



| Town of Moraga | Agenda Item |
|---|-------------|
| Ordinances, Resolutions, Requests for Action | XI. B. |

Meeting Date: March 11, 2015

TOWN OF MORAGA

STAFF REPORT

To: Honorable Mayor and Council Members

**From: Ellen Clark, Planning Director
Ben Noble, Contract Planner**

Subject: Receive an Update on the Hillsides and Ridgelines Project and Provide Direction to Town Staff and Consultants on Next Steps and List of Key Issues to be Addressed; and Consider Resolution ___-2015 Amending the Hillside and Ridgeline Steering Committee Charter to Modify the Required Composition of the Committee, and Extending the Term of the Committee (Continued from January 28, 2015)

Request

Receive an update on the Hillsides and Ridgelines Project and provide direction to Town staff and consultants on next steps and list of key issues to be addressed; and consider resolution ___-2015 amending the Hillside and Ridgeline Steering Committee Charter to modify the required composition of the committee, and extending the term of the committee (Continued from January 28, 2015).

Background

The Moraga Hillsides and Ridgelines project was initiated in late 2013 based on a Town Council Goal to study and potentially update the existing regulations for hillside and ridgeline development. A consultant team, headed by PlaceWorks, was selected to lead the effort and the Town Council formed a Steering Committee composed of representatives of the Town Council, Planning Commission, Design Review Board and Park and Recreation Commission. Key goals and tasks of the project include:

- Reducing community conflicts over hillside and ridgeline development.
- Clarifying and educating the community about existing regulations.
- Providing clear, factual, and technically-sound background data to support decision-making.
- Improving existing regulations to better achieve the Town's hillside and ridgeline goals and policies.

1 The Hillside and Ridgelines project will result in targeted amendments to the Town's
2 hillside and ridgeline policies and regulations. These amendments will clarify
3 ambiguities, increase certainty, eliminate conflicting requirements, and generally make
4 the Town's regulations easier to understand for project applicants, residents, Town staff,
5 and Town decision-makers.

6 The Hillside and Ridgelines project, as currently scoped, includes the following major
7 tasks:

- 8 • **Task A: Project Initiation** – Receive preliminary community input on key hillside
9 issues (completed)
- 10 • **Task B: Background Analysis** – Develop background data and maps to
11 address key issues (Late 2014). The Background Report prepared as part of this
12 task is discussed later in this memorandum.
- 13 • **Task C: Hillside Regulation Options** – Prepare options for how to address key
14 issues (Late 2015)
- 15 • **Task D: Draft Regulations** – Prepare draft amendments to the Town's policies
16 and regulations (Early 2016)
- 17 • **Task E: Review and Adoption** – Adopt amended policies and regulations (Mid
18 2016)

19
20 Attachment A presents the remaining project schedule for Tasks C through E.

21
22 Several meetings and workshops have been held to date, including:

- 23 • **Steering Committee Meeting #1** (April 10 and 16, 2014). The Steering
24 Committee was introduced to the project and provided preliminary input on key
25 issues to address through the project.
- 26 • **Stakeholder Meetings** (April 10, 2014). Town staff and consultants met with
27 groups of property owners, developers, engineers and architects, and community
28 members to discuss key project issues.
- 29 • **Community Workshop #1** (April 16, 2014). The first community workshop
30 provided an introduction to the project, and gathered input from approximately 80
31 participants on issues and concerns to be addressed.
- 32 • **Community Workshop #2** (June 5, 2014). At the second community workshop
33 approximately 50 participants learned more about the Town's hillside
34 development regulations and prioritized issues to address through the project.
- 35 • **Steering Committee Meeting #2** (November 19, 2014). The Steering
36 Committee received the revised Background Report, provided comments on
37 preliminary draft landslide hazard maps, and made a recommendation on issues
38 to focus on for the remainder of the project. Draft meeting minutes are provided
39 as Attachment B; Committee comments and recommendations are outlined later
40 in this staff report.
- 41 • **Planning Commission Meeting** (January 5, 2015). The Planning Commission
42 provided recommendations on the same material reviewed by the Steering
43 Committee on November 18, 2014. Draft meeting minutes are provided as
44 Attachment C; Commission comments and recommendations are outlined later in
45 this staff report.

