# CITY OF FULLERTON PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting City Council Chamber Monday, September 13, 2010 6:30 p.m.

## CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Shanfield called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

#### FLAG SALUTE

Commissioner Morgan led the flag salute.

#### ROLL CALL

Present: Shawna Adam, Sueling Chen, Scott Hayes, Wes Morgan, Kathleen

Shanfield and Carl Van Gorden.

Absent: Scott Stanford

Staff: Parks and Recreation Director Joe Felz; Redevelopment Executive Director

Robert Zur Schmiede; Senior Planner Jay Eastman; Parks and Recreation Managers Hugo Curiel, Judy Peterson and Dannielle Mauk; Recreation Supervisor John Clements; Parks Project Specialist Doug Pickard; Building and Facilities Superintendent Lyman Otley; Landscape Superintendent

Dennis Quinlivan.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

CONSENT ITEMS (Items 1 - 3)

Commissioner Morgan MADE A MOTION and Commissioner Hayes SECONDED the motion to approve the consent items.

AYES: Adam, Chen, Hayes, Morgan, Shanfield, Van Gorden

NOES: None

ABSENT: Stanford

The MOTION PASSED unanimously.

# REGULAR BUSINESS (Items 4 – 10)

## 4. GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY AT THE LIONS FIELD COMPLEX

Recreation Supervisor John Clements presented details of a Good Neighbor Policy at the Lions Field Complex.

Commissioner Questions: Commissioner Morgan wanted to know if there had been a good neighbor policy with the old Lions Field prior to the renovation and asked if the youth groups were informed of a good neighbor policy and were in agreement with the policy. Commissioner Morgan also inquired if the synthetic turf area would be the starting and ending location for the 5K runs. Commissioner Shanfield asked what special events besides sports would require permits. Commissioner Chen expressed concern regarding "no more than four special events per year" and the 5K run event starting time as to how it would affect the residential neighborhood. Commissioner Hayes asked if the course would be contained in Hillcrest Park. Commissioner Van Gorden wanted to know how the signs were being posted.

Recreation Supervisor John Clements stated there was no previous good neighbor policy at Lions Field and indicated the policy meets the parameters of the youth groups utilizing the facility and confirmed the start and finish location of 5K runs would be on the synthetic turf. Supervisor Clements said the special events would be grand openings or league operated sports related events and stated the race events typically start earlier; however, he noted sound restrictions would apply. He indicated the 5K runs would go through the parking lot and a couple of times around Hillcrest Park; although, the specifics are not firm, he confirmed the event would be contained within the park. Supervisor Clements noted signage will be attached with clips or zip ties and Director Felz stated staff is reviewing signage guidelines with the sports groups.

Commissioner Chen MADE A MOTION and Commissioner Adam SECONDED the motion to recommend that the Parks and Recreation Commission approve the Lions Field Complex Good Neighbor Policy and recommend approval by the City Council.

AYES: Adam, Chen, Hayes, Morgan, Shanfield, Van Gorden

NOES: None

ABSENT: Stanford

The MOTION PASSED unanimously.

5. APPOINTMENT OF COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO THE LEMON PARK MURAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Director Felz presented recommendation that the Parks and Recreation Commission appoint Suzy Hernandez to the Lemon Park Mural Planning Committee to replace Michael Maciel.

Commissioner Questions: Commissioner Chen asked where the mural would be located.

Director Felz indicated that most of the work has been directed toward the restoration plan for all of the current murals and noted other details are still forthcoming as this involves a five-year plan.

Commissioner Morgan MADE A MOTION and Commissioner Adam SECONDED the motion to recommend that the Parks and Recreation Commission appoint Suzy Hernandez to the Lemon Park Mural Planning Committee.

AYES: Adam, Chen, Hayes, Morgan, Shanfield, Van Gorden

NOES: None

ABSENT: Stanford

The MOTION PASSED unanimous

#### 6. FULLERTON TRANSPORTATION CENTER SPECIFIC PLAN

Director Felz presented a PowerPoint presentation review of a specific plan proposal for properties in and around the Fullerton Transportation Center, which included several public park spaces: a public plaza, two neighborhood parks, and several "paseos" or walkways. Director Felz introduced Redevelopment Executive Director Robert Zur Schmiede and Senior Planner Jay Eastman from Community Development for opening comments.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Vice Chair Kathleen Shanfield: If any of you would like to come up and make comments, you are welcome to at this time.

