



Appendix E: GPAC Policy Analysis



Appendix E: General Plan Advisory Committee Policy Analysis

The General Plan Advisory Committee reviewed the policy program of all existing General Plan Elements.

DRAFT



Yorba Linda General Plan

This page intentionally left blank.

DRAFT



GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSOLIDATED POLICY

March 26, 2013

III. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE EXISTING GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM

Consultant David Barquist gave an overview of the assignment that staff would like the GPAC to complete prior to the next meeting. The GPAC is being asked to individually review the existing General Plan policy program and provide their comments on the appropriateness of the existing goals and policies. Staff requests that the GPAC send their comments directly to Staff, who will compile the comments. The focus of the next GPAC meetings will be to discuss the existing policy program and the comments provided by the GPAC.

Mr. Barquist gave definitions for goals, objectives and policies. Mr. Barquist described the worksheets that the GPAC is asked to provide their comments on. The worksheets have the existing goals and policies and columns for the Committee Member to mark if the goal or policy is appropriate or not, or warrants further discussion. A notes/comments column is provided. This column contains notes from The Planning Center's previous review of the existing General Plan policy program. Mr. Barquist walked through examples from each General Plan Element.

Committee Member Watts asked about the ability of the GPAC to provide input on technical issues. Mr. Barquist asked that the GPAC request background information from Staff for Elements that they feel they need further information on in order to provide input. He also recommended that the GPAC refer to the current General Plan and EIR.

Committee Member Bent asked if the information provided on the CD includes information about hazards. Mr. Barquist said the CD does not have that information. Technical studies will be prepared in the future. The request of the GPAC is to set the policy vision direction first and then supplement with technical information.

Chair Pickel commented that questions from the Committee are as valuable as providing a comment. Questions will trigger a response from the project team to address the item or expand on the item.

Mr. Barquist commented that the task of the Committee is to identify higher order priorities and provide guidance to the City Council on what is important to the community.

Committee Member Behura asked if there are elements that are mandated to be updated or have legislative requirements and if the requirements for those elements will be provided to the Committee. Mr. Barquist said that Staff will look at the implementation timelines and other legislative requirements. The Committee does not need to look at that detail.

Committee Member Lyons asked why the Committee would need to discuss the Murdock and Shell properties if they are not within the City boundaries. Mr. Barquist responded that the General Plan will articulate policies to guide what the City wants to be in the future.

Committee Member Carbone asked if each Committee Member could add comments to the worksheet about new policies to consider. Mr. Barquist answered yes.

Committee Member Watson asked how the length of the current Yorba Linda General Plan compares to the General Plans of other cities. Committee Member Watson also commented that broader policies give Staff more flexibility in implementation. Mr. Barquist answered that the trend is that General Plans are becoming form simplified. The General Plan is used as the guidance tool while implementation mechanisms such as the Zoning Code are more detailed.

Committee Member Gorman asked if annexing properties from the sphere of influence would be something the Committee would recommend or negotiate in the General Plan. Mr. Barquist replied that the land within the City's sphere of influence is anticipated to eventually be a part of the City. The County of Orange currently has jurisdiction over the land, but the General Plan can articulate the community's thoughts on the future inclusion of that area. The City is currently a "responsible agency" in the environmental review process for Cielo Vista and Esperanza, which means the City has a higher level involvement than normal. Committee Member Watts commented that the General Plan could include a policy to encourage annexation of property, but the General Plan would not lay out the particulars.

Mr. Barquist noted that the Recreation and Resources Element includes the topics of parks and recreation. The draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan will be provided to the Committee for their review during the summer. Committee Member Huang asked if the Committee should be reviewing the Element prior to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Mr. Barquist responded that the General Plan Element will set the direction for the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, but due to the timing of the City's CIP preparation and other timelines, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan is being drafted first.

Committee Member Watson asked if the Committees written comments would be compiled and commented that written word can be interpreted differently than a verbal discussion. Committee Member Watson commented that the Committee's work going forward should be collaborative.

Committee Member Lyons asked about Brown Act requirements for these discussions. Chair Pickel responded that all Committee Members should send their comments to Staff and discussions will happen during the next GPAC meeting.

Committee Member Gorman suggested that the compilation of comments should not have the authors names attached to the comments.

Committee Member Lyons asked if the future GPAC meetings need to have a set end time. Mr. Barquist said the end time is not required, but requested that the Committee be respectful of Committee Members of the public who would like to speak during public comments on an item.

Committee Member Behura asked if it was acceptable if comments were shared with the various Commissions that the GPAC Committee Members are a part of. Committee Member Lyons said that the Planning Commission added a GPAC Progress item to their meeting agenda. This is the time for the GPAC Committee Member to share progress and get feedback.

Committee Member Bent asked if the Housing Element discussion could be moved to April 29th. Mr. Barquist responded that the Housing Element consultant is available on May 20th and that is why the discussion is scheduled for that meeting.

Committee Member Hansen asked if those Committee Members who could review and comment on all of the Elements should and those who cannot finish all of them prior to the April meeting should send their comments in parts to Staff.

Chair Pickel commented he thinks art in public places should be included in the General Plan.

Committee Member Lyons asked if the Recreation Element includes cultural arts. Chair Pickel said it does, but it does not include art in public places.

Chair Pickle opened the item up for public comments.

Mel Wagstaff asked if the schedule of future GPAC meetings was available. Chair Pickel responded that the dates had not been finalized, but when the meeting dates are finalized, staff would place the dates on the City's website.

**April 30, 2013
6:30 – 9:00PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. DISCUSSION OF GPAC'S REVIEW OF EXISTING GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM

Committee Member Adams noted that members who were having difficulty with the disk of information may need to copy the files on their local hard drive and save changes there, not on the disk itself.

Committee Member Behura noted that the Traffic Commission had the General Plan update as an item on their meeting agenda last week and it will take some time to get comments back from that commission.

Mr. Barquist commented that the next GPAC meeting will be related to the Housing Element. He asked that the GPAC finalize their comments on the remaining Elements and provide them to staff.

Each Committee member was provided with a hard copy matrix with each of current the Land Use goals and policies on the left and the comments received from Committee members on the right. The Committee discussed each goal and policy for appropriateness and necessary changes. Refer to Attachment A for discussion notes.

Motion: Committee Member Bent moved to end the Committee discussion for the night at Policy 3.7. The motion was passed unanimously.

**May 20, 2013
6:30 – 9:00PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT 2014-2021 HOUSING ELEMENT AND RECCOMENDATION TO PLANNING COMMISSION

Staff introduced Ms. Karen Warner, the city's Housing Element consultant who presented a brief powerpoint presentation

Ms. Warner provided an overview of the existing 2008-2014 Housing Element including prior actions by the City Council in the review and adoption of the current element. Ms. Warner describe key highlights of the existing policy program, including;

- Assistance in development of Villa Plumosa
- Habitat for Humanity construction of three ownership units
- Transfer of 26 RDA-owned units to non-profit purchaser
- Affordable Housing Agreement with OHDC to purchase foreclosure condos
- Adoption of changes to multi-family zoning
- Adoption of multi-family Design Guidelines
- Rezoning of 14 sites identified in the current Housing Element
- Entitlement processing for 69 affordable rental units on rezoned sites in Savi Ranch
- Provision of Housing Rehabilitation Grants (53 lower income
- Mortgage assistance to six moderate-income first-time homebuyers
- Adoption of Zoning for Special Needs Housing
- Adoption of Density Bonus, waivers and incentives for affordable housing consistent with state law

Ms. Warner provided an overview of the timing for the 5th Housing Element cycle, due on October 15, 2013 and described the positive aspects of meeting the deadline including the benefits of HCD compliance.

Ms. Warner provided a summary of the residents in Yorba Linda who need affordable housing. These include local workers (teachers, nurses, etc.), special needs households (seniors, disabled persons, etc.), children of long-time residents of Yorba Linda,

A summary of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process was provided to the Committee inclusive of the methodology and the unit distribution by state-defined income category. These include;

- Very Low (160 units)
- Low (113 units)
- Moderate (126 units)
- Above Moderate (270 units)

A total RHNA allocation for the 2014-2021 planning period is 669 units. Ms. Warner explained that the City is not required to build these units, but provide the policy mechanisms for the private market to develop these units if they choose to do so.

Ms. Warner provided the Committee with an overview of the Housing Element rezone sites indicated in the current housing element policy program and explained to the Committee that these sites have be rezoned and, if they are not currently entitled with project applications, the sites can be utilized to meet the needs for the 2014-2021 planning period.

Ms. Pam Stoker provided an overview of the elimination of Redevelopment in the City of Yorba Linda. Ms. Stoker described the challenge of losing the primary source of funding for affordable housing in the City and its effect on future programs and policy implementation. Ms. Stoker described potential future funding options, including a new Housing Asset Fund, asset proceeds use (land, loan repayments, etc.) and potential state legislative actions.

Ms. Warner provided the Committee with an overview of the City's new 2014-2021 Housing Element Policy program. A summary of the organization of policies was provided and broad overview of each goal and related policy and program was provided.

Committee Member Bent ask for clarification that the draft's sites inventory was identical to the existing policy in the current housing element and the programs and analysis was essentially and redrafting of existing policy and not a full re-write of the document.

Chair Pickel asked the public for their comments

Ms. Stephens addressed the Committee asking the strawberry fields as a potential library site will affect the housing sites needs of the Housing Element.

Ms. Stephens asked about the impact of Cielo Vista and Esperanza Hills developments. Mr. Harris explained that the proposed projects are in the County's jurisdiction and will be approved by the County. If and when annexation occurs, an annexation agreement will be developed to address many of the public service issues inherent in the annexation process. Mr. Harris explained it is very early in the annexation discussion and it will take much time before these issues are fully addressed. Mr. Harris explained that the City has a keen interest in the process and will ensure the City's interest are fully vetted in the process

Ms. Stephens had a question on on Goal Five related to about board and care facilities and if they can count. Ms. Warner explained that they don't count as part of the new construction objectives and are separate from the construction needs.

Ms. Walker(sp). Addressed concern over discussing future policy consider adjacent jurisdictions as it relates to the location of affordable housing. Ms. Walker also voiced concern about the distribution of affordable housing throughout the community and not just in the west side of the community.

Ms. Spendenberg(sp) expressed concerns at Prospect and Yorba Linda Boulevard projects at 4 story building heights take into consideration of existing single-family one story. She asked if this was taken into consideration. Mr. Rehmer explained that the design issues are considered during the design review process and will address adjacency issue among others.

Mr. Pickel asked the Committee for further comments.

Commissioner Lyons thanked staff for a easily readable document for their review

Commissioner Baker expressed concerned related to water infrastructure life expectancy based on the current age of existing facilities.

Ms. Stoker shared questions related to the Housing Element were permitted by Commissioner Behura and will be addressed in the response to the Planning Commission. Ms. Stoker explained the Planning Commission will be hearing the

Marilyn Adams (check name) asked when qualifying for affordable housing, what is a "long time" residents. Ms. Stoker explained that that is not a qualifying factor, but private sector may choose to provide some level of priority at their discretion, but is not

Commissioner Rakochy asked if this be required for a Measure B vote? He also asked if he could submit additional comments prior to Planning Commission hearing. Staff

indicated that he submit additional comments at his discretion and they will be forwarded to the Planning Commission. Ms. Stoker indicated the

Committee Member Bent asked about how residents are qualified if there is more demand than available units. Ms. Stoker explained that priority is based on first-come first serve based on loan qualification. Ms. Warner also indicated that funding sources my influence priority.

Mr. Pickel asked about Habitat for Humanity and similar sweat equity programs that involve owner participation that are available in the county.

**June 17, 2013
6:30 – 9:00PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. GPAC REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT POLICY PROGRAM

Vice Chair Watts reported out on a conference call he had with Chair Pickel and City staff to discuss how best to proceed with the Committee's review and discussion of the existing General Plan goals and policies. Tonight the Committee will try to follow a modified process where Staff has taken the comments received from the individual Committee Members prior to the meeting and edited the existing goals and policies to reflect the comments. The Committee will review the edited policies proposed by staff and provide input.

Committee Member Adams asked if the document to review was the one emailed by Staff to the Committee on June 15th and what the status of the previously reviewed goals/policies is. Mr. Barquist responded that the previously reviewed goals and policies will be brought back at a later date for the Committee to review in their edited format. The email on June 15th had the information to review for Goal 4 and forward.

Vice Chair Watts commented that he would like to see the forthcoming review documents include both the staff recommendations and the Committee comments within one spot for easy reference.

Committee Member Hansen said that many of her initial comments on the goals/policies were clarification questions and that in some cases she preferred the original policies over the revised policies proposed by Staff. She asked for clarification on what is meant by "higher order policy statement." Mr. Barquist responded that the note is meant refer to creating a more general, not specific policy that is overarching or more global in context. Committee Member Hansen asked for the purpose of creating more generalized policies. Mr. Barquist responded that having more general policies allows

the policies to remain applicable/relevant even if conditions (such as fiscal conditions) change over time.

Refer to Attachment A for Committee discussion on the individual goals and polices.

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
<p><i>Goal 4 High quality urban design that unites the City into a comprehensive entity, provides community gathering areas, and contributes to City pride and identity.</i></p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Goal 4: Community urban design that contributes to the preservation and enhancement of character and identity in Yorba Linda.</i></p> <p>Suggested revision is acceptable (Baker, Lyons, Hansen, Gorman) Would like to include uniformity or consistency across the whole city to reflect “comprehensive entity” (Adams) Uniformity or comprehensive could be addressed in the policies (Barquist) Would like to see semi-rural or rural instead of urban (Watts) Why was “City pride” removed? Is it too subjective to measure? (Bent) Remove “urban” and leave as “community design” (Watts)</p>
<p>Policy 4.1 Require that all structures be constructed in accordance with the City's building and other pertinent codes and regulations; including new, adaptive reuse, and renovated buildings.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 4.2 Ensure high quality community design image through the City design review process.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 4.2: Utilize the City's design review process to address community design considerations.</i></p> <p>Include unified City, comprehensive feel or other language to ensure new development is consistent with existing (Adams) Agree with Adams. (Bent) Policy is redundant, should be deleted (Carbone) How does the design review process exist today? Is it a policy or a code and what mechanisms make sure design review happens? Could delete policy if design review is required by some other means (Baker) Keep policy for consistency purposes, but be brief. Design review is mentioned in the Zoning Code. (Rakochoy) Keep policy as revised (Lyons) Policy reflects an important value of the city. Change to “to maintain comprehensive community design considerations” (Hansen) Ok with revised policy (Carbone) Use “address”, not “maintain” because recently adopted standards are different than previous and hold design to a higher standard (Lyons) Keep “address” and add “comprehensive” (Hansen) Consultant to look at compacting language (Watts)</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
	How is comprehensive defined in planning terms? (Adams) Comprehensive means encompasses the whole city, everything in the General Plan could be comprehensive (Bent)
Policy 4.3 Implement the comprehensive landscape program for major arterials, intersections and City entry points as established in the City's Landscape Design Manual.	No comments. Leave as is.
Policy 4.4 Stimulate improved citywide landscaping through public acceptance of limited area landscape maintenance districts in western areas of the City where landscape improvements and maintenance currently are provided for through the General Fund.	<p>Staff recommendation: Revise policy to a generalized statement related to landscaping's relationship to urban design</p> <p>How does this policy relate to new landscape districts? (Hansen) What is the charge of the newly appointed landscape maintenance committee? Would they have recommendations for this policy? (Lyons) Policy refers to trying to expand the LMAD into the western part of the City. Delete this policy because it is not relevant based on economic conditions anymore (Rakochoy) Delete policy (Lyons) Not enough information to make a decision on the policy (Hansen) Include a general policy instead. Include safety considerations (Gorman) Is Policy 4.4 already covered in Policy 4.3? (Adams) Policy 4.4 is the way to implement Policy 4.3. Keep Policy 4.4 but make it more general (Bent) Remove this policy and replace with new policy (Carbone) Agree with Carbone (Baker, Watts) Are the "limited area landscape" areas smaller than those included in Policy 4.3 and should be kept in? Remove "urban" and "western" (Adams) Make Policy 4.3 more general to encompass 4.3 and 4.4 (Bent) Agree with Bent (Gorman) Policy 4.4 advocates for creating a separate district, which should not happen. Make more general (Rakochoy)</p>
Policy 4.5 Emphasize attractive and functional urban design in new development.	Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.
Policy 4.6 Allow for the consideration, through the Area Plan designation, of changes in the permitted use and increases in the development density and residential intensity to accommodate the development of spaces and places for people to gather as a community in the Community Core area, provided that the uses are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Compatible with adjacent uses; 	<p>Delete this policy (Baker) Condense the policy. Call it the Town Center Specific Plan and say "promote the implementation of the Town Center Specific Plan to ensure..." (Rakochoy) What are staff's recommendations? (Watts) Should this policy be generalized to be applicable city-wide? (Barquist) Eliminate first half of the policy and reference the Town Center Specific Plan (Hansen)</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT (GPAC DISCUSSION ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Contribute economic and social benefits to the City; •Exhibit a distinctive level of architectural design and site planning merit; •Incorporate streetscape and other public urban design amenities which contribute a high quality image and benefit the community. 	<p>Does the Town Center Specific Plan need to be mentioned if it is already adopted? (Baker)</p> <p>Allow areas plans to develop in other areas in the future (Lyons)</p> <p>Keep bullet points (Gorman)</p> <p>Should expand to be city-wide (Adams, Bent)</p> <p>Should be kept specific to the Town Center to protect the community core (Carbone)</p> <p>Brief statement about Town Center is ok, but need area plans in other parts of the City as well (Baker)</p> <p>Policy should recognize use of area plans in other areas in the future (Watts)</p> <p>Incorporate list of areas such as Town Center, Savi Ranch, etc. for area plans (Hansen)</p> <p>List of areas could change over time (Watts)</p> <p>Do not need to have a list of specific areas, keep general (Carbone, Adams, Bent)</p>
<p>Policy 4.7 Provide pedestrian and visual linkages between commercial, residential and public uses in the Community Core area, with particular emphasis in the Downtown Historic District.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 4.7: Encourage the establishment of physical and functional connections between a variety of land uses.</i></p> <p>Agree with revision. Use “maintain” instead of “provide” (Bent)</p> <p>Agree with revision (Carbone, Baker, Rakochoy)</p> <p>Remove “variety” (Lyons)</p> <p>Keep “commercial, residential and public uses” instead of “variety of land uses” (Hansen)</p> <p>Make the policy more general (Gorman)</p> <p>Change beginning of policy to “Establish physical and functional connections...” (Watts)</p> <p>Agree with revisions (Adams, Bent, Rakochoy)</p>
<p>Policy 4.8 Update the City's building and development codes and regulations on a regular basis, as needed, to ensure that they incorporate state-of-the-art standards.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 4.8: When reviewing existing City policies and regulations, consider standards and provisions that further enhance overall community design.</i></p> <p>Should “state of the art” be kept? Or add “new” before standards and provisions (Hansen)</p> <p>Adding “new” or “state of the art” would not change the intent of the policy (Barquist)</p> <p>The policy should include direction on how buildings function, not just on how they look. Does the revised policy encompass green design, safety, etc.? (Adams)</p> <p>The revised policy encompasses function. “State of the art” can mean “cutting edge”. Do not think the City should be using unproven technologies. (Bent)</p> <p>Focus on “community” is the important part of the policy (Watts)</p> <p>“Design” is comprehensive enough, includes fire safety, traffic safety, etc. (Lyons)</p> <p>Environmental considerations will also occur in the Conservation</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
	Element (Barquist)
<p>Goal 5 New and existing development supported by adequate public infrastructure.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Goal 5: Existing and future development coordinated with future infrastructure capacity.</i></p> <p>Revised language is vague, not strong enough (Baker) Vague, should simplify language to be less planner-speak (Rakochoy) Suggest “Existing and future development coordinated with adequate infrastructure” (Bent) Change back to original. Should not rely on future infrastructure to be built (Lyons) Coordinated is too weak (Rakochoy) Keep original “adequate public infrastructure” and add “capacity” (Adams) Keep with original. Need a strong statement (Carbone) Change to “existing” or immediately built infrastructure (Watts)</p>
<p>Policy 5.1 Implement public infrastructure improvements necessary to serve land uses included in the Land Use Plan (as defined by the Circulation Element).</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 5.1: Coordinate future infrastructure improvements through the City’s Capital Improvement Program to ensure facilities meet the needs of existing and future land uses.</i></p> <p>Should be broader than “facilities”. Does this include roads? (Rakochoy) Facilities could include any infrastructure (Barquist) Use a more general term than facilities (Bent)</p>
<p>Policy 5.2 Require that development approvals, General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, Specific Plan adoptions, and other land use decisions be contingent upon the ability of public infrastructure and public services, including schools, to provide sufficient capacity to accommodate potential demand.</p>	<p>Delete this policy (Baker, Rakochoy, Lyons) Keep policy as it provides specific implementation, but remove schools (Hansen) Ok with keeping policy (Gorman, Adams) Keep policy and keep schools. Will ensure decision process looks at schools when approving new development (Bent) Could delete policy if stated strongly elsewhere the infrastructure/services need to be adequate (Watts) Remove policy 5.1 and keep policy 5.2 (Hansen) Merge 5.1 and 5.2 or reword goal to be strong (Watts)</p>
<p>Policy 5.3 Coordinate the timing of the implementation and siting of public infrastructure and public facilities with other related public facilities and development.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 5.4 Support the school district in its efforts to obtain financing and new sources of funding for the rehabilitation & improvement of existing facilities to meet increased need.</p>	<p>Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 5.5 Promote the development of affordable residential uses which convey a quality design and are compatible with adjacent uses in the community.</p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: <i>Policy 5.5 Ensure residential development is designed and developed so that they are complimentary to the overall urban design of the city.</i> Delete, redundant to have a policy specifically about design of</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
	affordable housing (Bent) Committee agreed to keep as revised. Change to “urban design” to “community design”
Policy 5.6 Encourage the use of public sewer systems in new and infill development rather than septic systems.	Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.
<i>Goal 6 Achieve a unified and contiguous City area through voluntary annexation by residents of developed County Islands located in the City's Sphere of Influence.</i>	Staff recommended revision: <i>Goal 6: Establish a unified and contiguous city boundary through the incorporation of county islands and lands within the City's Sphere of Influence.</i> Removed “voluntary”. Ok with recommended revision (Adams)
Policy 6.1 Work closely with residents and property owners of County islands when conditions are appropriate for consideration of possible annexation to the City in order to clarify the nature and extent of public facility and service improvements required at property owner expense before annexation can occur.	Staff recommended revision: Revise policy to focus on the LAFCO process, focusing on identifying/addressing the needs/concerns of residents within annexation sites. Should steer away from staff getting involved with annexation (Watts) Only encourage annexation when it makes sense for the City economically (Baker) Clarify cost and service issues associated with annexation (Adams) Not enough information on costs and benefits to make a decision to support annexations (Watts) Areas cannot be annexed unless property owners agree to be annexed (Gorman) Does annexation need to be addressed in the General Plan? (Bent) Eliminate annexation discussion (Carbone) Only in favor of annexation if it is to the City's advantage (Baker) Important to have annexation policy in the General Plan. Simplify the statement (Rakochy) Agree with staff recommendations on revisions. Strategic to have a policy (Lyons) Make the policy more general (Hansen) The City does not have control over the process. Delete the policy (Gorman) Keep it in to have strategic control (Adams) Keep the policy in (Bent) Does annexation need to have specific policies? Or just keep it as a goal (Watts) Without policies it would not be enforceable (Adams) Have one policy to support LAFCO and other processes (Watts)
Policy 6.2 Consider annexations of County islands which are a part of Yorba Linda's contiguous developed area, which receive services from the City, which will benefit from provision of services from the City, and are	Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
located in the Sphere of Influence, based on voluntary requests by residents of the County islands.	
Policy 6.3 Establish as the first priority for annexation the Yorba Linda Country Club unincorporated lands which are wholly surrounded by the City, and which will contribute the valuable golf course amenity to the City's private recreation facilities resources.	Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.
Policy 6.4 Require that, prior to any annexation activities involving the Fairlynn County island, improvements which bring the area into conformance with the City's infrastructure standards and other relevant factors are addressed to the satisfaction of the City.	Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.
Policy 6.5 Work with adjacent cities and the County to establish uniform and continuous boundaries, avoiding irregular intrusions and projections.	Committee agreed this policy should be deleted.
<p><i>Goal 7 New development opportunities offered by large undeveloped properties located in the sphere of influence.</i></p>	<p>Staff recommended revision: consider revising goal to address the management of future larger scale developments.</p> <p>What is meant by "opportunities"? (Baker) Should name specific areas and seek annexation as a goal (Rakochoy) Goal is redundant with Goal 6 (Watts) Change to be citywide, not just for annexations. Apply to all large developments (Lyons) Change Goal 7 to citywide (Watts) Change to "large developments of undeveloped properties in the sphere of influence and the City" (Adams)</p>
Policy 7.1 Seek the annexation of Shell, Murdock and other undeveloped properties within the northern sphere of influence based upon development plans that ensure access, infrastructure and land use concepts which are acceptable to the City.	<p>Staff recommended revision: revise policy to address all sphere areas. Focus policy on assurance for health, safety and welfare of current and future residents.</p> <p>Delete the policy. Covered under Goal 6 (Hansen) Policy is specific to areas identified (Rehmer) Expand policy to all areas in the City and the sphere of influence. Delete reference to annexation (Watts)</p>

July 23, 2013
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER

III. GPAC REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT POLICY PROGRAM

The Committee continued its discussion of the General Plan Land Use Element policy program. Refer to Attachment “A” (Yorba Linda General Plan Policy Review Matrix – July 23, 2013) for Committee discussion on the individual goals and polices.

LAND USE ELEMENT <i>(GPAC DISCUSSION ITEMS)</i>	Notes/Comments
<i>Goal 7 New development opportunities offered by large undeveloped properties located in the sphere of influence.</i>	
Policy 7.1 Seek the annexation of Shell, Murdock and other undeveloped properties within the northern sphere of influence based upon development plans that ensure access, infrastructure and land use concepts which are acceptable to the City.	<p>Adams- address all sphere of influence areas; remove specific names of properties Carbone- throughout the sphere of influence, not just the northern sphere; don't include specific names Lyons and Gorman- agree with above Rakochy- all of Goal 7 focuses undeveloped properties Adams- still include “undeveloped” properties Hansen- Seek the annexation of undeveloped properties to ensure access, infrastructure and land use concepts which are acceptable to the City. Gorman- look at next 2 policies, possibly combine Watson- disagree, keep separate policies Adams- do we need to include health safety and welfare? Pickel- already included with “acceptable to the City” Committee agreed on language in bold</p>
Policy 7.2 Require developers of undeveloped properties to complete improvements for required infrastructure and/or provide funds for required infrastructure (both on-site and related improvements) in accord with City determined service levels.	<p>Gorman- allow for case by case basis flexibility for Council to determine what developer should be required to do Adams- General Plan should provide guidance for future City Councils Watson- Agree w with Committee Member Gorman. With loss of RDA, don't want to tie hands of the City that prevents contribution to a good project. Change to “require collaboration between City and developers” or “recommend” Carbone- need developers to contribute, should be a requirement that developers bear the cost Rakochy- policy already in place as part of CUP process, etc. Pickel- still negotiable even if policy in place Behura- City has the ability to negotiate still, leave it as is Huang- keep as is. Important to tie to level of service Committee agreed to keep policy as stated</p>
Policy 7.3 Designate the Shell and Murdock properties for an Area Plan designation and require that a Specific Plan, Community (PC) or Planned Residential Development (PRD)	<p>Lyons- is this policy redundant w/ 7.1? Gorman- delete this policy Rakochy- doesn't include designating areas for SP or PRD development. Does it need to be included in 7.1?</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

Notes/Comments

development plan process, or other similar regulatory mechanisms acceptable to the City be prepared to implement the intent of the Area Plans as primarily low density residential communities.

Adams- include some of the wording about designation in 7.1 to have some control over properties
 Carbone- would like to see some designated as preserve instead of planned residential
 Adams- do not need to develop all of the area
 Watson- is there an acreage threshold for a specific plan?
 Rehmer- no threshold
 Watson- include in language 'undeveloped area in excess of X size'
 Rehmer- can be small areas; provide a comprehensive plan for entire development instead of designating PD or PRD; include list of uses
 Pickle- should be a separate policy, should be reworded to be big picture for entire area
 Lyons- would rather be vague in language- say "comprehensive plan for entire area"- not to include specifics
 Behura- make sure wording doesn't exclude something
 Rakochy- intent of area plans is primarily low density communities- keep this
 Carbone- Measure B ensures the low density intent is kept
 Hansen- keep policies 7.1 and 7.3 separate
 Adams- agree with Hansen
 Rakochy- 7.4 is very specific, move from general to specific, keep "low density"
 Pickel- propose language - **"designate properties for an Area Plan designation and require a comprehensive plan process or other regulatory mechanisms be prepared to implement the intent of the Area Plans as primarily low density residential communities, etc."**
 Adams- include "as primarily low density residential communities or preserves"
 Pickel- leave as comprehensive plan process, don't specify low density residential
 Huang- include in language comprehensive plan; property rights need to be balanced
 Pickel- would comprehensive plan process eliminate need for other language?
 Rehmer- include "to include such things as..."; beneficial for staff to have specifics
 Watson- Goal 7 is only for large properties undeveloped in sphere
 Gorman- include in list of uses "open space"; do not limit development to the point that no property taxes are generated
 Pickel- staff/consultant to list some items to include
 Barquist- need to define "comprehensive plan" as well
 Adams- include preserves along with open space
 Committee agreed on language in bold. Staff/consultant to propose a list of uses to include

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

Notes/Comments

Policy 7.4 Permit development at an average density of 1.0 dwelling units per base acre for the Murdock property; permit development at an average density not to exceed the City's target density of 2.8 dwelling units per base acre for the Shell property.

Hansen- does the City have control over this topic?
 Barquist- Yes, the City has the ability to designate areas in sphere
 Behura- doesn't the property have to be in the City to have control?
 Barquist- the City is an additional agency in EIR with some level of review
 Behura- Will the County give the City authority to review development?
 Watson- the City does not have control, but can comment on environmental; keep language general instead of calling out densities
 Pickel- moot point unless annexed before developed
 Hansen- density listed is unrealistic
 Rakochy- density achieved through clustering; General Plan should have some sort of structure for these areas; Measure B requires vote of people anyway
 Adams- does City have the option to litigate based on land being in the sphere of influence? Would it hurt to put numbers in?
 Pickel- anything could be litigated
 Watson- specifying a density could be a deterrent to bringing people to the table
 Behura- why do the properties want to be annexed? If properties are going to be annexed they should follow standards
 Huang- the City will want to annex these properties eventually because they will use Yorba Linda's roads
 Pickel- is there a limit of development based on LOS of roadways?
 Gorman- the City does not have control. Focus policy on how to deal with the County. Can't developer decide to piecemeal sell off area?
 Rakochy- need framework to give staff leverage
 Watson- instead of calling out specific density include "properties within sphere of influence should be developed consistent with adjacent properties within the City of Yorba Linda"
 Adams- include "not to exceed current adjacent residential densities"
 Lyons- "match zoning of contiguous"
 Rehmer- current proposal for these areas could meet 1 du/ac standards
 Behura- meeting it through clustering
 Gorman- include "work with the County to ensure..."
 Gorman- include something about infrastructure
 Lyons- do not include infrastructure because current plans say infrastructure could handle proposed development; don't want degradation of quality of life
 Pickel- Reword to **"Permit development in the sphere of influence should be no greater than the contiguous city properties."**

LAND USE ELEMENT (GPAC DISCUSSION ITEMS)	Notes/Comments
	Committee agreed to language in bold
Goal 8 Low density residential development in the hillside areas which protects the unique natural and topographic character.	
Policy 8.1 Target lower densities to hillside areas with yield based on slope severity and stability, topographic conditions, and natural resource protection and other environmental conditions.	Pickle- fold policies 8.2 and 8.3 into 8.1 Adams- don't make 8.1 too long Rakochoy- 8.1 and 8.3 could be in one policy. 8.2 could be a separate policy Committee agreed that 8.1 and 8.3 should be combined and 8.2 should be kept in a separate policy
Policy 8.2 Reduce the total yield of development if grading, habitat preservation, slope stabilization, drainage, etc. standards cannot be met.	
Policy 8.3 Uphold current development standards for determination of yield and regulation of quality within hillside areas.	
Goal 9 Preservation and enhancement of the natural setting of the City.	Committee agreed to change "setting" to "landscape and topography" Lyons- landscaping in Yorba Linda is natural and don't want to revert to natural Rakochoy- use "semi-rural" instead Adams- focus maintaining topography Pickel- focus on preserving ridgelines Behura- what is the definition of open space? What is sensitive? Rehmer- Yorba Linda designates 2 types of open space- public open space and private open space. Public allows for parks, private allows some development. Neither mentions preserves Gorman- haven't managed to preserve open space to date; lakebed is controlled by County
Policy 9.1 Preserve sensitive open space areas within the City.	Behura- clarify "sensitive" and "open space", talk about terrain Adams- change "open space" to "preserve" Watson- nothing is designated preserve now. Have a policy to create preserves Hansen- don't want to get too specific Lyons- policy to encourage or incentivize creation of preserves to protect open space Adams- open space isn't the right term Rehmer- change to "preserve natural landscaping" or "natural settings" or define open space Gorman- make policy 9.2 the goal Pickel- policy 9.2 would be too specific as the goal Rakochoy- also going to be addressed in recreation and resources element; what do we want future open space to look like? Adams- preserve sensitive areas within the City that provide biological significance

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
	<p>Behura- is sensitive clear? Pickel- sensitive is defined by CEQA; keep as “natural setting” Adams- preserve spaces that need to be left untouched- scenic, biological- flora and fauna Rakochy- agree with amendment recommended by staff- scenic, cultural and biological significance Watson- does cultural need to be included if talking about open space Rakochy- cultural in open space is not structures, example- cemetery Pickel- Preserve areas within the City that provide scenic, cultural, natural or biological significance. Gorman- doesn’t control private property Behura- yes, City can control private property through EIR process Huang- city can use nuisance ordinance can come after property owners that violate Committee agreed on language in bold</p>
<p>Policy 9.2 Protect the scenic and visual qualities of hillside areas and ridgelines.</p>	<p>Committee agreed to keep policy as stated</p>
<p>Policy 9.3 Ensure that land uses within designated and proposed scenic corridors are compatible with scenic enhancement and preservation.</p>	<p>Rehmer- 91 Fwy through Coal Canyon is a designated scenic corridor Carbone- is the wildlife corridor a scenic corridor? Rehmer- no Watson- is there a policy on scenic enhancement and preservation? Huang- is purpose of policy to keep character along existing developed corridors? Barquist- showed diagram of scenic corridor from based on State definition Behura- could have local definition of scenic corridor Gorman- portions of trails could be scenic corridors Adams- not hurtful to leave it in Watson- define what scenic corridor is Behura- time and effort to needed create definition of local scenic corridor Committee decided to keep the policy as is</p>
<p><i>Goal 10 Provision of adequate school facilities according to the standards of the School District.</i></p>	<p>Adams –include “coordination” to ensure adequate facilities for city residents Pickel- The City is a conduit, but can’t keep any funds collected for schools Huang- up to the school district to meet state standards</p>
<p>Policy 10.1 Facilitate coordination between the School District and the developer to ensure that school facilities are adequately sized, located and funded to serve the present and projected needs of the area according to</p>	<p>Lyons- state law prevails Huang- developer deals with schools, not with City on school issues Rakochy- can control development, include coordinate w/ the district</p>

LAND USE ELEMENT
(GPAC DISCUSSION
ITEMS)

	Notes/Comments
the standards of the School District.	Behura- City could complain to the district Rehmer- the City doesn't have a mechanism or inspection authority to look at maintenance issues at schools Rehmer- City collects the fees for schools and passes them on Pickel- joint use agreements are covered in Parks and Rec Master Plan, don't need to address here Rakochy- policy was driven by desire to have a high school in Yorba Linda, which is done; talk about coordination efforts only Watson- put in parks and rec master plan; not appropriate to put City in middle of land use discussions related to schools Pickel- a coordination process only Committee agreed to eliminate Goal 10 and all related policies; Include coordination of use of school facilities in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan/Element
Policy 10.2 Require that any new development contribute its fair share toward the costs of expanding, upgrading or providing school facilities to serve the population generated by the development, or provide the required facilities as a condition of approval.	
Policy 10.3 Work closely with the School District in identifying and pursuing new sources of adequate funding for the rehabilitation, improvement, expansion and construction of existing and future school facilities that will benefit students of the City.	
Policy 10.4 Require General Plan amendments and the specific plan or development plan process to identify and establish the impact upon school facilities.	
Policy 10.5 Coordinate the planning and siting of schools with the Parks and Recreation Department and other public facility providers in the City at an early stage in the planning and approval process.	
Policy 10.6 Recognizing the independent fiscal and operational authority of school districts regarding service boundaries, resource allocations and related considerations, seek the reconciliation of district boundaries so that, to the maximum extent possible, students within the City are served by a single school district.	
Policy 10.7 Promote the concept of the existence of a high school within the corporate boundaries of the City of Yorba Linda.	