1 Minutes and summaries for each of these meetings can be viewed at
2 www.moraga.ca.us/hillsides.

3
4 Meetings have been supplemented through an online civic engagement tool called
5 Open Town Hall, which enables the community to comment on a series of focused
6 questions during the course of the project. Open Town Hall aims to broaden public
7 participation in the project and has been carefully moderated to promote civility. To date
8 over 200 residents have visited Open Town Hall and 33 residents have posted
9 comments. A summary of public input received to date on the first three Open Hall
10 topics, which have generated feedback on key project issues, the background report,
11 and prioritization of issues to address through the project, is available at:
12 [http://www.moraga.ca.us/dept/planning/Hillsides/BackgroundReportDraft_Final_TrackC](http://www.moraga.ca.us/dept/planning/Hillsides/BackgroundReportDraft_Final_TrackChanges.pdf)
13 [hanges.pdf](http://www.moraga.ca.us/dept/planning/Hillsides/BackgroundReportDraft_Final_TrackChanges.pdf)

14

15 **Final Background Report**

16 The Draft Background Report, titled “Understanding Moraga’s Hillside Regulations” was
17 published in June, 2014. It contains a summary of the Town’s regulations that apply to
18 hillside and ridgeline development in Moraga, provides an overview of the existing
19 physical conditions relevant to hillside development, and highlights some of the key
20 issues that could be addressed through the Hillsides and Ridgelines project. The
21 Background Report presents complex and technical aspects of Moraga’s hillside
22 regulations in a clear and simple format to facilitate broad public participation in the
23 Hillsides and Ridgelines project.

24

25 Town staff invited the community to comment on the initial draft of the Background
26 Report. Many of the comments received on the Background Report requested that the
27 Report provide a more balanced discussion of property rights, the benefits of
28 development, and how these benefits relate to the Town’s economic development
29 goals. Other comments included requests for corrections of factual statements or
30 technical information included in the report. Based on these comments, Town staff and
31 consultants revised the document, included as Attachment H to this staff report in
32 strikethrough/underline text.

33

34 At the November 19, 2014 meeting Steering Committee members all agreed to accept
35 the revised Background Report as complete. One Committee member suggested that
36 the Town update the Background after the Hillsides and Ridgelines project is finished to
37 reflect amended regulations and provide a “citizens” guide to the Town’s hillside
38 regulations.

39

40 At the January 5, 2015 Planning Commission meeting the Commission also
41 recommended accepting the revised Background Report as complete. At this meeting
42 Dave Bruzzone expressed concern that Town staff did not adequately respond to a
43 letter prepared by his consultant, Richard Loewke, on the draft Background Report. Mr.
44 Loewke’s letter and staff’s response to it are provided as Attachment J.

45

46 After the Town Council reviews the Revised Background Report, Town staff will publish
47 a Final Background Report. This Final Report will function as a resource to be used as
48 the Town proceeds with the Hillsides and Ridgelines project.

1 **Draft Landslide Hazard Maps**

2 A goal of the Hillsides and Ridgelines project is to improve the factual basis and
3 underlying information and data that informs the Town regulations and decision-making
4 process for hillside and ridgeline development. With this goal in mind, the Town's
5 geotechnical consultant, Cotton Shires, developed preliminary landslide hazard maps
6 for select locations in Moraga. Information on the purpose and methodology used to
7 develop the maps is provided below.

