



**FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY**  
**BOARD OF DIRECTORS SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**  
**Monday, March 7, 2016 at 4:30 p.m.**  
**910 2nd Avenue, Marina CA (Carpenters Union Hall)**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair O'Connell called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Edelen.

**3. ROLL CALL**

**Voting Members Present:**

Councilmember Beach (City of Carmel-by-the-Sea)  
Mayor Pro Tem O'Connell (City of Marina)  
Councilmember Morton (City of Marina)  
Mayor Edelen (City of Del Rey Oaks)  
Supervisor Potter (County of Monterey)  
Supervisor Phillips (County of Monterey)  
Supervisor Parker (County of Monterey)  
Mayor Rubio (City of Seaside)  
Mayor Pro Tem Oglesby (City of Seaside)

**Ex-officio (Non-Voting) Board Members Present:**

Walter Tribley (Monterey Peninsula College),  
Lisa Rheinheimer (Monterey-Salinas Transit, alternate)

**Absent:**

**(Voting)** Councilmember Lucius (City of Pacific Grove), Mayor Pendergrass (City of Sand City), Vice Mayor Haffa (City of Monterey), Mayor Gunter (City of Salinas);

**(Non-Voting)** Congressman Farr (20<sup>th</sup> Congressional District), Senator Monning (17<sup>th</sup> State Senate District), Assembly member Stone (29<sup>th</sup> State Assembly District), Donna Blitzer (University of California Santa Cruz, Eduardo Ochoa (CSUMB), PK Diffenbaugh (Monterey Peninsula Unified School District), Debbie Hale (Transportation Agency of Monterey County), Col. Fellingner (U.S. Army), Bill Collins (Fort Ord BRAC Office), Director Gustafson (Marina Coast Water District).

**4. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

None.

**6. BUSINESS ITEMS**

a. Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG) Status Update

Economic Development Coordinator Josh Metz reviewed the history of the RUDG and introduced the "website RUDG" to the Members of the Board. He showed areas that have been refined since

January, when the first editable version was requested of the consultants, Dover Kohl & Partners. He asked for feedback from Board members and their staff to expand the Definitions section and evaluate the Objectives and Measures of each Guideline. He showed interactive maps developed by FORA staff to locate projects and look up required guidelines by location with symbols for required guidelines solid or filled in, while “opportunity” symbols are hollow. He explained “opportunity sites” signify that the Task Force preferred those locations be referenced because Task Force and Charrette noted their relevance. He gave specific examples using “Town and Village Centers” guidelines. Mr. Metz outlined how staff and RUDG Task Force (Task Force) volunteers reviewed guidelines included in existing plans on former Fort Ord to compare them with corresponding RUDG measures; staff found no conflicts and strengthened some RUDG measures in the process. Staff also drafted a RUDG instructional flyer for distribution to local Planning Departments once the RUDG is approved. Mr. Metz suggested a 15-day open public comment period and a final draft to the Board at April regular meeting or a later special meeting.

Several Board members commented that they found the “website RUDG” straightforward and useful, while others questioned specific language and implementation. Councilmember Morton asked that page 11, Policy Application, be amended to make it clear they apply to “new” projects. Supervisor Potter asked how the measures are going to work, and how flexible they will be. Mr. Metz explained a RUDG Checklist is being produced for jurisdiction staff that will have a Yes/No format with additional comment space for consistency with Measures, and that a fully implementable Checklist will augment the existing Consistency Determination process. Board representative to the Task Force, Councilmember Beach, said that the work of the Task Force grew into a positive collaboration of public, developer and jurisdiction staff. But, she emphasized, a few gaps remain, and significant work will need to be done in staff-Task Force editorial sessions or as discrete projects for consultants to make up for the content gaps. She listed the areas as a) trails and streets cross-sections, b) gateway and signage design, and c) landscaping palette. Supervisor Potter asked staff to search the text for architectural and engineering terms such as “arterial” and “stub” and add definitions in the Definitions section. Mayor Rubio suggested the definitions for special terms be handled by adding a glossary for each chapter of the RUDG. He also noted that the Charrettes were not very inclusionary at first and that he had to press the Task Force to hold them later and at more accessible locations. He shared his impression as a Board representative to the Task Force that developers input to remove “shall” from the objectives of the guidelines helped frame the opinion of the Task Force members that the guidelines should be handled as a subject for discussion between developers and jurisdiction staff to reach compromises. Mayor Rubio said he anticipates many comments on the current draft from his staff and that the final, complete document may be ready to be voted on in April or May, whenever it is truly final and everyone can live with it.

**MOTION:** Supervisor Potter moved and Councilmember Morton seconded to receive the RUDG report with consideration of Board members’ requests, leaving the date of vote on the item up to the process.

**MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.** Ayes: Beach, O’Connell, Morton, Edelen, Potter, Phillips, Parker, Rubio, Oglesby. *Absent:* Gunter, Haffa, Lucius, Pendergrass.

The Board received public comments.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair O’Connell adjourned the meeting at 5:38 pm.