



SUMMARY MINUTES
General Plan Advisory Committee
7:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m. Thursday, January 11, 2007
Police Community Room
155 Center Street

Call to Order – 7:07 pm

Roll Call –

Present: Committee Members Don Lane (chair), David Foster, Charlie Keutmann, Scott Daly, Michael Bethke, Bill Schultz, David Subocz; Kris Reyes (7:15 pm), Yolanda Henry, Rod Quartararo, Linda Bixby; Alternate Scott Wedge.

Absent: Committee Members Wally Brondstatter, Kaitilin Gaffney (with notice), Diane Louie, Larry Kasparowitz, Frank Zwart (without notice).

Staff: Greg Larson, Ken Thomas, Michelle King, Lupita Alamos, Julianne Ward, Liz Camarie (recorder).

Consultant: Naphtali Knox (lead consultant)

Public: Approx. 15 members of the public.

Announcements –

- Greg Larson expressed his thanks for the Committee’s wonderful card and sentiments after the birth of his son.
- Don Lane announced that Kaitilin Gaffney’s daughter, Zoe, had been born.
- Greg Larson said that he had been invited the previous Monday to address the Parks and Recreation Commission about the general plan process.

Oral Communications –

- Hugh Carter addressed residential zoning disparities in the Seabright Area. He encouraged the re-zoning of the central part of the neighborhood to R-1.

Approval of December 14, 2006 Minutes –

ACTION: Scott Wedge moved, and Michael Bethke seconded, **APPROVAL** of the GPAC December 14, 2006 Summary Minutes with the following corrections: last paragraph on the first page, correct the speaker’s name to Naomi Brouner and on page 3, third bullet, change the word “partial” to “parcel.” The Committee’s vote approving the motion was 10/0/1, Linda Bixby abstaining (Kris Reyes had not yet arrived).

Agenda Items

1. Adoption of “Sustainability” and “Sustainable” Definitions

Naphtali Knox introduced this item, saying that during the Committee’s discussion of goals for economic development, the Committee asked for a definition of “sustainability.” Staff recommends that one definition now be selected from the option provided with any changes deemed advisable.

Public Comments:

- Mike Dalby said that the nature of sustainability is that it changes over time, as it has in the understanding of sustainable agriculture. “Sustainable development” is an oxy-moron, especially if we are trying to “grow” our economy.
- Hugh Carter thought the definition should reflect a sense of a dynamic sustainability. The Committee might need a layer of definitions, depending upon which level of sustainability was being considered.
- Mary Dalton said there were geo-political concerns to be considered. She was glad to see the Committee trying to discern what the word means and agreed with Mr. Dalby’s comment that “sustainable development” is an oxy-moron.
- Derek Williams said he would select item F (Sustainable mobility) from the list provided by staff to create a sustainable community.
- Jan Warren expressed concern that there was no mention of such things as “green” building or any specifics about transit, which could lead to incentives that would help address global warming.
- Jeanie Collins thought all footprints should be as minimal as possible, e.g., water coming out of a factory should be cleaner than when it goes in.

Naphtali Knox asked if the Committee wanted a single definition or if the concept of layered definitions was something they wanted to pursue. He said that the definition of “sustainable” comes from two places: the United Nations and the Green Building Council.

Committee Comments:

- Leave it a bit vague, as in item C (*Sustainability: Community use of natural resources in a way that does not jeopardize the ability of future generations to live and prosper.*)
- Get a basic definition tonight and then flesh it out later.
- Item B would apply to many different kinds of resources (*Sustainable: Applied to resources or system that can be maintained at a rate or level that meets or exceeds present needs without compromising the needs of future generations, and in so doing, will conserve an ecological balance and avoid depleting nature resources.*)
- The comments of the public should be taken seriously. It is not in the nature of this town to lock in sustaining anything. Our understanding should be more ecological, as in item B, but take out “at a rate or level that meets or exceeds presents needs.”
- We should assume that present needs may not be adequate.
- The definition of sustainable was different 10 years ago than it would be now. Hopefully, in five to 10 years, we will have a different view of what it should be. We are trying to build something that moves towards sustainability.
- The book “Collapse” by Jerrod Diamond was a study of societies that used up resources faster than they could be created. The primary resources are water, food and energy. If we are using these up faster than they are being renewed, they are not sustainable. So item B is the most applicable.

- There are more resources than water, food and energy.
- We are attempting to define an acceptable way to live and prosper. We don't know what our technologies will allow us to do in the future. So item C is the most applicable.
- Past generations used the argument that oil was sustainable because we were discovering it faster than we were using it. The same is true of food production. There is no guarantee that future generations will be able to live and prosper. Avoiding the depletion of natural resources seems less human-centered – they are valuable on their own, not just so that humans can prosper. Avoiding unsustainable development is advisable. So focus on resources rather than the prosperity of future generations. Use item B, but delete “Applied to...”
- Take out the word “natural.”
- “Meets or exceeds” what we will need should be left in.
- Leave “Applied to” in. If not, it's a definition of a noun when it should be an adjective.

ACTION: Scott Daly moved that item B, with changes, be adopted so that the language would read as follows:

“Sustainable: applied to resources or systems that can be maintained without compromising the needs of future generations, and in so doing, will conserve or restore an ecological balance and avoid depleting resources.”

The GPAC's vote in favor of the motion was 11/1, Bill Schultz opposed.