8
9 **Purpose of Maps**

10 The purpose of the maps is to provide background information to inform the effort to
11 improve the Town's hillside development regulations by better understanding the
12 nature, type and location of landslide hazards in Moraga. The Town does not intend to
13 use these preliminary draft maps to impose new or more stringent development
14 restrictions on any specific sites or properties. Instead, they are planning-level maps
15 intended for informational purposes and to inform the Hillsides and Ridgelines project.
16 Further, the maps do not substitute for site specific mapping and geotechnical
17 information typically required when a site is proposed for development.

18
19 **Methodology and Areas Selected**

20 Attachment D and E present the two draft maps: a Landslide Inventory Map and a
21 Landslide Hazard Map. Cotton Shires prepared these maps through a stereographic
22 analysis of aerial photographs. This analysis allows geologists to view overlapping sets
23 of aerial photographs in three dimensions using a stereoscope. Cotton Shires analyzed
24 aerial photographs from 1954 and 2002 and plotted areas of past landslide areas based
25 on these maps. Maps were reviewed by the Town's consulting geologist Mitch Wolfe
26 and spot checked against site specific landslide mapping to verify accuracy.

27
28 A landslide is defined as the rapid downward sliding of a mass of earth and rock.
29 Landslides can have various characteristics, including the depth of the landslide, degree
30 to which it is active or inactive, and age. Factors such as size, slope steepness,
31 composition of soils and bedrock layers forming and underlying the landslide; and
32 external influences such as moisture/rainfall, seismic activity, and upslope or downslope
33 activity (natural or man-made) can all affect how a landslide moves and behaves.
34 Landslides, by definition, are dynamic features, and can change or take on new
35 characteristics over time.

36
37 At the Town's direction, Cotton Shires limited its analysis of landslide hazards to a
38 predetermined study area, primarily focused on open space or undeveloped properties
39 where development could occur and areas where detailed landslide hazard mapping
40 has not recently been prepared. Town staff took this approach to focus Town resources
41 on closing data gaps and supplementing existing information.

42
43 **Landslide Inventory Map**

44 The Landslide Inventory Map shows features within the study area related to landslide
45 hazards. The map identifies the areas with surficial deposits, active slope instability,
46 dormant slope instability, and old slope instability. Areas with slope stability are based
47 on the estimated age of the most recent landslide activity or slope movement. The map
48 also shows the following:

- 1 • **Topographic breaks in the slope** that are typically located along the top edge
2 of past landsliding or top of a landslide “scarp” where moving ground has pulled
3 away from intact ground.
- 4 • **Landslide deposits** that consist of disrupted earth materials displaced through
5 landsliding, often underlain by a weak surface of sheared clay.
- 6 • **Top of banks** that are associated with natural drainage channels and typically
7 mark a transition to steeper slopes formed by active erosion.
- 8 • **Artificial cut slopes** that are typically the result of excavation to prepare a
9 relatively level building pad or level surface for roadway construction.

10 11 Landslide Hazard Map

12 The Landslide Hazard Map consolidates and simplifies the information in the Landslide
13 Inventory Map to show areas with a significant potential for landsliding. There are two
14 basic categories of landslide hazard areas:

- 15 • **Shallow, potentially unstable areas.** These areas are subject to shallow
16 landsliding and contain unconsolidated material on gentle to steep slopes,
17 commonly less than 10 feet in thickness.
- 18 • **Deep, potential unstable areas.** These areas are subject to more significant
19 landsliding and contain unconsolidated or detached materials on moderate to
20 steep slopes, commonly more than 10 feet in thickness.

21
22 Shallow instability generally is associated with smaller landslides including a category of
23 very fast moving slope failures termed debris flows. This type of landslide is hazardous
24 to residential structures located within the flow path or debris deposition area. Many
25 engineering alternatives are available to remediate shallow landslides and to mitigate
26 hazards resulting from debris flows. However, debris flow protective structures must be
27 put in place prior to slope failure.