The Committee ended its discussion at the end of the policies for Goal 10. The Committee will discuss the remaining recommended additions to goals/policies for the Land Use Element at end of the August or September meeting.

**September 10, 2013
6:30 – 8:30PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM- LAND USE

Refer to Attachment “A”.

	Committee Comments
NEW GOALS AND POLICIES RECOMMENDED	
<i>Goal X Develop risk assessment processes to be applied to all proposed construction, reconstruction, or remodeling of structures located or proposed within the most current adopted Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.</i>	
Policy X.1 Projects which would increase the number of persons living or working within a VHFHSZ shall be assessed to determine the three most expeditious evacuation routes from the site to reach a paved public roadway outside the VHFHSZ and which is at least 60 feet in width.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it appropriate to require 3 routes? (Watts) • Three is based on the number of stairways in a high-rise buildings. Any neighborhood is required to have 2 evacuation routes. In high fire hazard areas backed up to Chino Hills State Park, increasing the number of routes to 3 would be beneficial (Baker) • Would like to see scientific/technical documentation to support the recommendation for number of evacuation routes (Watts) • This policy refers to the Shell/Murdock property where there is only 1 route out (Hansen) • This policy would apply to other areas such as Hidden Hills too (Baker) • Concerned regarding the specification of 3 routes based on building safety issue. What is the planning standard? (Watson) • Is this legally enforceable? (Behura) • Is there any precedence? (Pickel) • Having a requirement would help with setting parameters for the unincorporated properties that would be annexed into the City. Requirements would also apply to other areas of the City (Carbone) • Agree that a requirement should be included in the General Plan, but would like to reflect a scientific

Committee Comments
<p>standard (Watts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would routes already be addressed in the EIR? (Watson)• From a traffic engineering perspective there would be a way to calculate the number of routes needed based on standards (Behura)• The General Plan looks at implementing the community's vision. If this is part of the vision, there is no legal requirement to prove the vision or require a scientific study to implement the vision (Baker)• Would it be useful to the Planning Department to have something to refer to in the General Plan? (Bent)• Yes (Rehmer)• Replace language with a requirement to conduct additional studies to determine the minimum number of routes by project (Watson)• Would like to include a specific number (Hansen)• Not every project is the same and would require the same number (Watson)• Add language to require the EIR to assess the specific number of evacuation routes (Lyons)• Would support having a study required or using a formula (Watts)• Having a specific number would be trying to fit all projects into the same requirement, the General Plan should be broad (Rehmer)• If 3 routes are not used, there should be some mitigation. Traffic engineers look at the smaller neighborhood level, but these studies would need to go all the way to the edge of the evacuation zone (Baker)• There are other issues such as flood, earthquake and other natural disasters that should be addressed as well (Gorman)• This policy refers to safety and land use issues, primarily fire but could be expanded (Baker)• Suggest including a minimum number of routes and then requiring the EIR to look at what should be added. Specifying a specific number would be challenged by developers. The General Plan should not have that fine grained detail (Pickel)• Would a developer right now consult with Cal Fire, etc. for the EIR? (Huang)• The lead agency focuses the scope of the EIR. The City could comment asking for evacuation routes to be looked at, but it is not automatic (Rehmer)• For high fire hazard areas, policy should require consultation with Cal Fire and other agencies (Huang)• Does the City have a current policy? (Rakochoy)• No (Rehmer)• Remove the numbers. Should be developing the policy and process to come up with the numbers later (Rakochoy)

	Committee Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest saying “more than 2 routes” since 2 is already the required minimum. (Behura) • Policy should be focused on adequacy of routes based on the context of disasters that have occurred in the City. Are there mitigation measures available? (Watts) • Would like to have some flexibility to provide mitigation (Bent) • What type of development would this apply to? Concerned that small projects like a guest house would trigger this requirement (Watson) • 10 percent threshold included in the policy (Behura) • Suggest that any development that meets the threshold and proposes 2 or less evacuation routes be required to have a study to justify the number of routes (Watts) • The requirement for 2 routes is based on need for redundancy. How would 3 routes be better? (Lyons) • Because of locations of high fire hazard areas against the park, there are limited directions to go. Parallel routes may not be effective (Baker) • Include language to eliminate reliance on parallel routes (Lyons) • If egress in 2 different directions isn’t possible, what will the City require? Suggest language stating if a development is not able to provide egress in 2 different directions a 3rd route is required (Behura) • Would like to see more flexibility, not locked into a number (Bent)
<p>Policy X.2 Projects which would increase the number of persons living or working within a VHFHSZ shall be prohibited if the additional persons using any two of the three evacuation routes identified in Policy 1.1 would increase the total number of persons using that evacuation route by 10% or more, unless the project includes increasing the capacity of all three routes by an amount not less than the additional persons proposed to use each route. Projects which have less than three evacuation routes shall treat each missing evacuation route as increasing usage by more than 10%.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is 10% calculated? It is aggregate? • Suggest removing remodel and redevelop (Rehmer) • Suggest wording to say new development or zone change (Watson) • Committee agreed to requirements for construction and new development
<p><i>Goal 2X: Develop infrastructure to facilitate future use of non-potable water for irrigation and other approved uses.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 750 is a new bill that will require separate meters for multiunit structures, May affect this goal/policies (Pickel)
<p>Policy 2X.1 Require all new construction, reconstruction, or remodeling of structures to include dual pipe water distribution systems within the project. Initially, both pipes are connected to the same source of potable water at the water</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring this in new or replacement construction is not an undue burden (Rakochy) • Agree (Pickel) • Can be a burden. It is outfitting the house for infrastructure that doesn’t exist yet (Lyons) • Does the water district have plans to distribute

	Committee Comments
meter or property boundary.	<p>reclaimed water for houses? (Watson)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are areas already using reclaimed water in the City. It may be economical for large developments. There isn't a plan for providing non-potable water to houses because there aren't residents asking for it (Baker) • Would like to get input from Water District (Watson) • Would like to know if it is in the Water District's long range plans and what would be the trigger to providing it (Pickel) • Committee agreed that the policy should be for new development or replacement of the system. • City is the largest water user, but is not replacing its pipes. Suggest that the City does as well (Rakochoy) • Add encouragement to the policy if the Water District is on board and suggest adding a timeline (Behura) • Add working with the water district to the policy (Rehmer)

**Tuesday October 29, 2013
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM – GROWTH MANAGEMENT, NOISE, PUBLIC SAFETY

Resolve goal/policy numbering.

Refer to Attachment "A".

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT**

	COMMENTS
<p><i>Goal 1A: An adequate transportation/circulation system that supports regional and local land uses at adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards and complies with requirements of the Countywide Traffic Improvement and Growth Management Program (Measure M).</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this apply to general transportation as well as bus transportation (OCTA)? (Gorman) • Concerned with numbering and organization of goals and policies in this section. (Adams)

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ELEMENT

COMMENTS

Goal 2A: Reduced traffic congestion on the City's streets and highways through active coordination with the Congestion Management Agency to achieve transportation improvements consistent with land use planning.

- Sequencing of signalization could be part of this? At peak hours signalization is off and there are vehicles stacking up on side streets. (Pickel)
- These goals are general – these items are coming next. (Hansen)
- Why are there no policies logically addressing these goals? This needs to be clearly organized. (Adams)
- Trying to clarify. Let's say it in general terms. Policies should be more particular like Measure M. What does M apply to? Doesn't understand the terminology in this section. (Watts)
- Is this redundancy a good or bad thing? Between these elements? Congestion management agency – why not just say OCTA? Move to end of GP. (Rakochoy)
- Growth Management should be incorporated into all the other sections. Let's delete this section. Can we just pull goals and policies from the other elements and repeat? (Bent)
- This element is required via Measure M – must have for funding. Can streamline it and make more sense out of it. (Barquist)
- Coordination (Gorman)
- Elements are added, taken away, amended, and enhanced. Let's understand how this is formatted and determine organization/format. We'll go through step by step and make suggestions. (Pickel)
- Look at subsets and get through it. (Lyons)
- How do we satisfy Measure M with this section? We should be looking at the sections we've already been through before going through this section. (Bent)
- Identify local conditions and apply to regional network. How are you integrating into land use and circulation? Congestion management at a regional level. AB32 SB375 relate directly to this. Let's look at these is the broad context. (Barquist)
- Need explanation of LOS D in this section if it's being mentioned. Easily misinterpreted. (Rakochoy)
- LOS D is not reducing congestion. We are making sure that we don't put too many cars on the road that they can't handle. (Lyons)
- 2 points: we need to make sure we get our funding. Is this a rewrite? (Watts)
- We are not creating policies or defining LOS D. (Pickel)
- In the body of the element will have a graphic and description is of LOS and why in laymans terms so it's straight forward. (Barquist)

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ELEMENT

	COMMENTS
Traffic Level of Service	
<p>Policy 1.1 All feasible mitigation measures shall be implemented designated to achieve an acceptable level the target standard LOS D. unless it can be demonstrated that the unacceptable level of service is a direct result of regional traffic.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't like it. We want to achieve LOS D – period! Delete the part about a result of... (Lyons) • Edit policy. (Barquist) • Nothing we can do about regional traffic (people cutting through city). (Pickel) • Standard level of service.(Lyons) • Are we leaving it open by saying acceptable LOS? (Adams) • Read definitions of LOS A through F from CalTrans. (Rakochoy) • Define acceptable (Pickel)
<p>Policy 1.2 Each signalized intersection that has been improved to its maximum feasible configuration and still does not meet the target level of service shall be placed on the deficient intersection list.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest making policy into 2 sentences. (Watts) • Could move second part to implementation item list (Barquist)
<p>Policy 1.3 Allow adjustment of stated requirements if necessitated by <u>temporary</u>, unusual, or extraordinary circumstances. including, but not limited to, such conditions as an arterial highway temporarily accommodating traffic usually carried by a freeway while freeway improvements are being constructed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplify land use by deleting it (Lyons) • Do we need to say this? Make policy less wordy. Simplify. (Adams) • Its allowing an adjustment of these requirements. They would not change the LOS. Agency would be able to temporarily adjust requirements for capacity of street based on street closures, etc. (Pickel) • The standard is not changed (Lyons) • Is this justifying some money we've received or looking for future funds? (Bent) • 1.4 and 1.5 are redundant of this policy but more straight forward. Its saying we are holding everything to "Stated Requirement". Has nothing to do with funding. (Rokochoy) • Remove "including but not limited to" (Watts) • End sentence at end of highlighting and move to end of 1.1 (Gorman) • (Pickel) disagrees. • Combine 1.4 and 1.5 (Bent) • Add "temporary".(Adams)
<p>Policy 1.4 Measure Traffic LOS using the current guidance regarding traffic level of service policy implementation manual established by the Local Transportation Authority.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also covered in Circ. Element. Use suggested language. (Pickel)
<p>Policy 1.5 Permit the stated requirements to be adjusted if required by unusual circumstances (such as during highway</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend deletion of 1.5 (Pickel) • Keep 1.5 and delete 1.3 (Bent)

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ELEMENT

COMMENTS	
improvement construction).	
Development Mitigation and Phasing	
<p>Policy 2.1 Require completion of improvements to mitigate impacts of development projects to achieve Traffic LOS standards prescribed in this Element.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger with staff analysis (Pickel) • Agree with suggested revision. (Adams) • Need revision
<p>Policy 2.2 All new development shall be required to participate in the City's Transportation Fee Program(s). These fee programs shall be designed to ensure that all development projects fund their pro rata share of the necessary long-term transportation improvements identified in the Circulation Element.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep it direct. (Adams) • Is this what constitutes a nexus? (Lyons) • Change "Relational connection". (Watts) • Removed nexus. (Barquist) • Don't want to limit to long term transp. need. Change language to "based upon" (Watts) • Need to specify short and long term (Lyons) • Need revision
<p>Policy 2.3 Require all new development to pay its share of the costs associated with that project, including regional traffic mitigation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove 2.3 (Pickel)
<p>Policy 2.4 Where a new development project contributes measurable traffic, require that the necessary improvements to transportation facilities are constructed and completed pursuant to the following conditions:</p> <p>* Within three years of the issuance of a building permit for project; or, * Within five years of the issuance of a grading permit for the development project, whichever comes first.</p> <p>The City may establish a Level of Service "D" or the existing LOS as the mitigated LOS goal standard for intersections solely under the control of the City.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there something that required mitigation (Behura) • Clarify measurable as defined by... in circulation element (Bent) • Prescriptive nature of policies here. (Barquist) • Is there a policy about vehicles per day or is it using projected vehicles per day? Measurable? What is the basis for measurable? What is the criteria? (Rokochoy) • Leaves is up to interpretation. (Greg) • Quantify (Pickel) • Softer language needed. 3 and 5 are good goal but may be exceptions. Concerned with policy having these numbers? (Gorman) • Should be consistent with Zoning code, etc. need to confirm. Will revisit. (Barquist) • Reword. (Adams) • Need timeline on sunsets (Lyons) • GP is umbrella doc and other docs need to be consistent (Barquist) • Generally accepted practices or principles (Watts) • Are we referring to zoning code (Behura) • 3 and 5 years - not sure if I want it to be so specific so it doesn't get outdated. Refer to current zoning policy. (Bent) • Need revision
<p>Policy 2.5 <u>Should</u> the City shall determine that any project which has complied with Policy 2.4 by funding a specific transportation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is confusing. (Lyons) • Credit and fees. Don't know where it would go but don't think it goes in GM. (Pickel)

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ELEMENT

	COMMENTS
<p>improvement project, may be given credit for the fees required as part of the transportation fee programs as established in Policy 2.2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does answer a question (Hansen) • Is there a specific policy elsewhere? (Behura) • Change “shall” to “may” (Lyons) • City can decide with this language (Watts) • Can be or may (Behura) • Not sure about may.(Lyons) • Should the city... may....(Rakochy)
<p>Policy 2.6 Those intersections on the deficient intersection list shall may be exempted from the requirements of Policy 2.4.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can’t make it worse (Rakochy) • D and F are deficient. Need to alter this statement. (Hansen) • Give city leeway to determine. (Behura) • Development adjacent to deficient intersections may not increase the level of deficiency... (Adams) • Delete. (Gorman) • Specify what we want to do with those developments and not delete it (Behura) • Shall to may. Deficient intersection list. (Watts) • Gave examples. There is not much we can do for mitigation which is not acceptable. Need to collect money from every development to eventually have the funds to use later. Contribute to long term solutions – holding place. (Behura) • Where do the funds go? Where are they held for later? (Adams) • Mechanism to collect money is there, just not to hold it (Behura) • Can we even put the language in the GP? (Adams) • Easily add a financial element to GP for these issues. (Bent) • Economic development element. Must look at alternative means of funding since RDA is gone. (Barquist) • Est. mitigation fee program et al. we need to est. policy for LOS F intersections (Rakochy) • Need to keep on higher plane – more broad. How money is spent and where. (Pickel) • Needs to be stated here. (Hansen)
<p>Policy 2.7 In any case where 10% or more of the traffic using an intersection is generated by a project or where it contributes measurably to a Deficient Intersection, the City that is impacted may negotiate the requirement of a fee, as provided by the County Implementation Program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don’t understand this policy (everyone) • What is the purpose? Change so that the city may require fees from offending agency...(Watts) • Make it easier to read (Barquist)
<p>Policy 2.8 Review and evaluate existing traffic</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and evaluate – can’t let it be. (Hansen)

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ELEMENT

	COMMENTS
<p>mitigation fees and develop new fees, if necessary, to fund the improvements identified in the Circulation Element of the General Plan or its Technical Report. (Chapter 3 of the EIR Technical Appendices) in cooperation with other jurisdictions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest deletion of reference to Chapter 3 (Behura)
<p>Policy 2.9 Prohibit the use of Measure M tax revenues to replace private developer funds which have been committed for normal project or subdivision obligations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems fine. (Adams) • Go to developer only (Behura) • Too strong against developers. Want to entice developers. (Lyons) • Disagrees – developers need to assist in the impacts they create. (Adams) • Need revenue generators – we may need financial incentives. (Lyons) • Don't think you can use measure m for specific developments/developers (Rakochoy) • Measure M funds are earmarked (Behura) • We have empty buildings where traffic has already been planned for. (Bent) • Delete it! (Watts) • States to comply with the law. Measure M comes from sales taxes to be used on regional level. Doesn't necessarily make sense to keep in. (Barquist)
<p>Policy 2.10 Phase development in accordance with a comprehensive phasing program adopted by the City, which shall provide an overall build-out land use development plan which can be supported by implementation of the planned circulation system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewrite to make it simple (Watts) • Do we need buildout concept? (Adams) • Do we have a policy document (Rakochoy) • Needs follow up if there is a Comprehensive Phasing Program (Barquisit) • Capital improvement plans are phased after 2035. Compare development with phasing of roads which already exist. Its embedded in CIP. (Lyons) • CPP is not a formal doc so take away caps. (Adams)
<p>Policy 2.11 Periodically evaluate programs designed to mitigate development impacts and the phasing of development and feasible transportation improvements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave as it is (Behura) • Agree (Lyons)

Tuesday November 26, 2013

6:30 – 8:30 PM

YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER

III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM – GROWTH MANAGEMENT, NOISE, PUBLIC SAFETY

Resolve goal/policy numbering.

Refer to Attachment "A".

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)**

	No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<p><i>Goal 1A: An adequate transportation/circulation system that supports regional and local land uses at adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards and complies with requirements of the Countywide Traffic Improvement and Growth Management Program (Measure M).</i></p>		<p><i>Refer to Circulation Goal 1. See Information Supplement (Page 37) regarding Measure M requirements</i></p>
<p><i>Goal 2A: Reduced traffic congestion on the City's streets and highways through active coordination with the Congestion Management Agency to achieve transportation improvements consistent with land use planning.</i></p>		
<p>Traffic Level of Service</p>		
<p>Policy 1.1 All feasible mitigation measures shall be designated to achieve the target standard LOS D unless it can be demonstrated that the unacceptable level of service is a direct result of regional traffic.</p>		
<p>Policy 1.2 Each signalized intersection that has been improved to its maximum feasible configuration and still does not meet the target level of service shall be placed on the deficient intersection list.</p>		<p><i>This should be an implementation program item.</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.3 Allow adjustment of stated requirements if necessitated by unusual or extraordinary circumstances including, but not limited to, such conditions as an arterial highway temporarily accommodating traffic usually carried by a freeway while freeway improvements are being constructed.</p>		<p><i>This should be an implementation program item</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.4 Measure Traffic LOS using the current guidance regarding traffic level of service policy implementation manual established by the Local Transportation</p>		<p><i>Duplicative of Policy 1.3</i></p> <p><i>This does not appear to duplicate policy 1.3 (see highlighted text above) as 1.3 deals with unusual</i></p>

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)**

	No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
Authority.		<i>circumstances and 1.4 does not.</i>
Policy 1.5 Permit the stated requirements to be adjusted if required by unusual circumstances (such as during highway improvement construction).	X	<i>Duplicative of Policy 1.3 This does appear to duplicate 1.3</i>
Development Mitigation and Phasing		
Policy 2.1 Require completion of improvements to mitigate impacts of development projects to achieve Traffic LOS standards prescribed in this Element.		<i>This is an implementation item.</i>
Policy 2.2 All new development shall be required to participate in the City's Transportation Fee Program(s). These fee programs shall be designed to ensure that all development projects fund their pro rata share of the necessary long-term transportation improvements identified in the Circulation Element.		<i>This is an implementation item.</i>
Policy 2.3 Require all new development to pay its share of the costs associated with that project, including regional traffic mitigation.		<i>This is an implementation item.</i>
<p>Policy 2.4 Where a new development project contributes measurable traffic, require that the necessary improvements to transportation facilities are constructed and completed pursuant to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Within three years of the issuance of a building permit for project; or, * Within five years of the issuance of a grading permit for the development project, whichever comes first. <p>The City may establish a Level of Service "D" or the existing LOS as the mitigated LOS goal standard for intersections solely under the control of the City.</p>		<p><i>Policy should be more broad to ensure flexibility in implementation.</i></p> <p><i>Policy should not be so broad that it becomes unenforceable on specific issues.</i></p> <p><i>Policy also needs to address needs/requirements for rapid evacuation (wildfire) of new development without adversely impacting existing residents ability to safely evacuate from surrounding developments.</i></p>
Policy 2.5 The City may determine that any project which has complied with Policy 2.4 by funding a specific transportation improvement project, shall be given credit		<i>Does this mean that the specific transportation project funded is the one identified as needed in 2.2? Or, will the developer be allowed to receive credit for funding different transportation project?</i>

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)**

	No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
for the fees required as part of the transportation fee programs as established in Policy 2.2.		
Policy 2.6 Those intersections on the deficient intersection list shall be exempted from the requirements of Policy 2.4.	X	<p><i>May need to be deleted to ensure new development cannot be exempt from improvements</i></p> <p><i>New development needs to cover costs associated with increased impact on traffic.</i></p>
Policy 2.7 In any case where 10% or more of the traffic using an intersection is generated by a project or where it contributes measurably to a Deficient Intersection, the City that is impacted may negotiate the requirement of a fee, as provided by the County Implementation Program.		<i>This is an implementation item.</i>
Policy 2.8 Review and evaluate existing traffic mitigation fees and develop new fees, if necessary, to fund the improvements identified in the Circulation Element of the General Plan or its Technical Report (Chapter 3 of the EIR Technical Appendices) in cooperation with other jurisdictions.		<p><i>Policy should not reference particular EIR Section.</i></p> <p><i>Reference EIR generally? Or, only Circulation Element of General Plan?</i></p>
Policy 2.9 Prohibit the use of Measure M tax revenues to replace private developer funds which have been committed for normal project or subdivision obligations.		
Policy 2.10 Phase development in accordance with the Comprehensive Phasing Program adopted by the City, which shall provide an overall build-out land use development plan which can be supported by implementation of the planned circulation system.		
Policy 2.11 Periodically evaluate programs designed to mitigate development impacts and the phasing of development and feasible transportation improvements.		
Land Use and Program Administration		

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)**

	No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<p>Policy 3.1 Recognizing the particular constraints of existing physical development characteristics in Yorba Linda, strive towards an achievement of balanced land use, whereby residential, non-residential and public land uses have a reasonable proportion to each other.</p>		<p><i>Pickel - not in favor of deleting, in favor of making more concise and clear. Ambiguous right now. Need to make more concise.</i> <i>Baker – likes recommendation from staff/consultant</i> <i>Adams – need a word after “phasing” sentence is awkward. Agrees with what is says, sentence is just awkward</i> <i>Barquist – phasing references when it will occur</i> <i>Hansen – can you say “take into consideration”</i> <i>Adams – put a period after phasing</i> <i>Hansen – that won’t make sense</i> <i>Baker – need a word to ensure what? Timing, implementation, what are we trying to ensure “Phasing in consideration of”</i> <i>Question regarding the purpose of Growth Management Element – to respond to Measure M</i> <i>Baker – grammar awkward, but content is ok</i> <i>Adams – agree that content is ok, but grammar awkward –</i> <i>Lyons – “ensure that...” keep content but fix form</i> <i>Pickel – we agree that need to just fix wording</i> <i>Nathaniel – questioned what the policy should say</i> <i>Barquist – efficient with transportation system</i></p>
<p>Policy 3.2 Require continuation of the annual monitoring and reporting process to document compliance with the policies of this Element.</p>		<p><i>Pickel – some type of annual monitoring to ensure compliance. Asked if standard?</i> <i>Barquist – growth management element reviewed on a comprehensive basis with all GP</i> <i>Hansen – sounds good</i> <i>Behura – agree</i></p>
<p>Policy 3.3 Maintain a Seven Year Capital Improvement Program to meet and maintain the adopted traffic Level of Service standards.</p>		<p><i>Barquist – LOS D is current standard</i> <i>Adams – grammar is bad, can’t have two “maintains”. Content not wrong</i> <i>Pickel – another standard policy</i> <i>Gorman – say “to meet and maintain”</i> <i>Lyons – “sustain”</i> <i>Pickel – do we have 7 year CIPs?</i> <i>Lyons – I think we do</i> <i>Pickel – sustain the 7 year capital improvement program</i></p> <p><i>“to meet and sustain”</i></p>

GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
*(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)*

No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
Regional Coordination	
<p>Policy 4.1 Identify and promote Measure M priorities of importance to the City of Yorba Linda both within and outside the City.</p>	<p><i>Pickel – is there anything we can do outside the City?</i> <i>Baker – it says promote, does that mean to lobby?</i> <i>Barquist – looking at other policies, you can probably consolidate, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 (4.4 is more implementation)</i> <i>Pickel – I like idea of combining into one and making 4.4, 4.2 – let consultant wordsmith into a combined policy</i> <i>Adams – wouldn't policy need to be one sentence? How will you combine into one sentence that doesn't go on?</i> <i>Behura – can we combine</i> <i>Pickel – if you look at comments 4.2</i> <i>Gorman – 4.1 and 4.2 go together</i> <i>Lyons – 4.1 and 4.4 go together better and accomplish same</i> <i>Gorman – 4.2 is a repeat of 4.1</i> <i>Hansen – don't want to lose anything by combining</i> <i>Lyons – what's difference between 4.1 and 4.4</i> <i>Behura – 4.1 is policy and 4.2 is process</i> <i>Lyons – would assume they mean "promote" don't think 4.3 contributes anything</i> <i>Pickel – co</i> <i>Adams – combine 4.2 and 4.4, promoting is different than cooperating. I would put 4.2 and 4.3 together</i> <i>Behura – GMA is a different forum.</i> <i>Bent – can add 4.1 "identify, cooperate and participate..." GMA may be too specific. Want it open to other forums</i> <i>Behura – identify and promote</i> <i>Pickel – combine 4.1 and 4.2 and combine 4.3 and 4.4</i> <i>Hansen – don't think we should throw out unless we understand</i> <i>Behura – has participated at GMA level.</i> <i>Gorman – have one policy and combine all together. One paragraph with all points</i> <i>Behura – 4.3 and 4.4 are not the same</i> <i>Adams – 4.1 together, 4.3 and 4.4 separate.</i> <i>Behura – Talks about forum. Could combine 4.1</i></p>

<p>GROWTH MANAGEMENT ELEMENT <i>(NO LONGER APPROPRIATE)</i></p>	<p>No Longer Appropriate</p>	<p>NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS</p>
		<p><i>and 4.2 and leave 4.3 and 4.4 alone Bent – shouldn't summarize something – are we missing anything in 4.3, should it be expanded Barquist – 4.3 is fine – regularly scheduled planning forum – any agency is aware of. Input from interagency standpoint is important. Enforces need to have collective conversations Pickel – combine 4.1 and 4.2, leave 4.3 and 4.4 as separate policies – Consensus of group – Agree</i></p>
<p>Policy 4.2 Cooperate with nearby cities and the County of Orange which share transportation improvements of mutual interest and priority.</p>		<p><i>Behura – what does contribute mean Bent – is this mandatory? Barquist – relates to AB 32/SB 375 – from an AQ standpoint</i></p>
<p>Policy 4.3 Participate in Interjurisdictional Planning Forums at the GMA level.</p>		
<p>Policy 4.4 To the maximum extent possible, integrate Congestion Management Program and Measure M Growth Management requirements into a single set of development incentives/guidelines/regulations.</p>		
<p><i>Goal 1B: To contribute to improved air quality in the South Coast Air Basin in support of the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan.</i></p>		<p><i>Behura – what does contribute mean Bent – is this mandatory? Barquist – relates to AB 32/SB 375 – from an AQ standpoint. Part of South Coast Air Basin, need to reduce target levels. Bent – not sure this really means anything. Need to have specifics. Hansen – it's a goal, more broad Huang – thought we need to meet standards – we contribute to meeting targets Bent – would like to see compliance part addressed Barquist – goal is a stated end – Improved Air Quality – reach the goal by the policies Adams – recommendation "Improve air quality in the South Coast Air Basin" Behura – like "Improved air quality in the South Coast Air Basin" Pickel – can't improve AQ in just YL Behura – want to include both Pickel – more realistic to address within the Basin. Adams – other policies work on how we are going</i></p>

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)**

No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
	<p><i>to work with others to improve air quality Pickel – “improve air quality in the south coast air Basin” – Consensus agreed</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.1 Participate with the County and other cities in Orange County to coordinate air quality implementation on a countywide basis.</p>	<p><i>Adams – goal says to improve and policy says how we are going to do that Baker – we border two other counties, should address others, not just Orange Pickel -Participate with other agencies Behura – not just OC – adjacent Lyon – not adjacent, just other agencies Hansen – county is specific and can be measured – vs agencies which is more general Huang – any agency under the air basin Lyons – want to improve air quality in the SCAQMD Huang – SCAQMD is huge – are we forced to combine with everything else Adams – not happy with other agencies – we are a city in OC. Is it too much for us to go to all the other counties and coordinate with? There are financial implications. Lyons – what is mechanism to coordinate – there’s nothing to participate in Pickel – goal references south coast air basin – that’s the area Adams – don’t know what the plan is Lyons – is there any jurisdiction below SCAQMD Behura – data available for measuring, but within that jurisdiction Gorman – it’s a regional issue- shouldn’t reference OC Behura – AQMD would be agency Barquist – localized desire of better air quality with regional dynamic of where sources are coming from – policy reflects it at regional level. Bent – makes sense to me – we pollute less than others with less industry, manufacturing Behura – want better air quality and understand we influence air quality – “relevant” Adams – narrow agencies in general Behura – agency would clarify we can talk to anybody Huang – trouble with narrowing it – history with bay area and Bakersfield – if narrow too much, become too inflexible.</i></p>

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)**

No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
	<p><i>Behura – there are mechanisms in place now at the regional level</i></p> <p><i>Pickel – have no problem with “other agencies” court of law will deem relevant agency- what about 91 freeway – state; traffic emissions – question, is Caltrans a relevant agency. Don’t need word relevant. Ok with other agencies, whoever needs to be involved. Much bigger picture than Yorba Linda.</i></p> <p><i>Pickel - participate with other agencies to coordinate on a regional basis.</i></p> <p><i>Lyons – participate with other agencies to improve air quality in Yorba Linda</i></p> <p><i>Adams – improve air quality in Yorba Linda within SCAB</i></p> <p><i>Pickel – don’t think you can say Yorba Linda when thinking about air quality which is regional</i></p> <p><i>Behura – goal starts with Yorba Linda and trying to improve in the process</i></p> <p><i>Lyons- the ‘how’ doesn’t belong in the goal – the ‘how’ is in the policy</i></p> <p><i>Behura – have Yorba Linda in the goal – understands it’s a regional</i></p> <p><i>Pickel – improve air quality in the City of Yorba Linda</i></p> <p><i>In policies talk about how we will coordinate with other agencies.</i></p> <p><i>Barquist – goal can be about Yorba Linda with policies addressing the interest of Yorba Linda in mind. Interests considered in regional discussions. We can work on policies.</i></p> <p><i>Goal1B Improve air quality in Yorba Linda – consensus</i></p> <p><i>Policy 1.1 – RBF will work through other policies to support Goal 1B</i></p> <p><i>With interest of Yorba Linda in mind through policies</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.2 Stimulate mixed uses in the Community are area and key opportunity areas to contribute to reduced vehicle trips.</p>	<p><i>Barquist – RBF will verify policy is correct as written or a typo</i></p> <p><i>Bent – “maintain” not stimulate – people can walk and ride bikes, horses</i></p> <p><i>Gorman – how about “promote” mixed uses</i></p>

