

responded that there were additional neighborhood meetings planned in the next few months, and there would be meetings scheduled to discuss each Element of the General Plan. The dates of these meetings would be posted to the website when they were known.

Vice Chairman Griffin commented that at the April 23, 2007 meeting it was suggested that the City Attorney attend a GPAC meeting to explain how conflicts of interest should be handled during this process. Chairman Stopper responded by explaining the training that had been provided by the City, and stated he would follow up with staff.

Chairman Stopper asked staff how often the City's website was updated, and Acting Chief Planner Eastman responded that it was updated as information became available, usually within two to three days. Senior Planner St. Paul confirmed that information was added to the website as soon as was possible.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Community Outreach Program – Status of Community Outreach Program

Senior Planner St. Paul gave an overview of the Community Outreach meetings that had been held, and presented the Draft Visioning Report. This report contained the main “themes” that had been expressed the most during the outreach process, and “words” in the themes that were identified as important by the public during a follow-up meeting (open house). Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the community outreach would continue during the next several months, and gave a timeline for the General Plan Update process.

Review and Discussion of Draft Community Vision Report

Committee Member Buck made the following comments:

- Many of the “words” listed could have several meanings based on the context in which they were used.
- He asked why the bicycle element was not included on this list, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that it would be discussed separately.
- Believed “education” and “community” should be separate categories.
- Believed “open space and parks” and “sustainability” should be separate categories.
- “Mobility” was too broad of a term – it could include automobiles and everything else. He would like to see “less dependence on the automobile”. Acting Chief Planner Eastman explained that the Consultant had purposely deviated from using common terms because many of the more common terms carried a preconceived definition, and they wanted to encourage the Committee to be creative and not follow preconceived ideology.
- The General Plan was a document of restraints and incentives, and was not a market driven document.
- The Committee needed to identify what the citizens of the City wanted and incorporate those items in their recommendation.

Chairman Stopper made the following comments:

- We were collecting themes to collect other data into, and possibly expand on some of them rather than reduce.

- This meeting was the kickoff and now it was time for the GPAC to look at the raw data that has come back, and put some type of structure to it, and look at it to see if it seemed reasonably okay to where we were at now, but leaving the option open to add to it or change it in the future.
- The GPAC should focus on what state they wanted the City to be in twenty years. Some of the items may be unattainable, but the GPAC should focus on the strategy, while still being realistic.

Committee Member Harrell made the following comments:

- Asked if “open space” had come up, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that it had, just not as frequently as other theme words.
- Would like to add “Preservation of Resources” as a theme.
- It would be impossible to mandate that every home be “green”, but the City could require new homes and businesses to be energy efficient, and offer incentives.
- Believed that staff had done a considerable amount of work preparing the Draft Vision Report, and the Committee should look to it for guidance.

Committee Member Lambros made the following comments:

- The words listed were good, and when listed under a “theme” they had meaning. When listed separately, the “words” were out of context.
- Many things could be done in regards to housing; i.e. minimize lot sizes and increase density to lower housing prices.
- He was confused as to the purpose of tonight’s meeting – setting up the categories, or arguing for those items he was passionate for.
- He understood that the Committee did not need to identify how their ideas would be funded, but there was still a need to be fiscally responsible and that would eliminate some possibilities.
- He wondered if “resource preservation” might be better labeled “resource management”, so as to include finding new sources of water and energy.

Senior Planner St. Paul explained that it was the Committee’s task to use these “themes” and “words” to come up with a concise Vision Statement for the General Plan Update. Chairman Stopper asked how these “themes” had come about, and Senior Planner St. Paul explained that these were the most popular/common ideas expressed at the various Community Outreach meetings.

Committee Member Haley made the following comments:

- Asked if the Committee’s task was to give direction on what they wanted the Vision Statement to be, and Senior Planner St. Paul responded that it was, although the Statement would not be completed tonight.
- Asked if the Consultant could write a Vision Statement based on these “themes”, and also provide samples of other City’s Vision Statements, that the Committee could then edit into their own statement. Consultant Barquist responded that he would have a draft available at the next meeting.
- “Green” buildings should be looked at.
- Was concerned with global warming and believed it should be addressed during the Update process.

