



SGVCOG Planners TAC Approved Meeting Minutes

Date: March 22, 2018
 Time: 12:00 P.M.
 Location: Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
 602 E. Huntington Dr., Monrovia, CA 91016

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:14 P.M.
2. Roll Call

Planners TAC Members Present

P. Lam; Alhambra
 M. Nakajima, Diamond Bar
 C. Hensley, J. Golding; Duarte
 J. Mikaelian, El Monte
 M. Carnahan; Glendora
 M. Simpson; Irwindale
 M. Huntley, Monterey Park
 L. Stevens; San Dimas
 D. Whipple; San Gabriel
 S. Reimers, Temple City
 M. Kim, J. Drevno; LA County DRP

Planners TAC Members Absent

Arcadia
 Azusa
 Baldwin Park
 Claremont
 Covina
 La Verne
 Monrovia
 Pomona
 Rosemead
 Sierra Madre
 South Pasadena
 Walnut
 West Covina

SGVCOG Staff

P. Duyshart, Staff

3. Public Comment.

No public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 02/22/2018
There was a motion to approve the minutes (M/S: L. Stevens/J. Golding).

[Motion Passed]

Ayes	Alhambra, Diamond Bar, Duarte, El Monte, Glendora, Irwindale, Monterey Park, San Dimas, San Gabriel, Temple City, LA County DRP
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Arcadia, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Claremont, Covina, La Verne, Monrovia, Pomona, Rosemead, Sierra Madre, South Pasadena, Walnut, West Covina

ACTION ITEMS

PRESENTATIONS

5. City of Hope Specific Plan and EIR

J. Golding of the City of Duarte presented on this item. He noted that this presentation was the same presentation which was given to the Duarte City council, which very recently approved this specific plan. He first went over how the City of Hope Specific Plan will affect the City's General Plan and which zone changes will be necessary. Golding also noted that this process was a collaborative effort between the Cities of Duarte and Irwindale, because 90 acres of the City of Hope is within Duarte's city limits, and 25 acres falls within Irwindale's jurisdiction. He then provided an overview of the contents of the specific plan, which included elements such as: vision and goals, land use development and standards, mobility and streetscape, design guidelines, infrastructure and services, and administration and implementation. Additionally, the full buildout of the City of Hope's comprehensive Campus Plan would consist of approximately 1,426,000 square feet of new gross development, and this is a key reason why the specific plan is so necessary. Golding continued by talking about the 7 different main land use districts on the City of Hope property. He then concluded the first portion of his presentation by going over the CEQA and EIR portions of the specific plan process.

The majority of Mr. Golding presentation on the City of Hope Specific Plan centered around what makes the specific plan so unique from other municipal and local specific plans. The following components are some of the aspects that are unique to this specific plan, as detailed by Mr. Golding:

- 1.) Flexibility: The phasing plan showed how there would be 4 increments of 5 years each. Duarte however amended this plan significantly. The City is also allowing the City of Hope to have zoning flexibility in that the use table allows much more than hospital zoning. Landscaping requirements include requiring landscaping at edge conditions and at interior setbacks, too. The Development Project review relaxed compared to traditional process: The City of Duarte streamlined the approval process, including which items go to Planning Commission.
- 2.) Sustainable: The long-term sustainability provisions provide certainty and consistency for the City of Hope and surrounding residents. J. Golding also pointed out that there are sustainable development practices integrated into the specific plan, including energy efficiency, mobility, landscaping, healthy design, and complete streets principles. There are also traffic mitigation measures, too. The CoH must reduce demand but also increase supply.
- 3.) Parking: Duarte did not use standard parking ratios on this project; instead the City used a population-based parking system instead of an area-based parking system. The population ratios were calculated by Fehr and Peers. Golding explained how the unique Parking Tracking Supply System works and how it was developed. The parking locations throughout the campus are broken up into zones. Parking locations and traffic circulation and flow were also taken into consideration, too. Duarte made sure to have safety medians in the middle of main streets. Additionally, there is good access to Gold Line station and San Gabriel River greenway for those who reside or work at the City of Hope.
- 4.) Infrastructure Implementation
- 5.) Stormwater Mitigation: There are heavy mosquito problems in and near the San Gabriel River and the Settling Basins. Large bio-swales are prohibited due to vector concerns.
- 6.) Implementation Action Plan: The City of Hope Campus sometimes does things on its own, sometimes in a non-compliant way, like painting over mandatory fire lanes. Thus, the Cities of Duarte and Irwindale have to work together and be cognizant of how to effectively implement and enforce the Specific Plan.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- C. Hensley added that the legal implications and components to this 5-year process and project added about 14 months to this process.
- J. Golding stressed that pre-development meetings are very pivotal during a process like this one, especially for the concept design processes.
- There was a question from a TAC member regarding how did the Community receive this specific plan? J. Golding responded that the City of Hope brought in many people to provide input on the project, and that the City of Hope did a solid job on conducting fair and transparent public outreach. They did that in order to address and quell rumors that Duarte, Irwindale, and the City of Hope colluded on the project in private. Moreover, residents did show some concerns about the noise from new buildings and traffic patterns.
- C. Hensley added that there were not too many negative comments or complaints from the public, and there seemed to be general support for the specific plan.
- Another TAC member asked about the extent of the coordination between Duarte and Irwindale on this project. Golding addressed how tasks were divided, and the level of communication between the two cities. He added that Irwindale was an excellent partner on this project.
- A third TAC member asked about residential components to this project, and if affordable housing was a factor here. J. Golding said that affordable housing was not brought up. However, residential zoning was allowed in “residential flex-zones,” but residential building is very limited on the City of Hope campus and in its vicinity. Golding was also asked by a TAC member about the relation of new zoning rules with housing element compliance, too.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