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)**

	No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
		<p><i>Baker – should say “community core area”</i> <i>Pickel – maybe identify Downtown area.</i> <i>Hansen – or generalize it to other areas</i> <i>Pickel – would focus to Town Center to address where MU is even possible</i> <i>Lyons – stimulate mixed uses in community common area – “core” has exact geographic location</i> <i>Behura – would need to define what community core means</i> <i>Pickel – “Promote mixed uses in the community and key opportunity areas....”</i> <i>Pickel - “Promote mixed uses in the community to encourage reduced vehicle trips”</i> <i>Behura – any downside to reference whole community</i> <i>Lyons – want to say “Encourage”;</i> <i>Pickel “Promote mixed uses throughout the City to contribute....”</i> <i>Baker – don’t want to promote mixed-use anywhere</i> <i>Pickel – have Land Use and Zoning to address mixed-use and Council would make final decision. Other things in place to define that.</i> <i>Lyons – is mixed-use live/work</i> <i>DB – purpose is to reduce vehicle trips – land use and relationship with transportation – coordinate Land Use and transportation decisions to reduce trips. What are the techniques that can be used. Aalternative transportation, coordinate housing with jobs. Take step back from specific location.</i> <i>Baker – more than one possibility to reduce vehicle trips</i> <i>Gorman – are we assuming mixed-use will contribute to reduced vehicle trips?</i> <i>Barquist – depends upon the use and activity – interrelatedness; contributing factor.</i> <i>Behura – likes suggestion</i> <i>Hansen – agree “...to reduce local vehicle trips”</i></p>
<p>Policy 1 3 Develop a package of measures which will achieve maximum reduction in vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled that is practical in light of the percentage of the City that is built-out.</p>		<p><i>Baker and Pickel – agree with consultant suggestion</i> <i>Hansen – go with suggestion</i> <i>Pickel – ok to go with consultant?</i> <i>Substitute verbage with recommendation –</i></p>

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)**

	No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
		<i>consensus</i>
<p>Policy 1.4 Cooperate with Orange County jurisdictions in establishing various strategies which may include parking management, auto free zones, and additional growth management mechanisms which clearly bring cost effective emissions reductions.</p>		<p><i>Bent – shouldn't it be whole region, not just OC</i> <i>Baker – seems like redundant with 1.3 and 1.2</i> <i>Bent – ok with deleting</i> <i>Behura – ok with deleting</i> <i>Pickel – delete – consensus</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.5 Seek greater efficiency in the City's transportation system through the modified Superstreet program and the bus system.</p>		<p><i>Pickel – superstreet program only on Imperial Hwy</i> <i>Behura – definition of smart street vs superstreet</i> <i>Baker – too specific, could be others; inappropriate just to call out these two things</i> <i>Behura – do we say anything else about public transportation in the circulation element?</i> <i>Gorman – getting from east to west is difficult – would like to improve – challenge if don't have a car</i> <i>Pickel - "seek greater efficiency in city's public transportation system"</i> <i>Lyon – want to improve efficiency – doesn't relate to mobility.</i> <i>Behura – what was our purpose with this originally</i> <i>Gorman – want to consider other options for mass transit, not just bus system. Look at other alternatives as a goal. Challenge to get from one side of city to other without a car.</i> <i>Adams – can say "public transportation" to be broad enough</i> <i>Gorman – need to coordinate east/west side – long linear city, how do you solve that problem</i> <i>Baker – planning only within the city for transportation is not an answer</i> <i>Gorman – alternatives to mass transportation – be open to others</i> <i>Pickel- "seek greater efficiency in the City's transportation system through multi-modal transportation systems"</i> <i>Bent – can't control if businesses stay or go</i> <i>Lyons – have centers where people are</i> <i>Pickel – "seek greater efficiency in the City through multi-modal transportation systems".</i> <i>Lyons – encourage multi-modal transportation</i> <i>"Utilize multi-modal techniques to improve the City's transportation efficiency." Consensus</i></p>

**GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
ELEMENT
(NO LONGER
APPROPRIATE)**

	No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<p>Goal 2B: Reduce air pollutant emissions associated with development projects.</p>		<p><i>Pickel – isn't it part of AB 32 and SB 375</i> <i>Barquist – there are short-term and long-term transportation systems</i> <i>Hansen – is this related to LEED?</i> <i>Barquist – state has green building code, many are now a natural course of business. LEED is a way to identify an efficient use of resources.</i> <i>Baker – ambiguous from act and process of building or operational.</i> <i>Behura – seems reasonable</i> <i>Lyons – should be specific</i> <i>Baker – is this a goal, or another policy</i> <i>Bent – what is the standard, how do we reduce it. Don't understand, too broad.</i> <i>Baker – "minimize"?</i> <i>Hansen – should it be a goal?</i> <i>Pickel – "reduce air pollutant emissions"</i> <i>Behura – policies address emissions from a development project</i> <i>Bent – look at policies then go back and write goal</i> <i>Consensus – goal is ok</i> <i>Baker – question if we need goal</i> <i>Behura – separate because talking about development</i> <i>Pickel – goal is more specific</i></p>
<p>Policy 2.1 Integrate Air Quality considerations into the City's land use regulatory system and project application and standard conditions.</p>		<p><i>Lyon – endorse</i> <i>Behura – nothing wrong with this</i></p>
<p>Policy 2.2 Provide incentives for mixed-use projects and exceptional design features contributing to emissions reduction.</p>		<p><i>Hansen – covers "green"</i> <i>Baker – issue of mixed-use</i> <i>Bent – consultant suggestion doesn't include mixed-use</i> <i>Barquist – caution the word "incentive" – what does it mean – obligation</i> <i>Baker – could address incentive in implementation</i> <i>Lyons – suggested policy is missing words</i> <i>Behura – why are we focused on just vehicle emissions</i> <i>Lyons – can we say "require that....." instead of encourage.</i> <i>Hansen – remove "vehicle"</i> <i>Barquist – suggest keeping "encourage"</i> <i>Which consider methods</i></p>

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ELEMENT <i>(NO LONGER APPROPRIATE)</i>	No Longer Appropriate	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
		<i>Hansen – “Encourage the design, development, and location of future land uses to reduce emissions” Lyons – delete the word “future” Bent – ok without “future” Baker – may be unclear with “future” Consensus – remove “future” “Encourage the design, development, and location of future land uses to reduce emissions”</i>
Policy 2.3 Give visibility and acknowledgement to projects which reflect sound air quality improvement features.		<i>Pickel – suggest to delete Consensus – agree</i>

**Tuesday December 10, 2013
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM – PUBLIC SAFETY

Refer to Attachment “A”.

PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT <i>(DISCUSSION ITEMS)</i>	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<i>Goal 1: The protection of human life shall be the highest priority</i>	<i>Watts – “The City’s highest priority shall be the protection of human life” Consensus</i>
Policy 1.1 In the event of a conflict of goals or resources, the protection of residents of the City, workers at businesses within the City, and invited guests of residents or businesses within the City shall take precedence over the protection of other persons.	<i>Hansen – does it mean area (Esperanza) outside of City don’t have our protection? Baker – what do you do when run out of resources? Lend a hand when you can. However, potential no resources. Lyons – how do you run out when you have mutual aid? Baker – can be situations in which deputies and fire fighters are sent to another area – depleted resources. Should be policy of City</i>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

to not have resources overly depleted. They are contracted to provide a level of service to Yorba Linda. Situation has come up in other areas of the Country – large scale disaster situation. If no policy, City leadership doesn't have leg to stand on. Allows City to add language to contracts with service providers.
Carbone – If resources deployed in other areas, can we call in national guard.
Lyons – doesn't contract have right to force majeure? There has to be a trigger mechanism.
Carbone- chief rand has variety of resources. Five other cities have come in. Seems like resources would be available; quick to get help. Obligation to our City.
Watts – is flavor of policy what City is doing. Don't think we will tell OCFA that we need them more than somewhere else. I would think they would make call on their own.
Carbone – only five planes, if an area needs it, they are gone
Watts – had a note about protection of property in area of public safety.
Adams – people not in city boundaries; county islands.
Barquist – if put a period after precedence, don't have to define "other persons".
Baker – if large earthquake with displaced people; if others coming into city and asking for services who do you take care of.
Adams – agree we want to take care of everyone, but doesn't address issue of limited resources. Can't be gathering place for people whose own city can't take care of them. If displaced people, does policy cover them now.
Watts – we are expanding this to say what will happen if have this issue; like idea of it being City policy.
Hansen – says it clearly; take precedence over other persons.
Watts, Hansen, Carbone, Pickel – agree end sentence after "precedence".
Adams – get into state, federal disaster relief if find people coming in. Our responsibility with our financial resources is to protect our own first. Ok on ending after "precedence".

Policy 1.2 In the event of a disaster the City shall coordinate all available resources, including regularly contracted services, City employees, and organized volunteer groups.

Hansen – who does that?
Designated emergency response team
Watts – policy mirrors what happened during fire
Baker – example of what didn't happen. Other agencies had to step in. City needs to relook at it and address response.
Consensus on Wording

Policy 1.3 The City shall create and maintain a disaster response plan appropriate to each recognized natural or manmade disaster with a probability of occurrence of 40% or greater over the next 30 years. Staff may add additional plans based on risks from nearby

Bahura – where does 40 percent come from
Lyons – what is a disaster? We need a metric that is a combination of risk and potential for it to occur and the consequence. We need a definition for disaster. What is the threshold?
Hansen – federal government setting standard.
Lyons – what is consequence?

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

industries, facilities, or transportation infrastructure, or geopolitical events.

*Hansen – need to make plan if in that range
Lyons – had high winds today, high chance, did we kick into disaster relief – no because no consequence
Pickel – need to know what response plan is
Adams – says “appropriate” which covers issue.
Baker – agrees something may not rise to level of natural disaster. “appropriate”. Do you need a fancy plan for certain “disasters”
Lyon – does someone at City designate a disaster?
Harris – yes
Adams – issue with grammar. Remove first “or” – agreed*

Policy 1.4 The City shall create and maintain disaster response plans that, for their initial response periods, do not rely upon availability of resources beyond those identified in Policy 1.2

*Pickel – don’t overextend yourself
Baker – have seen other cities create plans that assume quick response from federal gov’t. Can’t assume outside resources readily available. Not really a plan.
Consensus on wording.*

Policy 1.5 The City shall maintain an effective police service to protect people from crime

*Watts – would add in “residences or businesses”
Adams – why do we separate out police from fire – is it because it is County? Don’t we have a contractual service? Not sure of reason as to why they are called out separately.
Watts – policy seems out of place.
Hansen – it is a public safety element
Carbone – goal is to protect people
Bahura – stands out.
Pickel – probably here because of situations that occur after natural disaster happens; theft of property.
Watt – maybe we can tie into disaster
Hansen – should be there no matter what
Pickel – will come back to this policy.*

Goal 2: The protection of property shall be the second highest priority.

*Bahura – bodily harm vs human life?
Pickel – would think it is any harm
Bahura – should we define human life? Injury to a person. Human life is people.
Pickel – protection of humans? Think the term “human life” is inclusive. Defines a human being, a living organism.
Adams – is concern that it is either “life or dead”*

*Pickel – get back to goal 2 –
Watt – when talking about public safety – personal security, City security, property, life. Any reason to not put them together
Bahura – reason not to is because of first goal.
Watt – they know what public safety is. We are debating in the meeting; concerned they may not understand intent in future.
Carbone – Chief Rand - #1 is to protect human life, and then #2 is property. That’s how they are trained.
Adams – need to keep separate for that reason. If look at policies, talking about other things then goal one.*

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p><i>Pickel – let’s keep separate and move to policy 2.1 to see if it helps define goal.</i></p>
<p>Policy 2.1 In the event of a conflict of goals or resources, the protection of private property within the City shall take precedence over protection of public property within the City, which shall, in turn, take precedence over protection of property not within the City.</p>	<p><i>Pickel – private, public, and out of City. Bahura – numbering is incorrect Pickel – in disaster response plan – are there any public areas in the City that are evacuation places. Other than essential facilities. Is there a location for equipment and people – designated area? Then maybe need to change priority if public area is designated for emergency response or equipment or evacuation center. Baker – facilities have been designated for a purpose – they will be protected. OCFA designates own sites for emergencies – helicopter landing areas.</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.5 The City shall maintain an effective police service to protect property from crime</p>	<p><i>Adams – listed twice – one is people, one is property. Consensus – wording ok</i></p>
<p><i>Goal 3: Proactively seek best practices in engineering and construction that can result in structures with enhanced occupant safety with particular emphasis on hazards covered by disaster response plans in Policy 1.3</i></p>	<p><i>Barquist – suggest moving to next Goal and can verify numbering. Lyons – doesn’t think it’s necessary. Adams – think it’s goal 3 and policies follow it. Bahura – is consultant going to verify if it is correct? Watt – proactively “utilize” Bahura and Lyons – “seek” is ok</i></p>
<p>Policy 2.1 Performance of existing or proposed Fire Sprinkler Systems within a 2500 foot radius shall not be impaired by drawing 100% of OCFA specified “Fire Flow” from a single fire hydrant. For structures located within a VHFHSZ the fire flow shall be increased to 200% from a single hydrant or 100% simultaneously from each of two adjacent hydrants.</p>	<p><i>Barquist – this is more implementation. Does it need to be this detailed as a policy? OCFA will have standards for VHFHSZ. What is it really saying? Baker – I put it in because there is an issue. Water systems works differently in hillside system. Pressure zones. When drawing from down the hill, you make pressure on top of hill from higher areas. OCFA apply same standard statewide and won’t make a more stringent requirement. If in GP, OCFA will make it a requirement for development. Only protection we have are policies that Yorba Linda water District has established to over-engineer water system. Only a policy, not a requirement. Can be overturned for a more uniform standard. Agencies need a reason to require more stringent requirements. Need something to point at to force system to function in hillside. Bahura – if we put policy in, how does it affect high fire zone that is not in a hillside area. Baker – don’t think we have that. Bahura – are we asking them to overdesign in not a hilly area. Baker – now require fire sprinklers in all homes. May not work if pulling water down the hill from you. Fire sprinklers would be impaired. Bahura – question for Chair...because it seems out of place, is there another place for this? Pickel – seems more like implementation than a policy. Barquist – standards to this level in higher order policy – can get overall idea of it in a higher level. Standards can be through implementation. Condition of approval or through building code.</i></p>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

My general opinion; push it to more general level.

Adams – need to keep concept. Need detail for a developer so they know there are certain guidelines they have to follow. Can we have concept that will give “teeth” to GP. Have it less regulatory. Can we change wording.

Baker – realize there is a lot of detail. Danger in taking detail out. Loses teeth. Not a GP item, but a building code item that can be changed or be exempted.

Bahura – is there a standard in Yorba Linda that can say a developer needs to follow specific set of standards and the goal says they need to be followed (ex. Traffic standards).

Barquist – need to adopt standards. Have a goal that then says they need to comply with standards.

Baker – part of problem is that City has no jurisdiction over fire sprinkler systems. OCFA reviews. City only looks for sign-off from OCFA. Nothing City has as a performance standard.

Adams – if no teeth to building policy – not sure what answer is. Need policy that is more general “multiple homes in a hillside area”

Baker – dealing with water flow. Pressure may be so low, fire sprinklers don’t work. Not a big problem in Yorba Linda because of water district requirements to developer. But, hasn’t worked in all areas. Example, Golden State Water District. Developers can look to other water districts.

Watt – is there a staff position on this proposal. I like idea, think it’s needed. Looking for “science” of it. Not sure if enough. Not clear what we are adopting. Is there a standard? Is this what we need?

Bahura – question of how and where you put it. Can it be researched?

Baker – no standard for these hillside areas.

Lyons – how do you have a requirement for fire sprinklers, but no requirement for them to work?

Baker – finger pointing between agencies. Have pressure when there is no issue of performance.

Adams – policy 3.1 and 3.2 – can we get consultant and city input – need more than 2 policies, 3 to 4 policies that can state in more general, but not too loose, that will have guidelines and weight that we need in GP.

Bahura – question of if there is a second opinion; has it been vetted.

Baker – will have issue with this and going to OCFA. Presumption from OCFA is one house is the only use of the system. Can give them guidance, but least common denominator of performance that state requires.

Watt – don’t doubt the sincerity or depth of proposal; want to get more information. Maybe a staff deal

Baker – can get some information from water district on effects of

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

flow. Get to fire protection engineer, but may need to be paid for their time. Complicated engineering problem. Requires complex models to say what is going to happen in system. Water district has modeling system, but need guidance that can feed models to determine pressure or pipe size. Not in position to tell OCHA how much water they need to fight a fire. Don't have any overriding control that makes sure it works. Need a push that says you have to make it work. Disconnected system.

Bahura – if City requires additional items, not just water, for example environmental, can't see why City can't have specific design standards for water. Need design standards.

Barquist – can implement through other regulatory mechanisms.

Bahura – concerned standards don't get lost or adopted.

Barquist – can we have discussion with text of GP itself

Pickel – don't think it's appropriate. Doesn't see how something gets lost in a building code.

Bahura – concerned it gets lost here.

Adams – meaning ensuring it gets into City Building Code

Pickel – is there a log or notes we are keeping of where these things get listed and a process is outlined into getting them in the areas they need to be, such as building code. Making sure it gets addressed and carried forward. Is there a process in place?

Barquist – use implementation program – consistency analysis. Use implementation plan as guidebook. Best tool as part of this process.

Pickel – it's like a project manual – technical specifications

Barquist – toolkit to implement higher order policy. Can be zoning code updates, building code updates, modifications; many mechanisms

Bahura – research where it should be.

Staff – where did language come from – specific numbers?

Baker – no one agency is covering this issue. 200% fire flow is from State (fire code) – have ability to double fire flow. Water district doesn't have authority to make developer provide more than requirement; although they have tried. No one is backing water district.

Watt – want staff to review to have us approve a defensible standard.

Pickel – staff to research this further.

Policy 2.2 Fire sprinkler systems in structures within VHFHSZ shall include sprinklers in accessible attic spaces located within 8 feet of any vent opening not protected by 1/8-inch or smaller mesh.

Goal 1: Protect the community from hazards associated with geologic instability, seismic

Pickel - "geologic instability and seismic events"

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

hazardsevents.

Policy 1.1 Require review of soil and geologic conditions in order to determine stability and to promote informed development decisions relate to development decisions, especially in regard to type of use, size of facility, and ease of evacuation of occupants in accordance with Fire Authority.

Lyons – take out “relate to development decisions,” Lyons/Adams – stop after “occupants”.
Hansen – does it take away authority if fire authority not in wording.
Baker – is this necessary in GP?
Bahura – didn’t we discuss evacuation routes somewhere else?
Lyons – need a pervasive authority for evacuation. What is plan?
Baker – usually have evacuation south; they drive you to avoid east/west – presupposes you can get onto freeway.
Bahura – did we discuss evacuation routes previously?
Barquist – will need to look back and verify
Adams – specific to geologic hazards
Bahura – can’t we refer back to policy if already addressed?
Baker – seems like a specific development, not community-wide. Geologic conditions of a specific site.
Pickel – vague from a site standpoint; geologic conditions need to be determined to be stable before people move around area. If one area of City is unstable, first place we wouldn’t evacuate. Needs to remain somehow, but convoluted.
Adams – saying have an “informed” development decision based on conditions.
Pickel – usually covered in other areas, COA, geologic reports, etc.
Hansen – need to address generally here
Adams – refer back to policy regarding evacuations
Pickel – is word “development” tripping us up.
Hansen – no, because talking about development. Want to look at conditions before a development exists.
Bahura – we are requiring soils reports
Pickel – where are we going with Policy.
Bahura – leave it, except for last phrase, reference policy that addresses evacuation. If there is not one, leave as is.

Policy 1.2 Monitor known and potential geologic hazards in the City. Such as: faults, flood channels.....

Lyons – don’t know how you monitor geologic hazards.
Bahura – readings on fault lines?
Baker – probably more concerned with landslide zones
Adams – should it be “identify and monitor....”
Hansen – flood channels need to be monitored.
Lyons – end where it ended before.
Bahura – when we say monitor; who is getting direction
Staff – more toward landslide areas; nothing City can do about faults
Pickel – OC flood control addresses channels – maintenance
End at “City”

Policy 1.3 Provide standards and requirements for grading and construction to mitigate the potential for landslides and

Pickel – we already have it
Bahura – should we say “maintain”
Pickel – that may denote there is no change to standards

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>seismic hazards.</p>	<p><i>Lyons – leave in as backbone for City code Leave as is – Consensus</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.4 Adopt and maintain high standards for seismic performance of structures, through enforcement of best available techniques for seismic design.</p>	<p><i>Pickel – has to do with Building Code Lyons – have problem with word “high” Baker – covered by requirements Adams – there is a comment to reword Pickel – state standards are incredibly high standards Barquist – application of that in public facilities Pickel – State inspectors are more stringent (DSA); costly from a construction standpoint Lyons – is there a measurable effect on the safety of the building Pickel – can’t answer that; most schools and hospitals have sustained the events – somewhere there is data and research to support standards Baker – now there are standards for ground shaking; proximity to fault Pickel – standards are consistent for geotechnical reports Bahura – seismic standards have been updated a lot over several years; question of if we should maintain word “high” Pickel – agree don’t like word “high”. Adopt and maintain required Lyons – “Adopt and maintain standards...” Pickel – “adopt and maintain required standards...” - Consensus</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.5 Promote the collection of relevant data on groundwater levels, and soil types in regard to liquefaction susceptibility, landslide potential and subsidence risks.</p>	<p><i>Pickel – geotechnical report addresses all of this Baker – have to drill to determine groundwater Pickel – geotechnical report typically conducts borings Baker – if on soil type that doesn’t liquefy, don’t need to go further Lyons – note says it’s an implementation item. Baker – doesn’t city require geotech Bahura – leave it and ask staff if ok to take out.</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.6 Prohibit the location of habitable facilities within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone (APSSZ) or within 50 feet of either side of the centerline of an active or potentially active fault.</p>	<p><i>Baker – state minimum Adams – should it be greater than 50 feet Bahura – wording says Staff – building code regulates; issue as planner, need to remove reference to “study zone” Baker – issue when looking for fault; can be parallel fractures; study zone may be a lot larger than 50 feet. By prohibiting within study zone, may be too limiting. Adams – study zone not necessarily area to be concerned with. “Prohibit location.... within 50 feet” – remove reference to APSSZ</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.7 Promote the use of earthquake survival and efficient post-disaster functioning in the siting, design and construction standards for <u>all</u> facilities.</p>	<p><i>Ok with policy – consensus</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.8 Assist the State Mining and Geology Board with the determination of Seismic Hazard Study Zones (SHSZ) within the City and actively implement the</p>	<p><i>Baker – is this something that’s done Bahura – so no more coordination necessary Staff – study has been done Hansen – what is meant by “requirements”</i></p>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>requirements.</p>	<p><i>Adams – are there other areas we should consider – should it be left due to unknown – no guarantee one is the only one</i> <i>Baker – can it be covered by other policies – not sure of need for this</i> <i>Lyons - look at Policy 2.1 – similar</i> <i>Pickel – talking about “upgrading”</i> <i>Lyons- talking about implementing requirements, which 2.1 is doing – Policy 1.8 is redundant</i> <i>Bahura – remove policy 1.8</i> <i>Lyons – 2.1 is the requirement</i> <i>Staff – 2.1 is addressing older buildings that haven’t been built to seismic standards – not related to proximity to fault line</i> <i>Pickel – move forward with it remaining.</i></p>
<p>Goal 2: Protect the community from loss of life, serious injuries, and major social and economic disruption caused by the collapse of or severe damage to hazardous structures.</p>	<p><i>Lyons – remove “hazardous” – worry about bridge on Orangethorpe</i> <i>Pickel – remove “hazardous” – consensus</i></p>
<p>Policy 2.1 Establish the location of potentially hazardous structures within the City and adopt a program for the orderly and effective upgrading to meet seismic requirements.</p>	<p><i>Consensus –ok as is.</i></p>
<p>Policy 2.2 Develop procedures for seismic review of potentially hazardous structures at appropriate points in each structure's history.</p>	<p><i>General – what does that mean</i> <i>Adam – maybe, every 5 years, or after seismic event, something that will trigger it</i> <i>Lyons – would become trigger point – seismic event would trigger review</i> <i>Baker – how is this policy useful – previous policy finds them and this policy reviews them</i> <i>Adams – develop procedures on how to monitor them – periodic review – add “after seismic event”</i> <i>Baker – “Periodically review”</i> <i>Pickel “Develop procedures for periodic seismic review of potentially hazardous structures.” – Consensus.</i></p>
<p>Goal 3: Protect the lives and property of city residents and visitors of the City from flood hazards.</p>	<p><i>Adams – someone added “City”?</i> <i>Bahura – don’t need to repeat “City”</i> <i>Pickel – remove first “City” – Consensus</i></p>
<p>Policy 3.1 Identify flood hazard areas and provide appropriate land use designations and regulations for areas subject to flooding.</p>	<p><i>Leave as is – Consensus</i></p>
<p>Policy 3.2 Maintain natural drainage courses</p>	<p><i>Adams – not doing very well right now</i></p>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

and keep them free of obstructions.

*Pickel – see this changing with water quality issues – natural and concrete bottoms – water quality issues will change all of this.
Baker – changing with new development – have issue – can we do this “natural” – do we have jurisdiction
Staff – not dealing with Corps areas
Adams – example, have area near property full of debris, when it burned, water drained heavily. Had to remove on own. Who is maintaining courses and keeping free of obstructions. Don’t see anyone keeping them clear. Is it City or County responsibility?
Confused by policy.
Pickel – jurisdictional issue?
Adams – if City responsible needs to be clear. Is it not really City responsibility and shouldn’t be in here.
Baker – if on own property, your responsible for keeping it clean
Staff – city has identified drainage courses and maintains them.
Not every channel is identified as a drainage course. Focus on flooding and maintaining facilities.
Adams – do we leave it in? does it belong?
Pickel – needs to be more generic “proper agency” would maintain – places where city, property owner, county or army corps maintains, depending upon situation.
Baker – drainage has changed a lot over years. More sophisticated on how it is handled now. Retain on site.
Adams – “natural drainage courses should be free of obstruction that adversely effect...”
Barquist – we can work on wording and start with this policy at next meeting.*

Goal 4: Protect people and property from ~~brush~~ Wildfire hazards.

Policy 4.1 ~~Institute~~ Designate a "High Risk Fire Hazard Area" and establish development standards which will reduce the risk for wildfires property damage and loss of life.

Policy 4.2 Work with the U.S. Forest Service, the Orange County Fire Authority, and private land owners to maintain landscape, and provide buffers which will reduce the risk of wildfires. Educate the public regarding vegetation that increases risk of wildfire or spread of wildfire.

Policy 4.3 Enforce fire inspection, code compliance, fuel modification, and weed

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

abatement programs.	
Policy 4.4 Educate the public as to the risk associated with wildfire hazards and encourage wildfire reduction activities by residents.	
<u>Policy 4.5 Coordinate with Orange County Sheriff's Office and Orange County Fire Authority to develop maintain and mark emergency corridors to the north east south and west of the City.</u>	
<i>Goal 5: Provide community protection from hazards associated with urban fires and crime.</i>	
Policy 5.1 Minimize the loss of life, damage to property, and the economic and social dislocations resulting from structural fires.	
Policy 5.2 Ensure that law enforcement and crime prevention concerns are considered in the review of planning and development proposals in Yorba Linda.	
Policy 5.3 Require that adequate police and fire service facilities and personnel are maintained to provide service at sufficient levels.	
Policy 5.4 Continue to conduct public safety education programs in the City.	
<i>Goal 6: Ensure the availability and effective response of emergency services following a disastrous event within the City.</i>	
Policy 6.1 Maintain the Emergency Response Plan that identifies all available resources and funds for use in the event of a disaster.	
Policy 6.2 Establish implementing actions or procedures under the Plan for rescue efforts, medical efforts, emergency shelters and provision of supplies.	
Policy 6.3 Coordinate with Orange County and the Federal Emergency Management	

PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT (DISCUSSION ITEMS)	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
Agency to reduce community risks in the event of a disaster.	
Policy 6.4 Provide for an Emergency Operations Center for use in the event of a disaster, based on an inter-agency communication system.	
<i>Goal 7: Protect public health, safety and welfare and the environment from exposure to hazardous materials and waste.</i>	
Policy 7.1 Establish planning procedures which consider the handling and transportation of hazardous materials and ensure that they are in accordance with applicable County, State and Federal regulations.	
Policy 7.2 Restrict transportation of hazardous materials on residential streets and establish transportation routes for the conveyance of hazardous materials.	
Policy 7.3 Aid with the implementation of, and continue with participation in the Orange County's Household Hazardous Waste Plan.	

**Wednesday, January 22, 2014
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM – PUBLIC SAFETY

Refer to Attachment “A”.

PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT (DISCUSSION ITEMS)	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<i>Goal 1: The protection of human life shall be</i>	<i>Watts – “The City’s highest priority shall be the protection of human life”</i>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

the highest priority

Consensus

Policy 1.1 In the event of a conflict of goals or resources, the protection of residents of the City, workers at businesses within the City, and invited guests of residents or businesses within the City shall take precedence over the protection of other persons.

*Hansen – does it mean area (Esperanza) outside of City don't have our protection?
Baker – what do you do when run out of resources? Lend a hand when you can. However, potential no resources.
Lyons – how do you run out when you have mutual aid?
Baker – can be situations in which deputies and fire fighters are sent to another area – depleted resources. Should be policy of City to not have resources overly depleted. They are contracted to provide a level of service to Yorba Linda. Situation has come up in other areas of the Country – large scale disaster situation. If no policy, City leadership doesn't have leg to stand on. Allows City to add language to contracts with service providers.
Carbone – If resources deployed in other areas, can we call in national guard.
Lyons – doesn't contract have right to force majeure? There has to be a trigger mechanism.
Carbone- chief rand has variety of resources. Five other cities have come in. Seems like resources would be available; quick to get help. Obligation to our City.
Watts – is flavor of policy what City is doing. Don't think we will tell OCFA that we need them more than somewhere else. I would think they would make call on their own.
Carbone – only five planes, if an area needs it, they are gone
Watts – had a note about protection of property in area of public safety.
Adams – people not in city boundaries; county islands.
Barquist – if put a period after precedence, don't have to define "other persons".
Baker – if large earthquake with displaced people; if others coming into city and asking for services who do you take care of.
Adams – agree we want to take care of everyone, but doesn't address issue of limited resources. Can't be gathering place for people whose own city can't take care of them. If displaced people, does policy cover them now.
Watts – we are expanding this to say what will happen if have this issue; like idea of it being City policy.
Hansen – says it clearly; take precedence over other persons.
Watts, Hansen, Carbone, Pickel – agree end sentence after "precedence".
Adams – get into state, federal disaster relief if find people coming in. Our responsibility with our financial resources is to protect our own first. Ok on ending after "precedence".*

Policy 1.2 In the event of a disaster the City shall coordinate all available resources, including regularly contracted services, City

*Hansen – who does that?
Designated emergency response team
Watts – policy mirrors what happened during fire*

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>employees, and organized volunteer groups.</p>	<p><i>Baker – example of what didn't happen. Other agencies had to step in. City needs to relook at it and address response. Consensus on Wording</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.3 The City shall create and maintain a disaster response plan appropriate to each recognized natural or manmade disaster with a probability of occurrence of 40% or greater over the next 30 years. Staff may add additional plans based on risks from nearby industries, facilities, or transportation infrastructure, or geopolitical events.</p>	<p><i>Bahura – where does 40 percent come from Lyons – what is a disaster? We need a metric that is a combination of risk and potential for it to occur and the consequence. We need a definition for disaster. What is the threshold? Hansen – federal government setting standard. Lyons – what is consequence? Hansen – need to make plan if in that range Lyons – had high winds today, high chance, did we kick into disaster relief – no because no consequence Pickel – need to know what response plan is Adams – says “appropriate” which covers issue. Baker – agrees something may not rise to level of natural disaster. “appropriate”. Do you need a fancy plan for certain “disasters” Lyon – does someone at City designate a disaster? Harris – yes Adams – issue with grammar. Remove first “or” – agreed</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.4 The City shall create and maintain disaster response plans that, for their initial response periods, do not rely upon availability of resources beyond those identified in Policy 1.2</p>	<p><i>Pickel – don't overextend yourself Baker – have seen other cities create plans that assume quick response from federal gov't. Can't assume outside resources readily available. Not really a plan. Consensus on wording.</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.5 The City shall maintain an effective police service to protect people from crime</p>	<p><i>Watts – would add in “residences or businesses” Adams – why do we separate out police from fire – is it because it is County? Don't we have a contractual service? Not sure of reason as to why they are called out separately. Watts – policy seems out of place. Hansen – it is a public safety element Carbone – goal is to protect people Bahura – stands out. Pickel – probably here because of situations that occur after natural disaster happens; theft of property. Watt – maybe we can tie into disaster Hansen – should be there no matter what Pickel – will come back to this policy.</i></p>
<p>Goal 2: The protection of property shall be the second highest priority.</p>	<p><i>Bahura – bodily harm vs human life? Pickel – would think it is any harm Bahura – should we define human life? Injury to a person. Human life is people. Pickel – protection of humans? Think the term “human life” is inclusive. Defines a human being, a living organism. Adams – is concern that it is either “life or dead” Pickel – get back to goal 2 –</i></p>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p><i>Watt – when talking about public safety – personal security, City security, property, life. Any reason to not put them together</i> <i>Bahura – reason not to is because of first goal.</i> <i>Watt – they know what public safety is. We are debating in the meeting; concerned they may not understand intent in future.</i> <i>Carbone – Chief Rand - #1 is to protect human life, and then #2 is property. That’s how they are trained.</i> <i>Adams – need to keep separate for that reason. If look at policies, talking about other things then goal one.</i> <i>Pickel – let’s keep separate and move to policy 2.1 to see if it helps define goal.</i></p>
<p>Policy 2.1 In the event of a conflict of goals or resources, the protection of private property within the City shall take precedence over protection of public property within the City, which shall, in turn, take precedence over protection of property not within the City.</p>	<p><i>Pickel – private, public, and out of City.</i> <i>Bahura – numbering is incorrect</i> <i>Pickel – in disaster response plan – are there any public areas in the City that are evacuation places. Other than essential facilities. Is there a location for equipment and people – designated area? Then maybe need to change priority if public area is designated for emergency response or equipment or evacuation center.</i> <i>Baker – facilities have been designated for a purpose – they will be protected. OCFA designates own sites for emergencies – helicopter landing areas.</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.5 The City shall maintain an effective police service to protect property from crime</p>	<p><i>Adams – listed twice – one is people, one is property.</i> <i>Consensus – wording ok</i></p>
<p><i>Goal 3: Proactively seek best practices in engineering and construction that can result in structures with enhanced occupant safety with particular emphasis on hazards covered by disaster response plans in Policy 1.3</i></p>	<p><i>Barquist – suggest moving to next Goal and can verify numbering.</i> <i>Lyons – doesn’t think it’s necessary.</i> <i>Adams – think it’s goal 3 and policies follow it.</i> <i>Bahura – is consultant going to verify if it is correct?</i> <i>Watt – proactively “utilize”</i> <i>Bahura and Lyons – “seek” is ok</i></p>
<p>Policy 2.1 Performance of existing or proposed Fire Sprinkler Systems within a 2500 foot radius shall not be impaired by drawing 100% of OCFA specified “Fire Flow” from a single fire hydrant. For structures located within a VHFHSZ the fire flow shall be increased to 200% from a single hydrant or 100% simultaneously from each of two adjacent hydrants.</p>	<p><i>Barquist – this is more implementation. Does it need to be this detailed as a policy? OCFA will have standards for VHFHSZ. What is it really saying?</i> <i>Baker – I put it in because there is an issue. Water systems works differently in hillside system. Pressure zones. When drawing from down the hill, you make pressure on top of hill from higher areas. OCFA apply same standard statewide and won’t make a more stringent requirement. If in GP, OCFA will make it a requirement for development. Only protection we have are policies that Yorba Linda water District has established to over-engineer water system. Only a policy, not a requirement. Can be overturned for a more uniform standard. Agencies need a reason to require more stringent requirements. Need something to point at to force system to function in hillside.</i> <i>Bahura – if we put policy in, how does it affect high fire zone that is not in a hillside area.</i> <i>Baker – don’t think we have that.</i> <i>Bahura – are we asking them to overdesign in not a hilly area.</i></p>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Baker – now require fire sprinklers in all homes. May not work if pulling water down the hill from you. Fire sprinklers would be impaired.

