



**Steering Committee
Members:**

Chair

Peter McCrea

Vice Chair

Tom Andrews

George Bachich

Debra Blodgett

Mary Ellen Boyet

Jon-Mark Chappellet

Stephen Cuddy

Tom Gamble

Michael Haley

James Hendrickson

Conrad Hewitt

Guy Kay

Carol Kunze

Carole Meredith

Beth Painter

Carol Poole

Jeff Reichel

Brad Simpkins

Stuart Smith

Bob Torres

Duane Wall

Approved

MINUTES

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE

**NAPA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
2121 IMOLA AVENUE, NAPA, CA**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 2006 – 2:00 PM

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Tom Andrews called the meeting to order and roll was called alphabetically.

Present

Tom Andrews, Debra Blodgett, Mary Ellen Boyet, Stephen Cuddy, Michael Haley, Conrad Hewitt, Guy Kay, Carol Kunze, Carole Meredith, Beth Painter, Carol Poole, Jeff Reichel, Brad Simpkins, and Bob Torres.

Absent

George Bachich at the time of roll and later arrived during item 5, Jon-Mark Chappellet at the time of roll and later arrived during item 5, James Hendrickson at the time of roll and later arrived during item 5, Stuart Smith at the time of roll and later arrived during item 6, Tom Gamble at the time of roll and later arrived during item 6.

Excused

Peter McCrea, Duane Wall.

Staff Present

Silva Darbinian, Patrick Lynch, Howard Siegel, John McDowell, Nancy Johnson, Bruce Wilson and Lori Maher.

PMC

Eric Norris and Liz Madison.

2. Election of Temporary Chair for Today's Meeting

Vice Chair was in attendance which made the process unnecessary.

3. Public Comment

Mark Richmond, President of the Napa Valley Economic Development Corporation (NVEDC), commended the committee on including an Economic Development Element in the County's General Plan Update. He noted that the NVEDC stands ready to assist the County in the coming decades. NVEDC will help craft a blue print, work with the County to identify areas of improvement and help implement their plan.

Wyman Smith, NVEDC Board Member, recognized the committee for their dedication to the general plan. He noted that NVEDC submitted a white paper to the committee as they strongly support the establishment of an Economic Development Element in the General Plan and pointed out a few items within the document. *This document can be found on the General Plan website in the meeting materials of April 26, 2006 meeting at:*

http://www.napacountygeneralplan.com/meetings_and_workshops/meetings.htm

4. **Update From City Representative – Carol Poole**

Nothing to report at this time.

5. **Action Items:**

a) Approval of Minutes from March 29th Meeting

Motion: Made by Guy Kay to approve the minutes with the correction of attendance (Bob Torres and Beth Painter) and include the conversation with Steve Lederer:

In terms of historical uses: Steve Lederer looks at a lot of property in the process of his work and noted that there are close to 30 historical resorts that he has stumbled across, so the committee needs to be careful what they say yes to. In regards to agricultural use, depending on how you phrase words, you might be looking at a Measure J vote.

In the terms of the CEQA Process-Example: Francis Ford Coppola lives in the Niebaum 1873 Mansion on his property. If there were no controls at all, he could request a permit and demo the home and build another house.

The current controls that the County has in place, is the CEQA Process. Francis Ford Coppola would come in for a demo permit that is identified as a potentially significant resource, than whatever he does to the property would have to be consistent with the Secretary of Interior Guidelines. If so, he would be free and clear to make those changes that are consistent.

If CEQA say this isn't a potentially significant resource, then a decision would have to be made and he would have to comply with whatever that decision was.

So the question is, since his house is not on the list, should he be allowed to demo that house?

Second: Jeff Reichel

Vote: AIF

Abstained: Conrad Hewitt

b) Adoption of Revised By-Laws (Meeting location change)

Motion: Made by Conrad Hewitt to revise the By-laws to reflect a new meeting location.

