

Topics. Also, in supporting handouts which had been provided by City staff prior to that meeting, it clearly denoted West Coyote Hills multiple times under an item called "Theme, Open Space, Parks & Recreation". It was during the theme discussion period that Member Fitzgerald made the motion and the Committee voted. Chairman Stopper requested staff to display a spreadsheet he had prepared which he believed would help the Committee understand their choices.

Member Savage asked Chairman Stopper if he had voted for or against this motion, and Chairman Stopper responded that he had voted against the motion because he believed it was premature in the discussion. He did not believe the Committee was far enough down the path to not process it.

Member Haley questioned whether a revisit of an item that was on a previous agenda, according to Robert's Rules, had to be brought up by one of the people who voted in the affirmative. Chairman Stopper clarified this was not a reconsideration at this point. He requested the Committee look at the four options he had put together, and indicated that reconsideration was the third option on his list.

Chairman Stopper explained the options as he saw them; 1. Agree the subject of that vote was in that agenda and take no further action. 2. The Committee does not agree, and there were some options that could be taken, or if the Committee did not want to take a position they could go to option three. 3. Reconsideration by the Committee. 4. Hand the item over to the City Attorney for his review and opinion. The Committee could also choose to use several of the options.

Member Bennett believed the Committee did in fact have enough documentation in the agenda for them to take action. He believed it was properly agendized, the vote was taken in an appropriate manner, and he wanted to move on with the current agenda. Chairman Stopper confirmed he was in support of option one, and Member Bennett responded affirmatively.

Chairman Stopper requested other Committee Members to voice their opinion on how they would like to proceed.

Member Savage asked if this Point of Order discussion would be available to all the Committee Members on other votes that may be taken as they went through the process, or was this just a one time Point of Order that Chairman Stopper had brought up on a vote that he did not like the outcome of. Chairman Stopper responded that he did not Chair the Committee based on his preferences, or whether he liked or disliked the outcome of a vote.

Member Richmond believed the subject was moot. The Committee had voted to cutoff the talk at that time because it was going to drag out all night. That was all they had cut off; it was a vote to cut off all the talking on one specific area.

Member Bennett wondered if it would be appropriate, to head off any legal challenge to this vote, to make a motion that the Committee reaffirms their vote of last month that excludes from discussion for GPAC purposes the Chevron property located in West Coyote Hills.

Member Lambros struggled with understanding why there was a necessity for action when staff had not indicated anything improper had taken place. He had seen the topic written about in the newspaper, that the Committee had supposedly taken an illegal vote, and he had a conversation with the City Attorney because people were stating the Committee had done something illegal. Based on his conversation with the City Attorney he was very comfortable with the action taken. He did not think they should be reacting to outside opinions so much as finding out from staff if there was anything improper in our vote.

Director Godlewski clarified that the City Attorney's response to staff was if the item was not on the agenda there needed to be another vote. In light of Chairman Stopper's explanation and review of the agenda, and his finding that it was on the agenda and part of the discussion, then the action, was consistent with the Rules of Order and that there was no further discussion necessary.

Vice Chairman Griffin stated that Chairman Stopper had approached him over the weekend to ask his opinion on the topic. He explained he had worked in this field for 27 years, worked with City Councils, put together agendas for Council meetings, made sure that the Minutes were correct, etc., and he believed it was very clear that the action taken in November was action taken on information that was before the Committee that evening. There was not a question in his mind that proper action was taken, and they had done nothing illegal or incorrect according to the Brown Act. This was his opinion, and he wanted to voice it publicly that he did not see any reason for the questioning, the information was contained in their written packet of information, Coyote Hills was mentioned several times in that documentation, there was no reason why the Committee could not take the action they took at the November meeting.

Member Buck asked for clarification on exactly what was voted on, and Chairman Stopper responded that the vote was in the Minutes that had just been approved, on page three; "Member Fitzgerald introduced a motion to withdraw the topic of the Chevron-owned property in the West Coyote Hills area from the GPAC discussion". Member Buck was not clear on what that meant; he wanted to know if it meant for all of the meetings in the future one could never mention the word Coyote Hills again. Chairman Stopper responded that it did not, just the Chevron-owned property in West Coyote Hills. He believed it was different than Coyote Hills, which was a particular piece of property, private property, which was owned by Chevron.

Member Buck asked if that meant they were not to refer to this specific piece of property throughout the remainder of this process, and Chairman Stopper responded that would be the condition they would be operating under, unless it was voted otherwise to change that motion.

