

ATTACHMENT 2

General Plan Update Issues Committee Summary of Recommendations

Exhibit A contains a summary of the specific recommendations made by the General Plan Issues Committee to date. Additional information on the Committee's actions and staff's understanding of their discussions were as follows:

Population Buildout/Smart Growth Areas

- The Committee did not want a target population, such as our estimated fair share growth for 2050, to drive the revision process. Instead, they felt we should examine the identified **potential** Smart Growth Areas to determine which were the most feasible and desirable without regard to a specific population target.
- They were supportive of planning for growth but stressed the need for appropriate densities and coordination with services and other Quality of Life Standards. **Member Stahl expressed opposition to any growth beyond the buildout of the present General Plan.**
- They were supportive of directing planned growth to Smart Growth Areas rather than increasing densities elsewhere.
- They did not want to eliminate study of any Smart Growth Areas or establish a development priority without some analysis **whether to have priorities at all as well as what the priorities should be.** However there did appear to be strong support for development in the Downtown Specific Plan Area.

General Plan Boundaries and Land Use

- They did not call for major changes to our existing General Plan Boundaries.
- They were supportive of creating additional employment lands by creating new areas and redeveloping existing areas. They noted the need to identify the type of employment lands desired so the categories are not overly inclusive **restrictive**. For instance, retail is typically not included in office and industrial areas.
- They did not want to conduct technical studies to establish a specific target for the creation of employment lands as a percentage of population or overall land use. Instead, they felt all feasible areas for employment lands should be identified and studied.
- Ownership patterns, desired types of uses, size requirements, transportation needs, number of owners, nature of existing improvements, financial feasibility, and land use compatibility should be used in the evaluation of land use changes.
- Some of the potential amendment areas discussed or suggested to date include the area bounded by I-15, Valley Parkway, Center City Parkway, and SR 78, the I-15/Citracado intersection, areas around the Escondido Research and Technology Center, **Escondido Boulevard and Quince Street corridors**, and areas around the SR 78/Broadway intersection.

Quality of Life Standards

- They felt the Quality of Life Standards should be retained in the General Plan rather than adopted in facility master plans in a manner done by many other jurisdictions.
- They felt ***recognized*** the Quality of Life Standards ~~should~~ play a strong role in the budget process.
- They were supportive of modifications to update and refine the standards as follows:
 - Fire-
 - Amend to address taller and more intensive development in Smart Growth Areas such as the Downtown.
 - Circulation-
 - Amend to recognize that Levels of Service will likely diminish in Smart Growth areas given the higher intensities. However, the impacts will be offset by increased transit opportunities and a reduction in vehicle miles traveled. Committee Members Prazeau and Paul did not support the language change since they felt that the current General Plan language provides sufficient flexibility.
 - Acknowledge that a very limited number of Circulation Element roads may either need to be downgraded or some not upgraded due to physical constraints. They did not want to identify these situations in advance of careful study. Concern was expressed that key circulation links with some constraints should not be downgraded merely because their construction presents some difficulties.
 - Water
 - Modify to reduce the current per unit capacity assumption of 600 gallons per day to 540 gallons per day to better reflect the State's conservation goals.
 - Parks
 - Modify to create an Urban Park Standard that would reflect the expansion of Grape Day Park and supplemental public recreational facilities that are not developed in a park setting (i.e. exercise courses, walking paths, public plazas, promenades, River Walk, dog parks, etc.).
 - Wastewater
 - Include a policy that reclaimed water be prioritized for local use.
 - Include the use of equivalent dwelling unit to better estimate water and sewer demands since it provides a better metric for addressing non-residential and mixed-use projects.
 - Libraries
 - Committee Discussion scheduled for January 7.
 - Circulation and Mobility
 - Committee consideration scheduled for January 7.
 - Status of Proposition "S"
 - Committee consideration scheduled for January 7.

EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF GENERAL PLAN ISSUE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Long Term Population Needs Discussion Issue	Committee Recommendation
<p>1) The General Plan Update should plan for at least Escondido’s fair share, and possibly more, of the regional growth that is forecasted for 2050.</p>	<p>ACTION (10/22/09):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The City should accept a “Fair Share” of the anticipated 70,000 unit-shortfall (approximately 2,500 units for Escondido) -0- votes 2) The City should accept no units; Escondido is already too crowded and as a result no density increases should occur -3- votes 3) The City should determine what densities are needed to meet community goals and determine what densities are appropriate to meet those goals –unanimous- <p>(Kildoo Absent)</p>
<p>2) Any forecasted growth that can’t be accommodated in the Downtown should be directed to prioritized Smart Growth Areas rather than studying all Smart Growth Areas, increasing the density of land use categories on a citywide basis (i.e. changing Suburban (3.3 du/ac) to Urban 1 (6.3du/ac.), or expanding the boundaries of the General Plan.</p>	<p>ACTION (10/22/09):</p> <p>No formal vote; the consensus was that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Smart Growth should also include jobs, not just residential densities 2) There was no interest in increasing densities in established neighborhoods <u><i>outside the Smart Growth Areas</i></u> 3) The City should evaluate redevelopment opportunities in deteriorated areas and revisit Quality of Life standards for possible refinement in areas where increased density is proposed 4) Consideration should be given to determine what goal the city wanted to accomplish in terms of providing employment land when evaluating ownership patterns, numbers of owners, existing improvements, redevelopment overlays, lot consolidation, financial feasibility, compatibility with surrounding areas, etc., all of which would have a bearing on how quickly the area could be developed for employment uses. <p>(Kildoo Absent)</p>

General Plan Boundaries and Land Use Discussion Issue	Committee Recommendation
<p>1) Lands suitable for the creation of new employment areas should be studied as Part of the Update even to the extent they involve changing residential land to an employment category.</p>	<p>ACTION (11/05/09): No formal vote; the consensus was that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Additional employment lands were needed and should be studied in the General Plan Update, including the potential conversion of existing, deteriorated residential areas 2) No specific target number of acres should be established as a goal; rather, the criteria for evaluating suitability for employment lands should include: a) the existing environmental conditions; b) whether the area is blighted; and, c) the status of the existing infrastructure 3) Design and development standards should be set <u><i>high as necessary to produce the desired goals. High standards just for their own sake could be counterproductive. For example, too high landscaping standards or setbacks in the industrial areas could impede job creation.</i></u> but flexibility should be provided regarding the allowable uses 4) There was no need for staff to perform extensive technical studies to substantiate the need for expanding employment lands in the General Plan Update; it is in the community’s best interest. <p>Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting concerned that rights of property owners be protected in “blighted, deteriorated areas.” (Wells Absent)</p>
<p>2) Rather than designating new commercial areas (such as along I-15 or in the area of Bear Valley and San Pasqual), the General Plan should continue policies of reinforcing existing commercial areas.</p>	<p>ACTION (11/05/09): No formal vote; the consensus was that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Mixed-use occurring on the same site, but not necessarily in the same building would be important to ensure compatibility between land uses (i.e. residential and entertainment, etc) 2) Smart Growth areas should be where mixed-use is focused and it should be compact and pedestrian oriented <p>(Wells Absent)</p>

General Plan Quality of Life Standards Discussion Issue	Committee Recommendation
1) Existing Quality of Life Standards should be modified to ensure they address forecasted needs.	
FIRE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain current language that acknowledges averaging of response times to achieve compliance in 90% of calls for service ■ <i>Add General Plan Policies to address taller and compact development in Smart Growth Areas</i> 	ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent)
POLICE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain current Quality of Life Standard 	ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent)
CIRCULATION: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Modify current QOL language to include instances where Level of Service lower than “C” will be accepted particularly in high density, infill areas based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compact and vertical nature of Smart Growth that generates additional congestion ▪ Lower levels of service is considered appropriate in many communities with urban components 	ACTION (12/17/09): Endorsed by Committee (Vote 10:2) Paul, Prazeau opposed by citing the current QOL language as sufficient for addressing the amendment (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent) Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting opposing this action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Streets that will never be widened to their current designations should be downgraded in recognition of their environmental constraints (even though some surrounding streets may experience more traffic).</i> 	ACTION (11/19/09): 1) Traffic and Circulation Quality of Life alternatives in Smart Growth Areas should be further evaluated to assess their status – Unanimous (Guthrie, Ross, Velasco, Absent) ACTION (12/17/09): 2) Staff evaluate the Circulation Element and report back identifying specified streets with the reasons why downgrading should be considered - Unanimous (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent)