Second: Guy Kay

Vote: AIF

6. **Housing Element – Nancy Johnson, Howard Siegel**

Howard explained that an extensive update will not be done on the Housing Element for two reasons: 1) An update was done about 18 months ago and 2) The State and Regional Agencies have not taken the necessary actions for us to move forward. However, there is enough information that will impact other areas of the element, land use in particular, and Howard would like everyone to be familiar with the process and the strange particulars of the Housing Element. He also distributed information on what "affordable housing" means.

Nancy Johnson informed the group that the Housing Element is a mandatory element in a general plan. And since 1991, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has been in charge of regulating the content of what going into a general plan. This element is required to receive its own

certification to ensure that all economic segments of the population receive access to housing.

Questions, concerns and discussion included:

Sites for future affordable housing were chosen due to vacancy, minimal development, environmental constraints, that they are within the bubble and based on density how many units could be built there. They are parcel specific destinations and zoning overlays.

On the environment side, was there consideration for water and sewer and whether the site can handle housing? *Yes, each parcel is somehow connected or near by services.*

How many affordable units are remaining that we have to come up with? *None in this cycle. We are currently waiting the next round of housing needs allocation numbers.*

Is there any fluidity with these sites? *The sites are pretty well set and if there was a change, we need approval from HCD.*

Is there an opportunity in the General Plan for the committee to review the process for deferring the duration of to maintain affordable housing? Does the committee have the ability to weigh in on the challenges? *There is a series of requirements to utilize the affordable housing overlay zone and you have to meet those requirements with regard to time constraints (i.e. 40-year affordability requirement). The standard funding sources also require this length of time.*

Instead of creating new cities, can encouraging second units on existing parcels be considered since everything is already in place to create these units economically? If the County adopted a policy encouraging so many of these units per year, this it would help create the needed amount of housing without being visible and/or creating new cities. *Patrick Lynch noted that HCD has written legislation on this and will get it to the committee. This will address this question. This is already in the State code and the question is do we adopt this on the local level or not.*

It seems that some of the parcels have too much difficulty to build anything on them. How can this been done? *Howard Siegel noted that one of the underlying issues within the Housing Element is that there some enforcement attached to it. Numbers include approximately 2000 units required of the unincorporated county for about a seven year cycle with more than half of these being affordable. It will be hard to achieve these numbers without going into a Measure J vote and this is why in part, the urban bubbles were chosen. These are the best of the bunch.*

Now that the sites are designated, what happens if nothing gets built? *We (the public sector) have to do whatever is in our power (zoning and such), but it is up to the private sector to take advantage of the entitlements.*

What can be done about the people that are being singled out (those folks that don't meet the requirements of persons within the household)? *The Housing Element requires that you provide programs for certain categories of people and, although there are draw backs in certain situations, a person would not be dismissed from the program. The Counties and most of the Cities have trust funds to help developers create homes and helps homeowners get into the homes.*

What about mobile homes? *That would be allowed under our combination district.*

Since everything seems to be above what the committee can do, what are you asking of the committee today? Are you providing information or asking for direction? *Information primarily.*

Can the Counties negotiate among themselves out side the State? *Good question, there is some pending legislation now that allows you in theory to negotiate with a city or the County of Solano.*

Do our Cities in Napa County have the capacity to allow a lot more housing units? *The cities had to have both, the willingness to create more housing as well as have the capacity to so and they have their own allocation requirements. We had a study done looking at the current zoning and land use in the cities to find out if they do have the capacity and how much if so can they handle our units as well as their own.*

And when the new cycle begins, we all will be getting new numbers. This is an ongoing problem.

Is there anything that this committee can do in a recommendation that would have a purpose or potential or is it a waste of time? *Given the current opportunity that ABAG is affording us to participate in this methodology, a position paper or letter that outlines all the reasons that Napa County feels the constraints we have that factor into the methodology requirements and what they should take into consideration when coming up with this number would certainly help.*

Who or what does ABAG consist of? *ABAG consists of 9 Counties and approximately 100 Cities within those counties.*

In the numbers of forecasting potential units, are you using “potential” guest houses and 2nd units as part of those numbers? *Even if we could make a case that all those units are affordable (which is questionable) there is not a significant number per year to make a difference. If agricultural lands (AP) were allowed to have affordable second units for workers, this would help.*