Member Lambros believed the context of the motion was being lost. The Committee had been discussing what Themes and Topics would go into the Plan, and there were numerous topics discussed. This was not the specific plan or final draft, just a discussion of what topics they would like to put in the plan. So along came a specific topic that started to get a lot of attention, and the group made a statement, that in discussing Themes and Topics it seemed inconsistent to have a project specific discussion. Member Lambros would support a motion to have no project specific discussions at this point in the General Plan update process, regardless of what project it was. We were talking about Themes and Topics, and in that context maybe it helped everybody understand, so they could move on. He, as one member of the Committee, and he believed there were others, did not view the motion as a gag order on that topic from ever coming up here again, but in an appropriate forum, not in an inappropriate part of the planning process.

Sunbie Harrell commented that looking at what led up to this discussion was when the consultant had the papers displayed with all the post-it notes and so forth. There were quite a few post-it notes mentioning Coyote Hills, which was the community's input, and her concern was now the Committee was going to arbitrarily ignore that or vote it down. She believed this item needed to be re-voted on and clearly stated. She was confused on whether the vote was to eliminate the topic just for the night, or if it was forever during this entire process; were they not to mention "Coyote Hills" or "Chevron-owned property", those words, at any discussions in the future. This was an item the community had expressed interest in, and she did not want to ignore that portion of input from the community.

Chairman Stopper believed that was what the vote was for; the vote was to eliminate the topic from their discussion, eliminate discussion about that private piece of property in West Coyote Hills. When he had done his research, he found that West Coyote Hills, in the General Plan today, was that large piece of land in Fullerton, north of Rosecrans, west of Euclid, and bounded by boundaries with other cities to the north and west. There were housing developments, existing there for sometime on that property. That was what the City called, in the General plan today, West Coyote Hills. There was in fact a West Coyote Hills map and element in the General Plan today. There was also a Master Plan associated with the Chevron property in Coyote Hills, which was a subset of that, in the General plan today. He believed that the motion would be interpreted as they would not have any further discussion about the Chevron property in West Coyote Hills. That did not eliminate discussions about that piece of Fullerton which was called West Coyote Hills, as described above.

Member Durette clarified they were talking about a privately owned piece of property, owned by Chevron, not an area of the City, and those were two separate things.

Member Heusser believed the paper did a disservice when it reported it as "Coyote Hills, in relation to open space, will not be discussed". It was presented the display board as open space. Coyote Hills, and the interpretation from at least one person on this Committee, was that Coyote Hills was all open space. The intent was that Coyote Hills would not be discussed as open space. When you discussed open space, Coyote Hills would come up, all the parks would come up, and the private property might come up, so Coyote Hills may be discussed, whether it is in relation to open space or housing, circulation, or resource management, because its part of the City. The way it was presented, as she saw it, was they were deciding it was open space and it was sitting there as open space, all five hundred acres, and she did not think that was what they wanted to do. She thought it was an excellent motion and it was very clear.

Dexter Savage stated that, absent the City Attorney saying they had done something wrong, he saw no reason to correct it. He believed the confusion was not Coyote Hills, but that Coyote Hills had become synonymous with the project, and what was discussed at the last meeting was a project. He would agree with Member Lambros and vote to not discuss any projects that were going on in the City of Fullerton. He did not want to go through this process on every motion, as it took considerable time and the Committee did not have a lot of extra time.

Member Jaramillo had heard people referring to the property as privately-owned, and in the minutes Consultant Barquist had said that open space could be privately or publicly owned, so she did not understand why they were getting into Coyote Hills being Chevron property. It could be considered or drawn out in generalizations in the Plan as open space, or hopefully our vision of open space, but the privately owned discussion did not make sense. It was owned by Chevron, but so were other properties, such as one or two of the golf courses, and we considered them open space. She understood it was not definite open space, but I did not understand why it could not be out there for discussion like it was in the previous General Plan.

Member Batinich commented that the Committee had voted, and they could be here through the next General Plan if this came up every time a situation was put to a vote. Either the Committee stayed with the vote, or moved on, but they needed to do something. They did not have that much time to discuss every detail of every situation that came up, they had already voted on this and it was not an illegal vote.

Member Bushala did not understand the motion to be a gag order on discussion of Coyote Hills as it related to Themes and Topics. He believed the motion was to table that discussion as it related to Themes and Topics, because possibly it did not belong in that category. There would be an opportunity in the future to discuss some of the important items related to Coyote Hills, and he would like to move on.

