

NEW MONTEREY NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
MINUTES

8 MAR 2010

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Howard Fossler called the meeting to order at 7:05M on 8 Feb 2010. Board members in attendance were Bob and Barbara Bass Evans, Sharon Dwight, Brian Greenshields, and Joanne Kelly.

B. Total attendance was 21, and included representatives from the City Staff, the City Council (Nancy Selfridge and Libby Downey), and residents of the local community.

II. Q&A WITH CITY OF MONTEREY STAFF

The meeting immediately started off with a question and answer period with Mr. Chip Rerig, AICP, Chief of Planning, Engineering, and Environmental Compliance, Plans and Public Works Department, City of Monterey; his deputy Ms Kim Coles; and Deputy City Manager, Mr. Fred Cohen on a variety of issues, but focused on the New Monterey Neighborhood Historic Survey (The NMNA had invited the City to discuss current planning efforts, including the New Monterey Historic Context Survey, Waterfront Plan, Lighthouse Specific Plan, Lighthouse Mixed Use Guidelines, and New Monterey Neighborhood Plan Update). Mr Rerig and Ms Cole provided a brief history of the historic survey process beginning with the 2000 Historic Preservation Ordinance which provided for area wide surveys and a \$20K funding line contained in the 2008 Housing Office Bill set aside for the historic survey effort. The actual conduct of the surveys and context statement drafting is the responsibility of Page and Turnbull, a historical preservation and architectural firm out of San Francisco. So far the City of Monterey has completed surveys for Cannery Row; Downtown, upper and lower; and Oak Grove. The City is now focused on New Monterey.

The first step in the process is to draft a context statement which is a series of themes used to best describe a community and can include local history, architecture, employers, government, etc. It becomes an iterative process with the local neighborhoods to ensure the context statement actually reflects the community. The City stated that if we were not happy with the draft context statement we do have the ability to provide additional data directly to Page and Turnbull. This was a major concern for the Board as it believes it was locked out of the process early on and could have shaped the context statement to better reflect the history and character of the New Monterey Neighborhood. The City representatives reassured the Board that this was indeed a collaborative process and we can also look at comments from other

cities. The conversation then moved into the main goal of the historic survey effort which is the architectural review piece and the submission of DPRs to get specific houses and/or entire neighborhoods designated as historic. In response to a comment by a NMNA Board member, the City reps made the point that while architectural review and preservation are different things and that while the HPC is vested with the authority to oversee the historic surveys as a certified local government, there have been occasions when they met jointly with the Architectural Review Committee. The ordinance for the Cannery Row Preservation Area mandates joint ARC/HPC action. The NMNA Board once again expressed an interest in looking at the DPRs earlier in the process or being allowed to know the criteria by which properties are being selected to be surveyed, but was told by the City representatives that they are not made available until an admin draft goes out to the entire community. City staff expressed willingness to receive community input into the process and were told that one and a half pages of suggestions had been given the week before to the staff member working on the project. In the end, it is the HPC that will hold formal hearings on the Context Statement and Surveys and be the final arbiter/approval authority. At this point, the Board made the City Staff members aware of the upcoming New Monterey History Day on 17 April and wanted to ensure that this information be included in the historic survey effort (One side note...it was at this point that Mr. Cohen mentioned Paul Conga (?) as someone to reach out to reference best practices in collecting oral histories).

The conversation then turned to the Waterfront Plan, the #1 planning priority for the City. The waterfront area runs from Sloat to San Carlos Beach with Del Monte Blvd as the southern border. According the City Staff, the process here will be very different than in the past as the City will actually get input **FIRST** from the community. More data on the initiative can be found at the following website <http://www.monterey.org/waterfrontmasterplan/>. Several other plans will be tied in or be combined with the Waterfront effort to include the Harbor Land Use and Wharf Master Plan, along with the Lighthouse Destination Plan and the new proposal for Downtown revitalization (the Ruhnke Plan). In conjunction with the plan is the light rail initiative pushed by TAMC. The Monterey City Council has asked TAMC to consider a dedicated bus lane instead of light rail...Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).

The conversation then turned to the Lighthouse Specific Plan. In order to conduct the preliminary engineering/environmental review the City will look for a community planning grant from Caltrans. Such a request must have a mass transit component. It was also mentioned that EPA grants were available. A question about stimulus money was raised, but in order to get stimulus money the project has to be "shovel ready"... thus such funds would not be available. Another question was asked concerning the Lighthouse Specific Plan and whether it was nested in the General Plan and Cannery Row Conservation Plan? (As a side note, the City also stated that the Presidio was looking at a master transportation plan for its installation.)

A discussion of area plans also came up. Sharon Dwight stated staff time for issues identified in the City's General Plan, such as updating the area plans, is being diverted by late-coming plans like the Ruhnke Plan. The City emphasized that the Ruhnke effort is a private plan with private land owners. Staff must respond to private applicants. Understanding our concern with updating the New Monterey Neighborhood area plan, Fred Cohen stated he was willing to have a "conversation" with us about what we, the NMNA, can do now. The City reps gave the impression that area plans were not high on the Planning Staff's priority list.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

One member of the community commented that noise abatement should be addressed

in all plans, and that was apparently not the case in the Jun 08 Traffic Management Plan in regards to on-going issues on Prescott and David Streets. A NIP to address the noise concerns exists but hasn't been accomplished because of money and other factors.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Alexandra Albin led a discussion on the New Monterey Garden Tour scheduled for May 2010 including insurance requirements, advertising, supervision, and deciding which gardens to accept for the tour. A suggestion was made to ask the experts at MPC to support. A lot of work needs to be done in a short time period to make this happen. See Action Items below.

B. The NMNA History Day was confirmed for 17 April at the Archer Park facility.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Two sub-committees were approved under the direction of the NMNA Board...the Historic Survey Committee and the Bay View Charter Committee. Motion by Sharon, Bob second to appoint the Historic Context Survey Subcommittee consisting of Sharon Dwight, Bob and Barbara Bass Evans, and Christine Di Iorio. Motion carried unanimously. Motion by Sharon, Joanne second to create The Bay View Charter School subcommittee consisting of Bob and Barbara Bass Evans, Bruce Crist, and Brian Greenshields. Motion carried unanimously.

B. Action Items include:

- Historic Survey Subcommittee meets, organizes and holds Community Input Day, tentatively Saturday 4/17.
- Garden Tour needs: gardens, insurance, promotion & advertising, ticket sales, supervisors for the day, date, printing, funding.
- By consensus, the Board authorized a letter to Caltrans supporting City's request for funds to study Lighthouse Ave.
- By consensus, the Board supported NMNA representation at the Waterfront Master Plan meeting on Wednesday, 10 March.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 PM