2. Review of Draft GP 2025 Goals

Greg Larson provided an introduction, describing the Committee's process of selecting goals in Phases 1 and 2, “pruning the rosebush” of the old General Plan to eliminate redundancy and conflicts. Now the new 2025 General Plan needs to “blossom anew” after having participated in education and community outreach. A new set of goals needs to be discussed. The proposed goals will then be taken to the City Council on February 13th.

Scott Wedge asked if a goal could be revisited after policies were being discussed, and Greg Larson replied that it would need to be flagged for the new round with the Council so that they would know they were being asked to change something they had already approved. S. Wedge expressed concern that the goals were being created somewhat out of context and might need to be fleshed out once the Committee was working on policies. Chair Don Lane noted that Committee members might want to bring this concern to the Council on February 13th. Naphtali Knox said it was even possible that new goals might be needed after policies had been created.

Public Comments:

- Micah Posner, director of People Power, thought the Mobility goals were good and positive. He suggested that Goal ED2 be modified to read, “Create opportunities for people to live and work in Santa Cruz.” Michelle King noted that ED2 presently read, “Allow for people to live and work in our community” and suggested that Micah's language might be adopted as a separate goal.
- Melanie Mayer expressed her gratitude for the Committee's efforts. She suggested that people think the words, “We want ...” ahead of any goal statement so that the capital letters beginning the first word and the period at the end could be eliminated in the goal statement. She also noted that members of the community have agency in their neighborhoods and suggested a goal that would read, “neighborhoods whose citizens feel invested in their neighborhoods.”

- Michelle David thought it was important to work on providing development that is inclusionary for all citizens of Santa Cruz, regardless of class, age, or disability. Think of that as sustainability. Another suggestion was that the University should provide for the “temporary” people who are in Santa Cruz and are not really a part of our community (and she acknowledged that this would include tourists as well as students).
- Richard Lewis thought there should be an emphasis in the plan for valuing young people and seeing the University for the asset it is. He additionally provided staff with copies of a pamphlet from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services entitled, “Reconnecting Youth and Community: A Youth Development Approach.”
- Goals should be proactive regarding the reduction of fossil fuel consumption.
- Hugh Carter thought the city’s unique character should be supported with a goal calling for high quality design/architecture. In Goal LU3, transit should include all types of travel including bikes, cars, etc. It’s not that we’re encouraging “transit” but that we want it to be more efficient or effective, which would actually reduce it. And, in Goal CC8, he questioned the use of the word, “exceptional.” Goal NRC3 should including the words “well-managed resources.”
- Mary Dalton emphasized reducing the need for imports from far away. Local needs should be met locally as much as possible. Also, neighborhoods should be strengthened.
- Matthew Thompson expressed concern that Goal LU2 did not contain any mention of diversity or mixed-use neighborhoods, diverse land uses within neighborhoods.
- Reed Searle expressed concern that Goal C3 should include protecting neighborhoods from commuter traffic.

Chair Lane noted that he was providing the Committee with a document entitled “Choices” as a tool to help move through the Goals discussion quickly.

The GPAC took a break from 8:22 to 8:32 pm.

The GPAC then discussed the Goals that had previously been prioritized. The Committee expressed appreciation for the work that Diane Louie had done in crafting language for various goals. Each goal was discussed and motions were made and seconded as follows:

ACTIONS:

<u>Goal:</u>	<u>Motion and adopted language:</u>	<u>Vote:</u>
CD3	Kris Reyes moved, and Scott Daly seconded, that Diane Louie’s version be adopted: <i>Diverse neighborhoods and districts with well-defined character</i>	12/0
CD4	Linda Bixby moved, and Michael Bethke seconded: <i>Unique community character that is reinforced by high quality design</i>	12/0
HA1 HA2	Michael Bethke moved, and David Foster seconded, that HA1 and HA2 be combined as follows: <i>Cultural resources protected and preserved</i>	12/0

Goal:	Motion and adopted language:	Vote:
LU3	David Foster moved, and Linda Bixby seconded: <i>Land use patterns that minimize transportation demand.</i>	7/5
	Rod Quartararo moved another (no second): <i>Land use patterns that facilitate alternative transportation.</i>	12/0
ED6	Kris Reyes moved, and Scott Wedge seconded: <i>A year-round visitor destination</i>	12/0
PR3	Kris Reyes moved, and Michael Bethke seconded: <i>Well-managed open space and coastline</i>	12/0
CC5	Rod Quartararo moved, and Kris Reyes seconded: <i>Minimal solid waste production</i>	12/0
H2	<i>No agreement. Staff was asked to come back with language</i>	None
CD1	Charlie Keutmann moved, and Linda Bixby seconded: <i>A built environment in harmony with its natural setting</i>	12/0
CD2	Scott Daly moved, and Yolanda Henry seconded: <i>A compact community with boundaries defined by the city's greenbelt and Monterey Bay</i>	12/0

It was agreed that staff should bring back any goals that should be thrown out.

Chair Lane noted that the public was welcome to submit goals to the Committee for consideration and Michelle King made her email address available to facilitate the public's doing so.

Naphtali Knox noted that this meeting was reflective of what a great meeting should look like.

Adjournment – 10:01 pm

The General Plan Advisory Committee will adjourn to a meeting to be held on **January 25, 2007 at 7:00 p.m.** in the Police Community Room.

The GPAC allows time for public comment on agenda items, and members of the public are invited to participate. The audience will be given an opportunity to comment on any item on the agenda.