

CITY OF PERRIS

MINUTES: City Council Work Session
Date of Meeting: 13 August, 2002
Time of Meeting: 5:00 p.m.
Place of Meeting: City Council Chambers-City Hall

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The Honorable Mayor Busch opened the Regular City Council Work Session at 5:05 p.m. and requested City Clerk Rey to call the roll.

5:05 p.m. Called to Order

2. **ROLL CALL:**

All Present

Council Members Present: Yarbrough, Landers, Motte, Rogers, Busch

Staff Members Present: City Manager Vasquez, Assistant City Manager Apodaca, City Attorney Dunn, City Engineer Motlagh, and City Clerk Rey.

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

4. **WORK SESSION:**

A. Discussion of the creation of the General Plan Advisory Committee.

Letter of Invitation to be Presented at Council Meeting 9/10/02

Community Development Director Gutierrez commented the item was for discussion to the creation of the General Plan Advisory Committee and it was staffs' intent to present it at the August 27th meeting for Council's action to appoint the committee.

Community Development Director Gutierrez's Introduction

Mr. Lepo, Hogle-Ireland, commented that the committee was the most efficient way to receive citizen input in coordination of the document. Mr. Lepo suggested placing an article in the newspaper that described the committee's duties, and requested a letter of interest. It was recommended to select no more than fifteen citizens. The committee would be asked to meet four times over the next fiscal year to review various aspects of land use, circulation, and open space components of the General Plan.

Hogle-Ireland, Mr. Lepo's Presentation

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION:

Mayor Pro Tem Rogers asked if the recommendations would go before the Planning Commission prior to Council.

Mayor Pro Tem Rogers' Query

In response, Community Development Director Gutierrez said the final draft products would be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council, but City Council would be the final decision making body on all issues of the General Plan Update. Council would appoint the committee in an open meeting.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez's
Response*

Mayor Pro Tem Rogers suggested that the Planning Commission alternates serve and participate in the committee.

*Mayor Pro Tem Rogers'
Comment Re: Inclusion
of Planning Commission
Alternates*

Mayor Busch reiterated on the concept of the committee and the procedure of recruitment. Also, if approached by citizen, would it be an option for a council member to appoint a citizen

*Mayor Busch's Comment
Re: Committee Concept
& Recruitment*

In regards to the recruitment procedure, Community Development Director Gutierrez said a letter of interest would be sufficient and the intent was to bring it before Council to familiarize them with the process. Council should address concerns now and direct staff. A Councilmember's citizen appointment would be considered at the open meeting.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez's
Comments Re:
Recruitment Process &
Council's Direction*

Mayor Pro Tem Rogers recommended that when the recruitment was posted the committee job description, qualifications, and responsibilities should be included.

*Mayor Pro Tem Rogers'
Comment Re: Committee
Recruitment*

Councilmember Yarbrough asked if the committee was to be recruited from the community, City, or sphere of influence and were there advantages or disadvantages if an interested party did not live within a specific area.

*Councilmember
Yarbrough's Query Re:
Areas of Recruitment*

In response, Community Development Director Gutierrez said an interested party did not have to live within the City and the committee should be made up of a broad spectrum of interest groups.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez's
Response*

Mr. Lepo informed Council that there would be focus groups of the Technical Advisory Committee. Those groups would look for input on specific business people (larger and smaller businesses; landowners) and had been indicated within the Scope of Work. They would have the awareness of what this process was (i.e. rezoning). The two community workshops at the end of the year gave status of the project.

*Hogle-Ireland, Mr.
Lepo's Comment Re:*

Community Development Director Gutierrez said the goal was to keep the process open and the City was not required by law to mail out notification to very property owner prior to the adoption of the General Plan Amendment. It would be staffs' goal to be aware of issues and address them.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez's
Comment Re:
Notification of Property
Owners*

City Manager Vasquez commented that the composition of the committee was important that it be diverse and represented various elements of the community. The committee should not be restricted to residency and everyone had a stake in the future of the City.

*City Manager Vasquez's
Comment Re: Committee
Composition*

As a result of general discussion it was clarified and confirmed that the recruitment article would clearly indicate that an interested party did not have to be a resident of the City.