Bahura – question for Chair...because it seems out of place, is there another place for this?

Pickel – seems more like implementation than a policy.

Barquist – standards to this level in higher order policy – can get overall idea of it in a higher level. Standards can be through implementation. Condition of approval or through building code. My general opinion; push it to more general level.

Adams – need to keep concept. Need detail for a developer so they know there are certain guidelines they have to follow. Can we have concept that will give “teeth” to GP. Have it less regulatory. Can we change wording.

Baker – realize there is a lot of detail. Danger in taking detail out. Loses teeth. Not a GP item, but a building code item that can be changed or be exempted.

Bahura – is there a standard in Yorba Linda that can say a developer needs to follow specific set of standards and the goal says they need to be followed (ex. Traffic standards).

Barquist – need to adopt standards. Have a goal that then says they need to comply with standards.

Baker – part of problem is that City has no jurisdiction over fire sprinkler systems. OCFA reviews. City only looks for sign-off from OCFA. Nothing City has as a performance standard.

Adams – if no teeth to building policy – not sure what answer is. Need policy that is more general “multiple homes in a hillside area”

Baker – dealing with water flow. Pressure may be so low, fire sprinklers don’t work. Not a big problem in Yorba Linda because of water district requirements to developer. But, hasn’t worked in all areas. Example, Golden State Water District. Developers can look to other water districts.

Watt – is there a staff position on this proposal. I like idea, think it’s needed. Looking for “science” of it. Not sure if enough. Not clear what we are adopting. Is there a standard? Is this what we need?

Bahura – question of how and where you put it. Can it be researched?

Baker – no standard for these hillside areas.

Lyons – how do you have a requirement for fire sprinklers, but no requirement for them to work?

Baker – finger pointing between agencies. Have pressure when there is no issue of performance.

Adams – policy 3.1 and 3.2 – can we get consultant and city input – need more than 2 policies, 3 to 4 policies that can state in more general, but not too loose, that will have guidelines and weight that we need in GP.

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Bahura – question of if there is a second opinion; has it been vetted.

Baker – will have issue with this and going to OCFA. Presumption from OCFA is one house is the only use of the system. Can give them guidance, but least common denominator of performance that state requires.

Watt – don’t doubt the sincerity or depth of proposal; want to get more information. Maybe a staff deal

Baker – can get some information from water district on effects of flow. Get to fire protection engineer, but may need to be paid for their time. Complicated engineering problem. Requires complex models to say what is going to happen in system. Water district has modeling system, but need guidance that can feed models to determine pressure or pipe size. Not in position to tell OCFA how much water they need to fight a fire. Don’t have any overriding control that makes sure it works. Need a push that says you have to make it work. Disconnected system.

Bahura – if City requires additional items, not just water, for example environmental, can’t see why City can’t have specific design standards for water. Need design standards.

Barquist – can implement through other regulatory mechanisms.

Bahura – concerned standards don’t get lost or adopted.

Barquist – can we have discussion with text of GP itself

Pickel – don’t think it’s appropriate. Doesn’t see how something gets lost in a building code.

Bahura – concerned it gets lost here.

Adams – meaning ensuring it gets into City Building Code

Pickel – is there a log or notes we are keeping of where these things get listed and a process is outlined into getting them in the areas they need to be, such as building code. Making sure it gets addressed and carried forward. Is there a process in place?

Barquist – use implementation program – consistency analysis. Use implementation plan as guidebook. Best tool as part of this process.

Pickel – it’s like a project manual – technical specifications

Barquist – toolkit to implement higher order policy. Can be zoning code updates, building code updates, modifications; many mechanisms

Bahura – research where it should be.

Staff – where did language come from – specific numbers?

Baker – no one agency is covering this issue. 200% fire flow is from State (fire code) – have ability to double fire flow. Water district doesn’t have authority to make developer provide more than requirement; although they have tried. No one is backing water district.

Watt – want staff to review to have us approve a defensible standard.

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<i>Pickel – staff to research this further.</i>
<p>Policy 2.2 Fire sprinkler systems in structures within VHFHSZ shall include sprinklers in accessible attic spaces located within 8 feet of any vent opening not protected by 1/8-inch or smaller mesh.</p>	
<p>Goal 1: Protect the community from hazards associated with geologic instability, seismic hazard events.</p>	<i>Pickel - “geologic instability and seismic events”</i>
<p>Policy 1.1 Require review of soil and geologic conditions <u>in order</u> to determine stability and <u>to promote informed development decisions</u> relate to development decisions, especially in regard to type of use, size of facility, and ease of evacuation of occupants <u>in accordance with Fire Authority.</u></p>	<p><i>Lyons – take out “relate to development decisions,” Lyons/Adams – stop after “occupants”.</i> <i>Hansen – does it take away authority if fire authority not in wording.</i> <i>Baker – is this necessary in GP?</i> <i>Bahura – didn’t we discuss evacuation routes somewhere else?</i> <i>Lyons – need a pervasive authority for evacuation. What is plan?</i> <i>Baker – usually have evacuation south; they drive you to avoid east/west – presupposes you can get onto freeway.</i> <i>Bahura – did we discuss evacuation routes previously?</i> <i>Barquist – will need to look back and verify</i> <i>Adams – specific to geologic hazards</i> <i>Bahura – can’t we refer back to policy if already addressed?</i> <i>Baker – seems like a specific development, not community-wide. Geologic conditions of a specific site.</i> <i>Pickel – vague from a site standpoint; geologic conditions need to be determined to be stable before people move around area. If one area of City is unstable, first place we wouldn’t evacuate.</i> <i>Needs to remain somehow, but convoluted.</i> <i>Adams – saying have an “informed” development decision based on conditions.</i> <i>Pickel – usually covered in other areas, COA, geologic reports, etc.</i> <i>Hansen – need to address generally here</i> <i>Adams – refer back to policy regarding evacuations</i> <i>Pickel – is word “development” tripping us up.</i> <i>Hansen – no, because talking about development. Want to look at conditions before a development exists.</i> <i>Bahura – we are requiring soils reports</i> <i>Pickel – where are we going with Policy.</i> <i>Bahura – leave it, except for last phrase, reference policy that addresses evacuation. If there is not one, leave as is.</i></p>
<p>Policy 1.2 Monitor known and potential geologic hazards in the City. <u>Such as: faults, flood channels.....</u></p>	<p><i>Lyons – don’t know how you monitor geologic hazards.</i> <i>Bahura – readings on fault lines?</i> <i>Baker – probably more concerned with landslide zones</i> <i>Adams – should it be “identify and monitor....”</i> <i>Hansen – flood channels need to be monitored.</i></p>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<p><i>Lyons – end where it ended before. Bahura – when we say monitor; who is getting direction Staff – more toward landslide areas; nothing City can do about faults Pickel – OC flood control addresses channels – maintenance End at “City”</i></p>
<p><i>Pickel – we already have it Bahura – should we say “maintain” Pickel – that may denote there is no change to standards Lyons – leave in as backbone for City code Leave as is – Consensus</i></p>
<p><i>Pickel – has to do with Building Code Lyons – have problem with word “high” Baker – covered by requirements Adams – there is a comment to reword Pickel – state standards are incredibly high standards Barquist – application of that in public facilities Pickel – State inspectors are more stringent (DSA); costly from a construction standpoint Lyons – is there a measurable effect on the safety of the building Pickel – can’t answer that; most schools and hospitals have sustained the events – somewhere there is data and research to support standards Baker – now there are standards for ground shaking; proximity to fault Pickel – standards are consistent for geotechnical reports Bahura – seismic standards have been updated a lot over several years; question of if we should maintain word “high” Pickel – agree don’t like word “high”. Adopt and maintain required Lyons – “Adopt and maintain standards...” Pickel - “adopt and maintain required standards...” - Consensus</i></p>
<p><i>Pickel – geotechnical report addresses all of this Baker – have to drill to determine groundwater Pickel – geotechnical report typically conducts borings Baker – if on soil type that doesn’t liquefy, don’t need to go further Lyons – note says it’s an implementation item. Baker – doesn’t city require geotech Bahura – leave it and ask staff if ok to take out.</i></p>
<p><i>Baker – state minimum Adams – should it be greater than 50 feet Bahura – wording says Staff – building code regulates; issue as planner, need to remove reference to “study zone” Baker – issue when looking for fault; can be parallel fractures; study zone may be a lot larger than 50 feet. By prohibiting within study zone, may be too limiting. Adams – study zone not necessarily area to be concerned with.</i></p>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<i>"Prohibit location.... within 50 feet" – remove reference to APSSZ</i>
<i>Ok with policy – consensus</i>
<p><i>Baker – is this something that's done</i> <i>Bahura – so no more coordination necessary</i> <i>Staff – study has been done</i> <i>Hansen – what is meant by "requirements"</i> <i>Adams – are there other areas we should consider – should it be left due to unknown – no guarantee one is the only one</i> <i>Baker – can it be covered by other policies – not sure of need for this</i> <i>Lyons - look at Policy 2.1 – similar</i> <i>Pickel – talking about "upgrading"</i> <i>Lyons- talking about implementing requirements, which 2.1 is doing – Policy 1.8 is redundant</i> <i>Bahura – remove policy 1.8</i> <i>Lyons – 2.1 is the requirement</i> <i>Staff – 2.1 is addressing older buildings that haven't been built to seismic standards – not related to proximity to fault line</i> <i>Pickel – move forward with it remaining.</i></p>
<p><i>Lyons – remove "hazardous" – worry about bridge on Orangethorpe</i> <i>Pickel – remove "hazardous" – consensus</i></p>
<p><i>Consensus –ok as is.</i></p>
<p><i>General – what does that mean</i> <i>Adam – maybe, every 5 years, or after seismic event, something that will trigger it</i> <i>Lyons – would become trigger point – seismic event would trigger review</i> <i>Baker – how is this policy useful – previous policy finds them and this policy reviews them</i> <i>Adams – develop procedures on how to monitor them – periodic review – add "after seismic event"</i> <i>Baker – "Periodically review"</i> <i>Pickel "Develop procedures for periodic seismic review of potentially hazardous structures." – Consensus.</i></p>
<i>Adams – someone added "City"?</i>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Goal 3: Protect the lives and property of city residents and visitors of the City from flood hazards.

*Bahura – don't need to repeat "City"
Pickel – remove first "City" – Consensus*

Policy 3.1 Identify flood hazard areas and provide appropriate land use designations and regulations for areas subject to flooding.

Leave as is – Consensus

Policy 3.2 Maintain natural drainage courses and keep them free of obstructions.

*Adams – not doing very well right now
Pickel – see this changing with water quality issues – natural and concrete bottoms – water quality issues will change all of this.
Baker – changing with new development – have issue – can we do this "natural" – do we have jurisdiction
Staff – not dealing with Corps areas
Adams – example, have area near property full of debris, when it burned, water drained heavily. Had to remove on own. Who is maintaining courses and keeping free of obstructions. Don't see anyone keeping them clear. Is it City or County responsibility?
Confused by policy.
Pickel – jurisdictional issue?
Adams – if City responsible needs to be clear. Is it not really City responsibility and shouldn't be in here.
Baker – if on own property, your responsible for keeping it clean
Staff – city has identified drainage courses and maintains them. Not every channel is identified as a drainage course. Focus on flooding and maintaining facilities.
Adams – do we leave it in? does it belong?
Pickel – needs to be more generic "proper agency" would maintain – places where city, property owner, county or army corps maintains, depending upon situation.
Baker – drainage has changed a lot over years. More sophisticated on how it is handled now. Retain on site.
Adams – "natural drainage courses should be free of obstruction that adversely effect..."*

Goal 4: Protect people and property from brush Wildfire hazards.

Policy 4.1 ~~Institute~~ Designate a "High Risk Fire Hazard Area" and establish development standards which will reduce the risk for wildfires property damage and loss of life.

*Adams – should we be using the naming the OCFA uses – such as high risk
Carbone – OCFA would identify specific things that together would be a high fire risk
Adams – there is already a coding used by OCFA. Properties coded as high risk, or severe risk, etc. Should we be consistent with their*

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p><i>naming.</i></p> <p><i>Watts – wouldn’t want GP to say “high risk fire area” and OCFA use a different naming system.</i></p> <p><i>Adams – should reference OCFA designations for fire hazard areas</i></p> <p><i>Watts – staff will identify naming system</i></p> <p><i>Baker – city already recognizes the mapped area</i></p> <p><i>Lyons – should say “recognize” not designate</i></p> <p><i>“Recognize...” consensus</i> Policy 4.1 Institute Recognize a "High Risk Fire Hazard Area" and establish development standards which will reduce the risk for wildfires <u>property damage and loss of life.</u></p>
<p><u>Policy 4.2 Work with the U.S. Forest Service, the Orange County Fire Authority, and private land owners to maintain landscape, and provide buffers which will reduce the risk of wildfires. Educate the public regarding vegetation that increases risk of wildfire or spread of wildfire.</u></p>	<p><i>Carbon – what is meant by buffers</i></p> <p><i>Baker – could mean a variety of things</i></p> <p><i>Lyons – what does it mean that the City would assist landowners</i></p> <p><i>Greg – city regularly informs property owners if they need to maintain buffer</i></p> <p><i>Baker – change “work with” to “encourage or motivate”; OCFA doesn’t have authority to do anything. Forest service doesn’t have jurisdiction. Chino Hills is state.</i></p> <p><i>Watts – how about “government authorities”</i></p> <p><i>Lyons – doesn’t OCFA have authority</i></p> <p><i>Baker – issue where properties abut park</i></p> <p><i>Watts – can’t deal with all of that in policy</i></p> <p><i>Adams – do we have US Forest Service in area</i></p> <p><i>Carbon – don’t want to cut out US Forestry</i></p> <p><i>Watts – “applicable government authorities”</i></p> <p><i>Rakochy – agree with “applicable government authorities”</i></p> <p><i>Watts – “appropriate” instead of “applicable”</i></p> <p><i>Staff – government “agencies”</i></p> <p><i>“risk from”; “reduces”</i></p> <p>Policy 4.2 Work with appropriate government agencies and private land owners to maintain landscape, and provide buffers which will reduce the risk from wildfires. Educate the public regarding <u>vegetation that reduces the risk of wildfire or spread of wildfire.</u></p>
<p>Policy 4.3 Enforce fire inspection, code compliance, fuel modification, and weed abatement programs.</p>	<p><i>No comment</i></p>
<p>Policy 4.4 Educate the public as to the risk associated with wildfire hazards and encourage wildfire reduction activities by residents.</p>	<p><i>No comment</i></p>

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Policy 4.5 Coordinate with Orange County Sheriff's Office and Orange County Fire Authority to develop maintain and mark emergency corridors to the north east south and west of the City.

*Adams – insert comma between develop and maintain
Rokochy – should be Orange County Sheriff's Department
Adams – are these all the policies we need.
Rakochy – add in about evacuation routes
Adams – add in Policy 4.6 that addresses "adequate evacuation plans"
Baker – not just have an evacuation plan, but needs to be publicized. People don't know what the plan is or where they are supposed to go.*

Policy 4.5 Coordinate with Orange County Sheriff's Department and Orange County Fire Authority to develop, maintain and mark emergency corridors to the north, east, south, and west of the City.

Goal 5: Provide community protection from hazards associated with urban fires and crime.

*Baker – "Protect the community from...."
Lyons – find that too weak. Need to add in earthquake or terrorism"
Adams – can add in other hazards.
Watts – how do we cover everything under one heading
Rakochy – can cover a policy for each one.
Carbon- hazardous spills
Watts- expand to address natural and man-made disasters*

Goal 5: Protect the community from hazards associated with natural and manmade disasters.

Combine Policy 5.1 into Goal 5

Policy 5.1 Minimize the loss of life, damage to property, and the economic and social dislocations resulting from structural fires.

*Watts – expand to include natural and man-made disasters; can staff craft language
Since expanded goal, we need to expand policies that support the goal
Adams – could list examples of disasters
Watts – "resulting from natural and man-made disasters"
Hanson – how are you going to do it
Watts – sounds like a goal more than a policy; can they be combined
Rakochy – "...to minimize..." end after social dislocations.
Hansen – two sentences under goal 5
Watts – combine goal and policy and then renumber. (Consensus)*

Policy 5.1 Minimize the loss of life, damage to property, and the economic and social dislocations resulting from natural and manmade disasters.
Natural and manmade disasters, such as...

Policy 5.2 Ensure that law enforcement and crime prevention concerns are considered in the review of planning and development

*Watts – do we add something about fire
Adams – we need to say more
Watts – when reviewing development they would ensure this*

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

proposals in Yorba Linda.

Lyons – ensure emergency services
 Adams – add before law enforcement “emergency services”
 Lyons – emergency services is an ambulance
 Carbon – law enforcement and crime prevention are the same
 Lyons – does not agree
 Hansen – asking for law enforcement and OCFA to have input in development? OCFA not included
 Watts – its asking for involvement when staff reviewing development proposals
 Rakochy – can we add in emergency services
 Adams – what about hazardous materials
 Watts – is the policy statement designed to have the planning function consult with law enforcement, OCFA?
 Staff – yes, is there is an issue, we will get their input on that project; it is a tool
 Watts – we need to add fire and emergency services
 “Police, fire, and emergency services”
 Hansen – need to make it stronger
 Baker – consider adding in “shall”
 Lyons – we were saying to use the word “shall”
 Baker – if feel strongly, should use stronger wording
 Watts – “City shall ensure....”
 Hanson – add in “fire”; say “consulted”
 Rakochy – not just consulting. Integrating them into project
 Baker – OCFA don’t tend to see the project early-on; could make recommendations earlier in the process – early consultation
 Carbon – in code, would be requirements. Process is within code.
 Hazardous materials have to be identified to OCFA and City before you can occupy an area.
 Adams – what is happening now with Cielo Vista and Esperanza?
 Staff – if processed through City, OCFA reviews everything at front-end.
 Hansen – if we have in GP will it have impact on that development?
 Watts – add language to ensure it would happen at front end or early-on in process
 Hansen – shouldn’t assume
 Staff – can add in “City shall consult...” versus “consider”
 Rakochy – should be two separate policies; first is its own process; should be consulting as well.
 Baker – give opportunity to consult with them early so not just minimal acceptable result; can get best practices to get over and beyond the minimal requirements. Nudge developer in right direction to do better. Not just minimum
 Adams – “city shall consult with the appropriate agencies to ensure that....”
 Lyons – is “appropriate” or “responsible”

**PUBLIC SAFETY
ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
	<p>Watts – agree “responsible” Consensus</p> <p>Policy 5.2 Consult with the responsible agencies to ensure that fire, police and emergency services concerns are considered in the review of planning and development proposals in Yorba Linda.</p>
<p>Policy 5.3 Require that adequate police and fire service facilities and personnel are maintained to provide service at sufficient levels.</p>	<p>Watts – what does this mean Rakochoy – add “emergency services” Watts – use same combination of words above in 5.2. Baker – city has no control over OCFA; there is no contract Watts – use the word “ensure” Rakochoy – we do have a contract with OCFA Baker – City does not contract with OCFA; inherited – different than Placentia. They had own fire department previously and then when rolled in OCFA, they maintained structure and has a contract with OCFA. Watts – shouldn’t we use “Ensure” instead of “Require”. Consensus</p> <p>Policy 5.3 Ensure that adequate police, fire and emergency service facilities and personnel are maintained to provide service at sufficient levels.</p>
<p>Policy 5.4 Continue to conduct public safety education programs in the City.</p>	<p>Watts – take out “Continue to”</p> <p>Policy 5.4 Conduct public safety education programs in the City.</p>
<p>Goal 6: Ensure the availability and effective response of emergency services following a disastrous event within the City.</p>	<p>Adams – missing verb; leave “Ensure” Lyons – numbering in previous sections is still not correct Hanson – who oversees emergency services Lyons – 1.3 says “Disaster Response Plan” Staff to confirm name of plan is accurate throughout</p>
<p>Policy 6.1 Maintain the Emergency Response Plan that identifies all available resources and funds for use in the event of a disaster.</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Policy 6.2 Establish implementing actions or procedures under the Plan for rescue efforts, medical efforts, emergency shelters and provision of supplies.</p>	<p>Adams – wording is off Lyons – we want more than procedures, we want actions Rakochoy – “establish implementation actions...” Watts – I like the word “plans” in there Hanson – implementation says you will put it in place Adams – actions items that can be done Watts – “establish procedures and implementation actions under the Plan...” Adams – FEMA comes in and assists to rebuild; not the City. We are doing something separate. Referring to immediately after, not regrouping efforts.</p> <p>Policy 6.2 Establish procedures and implementation actions under</p>

PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT <i>(DISCUSSION ITEMS)</i>	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
	the Plan for rescue efforts, medical efforts, emergency shelters and provision of supplies.
Policy 6.3 Coordinate with Orange County and the Federal Emergency Management Agency to reduce community risks in the event of a disaster.	<i>Lyons – we used to work with State</i> <i>Watts – should be responsible public agencies</i> <i>Baker – “Coordinate with local, state, and federal agencies....”</i> Policy 6.3 Coordinate with local, state and federal agencies to reduce community risks in the event of a disaster.
Policy 6.4 Provide for an Emergency Operations Center for use in the event of a disaster, based on an inter-agency communication system.	<i>Baker – “provide” or “maintain”</i> <i>Consensus – with leaving “provide”</i>
<i>Goal 7: Protect public health, safety and welfare and the environment from exposure to hazardous materials and waste.</i>	<i>Adams – need to remove “and”</i> <i>Lyons – “safety, welfare, and...”</i> <i>Consensus</i> <i>Goal 7: Protect public health, safety, welfare and the environment from exposure to hazardous materials and waste.</i>
Policy 7.1 Establish planning procedures which consider the handling and transportation of hazardous materials and ensure that they are in accordance with applicable County, State and Federal regulations.	<i>Lyons – why would City establish procedures</i> <i>Rakochoy – you can restrict certain streets from truck traffic</i> <i>No changes</i>
Policy 7.2 Restrict transportation of hazardous materials on residential streets and establish transportation routes for the conveyance of hazardous materials.	<i>No comment</i>
Policy 7.3 Aid with the implementation of, and continue with participation in the Orange County's Household Hazardous Waste Plan.	<i>Adams – doesn't Yorba Linda Disposal handle hazardous waste disposal</i> <i>Baker – there are some things they won't take</i> <i>Lyons – is it still relevant</i> <i>No changes</i>

Tuesday, February 25, 2014
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER

III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM – NOISE

Refer to Attachment “A” and Attachment “B”

NOISE ELEMENT (DISCUSSION ITEMS)	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
Goal 1 Indoor and outdoor living areas that are adequately protected from transportation noise impacts.	<p><i>Baker – suggestion is good idea</i> <i>Hansen – adequate?</i> <i>Adams – should we define excessive; how do you determine</i> <i>Barquist – code would define the threshold</i> <i>Adams – need something in there that define “excessive”</i> <i>Bent – reference to code; also identifies time of day.</i></p>
Policy 1.1 Construct sound barriers to mitigate excessive noise levels where necessary or where feasible.	<p><i>Gorman – makes more sense to me.</i> <i>Adams – should we list techniques, or reword.</i> <i>Barquist – technology could change over time. Broaden language, not necessarily provide a list.</i> <i>Lyons – policy saying you should have techniques to mitigate excessive noise</i> <i>Bent – same question, who is responsible</i> <i>Barquist – remove “sound barriers” and instead employ technologies</i> <i>Baker – don’t want to limit to barriers; visual impact</i></p>
Policy 1.2 Require the inclusion of noise mitigation measures in the design of new roadway projects.	<p><i>Lyons – seems identical to 1.2</i> <i>Adams – 1.2 addressing roadway projects</i> <i>Lyons – the goal is transportation noise</i> <i>Adams –do they need to be separate?</i> <i>Gorman – construction is not transportation</i> <i>Hansen – has there been an issue with implementing 1.2 in the past; seems more clear</i> <i>Barquist – could combine 1.1 and 1.2; make sure if built, it is mitigated – occurs through CEQA process</i> <i>Baker – may be a subtle difference. 1.1 intended to mitigate existing conditions; 1.2 more about development of a new project.</i> <i>Lyons – what about Bastanchury, not a new roadway</i> <i>Adams – would leave separate; 1.1 is addressing change/growth over time. 1.2 something brand new should be mitigated at front end.</i> <i>Bent – agree with Adams</i> <i>Carbone – 1.1 deals with issue that everyone entitled to peace without noise; leave separate</i> <i>Bent – ok with both; make reference to noise code – possibly within goal (Consensus)</i></p>
Policy 1.3 Ensure the effective enforcement of City, State and Federal noise levels by all appropriate City divisions.	<p><i>Lyons – are we adopting a policy to enforce laws? Shouldn’t have a policy to enforce law</i> <i>Adams – should we say “ensure compliance with”</i> <i>Lyons – policy is unnecessary</i> <i>Hansen – does staff think it is unnecessary?</i> <i>Staff – sometimes policies reinforce what we are trying to</i></p>

NOISE ELEMENT <i>(DISCUSSION ITEMS)</i>	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
	<p>accomplish.</p> <p>Adams – doesn't hurt to leave it in; maybe change word "enforcement" – purpose of GP is to provide staff and City atty something to stand upon, if needed.</p> <p>Bent – not sure we can enforce federal laws</p> <p>Adams – can say "comply" with current regulations</p> <p>Rakochoy – using word "ensure" is not saying you are enforcing.</p> <p>Ensuring someone is complying – city would be contacted by developer; not federal government. There to remind someone to comply "ensure compliance"</p> <p>Bent – change "enforcement" to "compliance" – Consensus</p>
<p>Policy 1.4 Encourage alternative transportation modes such as walking, bicycling and transit to minimize noise within sensitive receptor areas.</p>	<p>Adams – seems fine; not sure what is meant by encourage – provide appropriate sidewalks, bike trails</p> <p>Bent – encourage through accessibility and providing options</p> <p>Carbone – better include horses too – multi-purpose trail system; non-motorized access; equestrian access</p> <p>Adams – is their terminology that can be used to encompass all</p> <p>Barquist – can say "non-motorized" transportation; transit includes buses</p> <p>Bent – would bus system be considered mass transit – change to non-motorized and mass transit</p> <p>Hansen – I like image of having them all listed</p> <p>Carbone – multi-purpose trail for all activities</p> <p>Bent – not just limited to trails; considers streets, sidewalks, trails – considers everything</p> <p>Adams – add in "equestrian"</p> <p>Carbone – "equestrian activities" – multi-purpose would be best</p> <p>Add in equestrian - consensus</p>
<p>Goal 2 Land use planning decisions that incorporate noise considerations.</p>	<p>This is a compatibility issue that may be combined with Goal 4 below?</p> <p>Combine Goal 4 with this Goal</p> <p>Yes, combine with goal 4.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Barquist – recommendation is to combine Goal 2 and Goal 4</p> <p>Gorman – makes sense to me</p> <p>Hansen – word "incorporate" – not sure what that means</p> <p>Gorman – have to consider noise</p> <p>Bent – Goal 4 addressing same subject as Goal 2</p> <p>Rakochoy – the rewrites have already been incorporated in Goal 2</p> <p>Bent – Consensus on consolidating Goal 2 and Goal 4</p>
<p>Policy 2.1 Establish acceptable noise levels for various land uses.</p>	<p>Lyons – don't think "acceptable" adds anything – wording shows up in 2.2 – if we have a threshold that is the level of acceptability</p> <p>Bent – consensus – eliminate "acceptable" in both 2.1 and 2.2</p>

NOISE ELEMENT (DISCUSSION ITEMS)	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
Policy 2.2 Require <u>and enforce</u> acceptable noise levels near schools, hospitals, convalescent homes and other noise sensitive areas.	<i>Lyons – does noise sensitive receptor mean something – how is it defined Bent – what was thought behind deleting 4.1 and 4.2 Staff – keep 4.2 and modify to be consistent with zoning code Bent – move 4.2 to be new 2.5 – Consensus Adams – we are deleting 4.1 – Consensus</i>
Policy 2.3 Locate noise tolerant land uses in areas committed to noise producing uses.	<i>Adams – is it referring to the type of business and that it would be put in similar areas. Lyons – keep it if philosophy is to give teeth to staff.</i>
Policy 2.4 Adopt measures which alter, prohibit or mitigate noise generating uses through site design.	<i>Rakochoy – 4.2 becomes 2.4 and the old 2.4 is moved to Goal 5 and wording will be determined.</i>
Goal 3 Control non-transportation noise impacts.	<i>Hansen – likes the suggestion Bent – Consensus – go with suggested text</i>
Policy 3.1 Enforce the City Noise Ordinance to mitigate noise conflicts.	<i>Rakochoy – like recommendation Baker – doesn't seem General Plan-like. The plan is to enforce the ordinance. Should be more like "create", "maintain" Bent – agree, but gives more teeth Staff – would recommend deleting; the noise ordinance fixes the conflict Barquist – agree with staff Huang – residents in Vista Del Verde would disagree Staff – that is related to construction noise; covered in Goal 1 Bent – Consensus to delete policy</i>
Policy 3.2 Develop and implement measures to reduce noise generated by construction activities. <u>Building permits will not be issued until the developer mitigate noise caused by construction activities.</u>	<i>Hansen – thinks 3.2 and 3.3 are more clear in original Rakochoy – agrees Adams – leave the way they are Bent – recommendations say "enforce" Rakochoy – would hope that we enforce - could rephrase 3.2 to make easier to read Staff – add to end to ensure ordinances are enforced. Bent – do you need it? Staff – been an issue in some areas – having enforce is fine Baker – concerned saying "enforce" in certain places, but not others Bent – do we leave it out because already being done; doesn't code say that – when to enforce and when not to Barquist – establishes standards and procedures if in violation – GP is adopted by resolution – visioning document – "enforce" may not be best place in GP – the ordinance implements the GP – enforcement "shall". Use higher order wording to enforcement activity Bent – do not need "enforcement" Adams – leave it as it is now Hansen – leave as is</i>

NOISE ELEMENT (DISCUSSION ITEMS)	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
	<p><i>Rakochy – can do “ensure compliance with”</i> <i>Lyons – like that general policy – instead of saying “enforce” – “ensure compliance”</i> <i>Baker – ensuring compliance is the procedure or method</i> <i>Adams – “ensure compliance with standards and procures for mitigating....”</i> <i>Adams – “develop, implement, and ensure compliance to reduce noise....”</i> <i>Bent – consensus on Adams recommendation</i></p>
<p>Policy 3.3 Establish and maintain coordination among City agencies involved in noise abatement.</p>	<p><i>Hansen – like as is</i> <i>Huang – policy is saying noise abatement; but staff suggestion is saying “entitlement”</i> <i>Baker – context of entitlement is granting permits</i> <i>Huang – likes original language</i> <i>Bent – Consensus on keeping as is</i></p>
<p>Goal 4 Noise and land use compatibility.</p>	<p><i>Incorporated with Goal 2</i></p>
<p>Policy 4.1 Promote increased awareness concerning the effects of noise and suggest methods by which the public can be of assistance in reducing noise.</p>	
<p>Policy 4.2 Require that noise from motors, appliances, air conditions and other consumer products does not disturb the occupants of surrounding properties.</p>	
<p>Goal 5 Project approvals that include conditions to mitigate noise impacts.</p>	<p><i>Consensus – leave separate; do not combine with Goal 1</i> <i>Bent – need to consider how to incorporate old 2.4</i></p> <p><i>Consensus – leave as is</i></p>
<p>Policy 5.1 Utilize site design techniques as a primary means to minimize noise impacts.</p>	<p><i>Behura – 2.4 is at a planning level</i> <i>Hansen – moving 2.4, so doesn’t go in 5.1 – like 5.1</i> <i>Make recommendation new 5.1</i> <i>Bent – consensus to accept recommendation</i> <i>Staff – 2.4 and 5.1; any reasons to combine</i> <i>Behura – seems like different levels when you look at goal – during land use planning vs during project approval and design</i> <i>Barquist – tools during design review</i> <i>Adams – should we leave 2.4 under Goal 2</i> <i>Bent – both are saying through site design – not sure how different</i> <i>Behura – “site design” premature in 2.4 – can use other tools at planning level to implement at design level</i> <i>Adams – that’s why we should leave at 2.4, but change so not “site design”</i> <i>Behura – “Site planning” instead of “design”</i> <i>Baker – techniques are open at the planning level; details during design review</i> <i>Bent – keep 2.4; change “site design” to “site planning”; modified</i></p>

