



FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY
REGIONAL URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES (RUDG) TASK FORCE
MEETING MINUTES

9:30 a.m., Friday, February 5th, 2016

920 2nd Avenue, Suite A, Marina CA 93933 (FORA Conference Room)

1. CALL TO ORDER

RUDG Task Force (Task Force) Chair Michael Houlemard called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m. The following were present:

Committee Members:

Victoria Beach, City of Carmel-by-the-Sea
Elizabeth Caraker, City of Monterey
Diana Ingersoll, City of Seaside
Layne Long, City of Marina
Anya Spear, California State University Monterey Bay

FORA Staff:

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

Other Attendees:

Grace Bogdan, County of Monterey
Gene Doherty, Marina Planning Commission
Robert Guidi, Department of the Army (POMDWP)
Craig Malin, City of Seaside
Steve Matarazzo, University of California Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology Center (UCMBEST)
Virginia Murillo, Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC)
Tim O'Halloran, City of Seaside
Wendy Elliot, Dunes at Monterey Bay
Jane Haines, member of the public
Bob Schaffer, member of the public

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE led by Anya Spear.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Diane Ingersoll is appointed to the RUDG to replace John Dunn as the representative from City of Seaside.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Jane Haines said that she is concerned that Highway 1 lacks a sign for Former Fort Ord. She suggested it be located at Lightfighter Drive.

5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

- a. December 16, 2015 Minutes
Deferred to the next meeting.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. DRAFT RUDG format and content review/update

Executive Officer Michael Houlemard gave a brief overview of how the RUDG went with the consultants up until December, when they passed the editable copy to FORA staff lead Josh Metz, and the steps that staff have taken since to make final editing of the RUDG more efficient. Victoria Beach added that the process of ‘webification’ of the RUDG showed repetitiveness and fluffiness in writing as well as gaps in the product. She and Carl Holm have helped FORA staff clean up the writing and note where the gaps are.

Josh Metz then gave a live tour of the website version of the RUDG while Task Force members followed with the most recent draft from December 2015 for comparison. He explained that he did not send the latest 12/31/15 consultant draft RUDG document to members because he didn’t want them to go too deep in to the print since it has recently been revised. Instead, Mr. Metz encouraged a detailed review of each guideline in this format. He asked for help deciding what to do about the larger gaps in the work. These are: road and trail cross-section consistency; road and trail atlas; lighting and landscaping palettes; gateway and wayfinding signage design; transit hub design.

The Task Force discussed options for moving ahead including: a) bringing on consultants from the local sub-consultant pool of Dover-Kohl and Partners (DKP); b) assigning tasks directly to DKP; or c) reassigning some of these items to FORA staff. Victoria Beach suggested the Task Force also address the need for re-branding the former Fort Ord as recommended by the 2012 Reassessment Report and the RUDG Developer Consultants. Michael Houlemard cautioned that “branding” is a component of the Reasssessment Report – Category III items assigned to the Post Reassessment Advisory Committee and the task would be time consuming and complex.

Content and organizational recommendations from the Task Force included:

1. Introduce the terms and differences between Centers, Gateways, and Corridors above the main map. Can you make the legend more prominent? Perhaps with a pop-up window that gives directions to scroll down, and is clicked to close. Remove redundant links. Keep the left bar as a set format, add sub-lists under and keep it as an outline of the material that is clicked through to in the main body of the page. Clarify titles on left bar to be relevant exclusively to what is in the main body on that page.
2. Rotating pictures are distracting, leave that as optional.
3. How are the Consistency Determinations (CD) to be used? Clarify implementation and evaluation within the webpages on each guideline. Purpose is the first section, and CD is broken out as Objectives in the second section. Guidelines is confusing showing up in different uses. Compliance is with Design Objectives.
4. Consider Title line to offer Guidelines, subtitle to offer Location on each section.
5. Elizabeth Caraker agreed to draft a couple of sentences as the Objectives for each guideline.
6. For the next Agenda, Anya Spear requested the Task Force review what type of road designs go where, and designate.
7. Craig Malin asked for greater clarity on the building types and setbacks, and for the Task Force to consider using the term “landscape” rather than “landscaping.” Michael Houlemard replied that FORA Board of Directors (Board) chose the former in the Highway 1 Design Workshop, but the BRP used the latter.
8. Wendy Elliot said that lighting and signage design requirements should be in respect to where projects are (Coastal like the Dunes, Rolling hills like East Garrison, etc.) so that place is respected while the collective look is whole.
9. Road cross-sections don’t match trail cross-sections. Specific recommendations are needed. Victoria Beach suggested that staff gather what is known and hand a file off to a consultant

who would write a Regional Identity piece, label the roads correctly and say where the regulations apply.

Josh Metz said that the Board meets to review the RUDG on March 7, and that roughly 18% of the budget remains. The Task Force discussed options. Michael Houlemaid said it should stay on schedule and any pieces that need to be refined post-adoption can be done, but CDs will be coming in. He asked: can gap assignments be brought in-house for some of the data collection with consultants brought on for completion, as Victoria Beach suggested? Can the Task Force have a final draft ready for Board consideration in April/May? Some decisions can be made within RUDG Task Force meetings. Next meeting, the Task Force agreed to review roads and trails.

7. ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

None.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 11:36 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, February 25th from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m