

ATTACHMENT 2
GENERAL PLAN ISSUES SUMMARY

General Plan Consideration	Committee Recommendation
<p>FIRE:</p> <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> 	
<p>POLICE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain current Quality of Life Standard 	
<p>CIRCULATION:</p> <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 ■ 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). 	
<p>SCHOOLS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintain QOL current language ■ <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> ▪ <i>Minimum acreage requirements for school construction</i> 	
<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>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>Maximized use of reclaimed water</i> ▪ <i>Regional Water Quality Control Board amended policies regarding re-use</i> ▪ <i>“Equivalent Dwelling Unit” provisions that clarify non-residential sewer demand.</i> 	

General Plan Consideration	Committee Recommendation
<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>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>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>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>NCTD Rail Extension Discussion Issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Whether the extension of rail to the Westfield’s Shopping Town should be studied for inclusion in the Circulation Element. <p>STAFF Recommendation:</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. 	

General Plan Consideration	Committee Recommendation
<p>California High Speed Rail Discussion Issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Whether land Use changes around the potential High Speed Rail should be deferred until more details are known. <p>STAFF Recommendation:</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>Growth Management Discussion Issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 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>STAFF Recommendation:</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>Water Supply Discussion Issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 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>STAFF Recommendation:</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. ■ Ensure that long term supply accommodates planned buildout. 	
<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 Recommendation:</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.” 	