NOISE ELEMENT <i>(DISCUSSION ITEMS)</i>	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
	<p>4.2 becomes 2.5. <i>Bent – go with recommendation on 5.1 – new policy wording; but do not move under Goal 2</i> <i>“Consider noise impacts in the siting....”</i></p>
<p>Policy 5.2 Consider alternative architectural layouts as a means of meeting noise requirements.</p>	<p><i>Bent – need to consolidate 5.1, 5.2 or 5.2, or standalone.</i></p> <p><i>Consensus – leave as is.</i></p>
<p>Policy 5.3 Require a combination of noise barriers and landscape berms where architectural design treatments fail to adequately reduce adverse noise levels.</p>	<p><i>Consensus – leave as is.</i></p>
<p>Policy 5.4 Require the construction of noise barriers and landscaped berms in conjunction with architectural treatments, when needed to adequately mitigate noise impacts.</p>	<p><i>Lyons – more comfortable with “landscaping”, not “berms”</i> <i>Hansen – is 5.3 and 5.4 the same</i> <i>Behura – 5.3 is saying use these tools if 5.2 doesn’t work – berms are different with landscaping – can have berms without landscaping</i> <i>Bent – “noise barriers, landscaping, berms”</i> <i>Behura – can have policies that identify means – giving a step by step process – solve first through design/siting</i> <i>Baker – if all fails, then can use other forms (landscaping)</i></p> <p><i>Consensus – leave as is.</i></p>
	<p><i>General:</i></p> <p><i>Behura – who determines noise standards? Railroad noise increasing with rail traffic. Is there a way to address if conditions change? Are we monitoring if noise increasing. Don’t see anything in GP to address issues from an existing noise sources.</i> <i>Barquist – can add a policy to monitor changing noise conditions – can tell story in GP on changing conditions</i> <i>Behura – would like to see something about addressing increasing noise in City</i> <i>Adams – can add additional policy under Goal 1 to address monitoring.</i> <i>Bent – can we combine or add to 1.1?</i> <i>Adams – we are talking about more than sound barriers – monitoring as well.</i> <i>Bent – change 1.1 altogether.</i> <i>Adams – would keep 1.1 and add a new policy.</i> <i>Behura – monitoring existing transportation sources for noise</i> <i>Adams – need to move to top. Should be 1.1 or 1.2 and move others down</i> <i>Suggested wording:</i> <i>“monitor existing transportation noise sources to ensure continued compliance with the noise ordinance”</i> <i>Baker – don’t have control over railroad noise – what can city do to mitigate</i></p>

**NOISE ELEMENT
(DISCUSSION ITEMS)**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Behura – can have a dialogue with railroad authority – that’s how sound wall built – can give teeth to negotiate with rail authority
Bent – 1.1 - monitor existing transportation sources to mitigate excessive noise sources where necessary or feasible”
Adams – needs to standalone
Behura – don’t like where feasible
Staff – New 1.1 “monitor existing transportation noise sources and establish and maintain...” (look at Policy 3.3 for wording)

Goal 1 Indoor and outdoor living areas that are adequately protected from transportation noise impacts.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is a zoning code enforcement issue. Policies in place to ensure protection of noise levels*

Committee Considerations

- *Keep Goal statement in its current form with the addition of “excessive”*

Policy 1.1 Construct sound barriers to mitigate excessive noise levels where necessary or where feasible.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is an implementation measure. Excessive noise levels can be mitigate by a variety of techniques*

Committee Considerations:

- *Policy could be revised to address a variety of techniques to mitigate potentially excessive noise impacts.*

Policy 1.2 Require the inclusion of noise mitigation measures in the design of new roadway projects.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is a natural component of environmental analysis and would be address at a project level through the CEQA process.*

Committee Considerations:

- *“Ensure noise mitigation measures are clearly articulated and implemented prior to the approval of potentially significant noise generators”*

Policy 1.3 Ensure the effective enforcement of City, State and Federal noise levels by all appropriate City divisions.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *“Ensuring enforcement” seems an inappropriate terminology*

Committee Considerations:

- *Modify to “Ensure potentially excessive noise generators provide for the highest feasible level of noise mitigation and enforce local, state and federal noise standards”*

Policy 1.4 Encourage alternative transportation modes such as walking, bicycling and transit to minimize noise within sensitive receptor areas.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Policy is focus on sensitive receptors or noise generators*

Committee Considerations:

- *“Encourage alternative transportation modes such as walking, bicycling and transit to contribute to reducing or minimizing potential noise impacts”*

Goal 2 Land use planning decisions that incorporate noise considerations.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Policy does not discuss relationship between land use and compatibility.*
- *May be useful to consolidate with Goal 4*

Committee Considerations:

- *Consider the combining Goal 2 with Goal 4 with Goal 2 stated as "Noise and Land Use Compatibility"*

Policy 2.1 Establish acceptable noise levels for various land uses.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *These have been established in the Noise Ordinance.*
- *This is an enforcement issue vs. an establishment issue*

Committee Considerations:

- *Rewrite the Policy to read "Enforce the city's established acceptable noise thresholds for various land uses"*

Policy 2.2 Require acceptable noise levels near schools, hospitals, convalescent homes and other noise sensitive areas.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is established in the Noise Ordinance*

Committee Considerations:

- *Consider rewrite policy to "Enforce acceptable noise thresholds for noise sensitive receptors, land uses and activities."*

Policy 2.3 Locate noise tolerant land uses in areas committed to noise producing uses.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This policy may not adequately address noise issues*

Committee Considerations

- *Consider revising the policy to read "Ensure noise producing land uses and activities are designed and located to consider impacts adjacent uses and activities."*

Policy 2.4 Adopt measures which alter, prohibit or mitigate noise generating uses through site design.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This policy is similar to those under Goal 5*

Committee Considerations

- *Move and consolidate under Goal 5*

Goal 3 Control non-transportation noise impacts.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *Control term is an enforcement activity*

Committee Considerations

- *Consider revising policy to read, "Mitigate noise impacts from non-transportation sources"*

Policy 3.1 Enforce the City Noise Ordinance to mitigate noise conflicts.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *No change recommended*

Committee Considerations

Policy 3.2 Develop and implement measures to reduce noise generated by construction activities.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is an enforcement policy*

Committee Considerations

- *Consider refining language to read, "Enforce standards and procedures for mitigating construction-related activities that introduce excessive noise levels"*

Policy 3.3 Establish and maintain coordination among City agencies involved in noise abatement.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

-

Committee Considerations

- *Consider revising policy to read, "Ensure city department coordination when monitoring and enforcing noise-related policies and procedures for the entitlement and construction of land uses and activities citywide."*

Goal 4 Noise and land use compatibility.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This Goal can be combined with Goal 2*

Committee Considerations

- *Move this to Goal 2 and consolidate Goal 4 policies*

Policy 4.1 Promote increased awareness concerning the effects of noise and suggest methods by which the public can be of assistance in reducing noise.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This policy may not be instructive or useful*

Committee Considerations

- *Consider deletion of this policy*

Policy 4.2 Require that noise from motors, appliances, air conditions and other consumer products does not disturb the occupants of surrounding properties.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- *This is a zoning code/noise ordinance enforcement issue*

Committee Considerations

- *Consider deleting this policy*

Goal 5 Project approvals that include conditions to mitigate noise impacts.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- This Goal is similar to Goals 2 and 4.

Committee Considerations

- Delete Goal 5 and move its policies into Goal 1

Policy 5.1 Utilize site design techniques as a primary means to minimize noise impacts.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Repetative to Goals/Polices 2 and 4

Committee Considerations

- Consolidate Goal 5 policies and move into Goal 2

New policy for under Goal 2, "Consider noise impacts in the siting, design and construction of new development to minimize noise impacts."

Policy 5.2 Consider alternative architectural layouts as a means of meeting noise requirements.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Repetative to Goals/Polices 2 and 4

Committee Considerations

- Consolidate Goal 5 policies and move into Goal 2

Policy 5.3 Require a combination of noise barriers and landscape berms where architectural design treatments fail to adequately reduce adverse noise levels.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Repetative to Goals/Polices 2 and 4

Committee Considerations

- Consolidate Goal 5 policies and move into Goal 2

Policy 5.4 Require the construction of noise barriers and landscaped berms in conjunction with architectural treatments, when needed to adequately mitigate noise impacts.

Staff Analysis/Discussion:

- Repetative to Goals/Polices 2 and 4

Committee Considerations

- Consolidate Goal 5 policies and move into Goal 2

V. NEXT STEPS

Refer to Attachment "C"

Behura – current code not adequate for parking

Lyons – PC directed staff to review specific land uses/users – evaluate if parking standards need to be changed

Behura – location makes difference

Staff – want to see empirical studies for product type, demographic, etc. – what kind of demand?

Baker – data can be misleading. If no off-site parking, people won't live there or adapt themselves to what's available. People who buy-in don't always stay. Situation changes. Renters increase number of cars.

Bent – GPAC Meeting Forecasts

Knarr – concern Parks and Rec MP hasn't gone to Parks and Rec Commission yet

Barquist – Meeting by Parks and Rec Commission on 3/20; GPAC reviewing for GP policy consistency – review top level policies that are direction setting – broad level – provided after Commission and Council review.

Two GPAC meetings dedicated to Land Use. Request GPAC review existing GP LU Element; review LU policy review (minutes); review land use map; review land use designations/descriptions; distinguish between GP and Zoning designations.

Opportunity Areas – issues and context different today

Circulation and Land Use – obtaining count data; provide baseline to evaluate impacts; Cielo Vista/Esperanza Traffic Studies

Bent – can we get homework sections emailed all in one, including powerpoint slide – entire presentation

What is difference with this Parks and Recreation Master Plan versus what was previously reviewed.

Barquist – information item to use in context of GP. Different goals and policies.

Bent – can we get link to document to download?

Huang – concerned about time to review

Barquist – changed significantly with new information. Organization changed. Policy is one component. The documentation is a large part of it. Will verify with staff release of document.

Lyons – is there a time critical element to it? Can we move land use discussion before Parks and Recreation Master Plan/Recreation Element discussion.

Staff – should have two weeks before meeting. Can move meeting if need to.

Tuesday, March 25, 2014
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER

III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM – RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

Refer to Attachment “A”

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<p><i>Goal 1 To permanently preserve and maintain public and private open space.</i></p>	<p>These seem fine – consolidate where appropriate.</p> <p>Carbone – wants to leave, would like to see more open space. What is difference between private and public park? Knarr – why need “permanently” is there significance to it Hansen – thinks it is significant; not to be changed, not to be altered Huang – it doesn’t add anything Lyons – no such thing as permanent, although our intent is to keep it in perpetuity Consensus – do not delete permanently</p>
<p>Policy 1.1 Mitigate the impacts of development on sensitive lands such as steep slopes, cultural resources and sensitive habitats through the development review process.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 1.2 Preserve and protect the scenic and visual quality of canyon and hillside areas as a resource of public importance.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 1.3 Achieve the retention of permanent open space through dedication as a part of the development site plan and subdivision/review process.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 1.4 Concentrate higher intensity recreation uses in areas containing less sensitive resources and landforms and preserve the most sensitive landforms and natural resources as passive open space.</p>	<p>Huang – what is considered a higher intensity recreation use Watts – soccer vs picnic Knarr – organized vs spontaneous DB – programming and use of the site No changes</p>
<p>Policy 1.5 Insure that conversion of open space from vacant or passive status to permanent resource conservation or active recreation use is accompanied by a thorough analysis of site characteristics and potentials justifying the permanent open space use.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p><i>Goal 2 To provide a balanced system of public and private parks and recreation facilities achieved in cooperation with the Yorba Linda Parks and Recreation Department, School Districts and private community associations.</i></p>	<p>Carbone – what is a private vs public park Harris – can be owned by private association; HOA Carbone – private streets where unload horses; people in HOA don’t want us to unload Huang – there is a park/playground in Vista Del Verde that people use that do not live in the tract. It’s open street. Watts – issue is what is public vs private. Is it a term of the cities? How do we define</p>

RECREATION &
RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Gorman – private means privately owned. Can say as we approve buildout, have to keep as a private park. Part of negotiation of new building tract as it comes in. Can encourage when reviewing plans for buildout. For the community for the most part.
 Barquist – a matter of who is paying for it.
 Watts - do we need it in there
 Bent – need to keep for new neighborhood to build park and service community
 Watts – can we just delete; keep
 Knarr – comingling different ideas – should have a goal that talks about City assets and then different goal for contracts with school districts and private.
 Huang – is the reason for goal that if City is unable to build something, we require new development to build parks, but private park has to be within City’s requirements.
 Barquist – the purpose of the goal is the stated end. Looking at a larger level, is there access to private facilities. If idea is for public to have access to it, why have private. Private is about maintenance, not accessibility.
 Gorman – thought key word is “balanced”. Looking at all facilities and how needs are being met. Some are being met privately.
 Baker – Esperanza says it’s planning soccer fields, but can’t drive to get there. HOA going to maintain them. No way to get up there. Kids will be crowding on fields in YL where they can be accessed. Doesn’t really meet our community need. Can’t be used with way the access is structured. Going to get credit and it’s open to public, but not really helping out City. Will probably go partially unused.
 Carbone – what parks are private now. We don’t any say in School District and their design. City engages in contract to use the facility. That would be a private park, but don’t have any say in design.
 Watts – any reason to not have goal 2 as part of General Plan. Is it legitimate?
 Huang- it’s legitimate, but should we put it in a goal or a policy. Balanced system with adding accessibility as a policy.
 Knarr – recommend amend to read “provide a balanced system of parks and recreation facilities.” Need new goal for private and public.
 Bent – don’t have problem with goal as it is. Policy is referring to accessibility.
 Watts – 6 in favor of goal as stated. Leave the goal as is.

Policy 2.1 Provide park and recreational facilities that meet the needs of senior citizens, young adults, children, disabled individuals and families.

Carbone – good on goal
 Knarr – would just say “all residents”
 Hansen – ok as is
 Baker – inadvertently will leave out someone; better to make it simple
 Lyons – agree
 Hunag – fine as is

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Gorman – good Watts – what about “Provide park and recreational facilities that meet the needs of residents”. Hansen – listing everyone shows that there are different people with different needs Bent – are these specifics in our planning process already? We consider everyone in our planning process. Barquist – Parks and Rec Master Plan considers all users. Suggest: “Provide parks and recreation facilities that respond to the needs of Yorba Linda’s residents” Lyons – I like it Consensus on recommended change by Barquist</p>
<p>Policy 2.2 Ensure that park sites and programs are accessible to all residents.</p>	<p>Huang – concerned with “accessibility” Bent – want to say “reasonably” accessible? Huang – agree Watts – maybe we should let the developer prove it is accessible. Bent – do we need to worry about different meaning of accessibility? Barquist – by law have to provide accessibility. Does that community have access to the services? May add in “recreational facilities” “Ensure that park and recreational facilities are available and accessible to all residents” Staff – anyone can access the park. No encumbrances Huang – can’t use park in Vista Del Verde – have to climb over railing; field is already inaccessible. Consensus on Barquist recommendation - “Ensure that park and recreational facilities are available and accessible to all residents”</p>
<p>Policy 2.3 Provide high quality existing and new facilities which are compatible with adjacent land uses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Develop master site plans for each park to ensure that the siting of buildings, open air facilities and landscape are unified, functionally related to efficiency, and compatible with adjacent uses. b. Design and develop parks to complement and reflect their natural environmental setting and maximize their open space character. c. Design and improve neighborhood and community parks so that uses and parking do not adversely impact adjacent residences, and landscaping is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is very specific <p>Hansen – fine with me Baker – long and detailed; should it be broken up. Lyons – no problem with organization; have a problem with “c” because some people object to noise. If residence next to park, should expect to have kids yelling. Bent – ok as is Watts – I would break it down, but not passionate about it Huang – ok with it Gorman – have issue with it. In this City have a tendency to plan a park and not get funded for many years. Pay for it being planned, but then nothing being done and things change and plan may not be applicable. Need time frame or limit on when we do this. Tier 1 project, some funding that we can use. Waste money designing a park that we may not build. Watts – ok as is – 5 majority – leave as is</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

compatible with adjacent areas.	
Policy 2.4 Facilitate cooperative joint use of school facilities and programs for enhancement of recreation programs.	<p>Hansen – good Lyons – good Baker – good Huang – good Consensus – leave as is</p>
Policy 2.5 Pursue the construction of public golf courses in the City.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black Gold public golf course completed. Fiscal Implications with existing golf course. • DON'T NEED ANY MORE • Already done—Black Gold. • This policy is no longer needed IMO. The City has a public golf course and there is a private golf club in the adjacent County island. <p>Carbone – no more golf courses; we have 2</p> <p>Gorman – put something in there about overseeing management of golf course. Should have something in GP.</p> <p>Huang – is it a GP issue</p> <p>Watts – does 2.7 address it?</p> <p>Majority agree to delete 2.5</p>
Policy 2.6 Provide both active and passive park sites within the City.	<p>Carbone – what is passive vs active Barquist – wouldn't have any facilities. Knarr – walking, no organized parks Baker – not useable</p>
Policy 2.7 Maintain and enhance existing park sites within the City.	<p>Gorman – fine Carbone – good Hansen – good Bent – add park and recreation sites. Baker – should add “and recreation” throughout the policies Huang – does 2.7 address Gorman's comment re: golf course Gorman – need a separate policy addressing management of golf course. City owns the facility. We don't address the golf course at all. Bent – ok adding a goal and some policies to address golf course and management Huang – thinks it should be a separate goal and policy – fiscally responsible. Have solvency goal, better oversight. Watts – sees it more as a CC issue on a regular basis Barquist – more of a contractual issue – as a recreational facility, is it already addressed. Watts – add to 2.7 “Maintain, effectively manage, and enhance...” Gorman – similar to trash contract; do we have that in GP</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Knarr – we include school districts in plan Carbone – leave as is and add “parks and recreation” Consensus – no change; revise to include recreation facilities.</p>
<p>Policy 2.8 Permit flexible park planning and design where recreation value can thereby be improved. Provide a diversity of uses and facilities within park sites.</p>	<p>Consensus – no change, leave as is</p>
<p>Policy 2.9 Ensure a park master planning process that is responsive to community input.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this need to be here? <p>Consensus – agree to delete</p>
<p>Policy 2.10 Identify recreational uses for the Yorba Linda Lakebed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desired by surrounding community? • Not owned by the City nor under City control • Is this an appropriate policy since the YL Lakebed is still County and part of County flood control? Can we develop policy that discusses annexing Lakebed? • Where is this now? <p>Consensus – agree to delete</p>
<p>Policy 2.11 Investigate the feasibility of utilizing underground water reservoirs for recreation purposes through a joint use agreement with the Yorba Linda Water Department.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is planned here? Aquifers? • What does this mean in practical terms? • What does this mean? <p>Baker – Water Dept has been open to discussing using reservoirs for parks. Don’t want to take on maintenance. A lot of flat open space that can be used if can pay for it. Lyons – utilize useable space Knarr – not an open area, no lights, no parking- delete it Huang – I’d like to keep because of lack of water storage and part of current bond proposal is to put money in for water storage, recharging water – continue to have dialogue and make it useable. Still have not built underground water storage. Not sure if money will help YL. Carbone – agree have a water issue; but it’s not a park/recreation issue. Huang – don’t want land to become unusable because using it for storage. Use the land on top and everyone benefits. Question if bond will bring money to city to put park on top of reservoirs. Hansen – change wording to be clear Watts – needs to relate to recreational use Gorman – language is harmless and weak. No reason to not have it in. Who knows what will happen in future. Doesn’t stop people from doing what they are doing. Bent – can you put hard surfaces above. Recreational an</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>opportunity. Can be in land use side; solar panels. Watts – vote to leave in – majority agree to leave in; majority vote to leave in, but with changes. Lyons – change “Department” to “District” “...the surface of underground water reservoirs....” Agree on changes per Lyons</p>
<p>Policy 2.12 Actively pursue the development of existing park facilities to their maximum potential.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Goal 3 Provide park facilities to meet the needs of existing and future residents, including acreage to offset the current deficit and provide for projected population growth.</p>	<p>Huang – ok Gorman – parks 90% used by youth sports and cost a lot of money. Don’t use on Friday nights and Sundays. If add in that time can get use. Youth sports may have to get used to using at that time instead of building more parks. Carbone – agree and keep Knarr – important to provide for population growth Carbone – need to get out of deficit Consensus – good, no changes.</p>
<p>Policy 3.1 Require that 4.0 acres per 1,000 population be maintained as the City's parkland standard.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City is currently below this standard. Is there a vehicle to make it a stronger policy in the General Plan or part of an implementation program? • Is this a development standard now in other communities? (Other Yorba Linda esq communities- <p>Bent – is it current with master plan?</p> <p>Gorman – thinks we are meeting standard with the golf course</p> <p>Barquist – 3 per 1,000; but goal is to achieve 4 per 1,000 – look to achieve through acquisition. Consistent with parks and recreation master plan</p> <p>Knarr – specific to community parks. Best policy.</p> <p>Consensus – no change</p>
<p>Policy 3.2 Establish the following as initial standards for park development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mini-Park: 2,500 square feet to 2.5 acres b. Neighborhood Park: 2.5 to 5.0 acres, within 1/2 mile of its users c. Community Park: 5 to 20 acres, within 1/2 to two miles of its users d. Regional Park: 100 acres or greater, within a one-half hour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More appropriate for the Parks and Rec Master plan – This is very specific <p>Gorman – 2500 sf. seems small Barquist – can be up to 2.5 acres in master plan Gorman – make consistent with Master Plan Watts – can make it consistent with Parks and Rec Master Plan Barquist – Community Park within ½ to 3 miles; page 2-4 of document. Huang – question regarding distance of park – clarification on</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

drive	neighborhood vs. community park Consensus – make consistent with Parks and Rec MP
<p>Policy 3.3 Pursue the development of portions of the Santa Ana River, Featherly Regional Park, the Yorba Linda Lakebed and flood control drainages and detention basins for recreational uses which will not inhibit flood control purposes, or impact important visual open space, natural habitat areas, nor be adversely impacted by flooding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant portions should remain undeveloped as open space ensuring adequate wildlife habitat for all native species – including large mammals • Can we use YL Lakebed since it's County? See 3.3 comment. • Is this appropriate? <p>Gorman – delete Knarr – agree Hansen – agree Consensus to delete policy</p>
<p>Policy 3.4 Require that adequate acreage, per the City standard, of new parklands (minimum of five contiguous acres) be dedicated on-site as part of any new development, unless it becomes the objective of the City to develop a park to serve the subdivision at an alternative location, wherein in-lieu fees will be provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks within new developments should be within the development and held to the min. of 5 contiguous acres rather many mini parks. • Implementation issue? • Is this appropriate? <p>Lyons – ok as is Knarr – is this consistent with existing policy Barquist – this is the existing policy. Parks and Rec MP provides recommended standards – guideline. Consensus to keep as is</p>
<p>Policy 3.5 Pursue and acquire an appropriate site for a sports facility within the City which encompasses a broad array of active recreational facilities as described on pages RR-38 and RR-39.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tommy La Sorda gym? Veteran's Park? • Have we done this? <p>Gorman – delete Knarr – MP will address acquiring sites Gorman – don't have land to do anything. Hansen – what about Bastanchury site? Knarr – MP shows parkland is 100 acres short based on 4 acres/1,000 – whether or not a sports facility, will need park space. Lyons – doesn't consider sports facility the same as parkland. Watts – agree that it is specific – does this send message that it's a priority.</p>

**RECREATION &
RESOURCES ELEMENT**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Knarr – diverse group of residents and portfolio of facilities. Bent – doesn’t go with overall goal. Change from “sports” to just general park facilities – not locked into sports. MP will make it more specific. Watts – first proposal was to delete – not a majority Lyons – agree with Doug’s suggestion “....for recreational facility” instead of “sports” Consensus – agree on change per Lyons.</p>
<p><i>Goal 4 Ensure adequate funding sources for acquisition, operation and maintenance of park and recreation facilities within the City.</i></p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Policy 4.1 Continue to require developers of residential subdivisions to provide land or in-lieu fees based on the City's formula of number of units and cost of land to fund parkland acquisition and improvements. Fees shall be reviewed annually.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferable that developers provide land at the required level for a park (s) within the development. • THE PROVIDED LAND OPTION THE DEVELOPER SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO INCLUDE AN ENDOWMENT FUND TO COVER FUTURE MAINTENNACE OF THE LAND. <p>Knarr – good Lyons – need a provision to maintain – “...fund parkland acquisition, improvements, and maintenance.” Need to handle maintenance. Dedicate land, but no money to maintain. Also delete “Continue to” Start with “Require” Baker – multiple parcels are being added and increasing number of units being developed. How do we assess them? Watts – can’t do in this plan Staff – if don’t dedicate land, they pay in lieu fees. Pay per unit. Baker – fees are limited to acquisition – capital improvements, not maintenance. Watts – can we add some mechanism for maintenance. Lyons – let someone else figure out the details on how it gets done. Bent – can we make it “ongoing maintenance” Gorman – these issues are part of negotiations with a developer. Lyons – ability to negotiate enhanced if within GP Baker – once in GP has to be addressed with developer Watts – everyone agrees to delete “Continue to” from beginning – CONSENSUS Knarr – would leave maintenance out. Have to be competitive with market rate. Bent – mention negotiation – flexible. Huang – having maintenance would force City to include maintenance costs in the formula. Carbone – not going to have a developer maintain forever Huang – change formula to address maintenance – within fee Watts – issue of dealing with maintenance or not dealing with maintenance – How many in favor of leaving without maintenance</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>– 3; how many add maintenance generically – 6; is there anything else we can add. Add “maintenance to acquisition and improvement” – Majority Hansen – why don’t we add to all developments Barquist – can charge a fee as long as there is a nexus – should be discussed with City attorney – “maintenance” Watts – adding word maintenance, if a problem, can be discussed later. Baker – word “subdivision” is not correct. Don’t have to be subdivided to pay fee. Watts – get input from staff to see if we can had “commercial” Staff – take out “subdivision” and include “development” Watts – add “residential development” rather than “subdivision” – Consensus on change.</p>
<p>Policy 4.2 Develop fiscal criteria for the effective allocation of public resources for park and recreation facilities.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Policy 4.3 Identify new sources of funding for park and recreational facilities. a. Continue and expand mechanisms by which the City may accept gifts and dedications of parks, open space and facilities. b. Consider the sale of bonds, user fees, assessment districts and other sources that may be identified at a future date for park development and maintenance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. is very specific – would the city really issue bonds to do this? Even if they would are we potentially obligating ourselves by including this? <p>Knarr – propose more general and delete a and b. Majority agrees with recommended change.</p>
<p>Policy 4.4 Provide recreational facilities which are functional and are designed for cost effective maintenance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unnecessary policy statement <p>Delete – Consensus</p>
<p>Policy 4.5 Establish agreements wherever possible between the City and other public agencies for the purpose of development, operation, use and maintenance of recreation facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What about private? <p>Knarr – thinks it belongs here Lyons – would you include “private” Knarr – doesn’t have to restrict to “public” Baker – delete “public” Carbone – could be an agency Baker – “city and other entities...” Consensus on Baker recommendation</p>
<p>Policy 4.6 Plan recreational facilities to limit liability to the City and to protect the health and safety of citizens utilizing those facilities.</p>	<p>Gorman – thinking of adventure playground. Would hate to think it wouldn’t be built. Baker – can’t make it so there is no liability Watt – what happens if someone comes back and says we didn’t limit liability Bent – sees it as building safe facilities</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	Majority in favor to delete policy.
<p>Goal 5 Establish a trail system that meets the riding, hiking and bicycling needs of residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trails need to be connected thereby comprising a system <p>“Establish a multi-purpose trail system. “ - Consensus on recommended change</p>
<p>Policy 5.1 Require the dedication of right-of-way and construction of public trails as a condition of approval of development projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Everywhere in the city? <p>Bent – what about comment “everywhere in City” Baker – are we going to require of everyone/everywhere – not reasonable for all projects – blanket statement – should we change to in-lieu structure and funnel money to sites where trails work and can be connected. Staff – “...or in lieu fees” Baker – there are places where there will be no trail and silly to require a piece of trail that goes nowhere. Pay fee that can be used in functional place. Lyons Watts – “require the dedication of right-of-way and construction of public trails or in lieu fees as” Consensus on recommended change.</p>
<p>Policy 5.2 Separate trails from vehicular traffic wherever possible.</p>	No change
<p>Policy 5.3 Create bikeways which correlate with the circulation system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circulation Item? <p>Carbone – belong on multi-purpose trails, but to get funding from OCTA have to provide bike lanes. Bent – delete Majority agree to delete policy.</p>
<p>Policy 5.4 Provide for the construction of staging areas and trail connections that provide access to Chino Hills State Park.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider adding language that would discuss providing access to the Santa Ana River Bike Trail. Is this done? Do we want to pay for this? <p>Gorman - “Provide for the construction of “adequate” staging areas” Knarr – would prefer not to be as specific, remove “Chino Hills State Park” Public comment – connection to east and west Carbone – can be clarified in 5.5. Bent – do we have need for constructing new staging areas or maintaining existing. Knarr- always opportunity for new connections Baker – issue of accessibility. Bent – what is a staging area</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Hansen – add “adequate” Watts – “...adequate staging areas” can we add Santa Ana River. Baker – not specific to Chino Hills Staff – can make it generic. Gorman – end after trail connections. Carbone – needs to be specific to state parks. Gorman – policy before trailhead at Chino Hills State Park was made. Watts – “provide for construction of adequate staging areas and trails connection to adjacent recreational resources such as Chino Hills State Park and Santa Ana River.” – Consensus – agree on recommended change.</p>
<p>Policy 5.5 Complete the equestrian trail network through the community, with particular emphasis on extension of trails through the Shell and Murdock Properties, and connections</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Shell” and “Murdock” may not be appropriate terms. Should these be noted as “multi-purpose” trails as will also serve the needs of hikers, mountain bikers, etc.? • Can drop the reference to the Shell and Murdoch properties. Consider adding Cielo Vista and Esperanza Hills. Committee should consider language that discusses completion of the El Cajon Trail. • Appropriate? <p>Carbone – remove “Shell and Murdock” “Complete the multipurpose trail network throughout the City boundaries” – Consensus on recommended change.</p>
<p>Policy 5.6 Continue regional trail systems maintenance and operation within the City by the Yorba Linda Parks and Recreation Department or the Public Works Department.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.7 Route bikeways and multi-purpose trails to facilitate access to open space areas, recreational facilities, schools and shopping areas.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.8 Locate trails along designated scenic corridors wherever environmentally, physically, and economically feasible.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.9 Encourage commercial, office, industrial and multi-family residential developers to provide local bicycle trails and rack facilities within their projects as</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage or mandate? <p>No changes</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

conditions of development.	
Policy 5.10 Solicit and utilize all sources of local, regional, State and Federal funds to plan, acquire right-of-way and construct bikeways and equestrian trails, including such sources as SB 821 and SB 244 funds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these still available? How about other funding sources? <p>No changes – correct references or end sentence at equestrian trails.</p>
Policy 5.11 Assign priority to the completion of fragmentary portions of trails which currently exist in the City to ensure continuity and connection of all links in the trail system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our trails are linked. • Committee should discuss setting up Trail Completion Implementation Program. This could occur with discussion on completion of El Cajon Trail and a connection to the Santa Ana River Bike Trail. <p>Huang – is this the same as 5.5?</p> <p>Carbone – giving priority to trails that are fragmentary.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<i>Goal 6 Permanently preserve visual resources along existing and planned landscape corridors.</i>	CONTINUE HERE ON 4/22
Policy 6.1 Impose conditions on new development along landscaped corridors to preserve unique visual features.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage?
Policy 6.2 Design roadways that have visual quality and riding comfort. Design curves to take advantage of natural or man-made scenic features.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Policy 6.3 Incorporate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle trails into the right-of-way of landscaped corridors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-use trails?
<i>Goal 7 To permanently preserve natural resource areas of community and regional significance.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Policy 7.1 Preserve sensitive species and plant communities and wildlife habitats to the maximum extent possible through open space dedication and easements, creative site design and other workable mitigation actions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve corridors and sufficient natural areas to ensure populations of native predator species (bobcats, coyotes, mountain lions, hawks, etc.)
Policy 7.2 Require that appropriate resource protection measures are prepared and incorporated into development proposals.	