- Asked what the definition of “preservation” was; i.e. resources, zeroscape landscaping, green buildings. Each individual had a different background, therefore their definitions may be different.
- Under “Economic Development” add something about workforce housing / how to keep the young adults here in the City. Committee Member Bennett responded that there were State mandates on how to implement affordable housing, and these mandates would need to be addressed in the Housing Element.
- Use words such as “believes” or “encourages”; i.e. “The City believes energy conservation is important”. Words such as these allow for innovation in conservation.

Senior Planner St. Paul clarified that the Vision Statement did not have to be a single sentence. The current Vision Statement was several pages long, but a short statement may be more concise.

Committee Member Savage made the following comments:

- He suggested the Committee look at the current General Plan Vision Statement and see if it was in line with what the Committee wanted, or where it fell short.
- He believed if the Vision Statement was too complex it would not be read or considered.
- The General Plan was strategic to the economics of the City, and to abandon the economics during this update process would be irresponsible. Chairman Stopper responded that the Committee needed to focus on strategy.
- Government policy and mandates in the General Plan, whether it was green buildings or affordable housing, will cost someone money, and this will discourage people from coming into or stay in the City.

Committee Member Bennett made the following comments:

- Asked if the number of people listed as attending the various road shows/workshops were different people or could there be duplicates (some people attended more than one meeting and may have been double counted). Consultant Barquist responded that he would have the numbers available at the next meeting. Senior Planner St. Paul explained that the numbers shown for the Rotary Club meetings were accurate, but there may have been some duplicates with the workshops. Acting Chief Planner Eastman stated the Visioning Workshops were accurate, and did not double count.
- Was concerned with using “politically loaded” terms in the Vision Statement, as they could pull the Committee apart.
- Regarding open space – if you made Coyote Hills open space, who would pay for the upkeep; if you allowed Chevron to develop part of it and give open space to the community.
- The idea of “green” buildings was a good concept, and sometimes it happened naturally, but he did not think the government should mandate it.

Vice Chairman Griffin made the following comments:

- While reviewing the Draft Vision Report he had identified four things (Coyote Hills, traffic, the downtown, and development versus private property rights) that he believed were expressed as being important throughout the report, and he believed the “themes” presented today covered his items.

- “Sustainability” was a confusing term; it could mean something different in each area. Possibly use “preservation of resources” instead.
- Liked “mobility” as a theme, would like to add a separate theme of “education community”, and possibly “growth management” with as a subset of “community design”.
- Need to identify themes, and then add what would be under each theme.

Committee Member Bushala made the following comments:

- Believed it was a good idea to involve the youth in the update process.
- Did not want to “funnel” the ideas too closely because it would limit creativity in the future.
- “Sustainability” and “green”, how they related to “preservation”, and what did they really mean.
- Currently there was a mechanism in place that allowed for changes in the General Plan.
- Believed “preservation” could mean we limit the amount of resources we used.
- Questioned whether the City should require “green/smart” buildings in the future.
- Possibly offer incentives to resident’s willing to preserve/conserve.

Committee Member Jaramillo made the following comments:

- Suggested the Committee use the “themes” as headings that could have many different topics listed underneath, and decide what was important to list under each.
- Open space to her was Coyote Hills; Parks was all of the current parks, where new parks could be located, the need for the various leagues within the City, outside people using our parks; Sustainability could be communities, residential properties, commercial properties, and infrastructure, anything that we need to make sure it lasts.

Matthew Leslie, a member of the public, stated that “sustainability” could be defined in several ways. Some cities required “green” or “smart” buildings and encouraged the use of non-toxic materials and solar power. He wanted to know if the City could require, rather than encourage, this type of building.

Committee Member Durette made the following comments:

- Unless the City could control the housing prices in California, people will continue to move out of state.
- The General Plan was supposed to be an outline, not a specific plan.