Member Harrell asked for clarification, that this was not a gag order, and this topic would be open in the future; she did not want to be silenced if she said Chevron property in Coyote Hills.

Chairman Stopper stated there was no time dependency put on the motion, therefore it stood in perpetuity until such time there was a different motion to change it. It was not a motion for that instance only; it was a motion for the GPAC and would stand in perpetuity until the Committee changed it. If it was not changed, it would stand in perpetuity. That is what the motion was, there was no time domain in the motion itself, it did not state just now, tonight, November 5. It was open-ended, which meant perpetuity.

Chairman Stopper asked the will of the Committee, and Vice Chairman Griffin stated he did not believe they had taken any missteps, it was a legal vote, and they needed to move forward. Chairman Stopper asked if there were any objections, there were none, so discussion on this item was closed.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Present and discuss Draft vision statement

RBF Community Planner Suzanne Rynne explained the Draft Vision Statement had been developed using words and statements that the community had listed at the various charette's and community meetings. She asked the Committee to think about whether this statement reflected the words of the community, what words or phrases they believed should be a part of the vision statement, what should be added, and what should be changed.

Committee Member Bennett suggested striking the words "the needs of" in the third sentence.

Vice Chairman Griffin was concerned with the language in the same sentence; he did not believe you could "respect" a thing and suggested using the word "respond".

Committee Member Buck questioned the purpose of the Vision Statement, and thought it best to describe things as they were. He gave the example of "community-driven", yet only 150 residents out of 130,000 had participated in the General Plan outreach programs.

Committee Member Fitzgerald commented many companies write their mission statements in the present tense what they would want to be in an ideal world. She thought that stating items as if they had been accomplished would help you to accomplish them.

Committee Member Buck believed that speaking of the present was fine for a mission statement, but a General Plan Vision Statement was supposed to speak of the future.

Committee Member Batinich suggested "Fullerton embraces its heritage, active lifestyle, and cultural diversity".

Committee Member Bushala thought the draft statement was too generic. He would like to see the things that make Fullerton unique, such as the significant buildings and parks, included in the statement. He believed the statement needed to include words that described Fullerton today, and also described what Fullerton was striving for, sustainable design.

Committee Member Heusser liked the Santa Paula and Arizona samples that had been provided to the Committee. She thought the statement should use words from the charrette's that make Fullerton stand apart, such as education, medical, and topography/hills. She also believed the statement should begin with some description that would draw you in, and then move on to the vision.

Vice Chairman Griffin agreed with Committee Member's Heusser and Bushala, and suggested this statement may need to be different than the typical vision statement. He suggested the possibility of having two parts to the statement; what make Fullerton unique today, and what we want Fullerton to be in the future.

Committee Member Savage wanted to include descriptions that would capture some of the excitement of Fullerton, and describe what set the City apart from other Orange County cities.

Committee Member Harrell suggested including some action verbs, or words such as "seek to ensure" or "provide. She liked Ms. McNeil's examples.

Committee Member Haley thought the draft statement tried to say everything in as few words as possible. She believed the statement needed to be expanded.

Committee Member Richmond liked the words "heritage", "diversity", "recreation", "transportation", and "education". He also liked the last sentence in the draft statement.

Chairman Stopper commented that the statement needed to reflect an eclectic community. He believed some of the City's strengths were the hospital, education facilities, the airport, and the arts. He also would like to see something included that made referenced to the caring community and the over one hundred non-profit organizations that cared for people both in and out of the community.

Committee Member Bushala also agreed that the arts needed to be included.

Committee Member Lambros wanted to look for terms that embraced the ideas without listing each idea. He suggested terms such as "small town atmosphere" or "honor heritage".

Committee Member Buck thought that education was not given enough prominence in the statement if Fullerton was supposed to be an education community. He also commented that accountability was not mentioned.

At this point the Committee decided to have staff and the consultant's compile the suggestions from tonight's meeting and forward them to each Committee Member. Committee Member's could then use this information to create a vision statement. Director Godlewski stated that staff would work to get the information to the Member's before the holiday closure.

Public hearing opened.

Susan Petrella made the following comments:

- Fullerton was known for arts and culture also, and they needed to be prominent
- She questioned why Committee Member's were not looking at the information that had been gathered at the various community outreach meetings
- She asked why the common words from the outreach meetings were not included in the Draft Vision Statement
- She believed the Committee should not be generating a new vision statement, but instead they should look at the public comments. She thought the statement should be created in a way so the community participants would recognize their words.
- She like Ms. McNeil's comments

Chairman Stopper clarified that each Committee Member had been provided copies of the various community meeting inputs.