6. Solicitation and discussion of specific compliance issues with LA County Fire Department’s Fire Code Requirements

The Chair of the TAC, C. Hensley, facilitated and led the discussion on this topic. Similar to how he introduced this topic at February’s meeting, he stated that the purpose of discussing this item is to try to figure out how to proceed, and to identify the most common and pressing issues that cities have faced when interacting and working with the LA County Fire Department. If the cities of the TAC do decide to try to formally address a particular problem pertaining to difficulty with complying with the County’s fire code requirements, how can the TAC address a problem or problems, and which alternatives can the TAC consider?

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One Planning Directors’ TAC member expressed deep concern with LA County Fire’s onerous and impractical 20-foot wide driveways requirement for properties which have a structure that is more than 150 feet from the street. This requirement conflicts with that member’s city’s planning code. This City has already tried to reach out to LA County Fire to ask the Department if it can create exceptions in their compliance code to allow this City to have more flexibility so that it improves its ability to meet its state-mandated housing requirements.
- A second TAC member added that while cities are becoming more multi-family and more dense in their housing stocks, LA County Fire’s zoning standards are still very conservative and have not evolved to changing demographics and density demands.
- A member also expressed frustration that communication between LA County Fire staff and his City’s staff has been very poor and ineffective, which delays project progression and plan checks. He thinks that the County Fire Department treats cities like they are burdens, even though they are under contract to provide fire prevention services to the City.

- Another TAC member feels that the largest overarching issue pertaining to municipal problems with County Fire is the customer service issues. This same member also remarked that the SGVCOG member-cities can turn these issues into an impact initiative, and that TAC cities can try to work on these issues to create better and more practical outcomes or changes in LA County Fire compliance policies and communications. The COG can be an effective avenue by which to pursue these changes, since the COG has more power and influence behind it, as it represents a plethora of SGV cities, rather than just one individual city. It would be helpful, he thinks, to use the COG as a resource in this situation.
- ***One member of the TAC expressed that he thinks it is beneficial to form a sub-committee, whose task would be to whittle down the current list of compliance and customer service problems, and get consensus on which issues are most important and should be brought up with LA County Fire. He made a motion to set up this sub-committee, and to bring the sub-committees suggested actions to the SGVCOG City Managers' Steering Committee.

There was a motion made to establish an ad hoc subcommittee to further discuss compliance issues between municipalities and LA County Fire, and to decide which issues should be resolved with LA County Fire. This subcommittee's final recommendations are to be presented to the Planning Directors' TAC and to the City Managers' Steering Committee (M/S: L. Stevens/M. Huntley).

[Motion Passed]

Ayes	Alhambra, Diamond Bar, Duarte, El Monte, Glendora, Irwindale, Monterey Park, San Dimas, San Gabriel, Temple City, LA County DRP
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Arcadia, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Claremont, Covina, La Verne, Monrovia, Pomona, Rosemead, Sierra Madre, South Pasadena, Walnut, West Covina

INFORMATION ITEMS

UPDATE ITEMS

7. Metro Measure M Subregional Administrative Funds Update

P. Duyshart of the SGVCOG provided the update on this item. He reminded Committee members that this item was first presented at the November Transportation Committee Meeting. Mr. Duyshart then summarized the three possible funding options to fund the COG's administrative transportation work. Under Option A, the COG would utilize the available \$37,600 in funding to offset the cost and work of existing staff. Option B would call for utilizing the available funding to hire a consultant to develop a five-year programming plan and conduct outreach to member agencies and other stakeholders. Option C would call for the approval of a special assessment on COG cities which would be equal to 0.5% of cities' Measure M local return funds for the initial 5-year period.