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>Policy 7.3 Conserve resource areas which are preserved through public and private acquisition by an aggressive open space management program including such techniques as revegetation, educational projects and other appropriate means.</p>	
<p>Policy 7.4 To the extent possible under the City's authority, manage the open space resources within and adjacent to the Santa Ana River Corridor, Featherly Regional Park, Brush Canyon, the Yorba Linda Lakebed, and the Chino Hills State Park in order to preserve their open space and resource conservation value where appropriate and capitalize on their recreation value where that is appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add: Manage open space resources not only for open space but also for wildlife habitat and wildlife access to Santa Ana River Corridor and Chino Hills State Park.
<p>Policy 7.5 Require the delineation of permanent open space areas within the Shell and Murdock Area Plans through more detailed development planning so that the steep slopes and important natural resource areas can be properly preserved and protected through specific plans or other appropriate development regulations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Shell" and "Murdock" may not be appropriate terms. • Drop reference to Shell and Murdock and make statement more generic. • Is this appropriate?
<p>Policy 7.6 Require development proposals in areas expected to contain important plant communities and wildlife habitat to provide detailed biological assessments.</p>	
<p>Policy 7.7 Seek preservation of the mountain lion corridor from Coal Canyon to the Chino Hills area with particular emphasis on establishing a workable means of mountain lion passage through the Saba Property.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this the only mountain lion corridor within the city or adjacent lands? • What does this mean?
<p>Policy 7.8 Maintain an inventory of existing sensitive resources in and adjacent to the City through periodic updates of the General Plan Technical Document.</p>	
<p>Policy 7.9 Limit designated open space areas that contain sensitive biological resources to passive recreation uses.</p>	
<p><i>Goal 8 To permanently preserve and protect sensitive hillside areas within and adjacent to the community.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 8.1 Provide for the preservation of</p>	

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

sensitive hillside and canyon areas within the City.	
Policy 8.2 Respect the natural landform as a part of site planning and architectural design to minimize grading and visual impact.	
Policy 8.3 Control erosion during and following construction through proper grading techniques, vegetation replanting and the installation of proper drainage, and erosion control improvements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation issue
Policy 8.4 Require the practice of proper soil management techniques to reduce erosion, sedimentation, and other soil-related problems.	Shouldn't this be an implementation program? Connect to City grading policy?
Policy 8.5 Preserve significant natural features, including sensitive hillsides as part of new development.	Duplicative
Policy 8.6 Require analysis of visual quality impacts of proposed development projects on a project-by-project basis.	
<i>Goal 9 To preserve and enhance the Santa Ana River as an open space/recreation opportunity.</i>	
Policy 9.1 Work with The County of Orange in promoting the preservation of natural resources within the Santa Ana River corridor.	
Policy 9.2 Preserve and enhance the Santa Ana River corridor and other stream courses in the City.	
Policy 9.3 Maintain ecological balance by protecting infringement on those areas in and along the Santa Ana River which have significant environmental value.	
Policy 9.4 Preserve riparian areas in the Santa Ana River area as sources of shelter and water for wildlife.	
Policy 9.5 Preserve a continuous open space corridor along the Santa Ana River in order to maintain animal migration opportunities and preserve natural and recreational resource values.	
Policy 9.6 Require a definitive biological	

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>study to identify mitigative actions which may include a minimum setback from riparian vegetation areas for new development, replacement of riparian vegetation, or other suitable measures.</p>	
<p>Policy 9.7 Provide open space and trail connections between Yorba Linda and the County's Santa Ana River Trail wherever possible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aha. Here's the policy that I was looking for. Suggest expanding this statement and for Committee to discuss.
<p>Policy 9.8 Pursue the possibility of establishing active recreation uses in portions of Featherly regional Park in which sensitive natural resource preservation is not of predominant importance.</p>	
<p><i>Goal 10 To enhance the interrelationship of the City's open space resources and Chino Hills State Park.</i></p>	
<p>Policy 10.1 Provide earthen multipurpose trail alignments for hiking, equestrian and bicycle trails on segments of regional trails within the City wherever possible.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.2 Develop staging centers where appropriate to complement existing and proposed trail connections into Chino Hills State Park.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wasn't a staging area developed? If so, consider saying "maintain."
<p>Policy 10.3 Protect sensitive wildlife and plant life communities.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.4 Maintain the majority of Brush Canyon in its natural state.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.5 Enhance and retain appropriate portions of Brush Canyon as a sustainable natural habitat as a 300 acre wildlife preserve and corridor from the San Bernardino County line to the Santa Ana River.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.6 Ensure continuation of open space resources in their natural state through a long term preservation program.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.7 Implement policies guiding the City of Yorba Linda/Chino Hills State Park relationships in such a way that reasonable benefits accrue to the citizens of Yorba Linda through appropriate negotiations with the State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation issue. • Committee should consider adding a policy that discusses the environmentally sensitive land in the proposed Cielo Vista and Esperanza Hills properties. After all, they are part of the City's sphere of influence.

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>Goal 11 To protect and conserve surface water, groundwater and imported water resources.</p>	
<p>Policy 11.1 Require appropriate water usage mitigation measures on all development projects.</p>	
<p>Policy 11.2 Review all development proposals and public facility improvement plans to ensure water resources are conserved to the maximum extent possible.</p>	
<p>Policy 11.3 Require drought-tolerant landscaping, water conserving fixtures, reuse of wastewater when feasible and the capture of storm runoff in all private and public development projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add language that requires the City to maintain and utilize a drought tolerant plant list. Implementation program? Also, add language that requires City to update irrigation systems to new water saving technologies, like xerigation and moisture sensors, etc.
<p>Policy 11.4 Design flood control and drainage facilities to provide protection from inundation from a 100-year flood event.</p>	
<p>Policy 11.5 Retain local drainage courses, channels and creeks in their natural condition where possible.</p>	
<p>Policy 11.6 Protect groundwater from sources of pollution.</p>	
<p>Goal 12 To permanently preserve significant cultural or historical buildings, sites or features within the community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this policy necessary since there is a Historic Resources Element? May be redundant. However, it may be a good idea to keep these policies since not everyone reads the entire General Plan, even those currently on or running for the City Council. 😊
<p>Policy 12.1 Protect significant areas of historical, archaeological, educational or paleontological resources.</p>	
<p>Policy 12.2 Require effective mitigation measures where development may affect historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.</p>	
<p>Policy 12.3 Require the preparation of archaeological or paleontological reports in areas where there is potential to impact cultural resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHERE WOULD THAT BE AND HOW IS THAT DETERMINED?
<p>Policy 12.4 Require that an archaeologist be retained to observe grading activities in</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this overly burdensome?

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

areas where the probable presence of archaeological or paleontological resources is indicated.	
Policy 12.5 Preserve uncovered resources in their natural state, as much as feasible to assure their preservation and availability for later study.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Goal 13 To properly manage designated areas for mineral extraction to meet the needs of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording seems broad. Committee should be provided with information and discuss potential impact of future mineral (assume includes oil and gas) extraction on residents and quality of life. Should General Plan include restrictions as to such development? • Need some background to comment on the contents of Goal 13
Policy 13.1 Compile and maintain maps and descriptions of mineral resources as a basis for policy and program implementation.	
Policy 13.2 Document current extraction sites, including sand and gravel quarries, including the current status and duration of existing permits and approvals, for compliance monitoring.	
Policy 13.3 Cooperate with other governmental agencies and educational institutions to arrange for the development and exchange of information on mineral resources.	
Policy 13.4 Develop rationale as to why mining is not a feasible use of the properties classified as resource sectors by the SMARA to support request for deletion of the area as a potential mineral resource supply.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mining? Really? In Yorba Linda? Is this policy necessary? Does mining include oil extraction?
Policy 13.5 Require that all mineral extraction reclamation plans be consistent with the policies and procedures of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don't need a policy to say follow the law.
Policy 13.6 Require that permits for reclamation projects specify compliance with State, federal, and local standards and attainment programs with respect to air quality, watersheds and basins, and erosion potential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don't need a policy to say follow the law.
NEW POLICIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 2.13 Be aware of existing and planned local residential densities when planning the location of park

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
	<p>facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 14: Preserve equestrian/agricultural land sites. • Committee should consider adding a policy for a “public” equestrian facility.

**Tuesday, April 21, 2014
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

**III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN
POLICY PROGRAM – RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT**

Refer to Attachment “A”

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<i>Goal 1 To permanently preserve and maintain public and private open space.</i>	<p>These seem fine – consolidate where appropriate.</p> <p>Carbone – wants to leave, would like to see more open space. What is difference between private and public park? Knarr – why need “permanently” is there significance to it Hansen – thinks it is significant; not to be changed, not to be altered Huang – it doesn’t add anything Lyons – no such thing as permanent, although our intent is to keep it in perpetuity Consensus – do not delete permanently</p>
Policy 1.1 Mitigate the impacts of development on sensitive lands such as steep slopes, cultural resources and sensitive habitats through the development review process.	No changes
Policy 1.2 Preserve and protect the scenic and visual quality of canyon and hillside	No changes

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

areas as a resource of public importance.	
Policy 1.3 Achieve the retention of permanent open space through dedication as a part of the development site plan and subdivision/review process.	No changes
Policy 1.4 Concentrate higher intensity recreation uses in areas containing less sensitive resources and landforms and preserve the most sensitive landforms and natural resources as passive open space.	Huang – what is considered a higher intensity recreation use Watts – soccer vs picnic Knarr – organized vs spontaneous DB – programming and use of the site No changes
Policy 1.5 Insure that conversion of open space from vacant or passive status to permanent resource conservation or active recreation use is accompanied by a thorough analysis of site characteristics and potentials justifying the permanent open space use.	No changes
<i>Goal 2 To provide a balanced system of public and private parks and recreation facilities achieved in cooperation with the Yorba Linda Parks and Recreation Department, School Districts and private community associations.</i>	Carbone – what is a private vs public park Harris – can be owned by private association; HOA Carbone – private streets where unload horses; people in HOA don't want us to unload Huang – there is a park/playground in Vista Del Verde that people use that do not live in the tract. It's open street. Watts – issue is what is public vs private. Is it a term of the cities? How do we define Gorman – private means privately owned. Can say as we approve buildout, have to keep as a private park. Part of negotiation of new building tract as it comes in. Can encourage when reviewing plans for buildout. For the community for the most part. Barquist – a matter of who is paying for it. Watts - do we need it in there Bent – need to keep for new neighborhood to build park and service community Watts – can we just delete; keep Knarr – comingling different ideas – should have a goal that talks about City assets and then different goal for contracts with school districts and private. Huang – is the reason for goal that if City is unable to build something, we require new development to build parks, but private park has to be within City's requirements. Barquist – the purpose of the goal is the stated end. Looking at a larger level, is there access to private facilities. If idea is for public to have access to it, why have private. Private is about maintenance, not accessibility. Gorman – thought key word is “balanced”. Looking at all facilities and how needs are being met. Some are being met privately. Baker – Esperanza says it's planning soccer fields, but can't drive to

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>get there. HOA going to maintain them. No way to get up there. Kids will be crowding on fields in YL where they can be accessed. Doesn't really meet our community need. Can't be used with way the access is structured. Going to get credit and it's open to public, but not really helping out City. Will probably go partially unused. Carbone – what parks are private now. We don't any say in School District and their design. City engages in contract to use the facility. That would be a private park, but don't have any say in design. Watts – any reason to not have goal 2 as part of General Plan. Is it legitimate?</p> <p>Huang- it's legitimate, but should we put it in a goal or a policy. Balanced system with adding accessibility as a policy.</p> <p>Knarr – recommend amend to read “provide a balanced system of parks and recreation facilities.” Need new goal for private and public.</p> <p>Bent – don't have problem with goal as it is. Policy is referring to accessibility.</p> <p>Watts – 6 in favor of goal as stated. Leave the goal as is.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1 Provide park and recreational facilities that meet the needs of senior citizens, young adults, children, disabled individuals and families.</p>	<p>Carbone – good on goal</p> <p>Knarr – would just say “all residents”</p> <p>Hansen – ok as is</p> <p>Baker – inadvertently will leave out someone; better to make it simple</p> <p>Lyons – agree</p> <p>Hunag – fine as is</p> <p>Gorman – good</p> <p>Watts – what about “Provide park and recreational facilities that meet the needs of residents”.</p> <p>Hansen – listing everyone shows that there are different people with different needs</p> <p>Bent – are these specifics in our planning process already? We consider everyone in our planning process.</p> <p>Barquist – Parks and Rec Master Plan considers all users. Suggest: “Provide parks and recreation facilities that respond to the needs of Yorba Linda's residents”</p> <p>Lyons – I like it</p> <p>Consensus on recommended change by Barquist</p>
<p>Policy 2.2 Ensure that park sites and programs are accessible to all residents.</p>	<p>Huang – concerned with “accessibility”</p> <p>Bent – want to say “reasonably” accessible?</p> <p>Huang – agree</p> <p>Watts – maybe we should let the developer prove it is accessible.</p> <p>Bent – do we need to worry about different meaning of accessibility?</p> <p>Barquist – by law have to provide accessibility. Does that community have access to the services? May add in “recreational facilities”</p> <p>“Ensure that park and recreational facilities are available and</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>accessible to all residents” Staff – anyone can access the park. No encumbrances Huang – can’t use park in Vista Del Verde – have to climb over railing; field is already inaccessible. Consensus on Barquist recommendation - “Ensure that park and recreational facilities are available and accessible to all residents”</p>
<p>Policy 2.3 Provide high quality existing and new facilities which are compatible with adjacent land uses.</p> <p>a. Develop master site plans for each park to ensure that the siting of buildings, open air facilities and landscape are unified, functionally related to efficiency, and compatible with adjacent uses.</p> <p>b. Design and develop parks to complement and reflect their natural environmental setting and maximize their open space character.</p> <p>c. Design and improve neighborhood and community parks so that uses and parking do not adversely impact adjacent residences, and landscaping is compatible with adjacent areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is very specific <p>Hansen – fine with me Baker – long and detailed; should it be broken up. Lyons – no problem with organization; have a problem with “c” because some people object to noise. If residence next to park, should expect to have kids yelling. Bent – ok as is Watts – I would break it down, but not passionate about it Huang – ok with it Gorman – have issue with it. In this City have a tendency to plan a park and not get funded for many years. Pay for it being planned, but then nothing being done and things change and plan may not be applicable. Need time frame or limit on when we do this. Tier 1 project, some funding that we can use. Waste money designing a park that we may not build. Watts – ok as is – 5 majority – leave as is</p>
<p>Policy 2.4 Facilitate cooperative joint use of school facilities and programs for enhancement of recreation programs.</p>	<p>Hansen – good Lyons – good Baker – good Huang – good Consensus – leave as is</p>
<p>Policy 2.5 Pursue the construction of public golf courses in the City.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Black Gold public golf course completed. Fiscal Implications with existing golf course. DON’T NEED ANY MORE Already done—Black Gold. This policy is no longer needed IMO. The City has a public golf course and there is a private golf club in the adjacent County island. <p>Carbone – no more golf courses; we have 2</p> <p>Gorman – put something in there about overseeing management of golf course. Should have something in GP.</p> <p>Huang – is it a GP issue</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Watts – does 2.7 address it?</p> <p>Majority agree to delete 2.5</p>
<p>Policy 2.6 Provide both active and passive park sites within the City.</p>	<p>Carbone – what is passive vs active Barquist – wouldn't have any facilities. Knarr – walking, no organized parks Baker – not useable</p>
<p>Policy 2.7 Maintain and enhance existing park sites within the City.</p>	<p>Gorman – fine Carbone – good Hansen – good Bent – add park and recreation sites. Baker – should add “and recreation” throughout the policies Huang – does 2.7 address Gorman’s comment re: golf course Gorman – need a separate policy addressing management of golf course. City owns the facility. We don’t address the golf course at all. Bent – ok adding a goal and some policies to address golf course and management Huang – thinks it should be a separate goal and policy – fiscally responsible. Have solvency goal, better oversight. Watts – sees it more as a CC issue on a regular basis Barquist – more of a contractual issue – as a recreational facility, is it already addressed. Watts – add to 2.7 “Maintain, effectively manage, and enhance...” Gorman – similar to trash contract; do we have that in GP Knarr – we include school districts in plan Carbone – leave as is and add “parks and recreation” Consensus – no change; revise to include recreation facilities.</p>
<p>Policy 2.8 Permit flexible park planning and design where recreation value can thereby be improved. Provide a diversity of uses and facilities within park sites.</p>	<p>Consensus – no change, leave as is</p>
<p>Policy 2.9 Ensure a park master planning process that is responsive to community input.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this need to be here? <p>Consensus – agree to delete</p>
<p>Policy 2.10 Identify recreational uses for the Yorba Linda Lakebed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desired by surrounding community? • Not owned by the City nor under City control • Is this an appropriate policy since the YL Lakebed is still County and part of County flood control? Can we develop policy that discusses annexing Lakebed? • Where is this now?

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	Consensus – agree to delete
<p>Policy 2.11 Investigate the feasibility of utilizing underground water reservoirs for recreation purposes through a joint use agreement with the Yorba Linda Water Department.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is planned here? Aquifers? • What does this mean in practical terms? • What does this mean? <p>Baker – Water Dept has been open to discussing using reservoirs for parks. Don't want to take on maintenance. A lot of flat open space that can be used if can pay for it.</p> <p>Lyons – utilize useable space</p> <p>Knarr – not an open area, no lights, no parking- delete it</p> <p>Huang – I'd like to keep because of lack of water storage and part of current bond proposal is to put money in for water storage, recharging water – continue to have dialogue and make it useable. Still have not built underground water storage. Not sure if money will help YL.</p> <p>Carbone – agree have a water issue; but it's not a park/recreation issue.</p> <p>Huang – don't want land to become unusable because using it for storage. Use the land on top and everyone benefits. Question if bond will bring money to city to put park on top of reservoirs.</p> <p>Hansen – change wording to be clear</p> <p>Watts – needs to relate to recreational use</p> <p>Gorman – language is harmless and weak. No reason to not have it in. Who knows what will happen in future. Doesn't stop people from doing what they are doing.</p> <p>Bent – can you put hard surfaces above. Recreational an opportunity. Can be in land use side; solar panels.</p> <p>Watts – vote to leave in – majority agree to leave in; majority vote to leave in, but with changes.</p> <p>Lyons – change "Department" to "District" "...the surface of underground water reservoirs...."</p> <p>Agree on changes per Lyons</p>
<p>Policy 2.12 Actively pursue the development of existing park facilities to their maximum potential.</p>	No change
<p>Goal 3 Provide park facilities to meet the needs of existing and future residents, including acreage to offset the current deficit and provide for projected population growth.</p>	<p>Huang – ok</p> <p>Gorman – parks 90% used by youth sports and cost a lot of money. Don't use on Friday nights and Sundays. If add in that time can get use. Youth sports may have to get used to using at that time instead of building more parks.</p> <p>Carbone – agree and keep</p> <p>Knarr – important to provide for population growth</p> <p>Carbone – need to get out of deficit</p> <p>Consensus – good, no changes.</p>
<p>Policy 3.1 Require that 4.0 acres per 1,000 population be maintained as the City's parkland standard.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City is currently below this standard. Is there a vehicle to make it a stronger policy in the General Plan or part of an implementation program?

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this a development standard now in other communities? (Other Yorba Linda esq communities- <p>Bent – is it current with master plan?</p> <p>Gorman – thinks we are meeting standard with the golf course</p> <p>Barquist – 3 per 1,000; but goal is to achieve 4 per 1,000 – look to achieve through acquisition. Consistent with parks and recreation master plan</p> <p>Knarr – specific to community parks. Best policy.</p> <p>Consensus – no change</p>
<p>Policy 3.2 Establish the following as initial standards for park development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mini-Park: 2,500 square feet to 2.5 acres b. Neighborhood Park: 2.5 to 5.0 acres, within 1/2 mile of its users c. Community Park: 5 to 20 acres, within 1/2 to two miles of its users d. Regional Park: 100 acres or greater, within a one-half hour drive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More appropriate for the Parks and Rec Master plan – This is very specific <p>Gorman – 2500 sf. seems small</p> <p>Barquist – can be up to 2.5 acres in master plan</p> <p>Gorman – make consistent with Master Plan</p> <p>Watts – can make it consistent with Parks and Rec Master Plan</p> <p>Barquist – Community Park within ½ to 3 miles; page 2-4 of document.</p> <p>Huang – question regarding distance of park – clarification on neighborhood vs. community park</p> <p>Consensus – make consistent with Parks and Rec MP</p>
<p>Policy 3.3 Pursue the development of portions of the Santa Ana River, Featherly Regional Park, the Yorba Linda Lakebed and flood control drainages and detention basins for recreational uses which will not inhibit flood control purposes, or impact important visual open space, natural habitat areas, nor be adversely impacted by flooding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant portions should remain undeveloped as open space ensuring adequate wildlife habitat for all native species – including large mammals Can we use YL Lakebed since it's County? See 3.3 comment. Is this appropriate? <p>Gorman – delete</p> <p>Knarr – agree</p> <p>Hansen – agree</p> <p>Consensus to delete policy</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>Policy 3.4 Require that adequate acreage, per the City standard, of new parklands (minimum of five contiguous acres) be dedicated on-site as part of any new development, unless it becomes the objective of the City to develop a park to serve the subdivision at an alternative location, wherein in-lieu fees will be provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks within new developments should be within the development and held to the min. of 5 contiguous acres rather than many mini parks. • Implementation issue? • Is this appropriate? <p>Lyons – ok as is Knarr – is this consistent with existing policy Barquist – this is the existing policy. Parks and Rec MP provides recommended standards – guideline. Consensus to keep as is</p>
<p>Policy 3.5 Pursue and acquire an appropriate site for a sports facility within the City which encompasses a broad array of active recreational facilities as described on pages RR-38 and RR-39.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tommy La Sorda gym? Veteran’s Park? • Have we done this? <p>Gorman – delete Knarr – MP will address acquiring sites Gorman – don’t have land to do anything. Hansen – what about Bastanchury site? Knarr – MP shows parkland is 100 acres short based on 4 acres/1,000 – whether or not a sports facility, will need park space. Lyons – doesn’t consider sports facility the same as parkland. Watts – agree that it is specific – does this send message that it’s a priority. Knarr – diverse group of residents and portfolio of facilities. Bent – doesn’t go with overall goal. Change from “sports” to just general park facilities – not locked into sports. MP will make it more specific. Watts – first proposal was to delete – not a majority Lyons – agree with Doug’s suggestion “....for recreational facility” instead of “sports” Consensus – agree on change per Lyons.</p>
<p><i>Goal 4 Ensure adequate funding sources for acquisition, operation and maintenance of park and recreation facilities within the City.</i></p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Policy 4.1 Continue to require developers of residential subdivisions to provide land or in-lieu fees based on the City's formula of number of units and cost of land to fund parkland acquisition and improvements. Fees shall be reviewed annually.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferable that developers provide land at the required level for a park (s) within the development. • THE PROVIDED LAND OPTION THE DEVELOPER SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO INCLUDE AN ENDOWMENT FUND TO COVER FUTURE MAINTENANCE OF THE LAND. <p>Knarr – good Lyons – need a provision to maintain – “...fund parkland acquisition,</p>

**RECREATION &
RESOURCES ELEMENT**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>improvements, and maintenance.” Need to handle maintenance. Dedicate land, but no money to maintain. Also delete “Continue to” Start with “Require” Baker – multiple parcels are being added and increasing number of units being developed. How do we assess them? Watts – can’t do in this plan Staff – if don’t dedicate land, they pay in lieu fees. Pay per unit. Baker – fees are limited to acquisition – capital improvements, not maintenance. Watts – can we add some mechanism for maintenance. Lyons – let someone else figure out the details on how it gets done. Bent – can we make it “ongoing maintenance” Gorman – these issues are part of negotiations with a developer. Lyons – ability to negotiate enhanced if within GP Baker – once in GP has to be addressed with developer Watts – everyone agrees to delete “Continue to” from beginning – CONSENSUS Knarr – would leave maintenance out. Have to be competitive with market rate. Bent – mention negotiation – flexible. Huang – having maintenance would force City to include maintenance costs in the formula. Carbone – not going to have a developer maintain forever Huang – change formula to address maintenance – within fee Watts – issue of dealing with maintenance or not dealing with maintenance – How many in favor of leaving without maintenance – 3; how many add maintenance generically – 6; is there anything else we can add. Add “maintenance to acquisition and improvement” – Majority Hansen – why don’t we add to all developments Barquist – can charge a fee as long as there is a nexus – should be discussed with City attorney – “maintenance” Watts – adding word maintenance, if a problem, can be discussed later. Baker – word “subdivision” is not correct. Don’t have to be subdivided to pay fee. Watts – get input from staff to see if we can had “commercial” Staff – take out “subdivision” and include “development” Watts – add “residential development” rather than “subdivision” – Consensus on change.</p>
<p>Policy 4.2 Develop fiscal criteria for the effective allocation of public resources for park and recreation facilities.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Policy 4.3 Identify new sources of funding for park and recreational facilities. a. Continue and expand mechanisms by which the City may</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b. is very specific – would the city really issue bonds to do this? Even if they would are we potentially obligating ourselves by including this?

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>accept gifts and dedications of parks, open space and facilities. b. Consider the sale of bonds, user fees, assessment districts and other sources that may be identified at a future date for park development and maintenance.</p>	<p>Knarr – propose more general and delete a and b. Majority agrees with recommended change.</p>
<p>Policy 4.4 Provide recreational facilities which are functional and are designed for cost effective maintenance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unnecessary policy statement <p>Delete – Consensus</p>
<p>Policy 4.5 Establish agreements wherever possible between the City and other public agencies for the purpose of development, operation, use and maintenance of recreation facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What about private? <p>Knarr – thinks it belongs here Lyons – would you include “private” Knarr – doesn’t have to restrict to “public” Baker – delete “public” Carbone – could be an agency Baker – “city and other entities....” Consensus on Baker recommendation</p>
<p>Policy 4.6 Plan recreational facilities to limit liability to the City and to protect the health and safety of citizens utilizing those facilities.</p>	<p>Gorman – thinking of adventure playground. Would hate to think it wouldn’t be built. Baker – can’t make it so there is no liability Watt – what happens if someone comes back and says we didn’t limit liability Bent – sees it as building safe facilities Majority in favor to delete policy.</p>
<p><i>Goal 5 Establish a trail system that meets the riding, hiking and bicycling needs of residents.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trails need to be connected thereby comprising a system <p>“Establish a multi-purpose trail system.” - Consensus on recommended change</p>
<p>Policy 5.1 Require the dedication of right-of-way and construction of public trails as a condition of approval of development projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Everywhere in the city? <p>Bent – what about comment “everywhere in City” Baker – are we going to require of everyone/everywhere – not reasonable for all projects – blanket statement – should we change to in-lieu structure and funnel money to sites where trails work and can be connected. Staff – “...or in lieu fees” Baker – there are places where there will be no trail and silly to require a piece of trail that goes nowhere. Pay fee that can be used in functional place. Lyons Watts – “require the dedication of right-of-way and construction of public trails or in lieu fees as” Consensus on recommended change.</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>Policy 5.2 Separate trails from vehicular traffic wherever possible.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Policy 5.3 Create bikeways which correlate with the circulation system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulation Item? <p>Carbone – belong on multi-purpose trails, but to get funding from OCTA have to provide bike lanes. Bent – delete Majority agree to delete policy.</p>
<p>Policy 5.4 Provide for the construction of staging areas and trail connections that provide access to Chino Hills State Park.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider adding language that would discuss providing access to the Santa Ana River Bike Trail. • Is this done? Do we want to pay for this? <p>Gorman - "Provide for the construction of "adequate" staging areas"....</p> <p>Knarr – would prefer not to be as specific, remove "Chino Hills State Park"</p> <p>Public comment – connection to east and west Carbone – can be clarified in 5.5. Bent – do we have need for constructing new staging areas or maintaining existing. Knarr- always opportunity for new connections Baker – issue of accessibility. Bent – what is a staging area Hansen – add "adequate" Watts – "...adequate staging areas" can we add Santa Ana River. Baker – not specific to Chino Hills Staff – can make it generic. Gorman – end after trail connections. Carbone – needs to be specific to state parks. Gorman – policy before trailhead at Chino Hills State Park was made. Watts – "provide for construction of adequate staging areas and trails connection to adjacent recreational resources such as Chino Hills State Park and Santa Ana River." – Consensus – agree on recommended change.</p>
<p>Policy 5.5 Complete the equestrian trail network through the community, with particular emphasis on extension of trails through the Shell and Murdock Properties, and connections</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Shell" and "Murdock" may not be appropriate terms. Should these be noted as "multi-purpose" trails as will also serve the needs of hikers, mountain bikers, etc.? • Can drop the reference to the Shell and Murdoch properties. Consider adding Cielo Vista and Esperanza Hills. Committee should consider language that discusses completion of the El Cajon Trail.

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate? <p>Carbone – remove “Shell and Murdock” “Complete the multipurpose trail network throughout the City boundaries” – Consensus on recommended change.</p>
<p>Policy 5.6 Continue regional trail systems maintenance and operation within the City by the Yorba Linda Parks and Recreation Department or the Public Works Department.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.7 Route bikeways and multi-purpose trails to facilitate access to open space areas, recreational facilities, schools and shopping areas.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.8 Locate trails along designated scenic corridors wherever environmentally, physically, and economically feasible.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.9 Encourage commercial, office, industrial and multi-family residential developers to provide local bicycle trails and rack facilities within their projects as conditions of development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage or mandate? <p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.10 Solicit and utilize all sources of local, regional, State and Federal funds to plan, acquire right-of-way and construct bikeways and equestrian trails, including such sources as SB 821 and SB 244 funds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these still available? How about other funding sources? <p>No changes – correct references or end sentence at equestrian trails.</p>
<p>Policy 5.11 Assign priority to the completion of fragmentary portions of trails which currently exist in the City to ensure continuity and connection of all links in the trail system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our trails are linked. • Committee should discuss setting up Trail Completion Implementation Program. This could occur with discussion on completion of El Cajon Trail and a connection to the Santa Ana River Bike Trail. <p>Huang – is this the same as 5.5?</p> <p>Carbone – giving priority to trails that are fragmentary.</p> <p>No change.</p>
	<p>No comments</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>Goal 6 Permanently preserve visual resources along existing and planned landscape corridors.</p>	
<p>Policy 6.1 Impose conditions on new development along landscaped corridors to preserve unique visual features.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage? <p>No comments</p>
<p>Policy 6.2 Design roadways that have visual quality and riding comfort. Design curves to take advantage of natural or man-made scenic features.</p>	<p>Adams – leave as is</p>
<p>Policy 6.3 Incorporate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle trails into the right-of-way of landscaped corridors.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-use trails? <p>Knarr – can say “incorporate trails” or just say “multi-use”. Hansen – question of difference with horse trails Lyons – that would be categorically a multi-use trail. Sign says who has precedence Adams – changing to multi-use trail? Lyons – take out pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle and use multi-use Staff – in the code multi-use is defined Hansen – multi-use refers to one trail, still need to address others Staff – would need to expand the list Bent – many mentioned horse trails are multi-use because you can bike on them, walk on them, etc. Barquist – recommended text...XXXX</p>
<p>Goal 7 To permanently preserve natural resource areas of community and regional significance.</p>	<p>No comments</p>
<p>Policy 7.1 Preserve sensitive species and plant communities and wildlife habitats to the maximum extent possible through open space dedication and easements, creative site design and other workable mitigation actions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve corridors and sufficient natural areas to ensure populations of native predator species (bobcats, coyotes, mountain lions, hawks, etc.) <p>Adams – concerned with “maximum extent possible” – would say “...species, including predators and plant communities...” eliminate maximum extent possible. Hansen – agree Adams – include “corridors” – projects not considering predators. Need enough areas to preserve larger species. Need more space. Watts – add “corridors” within open space dedication and easements...” Barquist – Adams – concerned people are going to interpret sensitive species to be smaller species and not larger species at top of food chain. Need to include native predator species - “Sensitive species, native</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>predator species, and plant communities". Also add in word "corridors"</p> <p>Hansen – can we add another policy.</p> <p>Bent – concerned with being too specific in General Plan</p> <p>Adams – natural species and plant communities"</p> <p>Lyons/Adams – "preserve native wildlife and plant communities, and their habitats"</p>
<p>Policy 7.2 Require that appropriate resource protection measures are prepared and incorporated into development proposals.</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Policy 7.3 Conserve resource areas which are preserved through public and private acquisition by an aggressive open space management program including such techniques as revegetation, educational projects and other appropriate means.</p>	<p>Watts – remove "aggressive"</p> <p>Bent – agree</p> <p>Lyons – City Council would have to agree to implement</p>
<p>Policy 7.4 To the extent possible under the City's authority, manage the open space resources within and adjacent to the Santa Ana River Corridor, Featherly Regional Park, Brush Canyon, the Yorba Linda Lakebed, and the Chino Hills State Park in order to preserve their open space and resource conservation value where appropriate and capitalize on their recreation value where that is appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add: Manage open space resources not only for open space but also for wildlife habitat and wildlife access to Santa Ana River Corridor and Chino Hills State Park. <p>Knarr – too specific – recommend changing to "Participate in open space management"</p> <p>Huang – agree with change</p> <p>Adams – important to doing something adjacent to those areas</p> <p>Behura – we support existence of areas</p> <p>Watts – "manage" not correct because we are not managing</p> <p>Behura – if it's within, we do "manage"</p> <p>Watts – remove "to the extent possible under the City's authority" and replace with "Support"</p> <p>Adams – end after "value"</p>
<p>Policy 7.5 Require the delineation of permanent open space areas within the Shell and Murdock Area Plans through more detailed development planning so that the steep slopes and important natural resource areas can be properly preserved and protected through specific plans or other appropriate development regulations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Shell" and "Murdock" may not be appropriate terms. Drop reference to Shell and Murdock and make statement more generic. Is this appropriate? <p>Watts – remove "more" after "through".</p> <p>Staff – remove "shell and Murdock"</p> <p>Adams – remove "within"</p> <p>Recommendation: XXX</p>
<p>Policy 7.6 Require development proposals in areas expected to contain important plant communities and wildlife habitat to provide detailed biological assessments.</p>	<p>Adams – "containing" instead of "expected"</p> <p>Recommendation "which may contain"</p>
<p>Policy 7.7 Seek preservation of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this the only mountain lion corridor within the city or