28
29 Deep landsliding also presents hazards to residential development unless potentially
30 unstable ground is stabilized prior to development. Deep landslides also present
31 hazards to existing development on adjacent properties. Commonly utilized measures to
32 stabilize deep landslides include mass grading to remove and re-compact existing
33 landslide debris, subsurface dewatering systems, buttress fill construction, and/or
34 construction of deep steel reinforced concrete piers to “pin” potentially unstable ground
35 in-place.

36 37 Key Findings from Maps

38 The preliminary Landslide Hazard Map shows that within the study areas there are a
39 large number of areas with a significant potential for landsliding (more than 50 percent
40 of these areas). The majority of landslide hazard areas are shallow and potentially
41 unstable. Areas with the greatest prevalence of deep landslide hazard areas are in the
42 areas around Indian Ridge.

43
44 Shallow earthflows have a relatively high potential for future reactivation and steep
45 slopes within and immediately adjacent to active shallow earthflows have a relatively
46 high risk for failure. Soils within steep swales have a relatively high risk for failure as

1 either shallow earthflows or debris flows. Steep slopes that flank ridgelines have a
2 relatively high potential for generation of shallow earthflows.

3
4 Mapping work also revealed evidence of actively incising creek channels within the
5 Town. As creek channels incise, this often leads to undermining of adjacent ground.
6 Active earth slumps are common adjacent to creek channels that are experiencing
7 active erosion and incision. Direction of concentrated runoff to natural drainage
8 channels can lead to channel incision and associated landsliding. Appropriate drainage
9 design and control is a key aspect of hillside development to minimize both onsite and
10 offsite adverse impacts to slope stability.

11 12 Relationship with MOSO High Risk Area Map

13 It is informative to compare the two landslide hazard maps with the MOSO Guidelines
14 Development Capability Map (see Attachment F). The Development Capability Map,
15 first adopted in 1989, established a preliminary determination of high-risk areas in
16 Moraga, based on a number of factors. The map divides Moraga into a grid of 200 by
17 200 foot squares, and assigns each square a numerical value between 0 and 9. A value
18 of 0 means the square has the least development capability (i.e. most constrained), and
19 9 means the square has most development capability (i.e. least constrained). Values
20 were based on six physical attributes: ridgelines, landslide susceptibility, slope, flood
21 hazard, vegetation, and soil erosion. Per the MOSO Guidelines, squares designated 1,
22 2, 3, or 4 are determined, on a preliminary basis, to be “high-risk.”

23
24 Attachment G shows some examples of the Landslide Hazard Map layered on top of the
25 MOSO Guidelines Development Capability Map at sample locations. This attachment
26 shows that some of the landslide hazard areas mapped by Cotton Shires are classified
27 as having high development capability. Conversely, in a number of areas Cotton Shires
28 found no landslide hazards present in areas classified as high risk by the Development
29 Capability Map. This discrepancy is present throughout the study areas mapped by
30 Cotton Shires, not just at these sample locations. However, as shown in the
31 attachments there is better correlation in some areas than others.

32
33 One would expect some degree of variation between Cotton Shires’ landslide hazard
34 maps and the Development Capability Map given that the Development Capability Map
35 considers more attributes than just landslide susceptibility. But the degree and extent of
36 the discrepancy raises questions about the relevance and accuracy of the Development
37 Capability Map. Considering this finding, the Town may wish to update the map of “high
38 risk” areas based on improved data and more modern mapping and analysis tools.

39 40 Future Use of Maps

41 At the March 11, 2015 Town Council meeting Town staff and consultants will provide
42 more detail on the methodology used to prepare the maps and some policy implications
43 that they raise. Ultimately, the Town Council, with input from the Steering Committee
44 and the Planning Commission, will provide direction on how best to utilize the
45 information contained in these maps. For example, these maps could become the basis
46 for an updated landslide hazard map in the General Plan. Information from these maps
47 could also supplement or replace existing maps that designate MOSO high risk areas.

1 How best to utilize these maps will be discussed and determined with public
2 participation through the Hillside and Ridgelines process.