*General Discussion Re:
Recruitment Article-
Interested Parties*

Community Development Director Gutierrez said if Council were comfortable with the concept, staff would proceed and present a Letter of Invitation at the first Council meeting of September.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez's
Comment Re: Review
Letter of Invitation at
September's Council
Meeting*

B. Discussion and review of the Scope of Work for the Comprehensive General Plan Update.

Community Development Director Gutierrez commented the Scope of Work presented was to inform the Council of the major undertaking; the process and steps taken. The comprehensive update laid the foundation and set the stage for how development occurred within the City.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez's
Introduction*

Mr. Lepo, Hogle-Ireland, indicated the update was a three-year process. The first year would include three elements, which would provide assistance and direction for the City. Most of the information was mandatory (State, Government Codes). The Land Use and Circulation Elements were guiding elements; everything else was built around those elements. In the Over-Lay Study Areas four particular areas of study were identified based on the City's concerns. The water quality, storms water handling, recreation issues were related and were placed in the first year process. The second year process included the Conservation Element; amendment to the Noise Element; Safety Element; and an Environmental Impact Report would be prepared. The third year addressed, based on the elements, a municipal fee study and it was suggested to process Request for Proposals (RFP). The fee would be distributed over potential developments identified in the land use plan. Also, proposed for the first half of the third year was to prepare a final impact report for certification by City Council; and for adoption of the final General Plan at that time as well.

*Hogle-Ireland, Mr.
Lepo's Presentation*

Community Development Director Gutierrez commented that the new General Plan Comprehensive Update would aid in facilitating the development review process; provide available information of environmental documentation; benefit development, address questions and concerns.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez's
Comments Re: General
Plan Update Facilitating
& Informational*

Mr. Lepo, Hogle-Ireland, commented the key outcome was to ensure the document was user and developer friendly. Therefore, those people subjected to the standards would be appreciative and particularly to the water quality and storm drain issues.

*Hogle-Ireland, Mr.
Lepo's Comment Re:
General Plan Update
User Friendly*

Mayor Busch asked how much of the County's General Plan Amendment could be incorporated into the City's General Plan Update.

*Mayor Busch's Query
Re: Incorporate County's
General Plan
Amendment*

In response, Mr. Lepo, Hogle-Ireland, indicated that some of the routes and traffic models were incorporated. The consultant the City selected was very familiar with the County's traffic model and the City would refer to the County's General Plan Amendment in regards to specific elements.

*Hogle-Ireland, Mr.
Lepo's Response*

Community Development Director Gutierrez commented that research was in process to develop policies based on factual information (infrastructure; drainage; circulation). The policies would allow for revisions or guide development in order to implement provisions.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez
Comment Re: Policies*

Mr. Lepo, Hogle-Ireland, commented on the existence of maintenance for the catch basins. There was the concept of integrating active uses within the basins, i.e. ball fields, and would serve as an incentive for maintenance. The concept would also benefit the issue of water quality and it was important to integrate a land use plan within the City.

*Hogle-Ireland, Mr.
Lepo's Comment Re:
Basin Maintenance*

Mayor Pro Tem Rogers asked if the Municipal Fee Study was developed towards the end of the plan.

*Mayor Pro Tem Rogers'
Query Re: Municipal Fee
Study*

Mr. Lepo, Hogle-Ireland confirmed that the study would be developed at completion of the update. The elements would be in place and the City would know what was involved to development the fee.

*Hogle-Ireland, Mr.
Lepo's Response*

Mayor Busch asked if an interim fee could be recommended for implementation. The City would not want to find out that after two-three years they should had been collecting more fees.

*Mayor Busch's Query
Re: Interim Fee*

Community Development Director Gutierrez interceded indicating that a fee could be implemented during the budget adjustment and the information generated could lead to a fee increase. Council would have to justify a fee. The main issue was what worked for the City.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez's
Comment Re: Fee*

Councilmember Yarbrough commented areas concerning money should be identified, addressed, and adjusted now. If the City waited until the end of the process it could be a potential burden on the City. Like the Mayor said, some of these areas the City could be losing revenues.

*Councilmember
Yarbrough's Comments
Re: Address Concerns*

Mayor Pro Tem Rogers commented that the General Plan had not been update in twelve years. Therefore, the City was already in a major growth pattern; sought revenue; dealt with the growth pattern; and provided services to the existing residents. It was a major problem for Council.

*Mayor Pro Tem Rogers'
Comment Re: City in
Major Growth
Pattern/Revenue*

In response, Community Development Director Gutierrez said the purpose of presenting the Scope of Work was to receive concerns to identify within the update and adjust numbers. There were urgency ordinances that identified the need for fees.

*Community Development
Director Gutierrez's
Response*

Mayor Busch commented on a development where the residents wanted it designated as Senior only development. It was confirmed that the City could not enact the designation. It could be designated if it met the requirements of the Civil Rights Law and was a very involved process.

*Mayor Busch's Comment
Re: Designation of
Senior Development*

5. **ADJOURNMENT:** By unanimous consent the Regular City Council Work Session was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

*5:55 p.m. Regular City
Council Work Session
Adjourned*

Respectfully Submitted,

Margaret Rey, City Clerk