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>mountain lion corridor from Coal Canyon to the Chino Hills area with particular emphasis on establishing a workable means of mountain lion passage through the Saba Property.</p>	<p>adjacent lands?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does this mean? <p>Huang – are we responsible for maintaining? Staff – state purchased, but located within Yorba Linda Watts – “support preservation” or “preserve” Gorman – if state owns, we don’t have anything to do with it. Just support continuation Staff – if sold as an asset and someone wants to develop, we have policy noting we want to preserve it as a corridor Bent – want to make sure preserve doesn’t mean maintain Watt – use word “support preservation” Agree on “support preservation” Behura – is reference to “Saba Property” the appropriate term – will it be clear Staff – history of property has always been Saba Property</p>
<p>Policy 7.8 Maintain an inventory of existing sensitive resources in and adjacent to the City through periodic updates of the General Plan Technical Document.</p>	<p>Huang – how often do we do updates to General Plan Barquist – every 10 years to update according to state; review annually Huang – if already required, does the General Plan need to say it Adams – think we need to leave it Watts – leave off “through periodic updates” – creates an obligation we don’t need to create Hansen – need to keep obligation; otherwise won’t be current Barquist – can be done separately Adams – “through period updates” – end there Watts – agree Hansen – current isn’t defined Delete “periodic updates” add “current” – Agree</p>
<p>Policy 7.9 Limit designated open space areas that contain sensitive biological resources to passive recreation uses.</p>	<p>Lyons – doesn’t see policy as good Adams – saying we will leave it as passive recreation Lyons – take out “designated” – “limit the use of open space areas that contain sensitive biological resources to passive recreation uses”.</p>
<p>Goal 8 To permanently preserve and protect sensitive hillside areas within and adjacent to the community.</p>	<p>Bent – what does “protect” mean – if adjacent, then not in our community Adams – it does say “within” Baker – county lands which may be within sphere of influence – need to influence their future through General Plan Bent – “Support”? Behura – need to define within and without Adams – does it address issue of County islands within City Watts – require preservation inside City and support preservation outside of the City – divide into 2 goals</p>
<p>Policy 8.1 Provide for the preservation of sensitive hillside and canyon areas within the City.</p>	<p>Behura – what does provide mean – are we funding Watts – want to say to preserve sensitive hillside and canyon areas Bent – “Support preservation of....”</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Behura – sounds like we are financially responsible Baker – “Require preservation....” Lyons – unenforceable</p>
<p>Policy 8.2 Respect the natural landform as a part of site planning and architectural design to minimize grading and visual impact.</p>	<p>Watts – what does “respect” mean Behura – what does it actually accomplish Lyons – like it as is Behura – “Support the natural” Huang – like “respect” Agree to leave “respect”</p>
<p>Policy 8.3 Control erosion during and following construction through proper grading techniques, vegetation replanting and the installation of proper drainage, and erosion control improvements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation issue <p>Lyons – purpose of the grading plan Bent – “Require the control of erosion” Staff - “Require erosion control measures during and following construction activities...” Lyons – stop after “proper grading techniques”. Hansen – should keep proper drainage Adams – vegetation and drainage not the same Huang – eliminate “erosion control improvements”</p> <p>Recommendation: Require erosion control measures during and following construction activities through grading techniques, vegetation replanting and installation of drainage.</p>
<p>Policy 8.4 Require the practice of proper soil management techniques to reduce erosion, sedimentation, and other soil-related problems.</p>	<p>Shouldn’t this be an implementation program? Connect to City grading policy?</p> <p>Huang – can we take out “reduce erosion”</p> <p>Behura – soil management includes after effects of erosion</p>
<p>Policy 8.5 Preserve significant natural features, including sensitive hillsides as part of new development.</p>	<p>Duplicative</p> <p>Adams – 8.2 saying to minimize grading; 8.5 saying to leave it alone Watts – maybe move this up to follow 8.2 Behura – possibly part of 8.2 – two sentence Hansen – 8.5 says significant natural features Watts – agree it is different than 8.1 Behura – can tag along to 8.2 Watts – move up to be numbered as 8.2 and renumber the remaining Bent – limit to new development? Huang – remove “as part of new development” Behura – assumption is there is some work being done Huang – if have an existing development that will be modified,</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>want to preserve natural feature</p> <p>Agree to delete “as part of new development”</p>
<p>Policy 8.6 Require analysis of visual quality impacts of proposed development projects on a project-by-project basis.</p>	<p>Lyons – we don’t guarantee preservation of views</p> <p>Watts – recommend we move up in goal structure</p> <p>Bent – not just homes, but trees – current policies have anything to do with trees and blocking growth?</p> <p>Staff – new development would analyze views as it relates to adjacent development</p> <p>Behura – leave as is</p> <p>Watts – seems like it is more in line with what was discussed in previous goals; after 8.2 – policies jumping around</p> <p>Knarr – I thought I was reading 1994 language – seems as if it has been modified</p> <p>Barquist – text on left is from the General Plan; if there is text on right it is recommendations made by the committee previously</p>
<p><i>Goal 9 To preserve and enhance the Santa Ana River as an open space/recreation opportunity.</i></p>	<p>Bent – “Support the preservation...”</p> <p>Hansen – agree with “support the preservation and enhancement...”</p> <p>Bent – would rather say “Encourage the preservation...”</p> <p>Adams – it will change the flow of other goals</p> <p>Barquist – if change to “support” it’s a policy – Goals are a stated end</p>
<p>Policy 9.1 Work with The County of Orange in promoting the preservation of natural resources within the Santa Ana River corridor.</p>	<p>Gorman – do we want to say County of Orange in State of California</p> <p>Adams – “Responsible Agencies”</p>
<p>Policy 9.2 Preserve and enhance the Santa Ana River corridor and other stream courses in the City.</p>	<p>Knarr – policy 9.1 sums it up</p> <p>Adams – add other stream courses into policy 9.1; maybe need to modify goal 9 because specifically states Santa Ana River.</p> <p>Watts – is the purpose to work on Featherly and other areas</p> <p>Barquist – suggest remove 9.2, falls within Goal 9 and Policy 9.1</p> <p>Adams – add “and watershed” to 9.1 after “corridor”</p> <p>Gorman – either change goal or remove “other streams” from 9.2. – goal relates to Santa Ana River</p> <p>Bent – move policies that are more specific to the City to goal 11 or somewhere else and focus on Santa Ana River in this section</p> <p>Gorman – agree</p> <p>Agree to move policy to Goal 11 and reword to not include Santa Ana River since covered in 9.1</p>
<p>Policy 9.3 Maintain ecological balance by protecting infringement on those areas in and along the Santa Ana River which have significant environmental value.</p>	<p>Watts – “maintain” doesn’t work</p> <p>Adams – start with “Protect”</p> <p>Behura – “Support” instead of “maintain -”Support the maintenance of ecological....</p> <p>Gorman – who are we supporting?</p> <p>Watts – “Support maintaining ecological balance in areas along...”</p> <p>Baker – move “significant environmental value” before “Santa Ana River”</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Behura – what are we saying we will do since we do not have authority Bent – are we changing meaning by remove “of” Recommendation: Support the maintenance of ecological balance in areas of significant environmental value along the Santa Ana River.</p>
<p>Policy 9.4 Preserve riparian areas in the Santa Ana River area as sources of shelter and water for wildlife.</p>	<p>No comments</p>
<p>Policy 9.5 Preserve a continuous open space corridor along the Santa Ana River in order to maintain animal migration opportunities and preserve natural and recreational resource values.</p>	<p>Adams – preserve is better than support preservation – saying not going to allow developer to build in the corridor Behura – preserve would mean we have jurisdiction over Staff – portion zoned within our City Adams – leave as is</p>
<p>Policy 9.6 Require a definitive biological study to identify mitigative actions which may include a minimum setback from riparian vegetation areas for new development, replacement of riparian vegetation, or other suitable measures.</p>	<p>Behura – is policy covered by others Gorman – is this reality – have development going within corridor Barquist – may need to do a biological study as part of CEQA depending upon site/location Hansen – is it covered under Goal 7 Watts – do we want to delete? Hansen – concerned about removing Behura – mention Santa Ana River corridor and leave it Gorman – other agencies will cover this issue Watts – majority agree to delete Adams – not against deleting, but want to make sure if it is deleted are we losing something, or will it be covered under some other regulation Barquist – CEQA requires you look at potential environmental effects. If determined there is the potential, my have to look at more in depth depending upon location or circumstances.</p>
<p>Policy 9.7 Provide open space and trail connections between Yorba Linda and the County's Santa Ana River Trail wherever possible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aha. Here's the policy that I was looking for. Suggest expanding this statement and for Committee to discuss. <p>Knarr – all of goal 5 is on trails. No need to have trails mixed in with document. We talked about having north/south, east/west trails. We support trails. Assuming already included in Goal 5. Lyons – agree with comment from Knarr. Adams – nothing in Goal 5 that specifically addresses connection. Watts – concern that this is generic to Santa Ana River. Agree to delete 9.7</p>
<p>Policy 9.8 Pursue the possibility of establishing active recreation uses in portions of Featherly regional Park in which sensitive natural resource preservation is not of predominant importance.</p>	<p>Hansen – do we have jurisdiction Staff – not within the City Knarr – we don't need it. Agree to delete 9.8</p>
<p>Goal 10 To enhance the interrelationship of</p>	<p>Gorman – we do not have control Adams – confused by wording</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p><i>the City's open space resources and Chino Hills State Park.</i></p>	<p>Watts – do not know what that means Recommendation: “To enhance the relationship between open space resources and Chino Hills State Park”</p>
<p>Policy 10.1 Provide earthen multipurpose trail alignments for hiking, equestrian and bicycle trails on segments of regional trails within the City wherever possible.</p>	<p>Huang – talking about two different trail systems? Gorman – can get up to State trail, but no money for state trail Adams – there are City horse trails that come to boundary of Chino Hills State Park. Want to keep connection to trail Knarr – Goal 5 – we have recommendations for amendments that cover connections and trails. 7.4 we listed out all the non-city assets which we now have a separate goal for. We are randomly considering non-City assets to include in General Plan. Watts – agree that this is an inherent problem Bent – proportionately, Chino Hills Park is big in terms of our border and may make more sense to have more policies. Watts – RBF to review previous goals/policies for repetitiveness Knarr – concerned we are covering areas that are not our jurisdiction. We can influence, but not a General Plan goal or policy. Where do we stop; expanding beyond borders. Need to focus on City. Watts – we have considered that with recommended modification of “supporting”. Adams – having Chino Hills State Park on our border is an enhancement to the City. Leave goal 10 and discuss how we will interface with the park. May want to modify 10.1. Huang – 5.4 is really specific to staging areas and trail connections. 10.2 says same thing. Either put in Goal 5, but not in both places. Knarr – if a trail issue, let’s move to 5 Adams- if 10.1 and 10.2 are now covered in changes made in Goal 5, then move there. Watts – concerned with mandatory language. When dealing with other people’s property, need to say “support” Can we give RBF task of combining 10.1 and 10.2 under Goal 5. In process, responding something that has already been planned. There are a number of occasions where we discuss and add to one goal statement that is covered in another goal statement because haven’t seen it or forgot about it. Lyons – not completely covered in Goal 5. Watts – consultant needs to be sensitive to those areas where trails were discussed previously and we incorporated Chino Hills into it and now we are reviewing goals that include Chino Hills. Can move 10.1 and 10.2 upon review by RBF.</p>
<p>Policy 10.2 Develop staging centers where appropriate to complement existing and proposed trail connections into Chino Hills State Park.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wasn’t a staging area developed? If so, consider saying “maintain.”
<p>Policy 10.3 Protect sensitive wildlife and plant life communities.</p>	<p>Adams – “Support the protection of...” – be a partner in protection Gorman – agree with Knarr – how much more can we do to say we</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>endorse equestrian. To pick each segment is overkill. Need to have one statement to show our support and not every little segment of the City.</p> <p>Bent – need to consider safety factors, like coyotes and fires with Chino Hills State Park.</p> <p>Watts – 10.3 through 10.7 change first words</p> <p>Adams – “Support protection of...”</p> <p>Lyons – thought we agreed with that – incorporate all the way through</p> <p>Watts – RBF can make change throughout.</p>
<p>Policy 10.4 Maintain the majority of Brush Canyon in its natural state.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.5 Enhance and retain appropriate portions of Brush Canyon as a sustainable natural habitat as a 300 acre wildlife preserve and corridor from the San Bernardino County line to the Santa Ana River.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.6 Ensure continuation of open space resources in their natural state through a long term preservation program.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.7 Implement policies guiding the City of Yorba Linda/Chino Hills State Park relationships in such a way that reasonable benefits accrue to the citizens of Yorba Linda through appropriate negotiations with the State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation issue. • Committee should consider adding a policy that discusses the environmentally sensitive land in the proposed Cielo Vista and Esperanza Hills properties. After all, they are part of the City’s sphere of influence.
<p><i>Goal 11 To protect and conserve surface water, groundwater and imported water resources.</i></p>	<p>Lyons – remove word “to” – stated end</p> <p>Agreement to be consistent with stated-end throughout</p>
<p>Policy 11.1 Require appropriate water usage mitigation measures on all development projects.</p>	<p>Adams – remove “appropriate”</p> <p>Agreement on recommendation</p>
<p>Policy 11.2 Review all development proposals and public facility improvement plans to ensure water resources are conserved to the maximum extent possible.</p>	<p>Huang – is this something with Water District and not the City</p> <p>Baker – they don’t usually get in details of construction; most is already in the code. Not a bad thing to support with the policy. May want a policy for new projects to allow for reclaimed water.</p> <p>Knarr – broadly it seems that storm water would be covered in other areas.</p> <p>Gorman – unclear why this is in this particular area.</p> <p>Lyons – ok with old policy</p> <p>Bent – can separate out resources somewhere else, but need to have somewhere</p> <p>Watts – not clear why here but don’t object</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Huang – can staff review to see if better in other area Adams – sees goals 11, 12, 13 as resources. Two components within one element. Even if covered in code doesn't hurt to leave here even if covered elsewhere. Hansen- ok if in another place, but keep values of the goals/policies. Watts – recreation resources for purposes of General Plan are different than parks and recreation. Come back and discuss possibly moving it around. Bring it back at next meeting to discuss. Gorman – maybe there should be a separate resource element?</p>
<p>Policy 11.3 Require drought-tolerant landscaping, water conserving fixtures, reuse of wastewater when feasible and the capture of storm runoff in all private and public development projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add language that requires the City to maintain and utilize a drought tolerant plant list. Implementation program? Also, add language that requires City to update irrigation systems to new water saving technologies, like xerigation and moisture sensors, etc. <p>START HERE MAY 13</p>
<p>Policy 11.4 Design flood control and drainage facilities to provide protection from inundation from a 100-year flood event.</p>	
<p>Policy 11.5 Retain local drainage courses, channels and creeks in their natural condition where possible.</p>	
<p>Policy 11.6 Protect groundwater from sources of pollution.</p>	
<p><i>Goal 12 To permanently preserve significant cultural or historical buildings, sites or features within the community.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this policy necessary since there is a Historic Resources Element? May be redundant. However, it may be a good idea to keep these policies since not everyone reads the entire General Plan, even those currently on or running for the City Council. 😊
<p>Policy 12.1 Protect significant areas of historical, archaeological, educational or paleontological resources.</p>	
<p>Policy 12.2 Require effective mitigation measures where development may affect historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.</p>	
<p>Policy 12.3 Require the preparation of archaeological or paleontological reports in areas where there is potential to impact cultural resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHERE WOULD THAT BE AND HOW IS THAT DETERMINED?

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>Policy 12.4 Require that an archaeologist be retained to observe grading activities in areas where the probable presence of archaeological or paleontological resources is indicated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this overly burdensome?
<p>Policy 12.5 Preserve uncovered resources in their natural state, as much as feasible to assure their preservation and availability for later study.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p><i>Goal 13 To properly manage designated areas for mineral extraction to meet the needs of the area.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording seems broad. Committee should be provided with information and discuss potential impact of future mineral (assume includes oil and gas) extraction on residents and quality of life. Should General Plan include restrictions as to such development? • Need some background to comment on the contents of Goal 13
<p>Policy 13.1 Compile and maintain maps and descriptions of mineral resources as a basis for policy and program implementation.</p>	
<p>Policy 13.2 Document current extraction sites, including sand and gravel quarries, including the current status and duration of existing permits and approvals, for compliance monitoring.</p>	
<p>Policy 13.3 Cooperate with other governmental agencies and educational institutions to arrange for the development and exchange of information on mineral resources.</p>	
<p>Policy 13.4 Develop rationale as to why mining is not a feasible use of the properties classified as resource sectors by the SMARA to support request for deletion of the area as a potential mineral resource supply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mining? Really? In Yorba Linda? Is this policy necessary? Does mining include oil extraction?
<p>Policy 13.5 Require that all mineral extraction reclamation plans be consistent with the policies and procedures of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don't need a policy to say follow the law.
<p>Policy 13.6 Require that permits for reclamation projects specify compliance with State, federal, and local standards and attainment programs with respect to air quality, watersheds and basins, and erosion potential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don't need a policy to say follow the law.

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
NEW POLICIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 2.13 Be aware of existing and planned local residential densities when planning the location of park facilities. • Policy 14: Preserve equestrian/agricultural land sites. • Committee should consider adding a policy for a “public” equestrian facility.

**Tuesday, May 13, 2014
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER**

III. GPAC CONTINUED REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF GENERAL PLAN POLICY PROGRAM – RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

Refer to Attachment “A”

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<i>Goal 1 To permanently preserve and maintain public and private open space.</i>	<p>These seem fine – consolidate where appropriate.</p> <p>Carbone – wants to leave, would like to see more open space. What is difference between private and public park? Knarr – why need “permanently” is there significance to it Hansen – thinks it is significant; not to be changed, not to be altered Huang – it doesn’t add anything Lyons – no such thing as permanent, although our intent is to keep it in perpetuity Consensus – do not delete permanently</p>
Policy 1.1 Mitigate the impacts of development on sensitive lands such as steep slopes, cultural resources and sensitive habitats through the development review process.	No changes
Policy 1.2 Preserve and protect the scenic and visual quality of canyon and hillside areas as a resource of public importance.	No changes
Policy 1.3 Achieve the retention of	No changes

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>permanent open space through dedication as a part of the development site plan and subdivision/review process.</p>	
<p>Policy 1.4 Concentrate higher intensity recreation uses in areas containing less sensitive resources and landforms and preserve the most sensitive landforms and natural resources as passive open space.</p>	<p>Huang – what is considered a higher intensity recreation use Watts – soccer vs picnic Knarr – organized vs spontaneous DB – programming and use of the site No changes</p>
<p>Policy 1.5 Insure that conversion of open space from vacant or passive status to permanent resource conservation or active recreation use is accompanied by a thorough analysis of site characteristics and potentials justifying the permanent open space use.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p><i>Goal 2 To provide a balanced system of public and private parks and recreation facilities achieved in cooperation with the Yorba Linda Parks and Recreation Department, School Districts and private community associations.</i></p>	<p>Carbone – what is a private vs public park Harris – can be owned by private association; HOA Carbone – private streets where unload horses; people in HOA don't want us to unload Huang – there is a park/playground in Vista Del Verde that people use that do not live in the tract. It's open street. Watts – issue is what is public vs private. Is it a term of the cities? How do we define Gorman – private means privately owned. Can say as we approve buildout, have to keep as a private park. Part of negotiation of new building tract as it comes in. Can encourage when reviewing plans for buildout. For the community for the most part. Barquist – a matter of who is paying for it. Watts - do we need it in there Bent – need to keep for new neighborhood to build park and service community Watts – can we just delete; keep Knarr – comingling different ideas – should have a goal that talks about City assets and then different goal for contracts with school districts and private. Huang – is the reason for goal that if City is unable to build something, we require new development to build parks, but private park has to be within City's requirements. Barquist – the purpose of the goal is the stated end. Looking at a larger level, is there access to private facilities. If idea is for public to have access to it, why have private. Private is about maintenance, not accessibility. Gorman – thought key word is "balanced". Looking at all facilities and how needs are being met. Some are being met privately. Baker – Esperanza says it's planning soccer fields, but can't drive to get there. HOA going to maintain them. No way to get up there. Kids will be crowding on fields in YL where they can be accessed.</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Doesn't really meet our community need. Can't be used with way the access is structured. Going to get credit and it's open to public, but not really helping out City. Will probably go partially unused. Carbone – what parks are private now. We don't any say in School District and their design. City engages in contract to use the facility. That would be a private park, but don't have any say in design. Watts – any reason to not have goal 2 as part of General Plan. Is it legitimate?</p> <p>Huang- it's legitimate, but should we put it in a goal or a policy. Balanced system with adding accessibility as a policy.</p> <p>Knarr – recommend amend to read “provide a balanced system of parks and recreation facilities.” Need new goal for private and public.</p> <p>Bent – don't have problem with goal as it is. Policy is referring to accessibility.</p> <p>Watts – 6 in favor of goal as stated. Leave the goal as is.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1 Provide park and recreational facilities that meet the needs of senior citizens, young adults, children, disabled individuals and families.</p>	<p>Carbone – good on goal</p> <p>Knarr – would just say “all residents”</p> <p>Hansen – ok as is</p> <p>Baker – inadvertently will leave out someone; better to make it simple</p> <p>Lyons – agree</p> <p>Hunag – fine as is</p> <p>Gorman – good</p> <p>Watts – what about “Provide park and recreational facilities that meet the needs of residents”.</p> <p>Hansen – listing everyone shows that there are different people with different needs</p> <p>Bent – are these specifics in our planning process already? We consider everyone in our planning process.</p> <p>Barquist – Parks and Rec Master Plan considers all users. Suggest: “Provide parks and recreation facilities that respond to the needs of Yorba Linda's residents”</p> <p>Lyons – I like it</p> <p>Consensus on recommended change by Barquist</p>
<p>Policy 2.2 Ensure that park sites and programs are accessible to all residents.</p>	<p>Huang – concerned with “accessibility”</p> <p>Bent – want to say “reasonably” accessible?</p> <p>Huang – agree</p> <p>Watts – maybe we should let the developer prove it is accessible.</p> <p>Bent – do we need to worry about different meaning of accessibility?</p> <p>Barquist – by law have to provide accessibility. Does that community have access to the services? May add in “recreational facilities”</p> <p>“Ensure that park and recreational facilities are available and accessible to all residents”</p> <p>Staff – anyone can access the park. No encumbrances</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Huang – can’t use park in Vista Del Verde – have to climb over railing; field is already inaccessible. Consensus on Barquist recommendation - “Ensure that park and recreational facilities are available and accessible to all residents”</p>
<p>Policy 2.3 Provide high quality existing and new facilities which are compatible with adjacent land uses.</p> <p>a. Develop master site plans for each park to ensure that the siting of buildings, open air facilities and landscape are unified, functionally related to efficiency, and compatible with adjacent uses.</p> <p>b. Design and develop parks to complement and reflect their natural environmental setting and maximize their open space character.</p> <p>c. Design and improve neighborhood and community parks so that uses and parking do not adversely impact adjacent residences, and landscaping is compatible with adjacent areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is very specific <p>Hansen – fine with me Baker – long and detailed; should it be broken up. Lyons – no problem with organization; have a problem with “c” because some people object to noise. If residence next to park, should expect to have kids yelling. Bent – ok as is Watts – I would break it down, but not passionate about it Huang – ok with it Gorman – have issue with it. In this City have a tendency to plan a park and not get funded for many years. Pay for it being planned, but then nothing being done and things change and plan may not be applicable. Need time frame or limit on when we do this. Tier 1 project, some funding that we can use. Waste money designing a park that we may not build. Watts – ok as is – 5 majority – leave as is</p>
<p>Policy 2.4 Facilitate cooperative joint use of school facilities and programs for enhancement of recreation programs.</p>	<p>Hansen – good Lyons – good Baker – good Huang – good Consensus – leave as is</p>
<p>Policy 2.5 Pursue the construction of public golf courses in the City.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Black Gold public golf course completed. Fiscal Implications with existing golf course. DON’T NEED ANY MORE Already done—Black Gold. This policy is no longer needed IMO. The City has a public golf course and there is a private golf club in the adjacent County island. <p>Carbone – no more golf courses; we have 2</p> <p>Gorman – put something in there about overseeing management of golf course. Should have something in GP.</p> <p>Huang – is it a GP issue</p> <p>Watts – does 2.7 address it?</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	Majority agree to delete 2.5
Policy 2.6 Provide both active and passive park sites within the City.	Carbone – what is passive vs active Barquist – wouldn't have any facilities. Knarr – walking, no organized parks Baker – not useable
Policy 2.7 Maintain and enhance existing park sites within the City.	Gorman – fine Carbone – good Hansen – good Bent – add park and recreation sites. Baker – should add “and recreation” throughout the policies Huang – does 2.7 address Gorman’s comment re: golf course Gorman – need a separate policy addressing management of golf course. City owns the facility. We don’t address the golf course at all. Bent – ok adding a goal and some policies to address golf course and management Huang – thinks it should be a separate goal and policy – fiscally responsible. Have solvency goal, better oversight. Watts – sees it more as a CC issue on a regular basis Barquist – more of a contractual issue – as a recreational facility, is it already addressed. Watts – add to 2.7 “Maintain, effectively manage, and enhance...” Gorman – similar to trash contract; do we have that in GP Knarr – we include school districts in plan Carbone – leave as is and add “parks and recreation” Consensus – no change; revise to include recreation facilities.
Policy 2.8 Permit flexible park planning and design where recreation value can thereby be improved. Provide a diversity of uses and facilities within park sites.	Consensus – no change, leave as is
Policy 2.9 Ensure a park master planning process that is responsive to community input.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this need to be here? Consensus – agree to delete
Policy 2.10 Identify recreational uses for the Yorba Linda Lakebed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desired by surrounding community? Not owned by the City nor under City control Is this an appropriate policy since the YL Lakebed is still County and part of County flood control? Can we develop policy that discusses annexing Lakebed? Where is this now? Consensus – agree to delete
Policy 2.11 Investigate the feasibility of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is planned here? Aquifers?

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>utilizing underground water reservoirs for recreation purposes through a joint use agreement with the Yorba Linda Water Department.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does this mean in practical terms? • What does this mean? <p>Baker – Water Dept has been open to discussing using reservoirs for parks. Don't want to take on maintenance. A lot of flat open space that can be used if can pay for it. Lyons – utilize useable space Knarr – not an open area, no lights, no parking- delete it Huang – I'd like to keep because of lack of water storage and part of current bond proposal is to put money in for water storage, recharging water – continue to have dialogue and make it useable. Still have not built underground water storage. Not sure if money will help YL. Carbone – agree have a water issue; but it's not a park/recreation issue. Huang – don't want land to become unusable because using it for storage. Use the land on top and everyone benefits. Question if bond will bring money to city to put park on top of reservoirs. Hansen – change wording to be clear Watts – needs to relate to recreational use Gorman – language is harmless and weak. No reason to not have it in. Who knows what will happen in future. Doesn't stop people from doing what they are doing. Bent – can you put hard surfaces above. Recreational an opportunity. Can be in land use side; solar panels. Watts – vote to leave in – majority agree to leave in; majority vote to leave in, but with changes. Lyons – change "Department" to "District" "...the surface of underground water reservoirs...." Agree on changes per Lyons</p>
<p>Policy 2.12 Actively pursue the development of existing park facilities to their maximum potential.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Goal 3 Provide park facilities to meet the needs of existing and future residents, including acreage to offset the current deficit and provide for projected population growth.</p>	<p>Huang – ok Gorman – parks 90% used by youth sports and cost a lot of money. Don't use on Friday nights and Sundays. If add in that time can get use. Youth sports may have to get used to using at that time instead of building more parks. Carbone – agree and keep Knarr – important to provide for population growth Carbone – need to get out of deficit Consensus – good, no changes.</p>
<p>Policy 3.1 Require that 4.0 acres per 1,000 population be maintained as the City's parkland standard.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City is currently below this standard. Is there a vehicle to make it a stronger policy in the General Plan or part of an implementation program?

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this a development standard now in other communities? (Other Yorba Linda esq communities- <p>Bent – is it current with master plan?</p> <p>Gorman – thinks we are meeting standard with the golf course</p> <p>Barquist – 3 per 1,000; but goal is to achieve 4 per 1,000 – look to achieve through acquisition. Consistent with parks and recreation master plan</p> <p>Knarr – specific to community parks. Best policy.</p> <p>Consensus – no change</p>
<p>Policy 3.2 Establish the following as initial standards for park development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mini-Park: 2,500 square feet to 2.5 acres Neighborhood Park: 2.5 to 5.0 acres, within 1/2 mile of its users Community Park: 5 to 20 acres, within 1/2 to two miles of its users Regional Park: 100 acres or greater, within a one-half hour drive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More appropriate for the Parks and Rec Master plan – This is very specific <p>Gorman – 2500 sf. seems small</p> <p>Barquist – can be up to 2.5 acres in master plan</p> <p>Gorman – make consistent with Master Plan</p> <p>Watts – can make it consistent with Parks and Rec Master Plan</p> <p>Barquist – Community Park within ½ to 3 miles; page 2-4 of document.</p> <p>Huang – question regarding distance of park – clarification on neighborhood vs. community park</p> <p>Consensus – make consistent with Parks and Rec MP</p>
<p>Policy 3.3 Pursue the development of portions of the Santa Ana River, Featherly Regional Park, the Yorba Linda Lakebed and flood control drainages and detention basins for recreational uses which will not inhibit flood control purposes, or impact important visual open space, natural habitat areas, nor be adversely impacted by flooding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant portions should remain undeveloped as open space ensuring adequate wildlife habitat for all native species – including large mammals Can we use YL Lakebed since it's County? See 3.3 comment. Is this appropriate? <p>Gorman – delete</p> <p>Knarr – agree</p> <p>Hansen – agree</p> <p>Consensus to delete policy</p>
<p>Policy 3.4 Require that adequate acreage, per the City standard, of new parklands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parks within new developments should be within the development and held to the min. of 5 contiguous acres

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

(minimum of five contiguous acres) be dedicated on-site as part of any new development, unless it becomes the objective of the City to develop a park to serve the subdivision at an alternative location, wherein in-lieu fees will be provided.

rather many mini parks.

- Implementation issue?
- Is this appropriate?

Lyons – ok as is

Knarr – is this consistent with existing policy

Barquist – this is the existing policy. Parks and Rec MP provides recommended standards – guideline.

Consensus to keep as is

Policy 3.5 Pursue and acquire an appropriate site for a sports facility within the City which encompasses a broad array of active recreational facilities as described on pages RR-38 and RR-39.

- Tommy La Sorda gym? Veteran’s Park?
- Have we done this?

Gorman – delete

Knarr – MP will address acquiring sites

Gorman – don’t have land to do anything.

Hansen – what about Bastanchury site?

Knarr – MP shows parkland is 100 acres short based on 4 acres/1,000 – whether or not a sports facility, will need park space.

Lyons – doesn’t consider sports facility the same as parkland.

Watts – agree that it is specific – does this send message that it’s a priority.

Knarr – diverse group of residents and portfolio of facilities.

Bent – doesn’t go with overall goal. Change from “sports” to just general park facilities – not locked into sports. MP will make it more specific.

Watts – first proposal was to delete – not a majority

Lyons – agree with Doug’s suggestion “...for recreational facility” instead of “sports”

Consensus – agree on change per Lyons.

Goal 4 Ensure adequate funding sources for acquisition, operation and maintenance of park and recreation facilities within the City.

No change.

Policy 4.1 Continue to require developers of residential subdivisions to provide land or in-lieu fees based on the City's formula of number of units and cost of land to fund parkland acquisition and improvements. Fees shall be reviewed annually.

- Preferable that developers provide land at the required level for a park (s) within the development.
- THE PROVIDED LAND OPTION THE DEVELOPER SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO INCLUDE AN ENDOWMENT FUND TO COVER FUTURE MAINTENANCE OF THE LAND.

Knarr – good

Lyons – need a provision to maintain – “...fund parkland acquisition, improvements, and maintenance.” Need to handle maintenance.

Dedicate land, but no money to maintain.

**RECREATION &
RESOURCES ELEMENT**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Also delete "Continue to" Start with "Require"</p> <p>Baker – multiple parcels are being added and increasing number of units being developed. How do we assess them?</p> <p>Watts – can't do in this plan</p> <p>Staff – if don't dedicate land, they pay in lieu fees. Pay per unit.</p> <p>Baker – fees are limited to acquisition – capital improvements, not maintenance.</p> <p>Watts – can we add some mechanism for maintenance.</p> <p>Lyons – let someone else figure out the details on how it gets done.</p> <p>Bent – can we make it "ongoing maintenance"</p> <p>Gorman – these issues are part of negotiations with a developer.</p> <p>Lyons – ability to negotiate enhanced if within GP</p> <p>Baker – once in GP has to be addressed with developer</p> <p>Watts – everyone agrees to delete "Continue to" from beginning – CONSENSUS</p> <p>Knarr – would leave maintenance out. Have to be competitive with market rate.</p> <p>Bent – mention negotiation – flexible.</p> <p>Huang – having maintenance would force City to include maintenance costs in the formula.</p> <p>Carbone – not going to have a developer maintain forever</p> <p>Huang – change formula to address maintenance – within fee</p> <p>Watts – issue of dealing with maintenance or not dealing with maintenance – How many in favor of leaving without maintenance – 3; how many add maintenance generically – 6; is there anything else we can add. Add "maintenance to acquisition and improvement" – Majority</p> <p>Hansen – why don't we add to all developments</p> <p>Barquist – can charge a fee as long as there is a nexus – should be discussed with City attorney – "maintenance"</p> <p>Watts – adding word maintenance, if a problem, can be discussed later.</p> <p>Baker – word "subdivision" is not correct. Don't have to be subdivided to pay fee.</p> <p>Watts – get input from staff to see if we can had "commercial"</p> <p>Staff – take out "subdivision" and include "development"</p> <p>Watts – add "residential development" rather than "subdivision" – Consensus on change.</p>
<p>Policy 4.2 Develop fiscal criteria for the effective allocation of public resources for park and recreation facilities.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Policy 4.3 Identify new sources of funding for park and recreational facilities.</p> <p>a. Continue and expand mechanisms by which the City may accept gifts and dedications of parks, open space and facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b. is very specific – would the city really issue bonds to do this? Even if they would are we potentially obligating ourselves by including this? <p>Knarr – propose more general and delete a and b. Majority agrees with recommended change.</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>b. Consider the sale of bonds, user fees, assessment districts and other sources that may be identified at a future date for park development and maintenance.</p>	
<p>Policy 4.4 Provide recreational facilities which are functional and are designed for cost effective maintenance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unnecessary policy statement <p>Delete – Consensus</p>
<p>Policy 4.5 Establish agreements wherever possible between the City and other public agencies for the purpose of development, operation, use and maintenance of recreation facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about private? <p>Knarr – thinks it belongs here Lyons – would you include “private” Knarr – doesn’t have to restrict to “public” Baker – delete “public” Carbone – could be an agency Baker – “city and other entities...” Consensus on Baker recommendation</p>
<p>Policy 4.6 Plan recreational facilities to limit liability to the City and to protect the health and safety of citizens utilizing those facilities.</p>	<p>Gorman – thinking of adventure playground. Would hate to think it wouldn’t be built. Baker – can’t make it so there is no liability Watt – what happens if someone comes back and says we didn’t limit liability Bent – sees it as building safe facilities Majority in favor to delete policy.</p>
<p>Goal 5 Establish a trail system that meets the riding, hiking and bicycling needs of residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trails need to be connected thereby comprising a system <p>“Establish a multi-purpose trail system.” - Consensus on recommended change</p>
<p>Policy 5.1 Require the dedication of right-of-way and construction of public trails as a condition of approval of development projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everywhere in the city? <p>Bent – what about comment “everywhere in City” Baker – are we going to require of everyone/everywhere – not reasonable for all projects – blanket statement – should we change to in-lieu structure and funnel money to sites where trails work and can be connected. Staff – “...or in lieu fees” Baker – there are places where there will be no trail and silly to require a piece of trail that goes nowhere. Pay fee that can be used in functional place. Lyons Watts – “require the dedication of right-of-way and construction of public trails or in lieu fees as” Consensus on recommended change.</p>
<p>Policy 5.2 Separate trails from vehicular traffic wherever possible.</p>	<p>No change</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Policy 5.3 Create bikeways which correlate with the circulation system.