3
4 Steering Committee Input on Maps

5 At the November 19, 2014 Steering Committee meeting the Committee asked a number
6 of questions about the methodology and reliability of the draft landslide hazard maps.
7 Committee members requested that Town staff reach out to property owners to verify
8 and enhance the information in the maps. The Steering Committee also recommended
9 that staff and consultants further study discrepancies between MOSO maps and the
10 draft landslide hazard maps, and consider ways to improve the mapping that is used as
11 a basis for the Town's hillside development regulations.

12
13 Planning Commission Input on Maps

14 At the January 5, 2014 Planning Commission several Commissioners expressed the
15 opinion that additional landslide hazard maps may not be needed. One Commissioner
16 expressed concern about the accuracy of the maps. As a whole, the Commission did
17 not object to the Steering Committee's recommendation on the maps described above.
18 At the meeting one member of the public commented that the draft maps are
19 inaccurate, unnecessary, and misleading. The next steps of the process will provide
20 additional opportunities for the public and Town Council to provide input on the content
21 and application of any mapping developed as part of the hillside project.

22
23 Key Project Issues

24 On November 19, 2014 the Steering Committee made a recommendation to the Town
25 Council on the issues, problems, and questions that the Town should continue to study
26 as part of the Hillside and Ridgelines project. The Planning Commission also
27 commented on the following project issue list on January 5, 2015. At the March 11
28 meeting the Town Council will consider these recommendations and provide direction to
29 Town staff and consultants.

30
31 Staff and the consultant team will then develop options for how to best address the
32 issues and facilitate a public process to select the preferred options, outlined at the end
33 of this report. Based on public input and Steering Committee direction during that
34 process, amended policies and regulations to implement these preferred options will be
35 developed for public and Town Council review, and potential adoption as amendments
36 to existing regulations, guidelines, and policies.

37
38 Below are the eight issues recommended by the Steering Committee and Planning
39 Commission for further study. This list is based on input received and prior workshops
40 and meetings and through Open Town Hall. Noted in parentheses after each issue
41 heading is the Background Report page number where additional information about the
42 issue can be found.

43
44 **1. Ridgeline Protection** (Background Report page 21)

45 General Plan Policy CD1.5 calls for the Town to "protect ridgelines from development."
46 There are different interpretations of this policy, and how it should be applied. Specific
47 questions to resolve include:

- Clarifying/determining if General Plan Policy CD1.5 applies to all ridgelines in Moraga, including those outside MOSO and Non-MOSO Open Space, or only Major and Minor Ridgelines on MOSO lands. This may require amending the definition of ridgelines in the General Plan.
- Clarifying/determining the precise meaning of “protect” in the context of hillside development (for example, does this term mean that no development at all is allowed, that certain development may be allowed; under certain conditions or circumstances, or even that development not on a ridgeline, but affecting aspects such as views, should be limited)

The meaning or interpretation of the term “development” is also a key issue, but since it has applicability beyond just ridgeline areas, it is treated as a separate issue, below.

2. Definition of Development (Background Report page 32)

MOSO Guidelines define development as “the placement, discharge or disposal of any material, the grading or removing of any material, the change in the density or intensity of use of land, the subdivision of land, or the construction or erection of a structure.”

The definition of development in the General Plan also includes virtually all types of construction, earthmoving, and change in intensity of land use. Both the General Plan and MOSO Guidelines make certain exceptions to this rule for 1) Remediation of hazards that are a threat to public safety; 2) Construction of fire trails; and 3) Roads “with attendant underground facilities.” Questions to resolve include:

- Is the type of extensive grading necessary to remediate landslides, especially when the purpose of that grading is to facilitate development, permissible as “development” under category 1?
- Can related surface facilities such as parking areas and sidewalks be allowed in conjunction with the construction of roads under Category 3?

