

# REGIONAL URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES TASK FORCE REGULAR MEETING NOTES 1:00 p.m., Thursday, April 14, 2016

920 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Suite A, Marina, CA 93933 (FORA Conference Room)

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Michael Houlemard Jr. called the meeting to order at 1:08 a.m. The following were present:

## **Committee Members:**

Layne Long, City of Marina Anya Spear, California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) Carl Holm, Monterey County

#### Other Attendees:

Mike Bellinger, BFS Landscape Architects (BFSLA)
Kathy Biala, Marina Planning Commission
Steve Matarazzo, University of California Santa Cruz
Karyn Wolfe, Citizens for Sustainable Marina
Levonne Stone, Fort Ord Environmental Justice Network
Bob Schaffer, member of the public
Brian Boudreau, member of the public
Beth Palmer, member of the public
Wendy Elliott, Dunes at Monterey Bay

#### FORA Staff:

Michael A. Houlemard, Jr. (Chair) Steve Endsley Jonathan Brinkmann Mary Israel Josh Metz Ted Lopez

# 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mike Bellinger led the pledge of allegiance.

# 3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Houlemard announced that FORA will be interviewing candidates for the new Prevailing Wage position next week.

## 4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

#### a. March 29, 2016 Minutes

<u>MOTION</u>: Layne Long moved, seconded by Carl Holm, to approve the March 29, 2016 RUDG Task Force meeting minutes. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### 5. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

None.

#### 6. BUSINESS ITEMS

## a) DRAFT RUDG content review/edit/recommendations

#### i. Checklist

RUDG Project Manager Josh Metz presented a working draft RUDG checklist. He noted specific edits including: a new "Applicable" checkbox to indicate relevant guidelines; staff retained the "Yes/No" and "Notes" columns for each measure, added Measure numbers corresponding to RUDG Measure numbers, and formatted keywords to bold. Finally, he noted that staff had

distilled and added FORA's (2005) adopted Highway 1 Corridor guidelines as part of the checklist.

Staff also addressed the following questions from the Task Force and public:

**Will the checklist be fillable online?** There will be a PDF form to download and fill in, as well as an online form. Mr. Houlemard noted the material submission timestamping requirements in the Master Resolution Chapter 8 remain unchanged.

Could someone not meet one out of ten of the guidelines and still have their project accepted? Assistant Executive Officer Steve Endsley said the checklist is not meant to be a pass/fail test. Rather, it would represent project RUDG compliance after discussions with planners and FORA staff, and be one component of the total consistency determination packet.

Could LEED for Neighborhood Development inform the RUDG checklist? Task Force member Anya Spear advocated for using the LEED for Neighborhood Development standard to strengthen the RUDG by further incorporating national planning best practices. Staff agreed to take this under consideration and return a recommendation at the next meeting.

UCMBEST Planning Director, Steve Matarazzo, suggested the best development project might use both a checklist and submit 4-5 pages of narrative so jurisdictional staff can see how they alternatively meet Objectives. Mr. Houlemard asked staff to add a sentence in the 'How to Use This Checklist' section to the effect that where a Legislative Land-use Consistency Determination has been made referring to a specific measure, attach a document to explain how the project meet these requirements.

Mr. Holm asked where 'applicability' will be noted, per measure or per guideline. Mr. Metz explained that some guidelines are not-applicable for any given planning area or location and therefore jurisdiction staff can check "No" on the top right corner before conveying the checklist to an applicant. Mr. Holm also suggested the measures be itemized with alpha-numeric code, i.e. change Complete Streets measure 1 to "CS1," for clearer communications.

Mr. Metz asked the Task Force to submit all comments and questions on the checklist by the end of the following week (April 22<sup>nd</sup>). Mr. Houlemard reminded the Task Force that the checklist planning tool for jurisdiction staff and developers is not for FORA Board Approval.

## ii. Landscaping

Mike Bellinger of BFSLA presented an updated draft plating palette. Following from previous street tree discussion, he reiterated his intent to offer durable trees with limited irrigation needs. He clarified that the plant palette is for public right-of-way only, such as parkway strips, medians and shoulders. Therefore, he chose to offer as few as possible, so as not to burden the agencies planting these areas with elaborate layouts and high-level care.

A representative of Citizens for a Sustainable Marina requested the development areas and regional corridor plant palette be based on the Fort Ord National Monument native plant list. She specifically requested madrone, flannel bush, native oak species, and said that Leptospermum and Echium are invasive and problematic. She spoke against Cypress trees. She offered her organization's support in sourcing native plants. Mr. Houlemard said that jurisdictions and developers can include more native plants if desired.

A representative of Fort Ord Environmental Justice asked for trees that are known to absorb air pollution to be included in the palette. She also said that the Army sprayed the native oak trees with Agent Orange.

A representative of the Dunes at Monterey Bay asked if microclimates of Fort Ord could be specified for a plant palette atlas. Mr. Bellinger said the main driver in his tree selections was the ability to survive and remain aesthetically appealing in the high winds that are typical in the former Fort Ord area.

A member of the Marina Planning Commission said she brought plant palette notes from Bruce Delgado and Rob Dupree for Mr. Bellinger and FORA staff to review. She asked for the RUDG Task Force to start looking at natural natives, then supplement them from an ecosystem approach. Staff agreed to review the notes. Mr. Bellinger offered to add notes about preserving native soils and delineate lead time for collection and propagation of native plants in the plant palette. Mr. Houlemard said that the plant palette will not cover 100% of the development area, but only about 5%.

Mr. Endsley asked staff to share the deadline for the plant palette input. Mr. Metz said the final draft is set to go to the June 10<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting, therefore a final public release needs to be May 16<sup>th</sup>, all other outstanding work must be done in early May. Mr. Houlemard said all plant palette feedback must be in to Mr. Bellinger and FORA staff by the end of next week (April 22<sup>nd</sup>).

# b) Draft RUDG upcoming review/discussion

## i. Gateways

Mr. Metz reminded members the Gateway content needed further attention. Mr. Houlemard asked for the Gateways landscaping palette to be part of Mr. Bellinger's assignment. He also said that the jurisdictions agreed to have military themes in gateways signage in the 1990s. He asked for language in the RUDG that encourages the jurisdictions to have monument-level signage or wayfinding at the gateways to recognize they are entering former Fort Ord.

Mr. Holm said there should be a consistent palette both in the landscaping and in the signage materials and colors of Gateways. Layne Long said the design of the gateway signage should be consistent across all jurisdictions. Ms. Spear said to refer to the TAMC wayfinding palette. Mr. Houlemard said the decision is already made to use the graphics that are in the RUDG and he suggested staff add language about the two gateways from the BRP as examples. He said the guidelines be kept generic and up to the jurisdictions.

#### ii. Cross-sections

Mr. Metz asked if the Task Force would like to include the cross-sections as they were provided by the consultants, although the road type titles do not match the BRP road types or FORA Fee Reallocation Study terms. Mr. Houlemard asked staff to come back to the Task Force at the next meeting with recommendations.

#### 7. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

None.

### 8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 3:03 p.m.

NEXT MEETING DATE: 1:00 p.m. April 28th, 2016