Duyshart concluded the update by recapping the decisions and actions of the other COG TACs pertaining to this budget issue. After considering the professional feedback and advice of the members of the various TACs, the COG has decided to postpone Option C and the possible hiring of a Transportation Planner, due to a worry that there would be too much confusion if Option C was adopted while the integration between the COG and ACE was ongoing, since COG staff promised COG member-cities that there would not be any extra costs associated with integrating the two departments. In January, the Transportation Committee supported this course of action.

Additionally, COG staff also provided this update to the Public Works TAC earlier this week. P. Duyshart did note though that COG staff may choose to pursue Option C again in Late 2018 or Early 2019 after Measure M subregional funds are allocated and programmed and the COG concludes that it needs to hire a Transportation Planner to program and coordinate transportation projects and funding in the SGV subregion.

8. Update on Measure M Subregional Fund Programming

P. Duyshart provided this update. He reminded Committee members that Metro's Measure M guidelines require each subregional entity, including the COG, to submit an MSP 5-Year Plan to the Metro Board of Directors for adoption. He then went over the funding that would be available for each subregional sub-program, as adopted by the Governing Board. Based on the funding allocation for each sub-program, SGVCOG staff will assign funding for the highest priority projects, mainly for active transportation projects, first/last mile projects, and highway efficiency projects. COG staff will identify the most important and highest-priority projects by consulting the COG's adopted Mobility Matrix. Mr. Duyshart alerted the Committee that COG staff will likely present a draft list of selected projects for Measure M funding at the Planners' TAC's April meeting, and that the Public Works TAC will also hear this presentation in April. After COG staff listens to the valuable input and feedback on the MSP 5-Year Plan programming list from the two TACs, COG staff will bring a revised draft list to the Transportation Committee, likely at that committee's May meeting. The SGVCOG Governing Board will need to formally approve the final draft of the proposed 5-Year programming project list, and the Governing Board will likely take up this item at its June or July meeting. P. Duyshart also reminded TAC members that each step in the project selection process, including presentations at TAC and Committee meetings, provides opportunities for members of the public to participate in this process and provide local perspectives.

9. CicLAvia Heart of the Foothills Planning Update

L. Stevens provided this update. He promoted the event to fellow TAC members and encouraged their respective cities to support this first-ever CicLAvia event in SGV history and to encourage their residents to attend this friendly active transportation event. Stevens stated that each participating City – San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, and Claremont – will have a “hub” where there will be booths, games, activities, and food options, and that at least a couple of the hubs will have a pro-environment and “green” theme to them, as this event coincides with Earth Day, on Sunday, April 22. This intriguing event will run from approximately 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Mr. Stevens also added that resident feedback regarding street closures to vehicular traffic in the weeks leading up to the event has been mostly positive.

10. Update on Metro Open Streets Cycle Three Grant

L. Stevens of the City of San Dimas provided the update on this item. Earlier that day, he attended the Metro Board meeting to recommend that the Metro Board change the funding mechanism and structure that Metro Staff had recommended. Many cities thought that Metro Staff had greatly underfunded this open streets grant on a per city basis, which would prevent cities from hosting multi-jurisdiction open streets events. L. Stevens and M. Creter of the SGVCOG had already received support for Stevens's funding recommendation from Metro's Planning and Programming Committee. L. Stevens then reported that J. Fasana made a motion for a \$200,000 per event minimum and an additional \$100,000 allotted to each City which was a part of a multi-city event proposal, but with a total cap of \$500,000 per event. The Metro Board ultimately decided to simply establish a \$500,000 cap for any open streets event proposal, and that Metro will use scoring over

anything else such as population ratios to determine allotted funding. The SGVCOG and its cities were mostly successful in its efforts to get the funding provisions amended.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

There were no comments or announcements from or on behalf of the SGVCOG Executive Director.

CHAIR'S REPORT

- 11.** Solicitation of presentation topics
There was no discussion on this item.

- 12.** Current City Projects
There was no discussion of city projects.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

April 26th, next Planning Directors' TAC Meeting.

P. Duyshart announced that the SGVCOG Governing Board formally approved a resolution in opposition to SB 827 (Wiener).

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:19 P.M.