3. Development on Steep Slope Areas (Background Report page 22)

MOSO Initiative Section 3(b)(1) prohibits development in MOSO Open Space on sites with an average slope of 20 percent or greater. There is disagreement over the intent of this language. Specific questions to resolve include:

- Can homes be built on a portion of a site with a slope (in that location) greater than 20 percent if the average slope of the entire site is less than 20 percent?
- Conversely, can homes can be built on a portion of a site with a slope (in that location) less than 20 percent slope, if the average slope of the entire site is greater than 20 percent?
- Can a home be remodeled or added to if it is on a site with an average slope of more than 20 percent?
- Can an existing, legal, single family lot without a structure be developed if it has an average slope of more than 20 percent?
- Do the Town’s regulations permit slopes to be re-graded (in conjunction with remediation or otherwise) to create areas with less than 20 percent slope, to allow for development?

1 **4. Calculation of Slope** (Background Report page 23)

2 Moraga Municipal Code Section 8.136.020 and MOSO Guidelines Section II.A.3 guide
3 slope calculations. Project applicants may define a cell as any polygonal shape
4 provided it has an area of at least 10,000 square feet. Some people believe “contorted”
5 or highly irregular cell shapes allow applicants to circumvent slope development
6 restrictions in MOSO lands. Questions to resolve include potential alternate methods
7 for calculating the average slope of a development site, and whether modifications are
8 needed to existing rules and formulas to calculate slope to better reflect the intent of
9 Moraga’s hillside regulations.

10
11 **5. Remediation in High Risk Areas** (Background Report page 26)

12 MOSO Guidelines Section D.2 addresses High Risk Areas and allows for remediation
13 and reclassification of such areas. There is disagreement as to the purposes for which
14 remediation and reclassification are allowed. Questions to resolve include clarifying if
15 and when geologic hazards in “high risk” areas can be remediated as part of a
16 development project to allow densities greater than 1 unit per 20 acres.

17
18 **6. Viewshed Protection** (Background Report page 34)

19 General Plan Policy CD1.3 directs the Town to protect viewsheds along the Town’s
20 scenic corridors, but the Town has not adopted any detailed standards or criteria for
21 evaluating the visual effects of development on these viewsheds. Items to be further
22 studied include: development of criteria and methodology (including, potentially,
23 quantified standards) to evaluate the visual effects of development visible from scenic
24 corridors or that would affect views of hillsides or ridgelines in order to determine
25 whether a project has a significant adverse impact on a visual resource. Such
26 standards could also be translated into additional guidelines or standards to regulate
27 development in scenic corridor, addressing aspects such as maintenance of view
28 planes or corridors.

29
30 **7. Hillside Development Permit** (Background Report page 44)

31 The Town requires Hillside Development Permits (HDP) for all projects on slopes of 20
32 percent or greater. Some have suggested that the HDP requirements are overly
33 burdensome and unnecessary or duplicative given other Town requirements such as
34 MOSO regulations, design review, grading permit approval and building permit
35 requirements. Specific questions to resolve include:

- 36 • If a Hillside Development Permit is required for all projects, including residential
37 additions or construction of accessory structures on developed single-family lots.
- 38 • Whether a Hillside Development Permit is required if any portion of a property
39 that has greater than 20 percent slope, or only when development would affect
40 such a slope.
- 41 • Determine if the requirements of the HDP are duplicative or redundant relative to
42 other permits typically required for projects on hillside sites; including grading
43 permits, MOSO approvals, and design review; and modify regulations to
44 eliminate these redundancies as appropriate.

1 **8. High Risk Area Map**

2 As discussed above, many of the landslide hazard areas mapped by Cotton Shires do
3 not appear as high risk areas in the MOSO Guidelines Development Capability Map.
4 This suggests the need to update the Development Capability map, supplement it with
5 new mapping, or replace it with a new map that reflects better information on landslide
6 hazards and other development constraints within MOSO areas.

