher-than-expected growth rate described in the report; Amsden responded that the report describes 1.8-percent growth. Rich Saxe, under public comment, stated that AMBAG's projections were compiled and published at the height of the economic bubble and were not sustainable; he expressed concern that it would seem unreasonable to use those numbers in all the all alternatives. Amsden confirmed that all the alternatives were based on the 1.8-percent growth rate; Chair Foley asked further questions about how AMBAG's growth numbers were developed, and Mintier gave further explanation on AMBAG and the State Department of Finance's projection methods. ADoP Turner gave a clarification regarding the County's Growth Management Ordinance and its recent amendment to allow growth matching the California-wide growth average, and discussion on that ordinance and future growth rates followed. Larry Mintier commented that Board of Supervisors directed that the AMBAG numbers be used and that the growth-rate variable was held constant to allow examination of other variables. Vice Chair West stated he preferred the 1.8-percent rate over a 1-percent rate to "err on the side of getting more jobs." Ms. Moore and Ms. Saxton briefly discussed providing the County's fair share of housing. Mintier stated that AMBAG does long-term projections that are mostly information for transportation planning, while short-term projections are used for housing allocation.

Amsden displayed three revised alternatives diagrams and asked whether the Committee had questions on alternatives assumptions and on findings. Mintier asked the Committee whether the alternatives were ready for public

input. He explained that the alternatives being presented were not the only possible alternatives that could result but were portrayal of different policy concepts and that it is important that the Committee and public understand the assumptions and findings.

Chair Foley solicited questions. Ms. Saxton mentioned that the report should mention that the Board directed the use of AMBAG's projections. Mr. Gatto asked whether the consultants incorporated changes from the previous meeting; his question was answered "yes," and Mr. Gatto suggested the alternatives go out to the public to learn what they have to say. Mr. Noble commented that the use of the word *protected* for agricultural land was problematic, being reminiscent of the Measure G debate in 2004. Ray Pierce, under public comment, suggested that the alternatives go out to the public as soon as possible, as public input may present a fork in the road that could require addressing; he also commented that transferable development credits (TDCs) are voluntary and actually do protect land in perpetuity. Mr. Noble said that safeguards against development of special agricultural land already exist, such as loss of Growth Management Ordinance points. Rich Saxe, under public comment, asked whether Alternative C required buy-in from the City of Hollister, given that Alternative C projects 95 percent of growth in the City of Hollister. Chair Foley asked about how to deal with the City; DoP Armstrong said the City's comments are expected and invited. Further discussion on the use of *protected* took place.

Amsden asked for further alternatives comments. Vice Chair West said he wanted to change all the alternatives and believed the public would want to make many changes but that the alternatives were good enough to start a discussion.

3. Discuss Community Workshops exercises.

Amsden spoke on scheduling a January workshop, what would take place there, and how it would be publicized. Chair Foley suggested Spanish-language outreach. Mr. Felice asked about the goal of the outreach; Amsden responded that intent was to update the community on the process and draw input on the alternatives. Discussion followed on the format and who should attend. Amsden also described future Planning Commission and Board involvement. Jerry Muenzer, under public comment, suggested involving local organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Hollister Downtown Association in outreach efforts. Ray Pierce, under public comment, suggested working with the school system to involve youth and include outreach in school newsletters. Discussion on workshop attendance and on further forms of outreach.

Amsden described a policy exercise for the workshop. Mintier talked about workshop format and asked the Committee for areas on which they would like input. Discussion took place on major policy areas of concern, on the workshop format, and on workshop location. Amsden then provided, in response to a Committee member's comment from an earlier meeting, an Urban Land Institute handout describing population and housing numbers typically required for different types of commercial development.

4. Adopt schedule for regular meetings in 2011.

The Committee accepted February 3, 2011, as the next regular meeting date but postponed the choice of later dates until the February 3 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m. to the regular meeting of February 3, 2011.

Minutes prepared by Michael Kelly, Associate Planner. Attest: Byron Turner, Assistant Director of Planning.