- Circulation Item?

Carbone – belong on multi-purpose trails, but to get funding from OCTA have to provide bike lanes.

Bent – delete

Majority agree to delete policy.

Policy 5.4 Provide for the construction of staging areas and trail connections that provide access to Chino Hills State Park.

- Consider adding language that would discuss providing access to the Santa Ana River Bike Trail.
- Is this done? Do we want to pay for this?

Gorman - "Provide for the construction of "adequate" staging areas"

Knarr – would prefer not to be as specific, remove "Chino Hills State Park"

Public comment – connection to east and west

Carbone – can be clarified in 5.5.

Bent – do we have need for constructing new staging areas or maintaining existing.

Knarr- always opportunity for new connections

Baker – issue of accessibility.

Bent – what is a staging area

Hansen – add "adequate"

Watts – "...adequate staging areas" can we add Santa Ana River.

Baker – not specific to Chino Hills

Staff – can make it generic.

Gorman – end after trail connections.

Carbone – needs to be specific to state parks.

Gorman – policy before trailhead at Chino Hills State Park was made.

Watts – "provide for construction of adequate staging areas and trails connection to adjacent recreational resources such as Chino Hills State Park and Santa Ana River." – Consensus – agree on recommended change.

Policy 5.5 Complete the equestrian trail network through the community, with particular emphasis on extension of trails through the Shell and Murdock Properties, and connections

- "Shell" and "Murdock" may not be appropriate terms. Should these be noted as "multi-purpose" trails as will also serve the needs of hikers, mountain bikers, etc.?
- Can drop the reference to the Shell and Murdoch properties. Consider adding Cielo Vista and Esperanza Hills. Committee should consider language that discusses completion of the El Cajon Trail.
- Appropriate?

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Carbone – remove “Shell and Murdock” “Complete the multipurpose trail network throughout the City boundaries” – Consensus on recommended change.</p>
<p>Policy 5.6 Continue regional trail systems maintenance and operation within the City by the Yorba Linda Parks and Recreation Department or the Public Works Department.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.7 Route bikeways and multi-purpose trails to facilitate access to open space areas, recreational facilities, schools and shopping areas.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.8 Locate trails along designated scenic corridors wherever environmentally, physically, and economically feasible.</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.9 Encourage commercial, office, industrial and multi-family residential developers to provide local bicycle trails and rack facilities within their projects as conditions of development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage or mandate? <p>No changes</p>
<p>Policy 5.10 Solicit and utilize all sources of local, regional, State and Federal funds to plan, acquire right-of-way and construct bikeways and equestrian trails, including such sources as SB 821 and SB 244 funds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these still available? How about other funding sources? <p>No changes – correct references or end sentence at equestrian trails.</p>
<p>Policy 5.11 Assign priority to the completion of fragmentary portions of trails which currently exist in the City to ensure continuity and connection of all links in the trail system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our trails are linked. • Committee should discuss setting up Trail Completion Implementation Program. This could occur with discussion on completion of El Cajon Trail and a connection to the Santa Ana River Bike Trail. <p>Huang – is this the same as 5.5?</p> <p>Carbone – giving priority to trails that are fragmentary.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p><i>Goal 6 Permanently preserve visual resources along existing and planned landscape corridors.</i></p>	<p>No comments</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>Policy 6.1 Impose conditions on new development along landscaped corridors to preserve unique visual features.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage? <p>No comments</p>
<p>Policy 6.2 Design roadways that have visual quality and riding comfort. Design curves to take advantage of natural or man-made scenic features.</p>	<p>Adams – leave as is</p>
<p>Policy 6.3 Incorporate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle trails into the right-of-way of landscaped corridors.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-use trails? <p>Knarr – can say “incorporate trails” or just say “multi-use”. Hansen – question of difference with horse trails Lyons – that would be categorically a multi-use trail. Sign says who has precedence Adams – changing to multi-use trail? Lyons – take out pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle and use multi-use Staff – in the code multi-use is defined Hansen – multi-use refers to one trail, still need to address others Staff – would need to expand the list Bent – many mentioned horse trails are multi-use because you can bike on them, walk on them, etc. Barquist – recommended text....XXXX</p>
<p>Goal 7 To permanently preserve natural resource areas of community and regional significance.</p>	<p>No comments</p>
<p>Policy 7.1 Preserve sensitive species and plant communities and wildlife habitats to the maximum extent possible through open space dedication and easements, creative site design and other workable mitigation actions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve corridors and sufficient natural areas to ensure populations of native predator species (bobcats, coyotes, mountain lions, hawks, etc.) <p>Adams – concerned with “maximum extent possible” – would say “...species, including predators and plant communities...” eliminate maximum extent possible. Hansen – agree Adams – include “corridors” – projects not considering predators. Need enough areas to preserve larger species. Need more space. Watts – add “corridors” within open space dedication and easements...” Barquist – Adams – concerned people are going to interpret sensitive species to be smaller species and not larger species at top of food chain. Need to include native predator species - “Sensitive species, native predator species, and plant communities”. Also add in word “corridors” Hansen – can we add another policy. Bent – concerned with being too specific in General Plan</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Adams – natural species and plant communities” Lyons/Adams – “preserve native wildlife and plant communities, and their habitats”</p>
<p>Policy 7.2 Require that appropriate resource protection measures are prepared and incorporated into development proposals.</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Policy 7.3 Conserve resource areas which are preserved through public and private acquisition by an aggressive open space management program including such techniques as revegetation, educational projects and other appropriate means.</p>	<p>Watts – remove “aggressive” Bent – agree Lyons – City Council would have to agree to implement</p>
<p>Policy 7.4 To the extent possible under the City's authority, manage the open space resources within and adjacent to the Santa Ana River Corridor, Featherly Regional Park, Brush Canyon, the Yorba Linda Lakebed, and the Chino Hills State Park in order to preserve their open space and resource conservation value where appropriate and capitalize on their recreation value where that is appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add: Manage open space resources not only for open space but also for wildlife habitat and wildlife access to Santa Ana River Corridor and Chino Hills State Park. <p>Knarr – too specific – recommend changing to “Participate in open space management” Huang – agree with change Adams – important to doing something adjacent to those areas Behura – we support existence of areas Watts – “manage” not correct because we are not managing Behura – if it’s within, we do “manage” Watts – remove “to the extent possible under the City’s authority” and replace with “Support” Adams – end after “value”</p>
<p>Policy 7.5 Require the delineation of permanent open space areas within the Shell and Murdock Area Plans through more detailed development planning so that the steep slopes and important natural resource areas can be properly preserved and protected through specific plans or other appropriate development regulations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Shell” and “Murdock” may not be appropriate terms. • Drop reference to Shell and Murdock and make statement more generic. • Is this appropriate? <p>Watts – remove “more” after “through”. Staff – remove “shell and Murdock” Adams – remove “within” Recommendation: XXX</p>
<p>Policy 7.6 Require development proposals in areas expected to contain important plant communities and wildlife habitat to provide detailed biological assessments.</p>	<p>Adams – “containing” instead of “expected” Recommendation “which may contain”</p>
<p>Policy 7.7 Seek preservation of the mountain lion corridor from Coal Canyon to the Chino Hills area with particular emphasis on establishing a workable means of mountain lion passage through the Saba</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this the only mountain lion corridor within the city or adjacent lands? • What does this mean? <p>Huang – are we responsible for maintaining?</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>Property.</p>	<p>Staff – state purchased, but located within Yorba Linda Watts – “support preservation” or “preserve” Gorman – if state owns, we don’t have anything to do with it. Just support continuation Staff – if sold as an asset and someone wants to develop, we have policy noting we want to preserve it as a corridor Bent – want to make sure preserve doesn’t mean maintain Watt – use word “support preservation” Agree on “support preservation” Behura – is reference to “Saba Property” the appropriate term – will it be clear Staff – history of property has always been Saba Property</p>
<p>Policy 7.8 Maintain an inventory of existing sensitive resources in and adjacent to the City through periodic updates of the General Plan Technical Document.</p>	<p>Huang – how often do we do updates to General Plan Barquist – every 10 years to update according to state; review annually Huang – if already required, does the General Plan need to say it Adams – think we need to leave it Watts – leave off “through periodic updates” – creates an obligation we don’t need to create Hansen – need to keep obligation; otherwise won’t be current Barquist – can be done separately Adams – “through period updates” – end there Watts – agree Hansen – current isn’t defined Delete “periodic updates” add “current” – Agree</p>
<p>Policy 7.9 Limit designated open space areas that contain sensitive biological resources to passive recreation uses.</p>	<p>Lyons – doesn’t see policy as good Adams – saying we will leave it as passive recreation Lyons – take out “designated” – “limit the use of open space areas that contain sensitive biological resources to passive recreation uses”.</p>
<p>Goal 8 To permanently preserve and protect sensitive hillside areas within and adjacent to the community.</p>	<p>Bent – what does “protect” mean – if adjacent, then not in our community Adams – it does say “within” Baker – county lands which may be within sphere of influence – need to influence their future through General Plan Bent – “Support”? Behura – need to define within and without Adams – does it address issue of County islands within City Watts – require preservation inside City and support preservation outside of the City – divide into 2 goals</p>
<p>Policy 8.1 Provide for the preservation of sensitive hillside and canyon areas within the City.</p>	<p>Behura – what does provide mean – are we funding Watts – want to say to preserve sensitive hillside and canyon areas Bent – “Support preservation of....” Behura – sounds like we are financially responsible Baker – “Require preservation....” Lyons – unenforceable</p>
<p>Policy 8.2 Respect the natural landform as a</p>	<p>Watts – what does “respect” mean</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>part of site planning and architectural design to minimize grading and visual impact.</p>	<p>Behura – what does it actually accomplish Lyons – like it as is Behura – “Support the natural” Huang – like “respect” Agree to leave “respect”</p>
<p>Policy 8.3 Control erosion during and following construction through proper grading techniques, vegetation replanting and the installation of proper drainage, and erosion control improvements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation issue <p>Lyons – purpose of the grading plan Bent – “Require the control of erosion” Staff - “Require erosion control measures during and following construction activities...” Lyons – stop after “proper grading techniques”. Hansen – should keep proper drainage Adams – vegetation and drainage not the same Huang – eliminate “erosion control improvements”</p> <p>Recommendation: Require erosion control measures during and following construction activities through grading techniques, vegetation replanting and installation of drainage.</p>
<p>Policy 8.4 Require the practice of proper soil management techniques to reduce erosion, sedimentation, and other soil-related problems.</p>	<p>Shouldn't this be an implementation program? Connect to City grading policy?</p> <p>Huang – can we take out “reduce erosion”</p> <p>Behura – soil management includes after effects of erosion</p>
<p>Policy 8.5 Preserve significant natural features, including sensitive hillsides as part of new development.</p>	<p>Duplicative</p> <p>Adams – 8.2 saying to minimize grading; 8.5 saying to leave it alone Watts – maybe move this up to follow 8.2 Behura – possibly part of 8.2 – two sentence Hansen – 8.5 says significant natural features Watts – agree it is different than 8.1 Behura – can tag along to 8.2 Watts – move up to be numbered as 8.2 and renumber the remaining Bent – limit to new development? Huang – remove “as part of new development” Behura – assumption is there is some work being done Huang – if have an existing development that will be modified, want to preserve natural feature Agree to delete “as part of new development”</p>
<p>Policy 8.6 Require analysis of visual quality impacts of proposed development projects</p>	<p>Lyons – we don't guarantee preservation of views Watts – recommend we move up in goal structure</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

<p>on a project-by-project basis.</p>	<p>Bent – not just homes, but trees – current policies have anything to do with trees and blocking growth? Staff – new development would analyze views as it relates to adjacent development Behura – leave as is Watts – seems like it is more in line with what was discussed in previous goals; after 8.2 – policies jumping around Knarr – I thought I was reading 1994 language – seems as if it has been modified Barquist – text on left is from the General Plan; if there is text on right it is recommendations made by the committee previously</p>
<p><i>Goal 9 To preserve and enhance the Santa Ana River as an open space/recreation opportunity.</i></p>	<p>Bent – “Support the preservation...” Hansen – agree with “support the preservation and enhancement...” Bent – would rather say “Encourage the preservation...” Adams – it will change the flow of other goals Barquist – if change to “support” it’s a policy – Goals are a stated end</p>
<p>Policy 9.1 Work with The County of Orange in promoting the preservation of natural resources within the Santa Ana River corridor.</p>	<p>Gorman – do we want to say County of Orange in State of California Adams – “Responsible Agencies”</p>
<p>Policy 9.2 Preserve and enhance the Santa Ana River corridor and other stream courses in the City.</p>	<p>Knarr – policy 9.1 sums it up Adams – add other stream courses into policy 9.1; maybe need to modify goal 9 because specifically states Santa Ana River. Watts – is the purpose to work on Featherly and other areas Barquist – suggest remove 9.2, falls within Goal 9 and Policy 9.1 Adams – add “and watershed” to 9.1 after “corridor” Gorman – either change goal or remove “other streams” from 9.2. – goal relates to Santa Ana River Bent – move policies that are more specific to the City to goal 11 or somewhere else and focus on Santa Ana River in this section Gorman – agree Agree to move policy to Goal 11 and reword to not include Santa Ana River since covered in 9.1</p>
<p>Policy 9.3 Maintain ecological balance by protecting infringement on those areas in and along the Santa Ana River which have significant environmental value.</p>	<p>Watts – “maintain” doesn’t work Adams – start with “Protect” Behura – “Support” instead of “maintain -”Support the maintenance of ecological.... Gorman – who are we supporting? Watts – “Support maintaining ecological balance in areas along....” Baker – move “significant environmental value” before “Santa Ana River” Behura – what are we saying we will do since we do not have authority Bent – are we changing meaning by remove “of” Recommendation: Support the maintenance of ecological balance</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	in areas of significant environmental value along the Santa Ana River.
Policy 9.4 Preserve riparian areas in the Santa Ana River area as sources of shelter and water for wildlife.	No comments
Policy 9.5 Preserve a continuous open space corridor along the Santa Ana River in order to maintain animal migration opportunities and preserve natural and recreational resource values.	Adams – preserve is better than support preservation – saying not going to allow developer to build in the corridor Behura – preserve would mean we have jurisdiction over Staff – portion zoned within our City Adams – leave as is
Policy 9.6 Require a definitive biological study to identify mitigative actions which may include a minimum setback from riparian vegetation areas for new development, replacement of riparian vegetation, or other suitable measures.	Behura – is policy covered by others Gorman – is this reality – have development going within corridor Barquist – may need to do a biological study as part of CEQA depending upon site/location Hansen – is it covered under Goal 7 Watts – do we want to delete? Hansen – concerned about removing Behura – mention Santa Ana River corridor and leave it Gorman – other agencies will cover this issue Watts – majority agree to delete Adams – not against deleting, but want to make sure if it is deleted are we losing something, or will it be covered under some other regulation Barquist – CEQA requires you look at potential environmental effects. If determined there is the potential, my have to look at more in depth depending upon location or circumstances.
Policy 9.7 Provide open space and trail connections between Yorba Linda and the County's Santa Ana River Trail wherever possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aha. Here's the policy that I was looking for. Suggest expanding this statement and for Committee to discuss. <p>Knarr – all of goal 5 is on trails. No need to have trails mixed in with document. We talked about having north/south, east/west trails. We support trails. Assuming already included in Goal 5. Lyons – agree with comment from Knarr. Adams – nothing in Goal 5 that specifically addresses connection. Watts – concern that this is generic to Santa Ana River. Agree to delete 9.7</p>
Policy 9.8 Pursue the possibility of establishing active recreation uses in portions of Featherly regional Park in which sensitive natural resource preservation is not of predominant importance.	Hansen – do we have jurisdiction Staff – not within the City Knarr – we don't need it. Agree to delete 9.8
Goal 10 To enhance the interrelationship of the City's open space resources and Chino Hills State Park.	Gorman – we do not have control Adams – confused by wording Watts – do not know what that means Recommendation: "To enhance the relationship between open space resources and Chino Hills State Park"
Policy 10.1 Provide earthen multipurpose	Huang – talking about two different trail systems?

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

trail alignments for hiking, equestrian and bicycle trails on segments of regional trails within the City wherever possible.

Gorman – can get up to State trail, but no money for state trail
 Adams – there are City horse trails that come to boundary of Chino Hills State Park. Want to keep connection to trail
 Knarr – Goal 5 – we have recommendations for amendments that cover connections and trails. 7.4 we listed out all the non-city assets which we now have a separate goal for. We are randomly considering non-City assets to include in General Plan.
 Watts – agree that this is an inherent problem
 Bent – proportionately, Chino Hills Park is big in terms of our border and may make more sense to have more policies.
 Watts – RBF to review previous goals/policies for repetitiveness
 Knarr – concerned we are covering areas that are not our jurisdiction. We can influence, but not a General Plan goal or policy. Where do we stop; expanding beyond borders. Need to focus on City.
 Watts – we have considered that with recommended modification of “supporting”.
 Adams – having Chino Hills State Park on our border is an enhancement to the City. Leave goal 10 and discuss how we will interface with the park. May want to modify 10.1.
 Huang – 5.4 is really specific to staging areas and trail connections. 10.2 says same thing. Either put in Goal 5, but not in both places.
 Knarr – if a trail issue, let’s move to 5
 Adams- if 10.1 and 10.2 are now covered in changes made in Goal 5, then move there.
 Watts – concerned with mandatory language. When dealing with other people’s property, need to say “support”
 Can we give RBF task of combining 10.1 and 10.2 under Goal 5.
 In process, responding something that has already been planned.
 There are a number of occasions where we discuss and add to one goal statement that is covered in another goal statement because haven’t seen it or forgot about it.
 Lyons – not completely covered in Goal 5.
 Watts – consultant needs to be sensitive to those areas where trails were discussed previously and we incorporated Chino Hills into it and now we are reviewing goals that include Chino Hills. Can move 10.1 and 10.2 upon review by RBF.

Policy 10.2 Develop staging centers where appropriate to complement existing and proposed trail connections into Chino Hills State Park.

- Wasn’t a staging area developed? If so, consider saying “maintain.”

Policy 10.3 Protect sensitive wildlife and plant life communities.

Adams – “Support the protection of...” – be a partner in protection
 Gorman – agree with Knarr – how much more can we do to say we endorse equestrian. To pick each segment is overkill. Need to have one statement to show our support and not every little segment of the City.
 Bent – need to consider safety factors, like coyotes and fires with

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Chino Hills State Park. Watts – 10.3 through 10.7 change first words Adams – “Support protection of....” Lyons – thought we agreed with that – incorporate all the way through Watts – RBF can make change throughout.</p>
<p>Policy 10.4 Maintain the majority of Brush Canyon in its natural state.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.5 Enhance and retain appropriate portions of Brush Canyon as a sustainable natural habitat as a 300 acre wildlife preserve and corridor from the San Bernardino County line to the Santa Ana River.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.6 Ensure continuation of open space resources in their natural state through a long term preservation program.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.7 Implement policies guiding the City of Yorba Linda/Chino Hills State Park relationships in such a way that reasonable benefits accrue to the citizens of Yorba Linda through appropriate negotiations with the State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation issue. • Committee should consider adding a policy that discusses the environmentally sensitive land in the proposed Cielo Vista and Esperanza Hills properties. After all, they are part of the City’s sphere of influence.
<p><i>Goal 11 To protect and conserve surface water, groundwater and imported water resources.</i></p>	<p>Lyons – remove word “to” – stated end Agreement to be consistent with stated-end throughout</p>
<p>Policy 11.1 Require appropriate water usage mitigation measures on all development projects.</p>	<p>Adams – remove “appropriate” Agreement on recommendation</p>
<p>Policy 11.2 Review all development proposals and public facility improvement plans to ensure water resources are conserved to the maximum extent possible.</p>	<p>Huang – is this something with Water District and not the City Baker – they don’t usually get in details of construction; most is already in the code. Not a bad thing to support with the policy. May want a policy for new projects to allow for reclaimed water. Knarr – broadly it seems that storm water would be covered in other areas. Gorman – unclear why this is in this particular area. Lyons – ok with old policy Bent – can separate out resources somewhere else, but need to have somewhere Watts – not clear why here but don’t object Huang – can staff review to see if better in other area Adams – sees goals 11, 12, 13 as resources. Two components within one element. Even if covered in code doesn’t hurt to leave here even if covered elsewhere.</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Hansen- ok if in another place, but keep values of the goals/policies. Watts – recreation resources for purposes of General Plan are different than parks and recreation. Come back and discuss possibly moving it around. Bring it back at next meeting to discuss. Gorman – maybe there should be a separate resource element?</p>
<p>Policy 11.3 Require drought-tolerant landscaping, water conserving fixtures, reuse of wastewater when feasible and the capture of storm runoff in all private and public development projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add language that requires the City to maintain and utilize a drought tolerant plant list. Implementation program? Also, add language that requires City to update irrigation systems to new water saving technologies, like xerigation and moisture sensors, etc. <p>Adams – should we add language to water conserving fixtures to address irrigation systems.</p>
<p>Policy 11.4 Design flood control and drainage facilities to provide protection from inundation from a 100-year flood event.</p>	<p>Carbone – isn't that what is going on with Sari line along river Hansen – need to keep language since still an issue – maintain Gorman – city wouldn't design or maintain it Watt – concern whether mandating Gorman – how about "support" Carbone – private entity handles, not the City Watt – change "design" to "support" Staff – wouldn't say "support" Bent – aren't all designed at this point – affects future construction Barquist – recommend "Ensure" Gorman – do we have any control Watt – be sensitive to mandatory language "maintain and monitor" – recommended language – no other revisions</p>
<p>Policy 11.5 Retain local drainage courses, channels and creeks in their natural condition where possible.</p>	<p>Adams – what is meant by "retain" – don't want to have an issue with water backing up into homes – need to maintain vegetation Bent – read as not going to build a house on top of it Carbone – debris cleared all the time Adams – there is a canyon with vegetation that if not clear, water backs up – would be an issue if not clear Carbone – is that the City's drainage? Adams – is it natural and never maintained? Watt – wording "where possible" Knarr – effort to not concrete everything No changes</p>
<p>Policy 11.6 Protect groundwater from sources of pollution.</p>	<p>No comments</p>
<p>Goal 12 To permanently preserve significant cultural or historical buildings,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this policy necessary since there is a Historic Resources Element? May be redundant. However, it may be a good

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

	NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS
<i>sites or features within the community.</i>	<p>idea to keep these policies since not everyone reads the entire General Plan, even those currently on or running for the City Council. ☺</p> <p>Adams – is this covered in historic resources element Barquist – doesn't conflict with other policies – can fix any redundancies Lyons – we are already doing this. It's applicable to all the policies.</p>
Policy 12.1 Protect significant areas of historical, archaeological, educational or paleontological resources.	Adams – expanded beyond just buildings
Policy 12.2 Require effective mitigation measures where development may affect historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.	
Policy 12.3 Require the preparation of archaeological or paleontological reports in areas where there is potential to impact cultural resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WHERE WOULD THAT BE AND HOW IS THAT DETERMINED? <p>Barquist – occurs at project level Lyon – isn't there a state policy Bent – if find something, they have to stop work Barquist – regulations that require consultation and stop of work</p>
Policy 12.4 Require that an archaeologist be retained to observe grading activities in areas where the probable presence of archaeological or paleontological resources is indicated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this overly burdensome? <p>Barquist – not over and above requirements Watts – is everyone ok with accepting all policies under Goal 12? No other comments on the policies in this section</p>
Policy 12.5 Preserve uncovered resources in their natural state, as much as feasible to assure their preservation and availability for later study.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<i>Goal 13 To properly manage designated areas for mineral extraction to meet the needs of the area.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wording seems broad. Committee should be provided with information and discuss potential impact of future mineral (assume includes oil and gas) extraction on residents and quality of life. Should General Plan include restrictions as to such development? Need some background to comment on the contents of Goal 13 <p>Adams/Carbone – we have oil extraction Watts – talking about resources and exploration – no mining operations in City Baker – discussion of consolidating wells/drilling Adams – wording seems broad; whose needs Gorman – can be interpreted in different ways</p>

RECREATION & RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>Adams – can add “while ensuring quality of life” or “to meet the needs of the area while ensuring quality of life” Watts – “and to ensure quality of life” Gorman – likes it the way it is Baker – question regarding “properly” manage Huang – do we need extra language – it’s for Yorba Linda – ok way it was Adams – there are working wells – want focus of what they are doing to remember it’s a residential area and that comes first; not focus of extraction activities Knarr – all of that is taken care of legally – there are requirements Huang – look down at policies and you have to comply with state, local standards – adding additional text doesn’t help. Can be strengthened through policies; rather than in goal. Adams – language to clarify meeting needs of area Carbone – already covered – ensuring safe and well-being of our residents Watts – it’s a statement of a goal Barquist – implement “quality of life” through policies, zoning, etc. ok if goal is more broad/general terms – define quality of life through implementation Watt – will revisit goal after looking at policies Knarr – if there is an issue with this, it would be on agenda of CC- Propose to amend to say “petroleum and mineral extraction” No objections to recommendation</p>
<p>Policy 13.1 Compile and maintain maps and descriptions of mineral resources as a basis for policy and program implementation.</p>	<p>Watts – add “petroleum” to all – consistent with above</p>
<p>Policy 13.2 Document current extraction sites, including sand and gravel quarries, including the current status and duration of existing permits and approvals, for compliance monitoring.</p>	<p>Knarr – “including sand, gravel quarries, and petroleum” No other changes</p>
<p>Policy 13.3 Cooperate with other governmental agencies and educational institutions to arrange for the development and exchange of information on mineral resources.</p>	<p>Add petroleum for consistency No other changes</p>
<p>Policy 13.4 Develop rationale as to why mining is not a feasible use of the properties classified as resource sectors by the SMARA to support request for deletion of the area as a potential mineral resource supply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mining? Really? In Yorba Linda? Is this policy necessary? Does mining include oil extraction? <p>Adams – mineral rights are anything. Hansen – need power to say can’t mine on property Huang – language written years ago – has a rationale been developed over all this time? Do we have a written policy somewhere – just sitting there for last 20 years. What’s the purpose of it. Adams – if mining potential comes up in future, a rationale would</p>

**RECREATION &
RESOURCES ELEMENT**

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

	<p>be developed. Watts – would be ok to delete policy Huang – seems useless Bent – doesn’t cover mining in the ground – surface Huang – has this ever come up? Knarr – covers if in future a mineral identified Adams – doesn’t interpret as something that needs to be done now. Huang – goes against point of General Plan – should be protected now, not if something happens in the future – should be the guiding vision Gorman – conversation shows that policy is confusing – should delete Bent – in general, should consider new technologies that may not have been mentioned 20 years ago. For example, fracking. Need to consider. Watts – Policy is referring to areas already identified Hansen – need to protect properties if something in future located Bent – do we have any control if someone else has a right to mine Huang – wants to delete Watts – poll if support to delete 13.4 Hansen – need something to protect in future for things we don’t know Adams – “develop rationale” sticking point for people – SMARA has identified properties for mineral rights development – we want to have right to say that these properties should not be mined – protect areas of City – request from State for them to be deleted. Gorman – extremely confusing – delete Direction – delete policy, but create new policy to protect property in future</p>
<p>Policy 13.5 Require that all mineral extraction reclamation plans be consistent with the policies and procedures of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don’t need a policy to say follow the law. <p>Baker – dealing with closing site and restoring condition Adams – they are different Watts – add “petroleum and mineral” Lyons – we may not add petroleum since dealing with surface Watts – since referring to specific act, should not add petroleum Agreement – not to add “petroleum”</p>
<p>Policy 13.6 Require that permits for reclamation projects specify compliance with State, federal, and local standards and attainment programs with respect to air quality, watersheds and basins, and erosion potential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don’t need a policy to say follow the law. <p>No changes</p>
<p>NEW POLICIES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 2.13 Be aware of existing and planned local residential densities when planning the location of park

RECREATION &
RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

facilities.

- Policy 14: Preserve equestrian/agricultural land sites.
- Committee should consider adding a policy for a “public” equestrian facility.

Adams – what is an equestrian land site

Carbone – lots zoned for horses – large lots should be preserved – semi-rural

Adams – can people have property that they can subdivide – single-property

Staff – depends upon lot and zoning

Carbone – preserve and protect – equestrian is an iconic monument in Yorba Linda – should protect lot size, even if no horses on them. Have a protected area. Some areas don’t have sidewalks, they don’t want them. Rural. Of historical value in Yorba Linda. Little by little edging it away.

Watts – tricky because should have right to develop property

Carbone – protect right to do something, but no rezoning

Watts – is it an equestrian issue or zoning issue

Bent – if build a mother-in-law unit, does that preclude having horses

Carbone – have to have certain lot size and setbacks to have horses; if scale down lot, reduced number of horses you can have – concern, if rezone properties and then have high-density (small units)

Watts – over years the community has had a strong connection to equestrian lifestyle. Keep putting off building facilities – equestrian. There’s also a zoning issue and public expenditure issue. Need to compartmentalize to a policy that encourages the equestrian lifestyle in properties that are already zoned

Carbone – properties zoned equestrian should retain zoning. There will be issues when certain properties are sold in future.

Adams – can we have a general goal that alludes to Yorba Linda’s

RECREATION &
RESOURCES ELEMENT

NOTES/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

historic equestrian community and policies for desire to maintain currently equestrian sites. Can't say for the City to provide a public equestrian site. Need to understand there are private property rights that we cannot override.

Bent – want to retain current equestrian residential zoning. Needs to be done in land use element.

Lyons – should be in land use element. Support goal of a public equestrian center since that is a recreation issue

Huang – worrisome about telling private property owners what to do. Rezoning of high density was done through a vote. We should not dictate what property owners can or cannot do. We have maintained and enforced that this is an equestrian community through General Plan. Not something we should deal with as a GPAC. Let CC figure out how to find the money to provide facilities.

Carbone – agree property owners have rights; but should protect equestrian properties. Want an umbrella to protect.

Watts – aren't we trying to state a policy of support for equestrian community, land, and facilities in general.

Barquist – talking about recreation and resources element; not land use

Recommend Goal: Celebrate and retain the equestrian heritage in Yorba Linda.

Establish policies to monitor resources and coordinate with others for protection.

Watts – have staff go back and develop goal and policies and then come back and revisit.

Adams – agree that recommended goal covers sentiments

Carbone – equestrian facility should be included – it was promised to residents for years – someone should monitor the loss of these lands

Watts – staging areas, features (no curbs), trails – are there other resources that are important to equestrian community that should be addressed

Carbone – all of the trails, unmarked trails, separation of autos and horses, don't lose Paxton – asset protected – maintain anything that is equestrian now – staging areas, rural areas – streets without curbs – features of the equestrian community

Bent – we addressed a lot about equestrian trails in previous meetings that should be looked at

Direction – staff to create goal and policies regarding this issue.

Tuesday, September 30, 2014
6:30 – 8:30 PM
YORBA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER

I. REVIEW OF GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT

Mr. Barquist stated the following points:

- The General Plan Land Use Designations ensures that future zoning is compatible with the land use policy. Existing General Plan land use designations and policy review (density/intensity).
- Distribution of commercial type of uses and whether it meets the needs of the community especially with the new developments occurring (Esperanza, Cielo Vista).
- Esperanza Hills and Cielo Vista are in the Sphere of Influence and the GPAC must look at the implications of development in these areas since they will eventually be incorporated into the City.

Committee Member Gorman asked why there is a 1.8 dwelling unit per acre standard. Senior Planner Rehmer responded that this is because landowners may have two acres and will only be allowed to build two units.

Committee Member Lyons asked if City staff and consultants can overlay the GP land use map over a topographic layer.

Committee Member Adams asked to designate Cielo Vista and Esperanza on the General Plan land use map.

Committee Member Carbone asked to indicate equestrian parcels on the General Plan land use map, and wants a "Preserve" land use designation.

Committee Member Hansen asked to indicate the trails on the General Plan land use map.

Committee Chair Watts asked how to start the process of developing the land use updates.

Mr. Barquist replied that criteria must be established in order to determine the changes in land use in the City; and a process of voting must be determined in order to reach consensus about the land use changes.

Committee Member Bent asked whether the changes to land use are determined by future desired uses and density by parcel. And asked for an example of how General Plan policies can address community needs.

Mr. Barquist replied that it does not really mean that land use changes need to be made in the General Plan.

Committee Member Baker requested that school sites should be shown along with water district sites on the General Plan land use map.

Committee Member Knarr stated that there is already a Zoning Map and a Trails map on the City's website.