7
8 Other Issues

9 On November 19, 2014 the Steering Committee recommended that the following four
10 issues, originally included in staff's preliminary list of issues, not be addressed as part of
11 the Hillsides and Ridgelines project:

- 12 • The Grading Ordinance guideline that “all grading should be balanced on site.”
- 13 • Various other guidelines in the Town’s Grading Ordinance, including limits on
14 maximum gradients for cut and fill.
- 15 • The Town’s three-step planned development process.
- 16 • Broader issues of town-wide growth and development.

17
18 In the case of the first two issues, the Steering Committee felt that, since these were
19 guidelines in the grading ordinance, the intent was for the Town to have flexibility in their
20 interpretation that is properly accommodated in the existing Grading Ordinance.

21
22 With regard to the Town’s three-step planned development process, these particular
23 standards will be looked at as part of a separate process, since they apply to most large
24 subdivisions throughout Moraga, and not just hillside areas.

25
26 Finally, with regard to broader issues of growth and development, the Steering
27 Committee also recommended that the Hillsides and Ridgelines project focus on
28 targeted amendments to existing regulations and should not attempt to revisit broader
29 community land use and growth management goals contained in the General Plan,
30 noting that this process would likely be both expensive and time-consuming (also see
31 discussion below).

32
33 On January 5, 2015 the Planning Commission concurred with these Steering
34 Committee recommendations, and did not modify the issues list.

35
36 **Project Approach Moving Forward**

37 When the Hillsides and Ridgelines project began, the scope of the project was to make
38 targeted amendments to the Town’s existing hillside and ridgeline development
39 regulations to clarify requirements, eliminate conflicts, and increase certainty, in keeping
40 with requirements of the MOSO Ordinance. The first two community workshops elicited
41 concerns about the amount of growth in Moraga and its impacts on traffic, school
42 enrollment and capacity, and quality of life. Some participants felt that it is not desirable
43 to amend the Town’s hillside regulations without revisiting community land use and
44 growth management goals contained in the General Plan.

45
46 At its November 19, 2014 meeting, the Steering Committee considered the idea of
47 addressing hillsides and ridgelines issues as part of a more comprehensive General

1 Plan Update. This approach could involve suspending or significantly altering the
2 Hillside and Ridgelines project. The Steering Committee did not support this idea and
3 instead recommended continuing with the Hillside and Ridgelines project as originally
4 planned. The Committee felt that the Town would benefit from improvements to existing
5 regulations and that this can occur without a lengthy process to overhaul or
6 comprehensively update the General Plan.

7
8 The Planning Commission agreed with this recommendation on January 5, 2015. The
9 Planning Commission also expressed the desire to obtain broad public input moving
10 forward. Members of the public also commented on the importance of engaging a full
11 spectrum of public opinions on this issue.

12
13 Next steps are outlined in Attachment A (Project Schedule). In mid-2015 staff and
14 consultants will work with the Steering Committee to develop options for how best to
15 address the list of issues described in this staff report. The public will provide input on
16 these options at one or more workshops, and through Open Town Hall, and the Town
17 Council will select preferred options in late 2015. Staff and consultants will then work
18 with the Steering Committee to prepare the amended policy and regulations consistent
19 with this preferred approach. In mid-2016 the Planning Commission and Town Council
20 will consider the final regulations at a series of public meetings for final review and
21 adoption. The project will be completed by the fall of 2016.

22 23 **Community Outreach and Public Participation**

24 In early 2015 Town staff and consultants will also initiate an effort to increase public
25 participation in this project. A component of this effort will be increased use of Open
26 Town Hall, other online applications such as NextDoor.com, as well as outreach through
27 traditional forums such as newspaper advertising, mail and email. Town staff sees this
28 effort as an opportunity to better utilize social media tools to increase public
29 engagement in Town decision-making. The community survey and focus groups
30 included among the Mayor's 2015 goals may provide an opportunity to receive "high
31 level" feedback on key issues and concerns with regard to development and
32 conservation within open space areas.

