

From: Wisneski, Brenda
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2014 8:24 AM
To: Burns, Marlene
Subject: FW: Agenda Packet for February 3, 2014 Meeting of Newport Beach Land Use Element Amendment Advisory Committee

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

For distribution

From: Paul Watkins [<mailto:paul@lawfriend.com>]
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 6:04 PM
To: Ramirez, Gregg
Cc: Wisneski, Brenda; Brandt, Kim
Subject: Agenda Packet for February 3, 2014 Meeting of Newport Beach Land Use Element Amendment Advisory Committee

Hi Gregg:

I had a chance to take a look at the Agenda and its attachments for our upcoming meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 3, 2014 at 2:30 PM in the Friends Room.

If it's OK, I wanted to share a couple of thoughts:

January 7, 2014 Minutes:

- (i) Handwritten page 3, Section II, third line: please correct the spelling of "Mosher".
- (ii) Handwritten page 3, Section III, third paragraph, sentence reading: "The Committee asked staff to look at the definition of "reduce" and search for the words "reduce, reduction, reducing" to determine if any of the references are on a citywide basis." I may have misunderstood Mr. Tucker's requests but wasn't the gist of his requests as follows: (a) Would staff please provide to the Committee a clear simple definition of "reduce", "reduction", and "reducing" in the context of greenhouse gases ("GHG")? (b) Would staff please make a change throughout the "Goals and Policies" (i.e., on a "global" basis) to make it very clear that when the words "reduce", "reduction", and "reducing" are used with reference to GHG, the **standard** for "reduction" of GHG will be applied on an overall CITYWIDE basis as opposed to a PROJECT-BY-PROJECT basis (i.e., the concept here is that rather than imposing a nebulous undefined project condition that a particular project must "reduce" GHG emissions, perhaps a project condition could be added along the following lines: "The Project shall be designed and constructed where feasible to reduce GHG emissions on an overall citywide basis." (I noted in the "Goals and Policies" a few instances where the word

"reduce", "reduction", or "reducing" appear without the "citywide" qualifier; I will raise these inadvertent omissions at our meeting.) (c) Would staff please provide the Committee with a beginning baseline so that our policy makers will be able to determine the "reduction" of GHG from that specific beginning baseline? (d) Would staff please add the words "where feasible" or "lessen to the extent practicable" at appropriate places throughout the "Goals and Policies" in connection with GHG emissions "reduction"? Mr. Tucker may disagree with my interpretation of his requests and may suggest revisions/additions.

(iii) Handwritten page 4, top line: please correct the spelling of "General".

I look forward to seeing you next Tuesday, February 3 at 2:30 PM. Thanks, Gregg.

Best regards,
Paul

Paul K. Watkins for
Watkins, Blakely & Torgerson, LLP
535 Anton Boulevard, Suite 810
Costa Mesa, California 92626-7047
Telephone: (714) 556-0800, ext. 2108
Facsimile: (714) 641-4012
E-Mail: paul@lawfriend.com