Committee Member Batinich made the following comments:

- Housing under “growth management and density”, which should also incorporate the cost of living in town, low cost housing, Coyote Hills, resources of the City.
- Ideas are good but who will pay for them; i.e. If West Coyote Hills is to be left as open space, and the City buys the property, where will the money come from? Taxpayers. Chairman Stopper responded that the Committee was not to worry about where the money would come from, but rather they should look at this process in the strategic sense. Committee Member Batinich commented that the Committee needed to be realistic in its recommendation to the City Council.

Committee Member Heusser made the following comments:

- She believed that economics needed to play a part in this discussion.
- Asked if the “themes” were the Elements. Consultant Barquist explained that these “themes” were like umbrellas, and were used to capture the entirety of the subject.
- Tonight’s discussion placed individual items, such as West Coyote Hills, into specific “themes”. She felt it would be better to discuss the “themes” rather than specific projects.

Public hearing opened.

Susan Petrella made the following comments:

- The General Plan should be Fullerton’s highest and best.
- Was not clear; were the “themes” the “elements” of the General Plan. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that they were not. Ms. Petrella asked if the GPAC would identify the elements, and Chairman Stopper responded that they would.
- She sat on the Energy and Resource Management Committee and staff had not made a General Plan presentation to this Committee. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that he would be making contact with that Committee.
- The road shows she had attended were reactive, providing information, rather than allowing proactive participation. Need to allow at least a half day for each session.
- She was Chair of the Arts Committee and believed the Arts were important.
- She would like to see the City as not only the “Education” City, but also the “Arts and Cultural” City.
- Open space could mean a community garden.

Jane Rands made the following comments:

- The Draft Vision Report was not available to the public. Chairman Stopper responded that the Draft was available online, and Senior Planner St. Paul added that copies were available at both the Main Branch Library and the Hunt Branch Library, as well as the public counter on the second floor of City Hall.

Matt Leslie made the following comments:

- He had viewed the draft online, and attended some of the workshops.
- He was happy with the number of people attending these events, but thought it was a small number compared to the population of the City.
- He suggested adding a “sticky note” section on the website. Consultant Barquist responded that a virtual workshop was available on the website, and he would report back at the next meeting as to the number of responses received. Senior Planner St. Paul stated this site had been advertised at least once, and he would look into advertising it again.

Barbara Kilponen made the following comments:

- She had attended a Visioning meeting.
- She believed that the majority of themes fell under “quality of life” and suggested the following vision statement: The City of Fullerton is committed to the preservation and enhancement of quality of life.

Public hearing closed.

OTHER MATTERS

Future Meeting Schedule

The following dates were set for GPAC meetings:

October 8, 2007
November 5, 2007
December 10, 2007

The meetings would be held at 7:00 p.m. in the Police Department Mural Room.

Chairman Stopper asked for the seating at future meetings to be arranged so that the GPAC did not have their backs to the public.

Administrative Comments

Chairman Stopper asked about the visioning workshop that was to be held at Richman School, and whether the information for this meeting was on the City's website. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that Mayor Pro Tem Quirk was working with him to schedule several workshops/road shows in the southern part of Fullerton. They had not yet reserved any dates at Richman School, so the information was not available on the website at this time. This meeting would be added to the website once a location was known.

Chairman Stopper recommended the other GPAC Members keep in contact with their Council Members and update them on the status of these meetings. He believed that because the Council would ultimately approve or modify the GPAC recommendation, it was important for them to understand what took place during the GPAC meetings.

Chairman Stopper clarified the definitions for excused and unexcused absences:

- Excused – A Member let staff or the Chairman know in advance of the meeting that they would not be in attendance
- Unexcused – No show, no notice

If any Member had two or more unexcused absences the Chairman would contact the appropriate Council Member.

Committee Member Heusser requested staff to provide the information that would be discussed prior to the meeting, to allow time for review.

Chairman Stopper asked staff to take the Committee's input from tonight and list the Community Themes that had had been brought up.

Vice Chairman Griffin requested staff provide the "goal" of the meeting, along with the packet of information, so that the Member's could review the material with the "goal" in mind. He would also like to receive an email with the "themes" from the PowerPoint and notes from tonight's meeting. Senior Planner St. Paul responded that they should be ready within two to three days.

AGENDA FORECAST

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting would be October 8, 2007 at 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.