Ms. McNeil commented that the first sentence of the draft statement contained "...community-driven principles..." but did not describe them. She believed the statement needed to be broken down into several sections.

Dave Musante made the following comments:

- Should talk about the past and also about what was going on today in Fullerton.
- Take out "is built" in the first sentence and substitute "should continue".
- Add items that are important today such as green buildings and open space.
- Many people believe there is too much development in Fullerton and more deliberation is needed before projects are approved.

Tom Dalton made the following comments:

- The draft statement was too long. He believed it needed to be more concise.
- Historical preservation was very prominent in the community meetings, yet it was not mentioned in the draft statement.

Public hearing closed.

Housing Element discussion

RBF Principal Community Planner David Barquist explained that the Housing Element of the General Plan had recently been added to RBF's contract. The Housing Element was unique in that State review and certification were required. The State-wide housing goal was to provide decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family.

Mr. Barquist continued by explaining the Housing Element was one of seven State-required elements of the General Plan, and must include provisions for housing at a variety of income levels. The City would complete the Housing Element, send it to the State for review, make any necessary changes, and return it to the State for certification. The Housing Element was required to be certified by the State no later than June 30, 2008.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers were explained and the 2006-2014 allocations were discussed. Mr. Barquist explained the Housing Element would be updated every five years, but the goal now was to establish a plan that would meet the growth needs by 2014.

Committee Member Buck asked what would happen if the City did not meet the number of units needed, and Mr. Barquist explained that there were still questions as to whether the City could be

punished in some way. Director Godlewski added to be eligible for State funds there needed to be a Housing Element in place. Financial sanctions against City's had also been threatened.

Mr. Barquist continued, and explained the five phases of the review process:

- Review the existing plan
- Public participation
- Draft Housing Element
- Environmental Review
- Housing Element Adoption

In order to meet the deadline, staff believed the process needed to be complete by the end of March 2008.

Vice Chairman Griffin commented the RHNA numbers were indicated the City had to zone sufficient property to that the private sector could development the land and meet the RHNA needs. The City was not required to build / provide housing to meet these needs. Mr. Barquist added the City could choose to use CDBG monies or other funds to meet some of the need if they desired.

Committee Member Lambros asked if the biggest impediment to meeting the RHNA numbers was land availability or community support. Mr. Barquist responded that several items went into meeting the numbers such as the cost of land, affordability of the housing, and the desire to live in this community. Committee Member Lambros asked if density needed to increase to make housing more affordable, and Mr. Barquist responded there was no simple answer; it would depend on what the community wanted.

Chairman Stopper stated there was much to do in a short amount of time. He suggested the Committee meet more than once a month, and requested staff to inform the Committee of the schedule as soon as possible so additional meetings could be scheduled.

Committee Member Lambros requested staff provide the Committee Members with a list of items discussed at this meeting related to the Vision Statement.

Initial discussion regarding general plan structure

- Explanation of a general plan structure
- Discuss how themes and topic relate to design
- Explanation and example of policy

This discussion was continued until the January 14, 2008 meeting.

Public comment opened.

Judith Kaluzny commented that the information provided to the Committee was still not available to the public; she had checked the City's website prior to the meeting and was not able to find the material. She believed the issue on the vote at the previous meeting may not have come up if the public had access to the same information the Committee received.

Director Godlewski stated the information would not be put on the website until the Committee Members had received their packets. The information for this meeting had been put on the City's

website this morning. Senior Planner St. Paul added the agenda, draft Vision Statement, and PowerPoint presentation were available to the public on the website.

Kathleen Rhee believed that the comments being made were too long. Chairman Stopper clarified that it was a large Committee, and they needed to allow everyone time to speak.

Public comment closed.

AGENDA FORECAST

The next regularly scheduled GPAC meeting will occur at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, January 14, 2008. Subsequent meetings will occur at 7:00 p.m. on the following dates: February 11 and March 10, 2008.

STAFF/COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

Senior Planner St. Paul clarified staff would provide the Committee with notes from this meeting's discussion of the draft Vision Statement, and a proposed schedule for the Housing Element. He stressed the need for the Committee to stay on schedule with the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Janelle Pasillas
Administrative Assistant