Staff asked should there be any changes in the land use map and if so where would you put them? *We should look at the plan we have in place and implement it more effectively. Maybe staff can look at this and see if there is more flexibility there and we don't constrain a project for leading out of affordability.*

In this inclusionary housing fund, how many units (an average number) do you expect to get of each million dollars that is taken out of that fund? *For our million dollars (plus leveraged funds), about 100 units.*

Staff wanted to define the difference between a guest cottage and a second unit. A guest cottage is not considered a second unit as it is allowed 1000 sq. ft. and can not include a kitchen. A second unit is allowed 1200 sq. ft. and has to include a kitchen.

The committee can look at the land use designations that will generate jobs and get us a better housing number.

Staff will work on getting information from HCD is looking at when they certify and is currently working on getting numbers for Napa Pipe and Syar. The developer's numbers and our numbers are different and our numbers may not be the maximum they are seeking.

Tom Andrews noted that staff should have enough information to provide goals and policies on the issues they are concerned with for the next round.

Howard noted that there are two upcoming Board meetings, May 9th, a joint meeting with the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission, primarily to provide an update on this process. And on May 16th, the Board may be discussing the ABAG methodology, what we think the numbers is going to be and where we think we will be able to accommodate them. He encouraged folks to attend them both.

Public Comment

Karen Fischer, Board member of NVEDC, asked the committee to consider the perspective of the employer's in the valley and their needs and the importance of integrating the concept of workforce development issues. She also asked the committee consider looking at ways to coordinate with some of the career and education institutions in the valley to prepare people in ways to advance in the industries that the valley supports.

Julian Weidler, founder of NVEDC, wanted to give the committee an example of what NVEDC has accomplished. American Canyon was originally housing area for those working on Mare Island and because NVEDC was there in the beginning, they were able to help American Canyon become its own city.

Dieter Dice, Board member of NVEDC and resident of Calistoga, suggests the committee look at what Economic Development as a) making sure the various initiatives are working together and noting fighting

with each other and b) bring together the communities in the valley together in an economic point of view.

Joe Fischer, County resident express his support of the Economic Development Element and feels it should address the cultural core of the county. He feels the Economic Development Element should look to the future - how is the way we do business today going to be different then how we do business in the future. Another important piece should be some type of on going planning.

The committee took a 15 minute break at 3:41 PM

7. Economic Development Element – Bruce Wilson, Howard Siegel

Howard noted that this element is a blank slate in regards to goals and policies and staff is looking for the committee's direction on this.

Bruce Wilson presented a PowerPoint that was closely related to the staff report that was included in the meeting packet. Some key points made by the committee were:

Existing business can be harmed by a shift to newer “better” businesses

Bring more information on wages and benefits for various job types-need more information to make decisions

Do not stick with the status quo just because existing businesses are there

Do not compromise success of the agricultural industry

Rename the *Economic Development* Element – suggestions were:

Sustainability - Considerations - Vitality - Opportunity

What's the County's role – Subsidize or get out of the way?

Element should rely on groups already working to continue their efforts

Removing obstacles

Partnership with community organizations and cities

Balance – Affordability and wage-earnings

Government – Not an industry, it is a big employer, but not an industry per se

How is government employment broken down? Federal, State, Local

Economic Development – Ensure that future growth is not in conflict with the general plan policies

Economic growth = growth that county has historically discouraged; but it could occur by improving the existing industries

Involve American Canyon as they are an important part of the economy

All cities should be a part of this strategy

The vision: A vibrant and robust economy that benefits Napa County and its residents

#1 Goal should specifically include the “wine industry”

The committee agreed that there was not enough time to make any decisions on the discussion and should be continued at the next meeting.

8. Future Agenda Items

- a) 2nd Round of Previously Discussed Elements

- b) Special Meeting May 10th – The continuation of the Economic Development Element will replace the Recreation and Open Space Element.
- c) Berryessa Trip, May 18th – Special Meeting
- d) Election of Officers – Nomination of Officers in June; Election in July

9. Adjourn – 5:07 PM