33
34 The Town may also benefit from increasing the number of public meetings and
35 workshops for the project. Based on input from the Planning Commission and Town
36 residents, staff suggests adding several Steering Committee meetings, an additional
37 workshop, and a series of community meetings to the project outreach program. Town
38 staff will return with an amended project scope and schedule for the Town Council's
39 consideration at a future meeting.

40 41 **Steering Committee Composition**

42 The Hillside and Ridgelines Steering Committee charter states that the Steering
43 Committee shall be comprised of two members from the Town Council, two members
44 for the Planning Commission, one member from the Design Review Board, and one
45 member from the Parks and Recreation Commission. In February 2015 the terms of
46 several Steering Committee members, including both Planning Commission and the
47 Park and Recreation Commission representative, expired. The Hillside and Ridgelines

1 Steering Committee charter requires members to be actively serving on a Board or
2 Commission and so these members must also step down from the Steering Committee.

3
4 Staff sees value in continuity of Steering Committee membership and is concerned that
5 a change in membership could negatively affect the process and timeline. Staff
6 therefore recommends that the Town Council modify the Steering Committee charter to
7 allow each Commission to either appoint a new representative or continue appointment
8 of an existing member, even if the member's term has expired. A draft resolution and
9 amended charter, reflecting this revision is provided for the Council's consideration as
10 Attachment J. The charter also reflects an extension to the "sunset" date for the
11 Committee, to June 2016, since the project is taking longer to complete than originally
12 anticipated.

13
14 If the Steering Committee charter remains unchanged, Commissions will not be able to
15 appoint new Steering Committee members until later in March of 2015, when new
16 Board and Commission members are seated. This may also be the case if the
17 Commission wished to appoint a new representative, including consideration of newly
18 appointed members. Thus, unless the Town Council directs, and all existing Committee
19 members agree to continue to serve, it is likely the next Steering Committee meeting
20 would not be scheduled until April 2015. This would be later than the desired February
21 2015 start date requested by the Steering Committee.

22 23 **Alternatives**

24
25 Receive an Update on the Hillsides and Ridgelines Project and Provide Direction to
26 Town staff and Consultants on Next Steps and List of Key Issues to be Addressed; and
27 either:

- 28
29 1. Adopt Resolution ____-15 amending the Hillside and Ridgeline Steering
30 Committee Charter to modify the required composition of the Committee, and
31 extend the Term of the Committee. (Continued from January 28, 2015) or
32
33 2. Adopt Resolution ____-15 amending the Hillside and Ridgeline Steering
34 Committee Charter, with a revision solely to extend the term of the Committee
35 only, without other changes.

36 37 **Recommendation**

38
39 Receive an Update on the Hillsides and Ridgelines Project and Provide Direction to
40 Town staff and Consultants on Next Steps and List of Key Issues to be Addressed; and
41 adopt Resolution ____-15 amending the Hillside and Ridgeline Steering Committee
42 Charter to modify the required composition of the Committee, and extend the Term of
43 the Committee. (Continued from January 28, 2015)

44
45 **Report reviewed by: Jill Keimach, Town Manager**

- 1 **Attachments:**
- 2 **A.** Project Schedule
- 3 **B.** November 18, 2014 Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
- 4 **C.** January 5, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
- 5 **D.** Draft Landslide Inventory Map
- 6 **E.** Draft Landslide Hazard Map
- 7 **F.** MOSO Guidelines Development Capability Map
- 8 **G.** Landslide Hazard Map layered on top the MOSO Guidelines Development
- 9 Capability Map
- 10 **H.** Revised Background Report, Strikethrough Version
- 11 **I.** Letter from Richard Loewke, dated June 27, 2014 and Town Staff
- 12 Response, dated January 23, 2015
- 13 **J.** Resolution ___-2015 Amending Hillsides and Ridgelines Steering
- 14 Committee Charter
- 15 **K.** Communication Received
- 16 **L.** PowerPoint Presentation