<p>SCHOOLS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain QOL current language 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent) Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting opposing this action</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Clarify current General Plan Policies regarding:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Current provisions for joint-use facilities and coordination of City capital improvement projects with school construction.</i> 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Minimum acreage requirements for school construction</i> 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee to remove minimum acreage requirements (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent)</p>
<p>WATER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Modify General Plan QOL language reducing current “600 gallons per day” to “540 gallons per day” to better reflect the state’s conservation goals. ■ Include General Plan Policies clarifying “Equivalent Dwelling Unit” water demand for non-residential uses. 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent) Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting opposing this action</p>
<p>WASTEWATER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain current QOL language ■ <i>Amend General Plan Policies to reflect:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Regional Water Quality Control Board amended policies regarding re-use</i> ▪ <i>“Equivalent Dwelling Unit” provisions that clarify non-residential sewer demand.</i> 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Maximized use of reclaimed water</i> 	<p>ACTION (12/17-09): Unanimously endorse staff consideration with the provision that reclaimed water be prioritized for local use (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent)</p>
<p>PARKS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Modify QOL language to create an Urban Park Standard that would include the expansion of Grape Day Park and supplemental public recreational facilities that are not developed in a park setting (i.e. exercise courses, walking paths, public plazas, promenades, River Walk, dog parks, etc.) 	<p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee</p>
<p>AIR QUALITY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Replace references to state and federal requirements with implementation measures from an associated local Climate Action Plan that will call for compact design, increasing transit, decreasing vehicle miles traveled, etc. 	<p>ACTION: To be considered January 7, 2010</p>

<p>LIBRARY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Modify current QOL language based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technological changes in information access & delivery ▪ Trends in patronage, staffing and space needs ■ <i>Eliminate polices referencing driving distances to libraries to determine branch facilities.</i> ■ <i>Maintain flexibility for satisfying space needs with a combination of branch libraries and/or a main facility.</i> 	<p>ACTION: To be considered January 7, 2010</p>
<p>ECONOMIC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Supplement Economic QOL Standard with a separate comprehensive Economic Element in the General Plan to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide direction concerning future economic growth of the community ▪ Direct the community’s future economic growth and performance ▪ Define an economic strategy necessary to ensure competitiveness within the region. 	<p>ACTION: To be considered January 7, 2010</p>
<p>General Plan Transportation & Mobility Discussion Issues:</p>	<p>Committee Recommendation</p>
<p>1) NCTD Rail Extension: Whether the extension of rail to the Westfield’s Shopping Town should be studied for inclusion in the Circulation Element.</p> <p>STAFF Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Study rail extension to Westfield’s to coordinate with Regional Transportation Plan ▪ Supplement Circulation Element policies to incorporate rail & bus rapid transit facilities and associated station amenities along the route and at Westfield’s. 	<p>ACTION: To be considered January 7, 2010</p>
<p>2) California High Speed Rail: Whether land Use changes around the potential High Speed Rail should be deferred until more details are known.</p> <p>STAFF Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include language calling for monitoring and coordinating rail efforts; refine General Plan polices to identify appropriate land uses around transit stations that promote Escondido as a destination for employment and entertainment rather than for development of large-scale parking facilities. ▪ Do not make land use changes in anticipation of future alignment or station locations. 	<p>ACTION: To be considered January 7, 2010</p>

General Plan Growth Management Discussion Issues	Committee Recommendation
<p>1) Growth Management: Whether the General Plan’s growth management system should ensure minimum service levels are maintained but provide for some level of development to proceed even to the extent that some, non-critical, infrastructure deficiencies exist.</p> <p>STAFF Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refine criteria and thresholds that establish better guidance for defining critical infrastructure areas affecting the timing of development. ▪ Simplify existing “Tier” designations. ▪ Revisit across the board exemptions allowed in Tier 1. 	<p>ACTION: To be considered January 7, 2010</p>
<p>2) Water Supply: Whether in light of the issues with long-term water supply, the General Plan Update should establish some water use parameters to constrain planning efforts. One example would be to stay within the water use projections of the current General Plan.</p> <p>STAFF Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish an updated standard of 540 GPD Quality of Life Standard as a maximum. The Water Master Plan would be the tool for establishing water use parameters that do not exceed the QOL Standard. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that long term supply accommodates planned buildout. 	<p>ACTION: To be considered January 7, 2010</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <p>ACTION (12/17/09): Unanimously endorsed by Committee (Bailey, Guthrie, Stahl Absent) Note: Stahl followed up after the meeting opposing this action</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <p>ACTION: To be considered January 7, 2010</p>
<p>Proposition “S” Discussion Issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Whether Proposition “S” should be eliminated in its entirety concurrently with the General Plan Update. <p>STAFF Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Place on ballot as a separate item. ■ Link Prop “S” to the vote on the General Plan. ■ Do not place an item on the Ballot pertaining to Prop “S.” 	<p>ACTION (12/5/09):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The City should not consider Proposition S as part of the General Plan Update – 5 votes 2) The City should consider Proposition S as part of the General Plan Update – 0 votes 3) It is too early to decide on this matter at this time; discussion on Proposition S should be deferred to a later meeting of the committee – 6 votes <p>To be considered January 7, 2010</p>