## Rachel Perez, Franklin Avenue, Fullerton:

Rachel Perez: My name is Rachel Perez and I grew up in the Truslow area and I am here with my mom, because she still lives there. According to the south parks, where all of the little yellow ones like Truslow are. Is it that a big building? The building in the back where the old railroad tracks used to be before the Truslow alley?

Director Zur Schmiede: It's the old warehouses.

Rachel Perez: The warehouses there in the back of the alley?

Director Zur Schmiede: I think that alley actually has a name. Isn't it Patterson Way? Isn't that the name of the street?

Rachel Perez: Well, it was Truslow Street and behind it was the alley and then we had the railroad tracks too.

Director Zur Schmiede: The yellow buildings are between the railroad tracks and the alley. It's where the warehouse buildings are today.

Rachel Perez: Okay. Well, the majority of the women here, they live on Truslow. In other words, you could say in front of those warehouses.

Director Zur Schmiede: The warehouses.

Rachel Perez: Is that going to affect them in anyway, this project, where the City acquires the properties if they need be?

Director Zur Schmiede: No, it would not. There's no property acquisition planned. The development that's shown in this plan would occur all to the north. This would happen over a period of time and what you would see, as an adjacent resident, is to have those warehouses replaced with buildings that would have residential units in them and the side of the site closest would be a two-story minimum.

Senior Planner Eastman: Three.

Director Zur Schmiede: Three-story.

Rachel Perez: Just like what's across the street?

Vice Chair Shanfield: SOCO?

Director Zur Schmiede: Yes.

Rachel Perez: Something like that?

Director Zur Schmiede: Yes, it's very similar to that.

Rachel Perez: Because the majority of them near there -- since this project is coming up, they're assuming that their properties might be -

Vice Chair Shanfield: Taken?

Rachel Perez: It may be acquired for this project.

Director Zur Schmiede: If we have your information, we would be happy to sit down with you as a group or individually and answer specific questions.

Rachel Perez: I think that would be good.

Director Zur Schmiede: Yes. We'd be more then happy to do that.

Rachel Perez: Because that was their main concern with the project is if their homes are going to be part of where they might be acquired.

Director Zur Schmiede: They are not, but we'd be happy to sit down and talk a little more around a table.

Rachel Perez: All right. That would be good.

Director Felz: We'll get your contact information and our Department will take the lead on getting in touch with you.

Rachel Perez: Okay. Well, thank you.

Vice Chair Shanfield: I have a question for you, because you live in that area. They're looking at a small park somewhere right along there. Can you think of the best place for that park? Would it be appropriate to put a park in one area versus another or do you just feel that a park anywhere in that area would be helpful?

Rachel Perez: I'll ask them and see. I moved out of the area. There's the little Truslow Park there and that little park too. It's going to get crowded.

Director Zur Schmiede: Maybe you could ponder that and then when we meet with you we could talk about it.

Rachel Perez: I'll keep that in mind and I'll let them know too.

Director Zur Schmiede: Great.

Vice Chair Shanfield: Thank you for coming up and speaking.

Rachel Perez: Thank you.

Vice Chair Shanfield: Any other members of the audience? Okay, so we'll bring it back up here. Go ahead.

Commissioner Carl Van Gorden: I want you to know that I drove over there and walked over there and I'm as confused as they are. It just doesn't look the same on a map as it does in real life. The question, though, is about the Fender Alley. Is that a traffic-patterned street? Is that limited traffic? One of these two men mentioned loading and unloading.

Senior Planner Eastman: Yes, it would continue to be an alley. It would provide access for service purposes as an alley does. It would provide for access to residential parking and below grade underground parking. It would not be a street. It would be widened to be 30 feet to ensure that the heavier traffic and the loading and unloading can occur.

We have an existing alley in SOCO. That was a decorative paving project which enhanced it. It's only 20-feet wide. When you have businesses that are operating or two cars passing or pedestrians, there tends to be a tighter environment. So this plan takes what we learned there and widens the alley to 30 feet. That would be the new standard, but it's not a street. It would be an alley function.

Commissioner Van Gorden: Okay. So my concept, though, is in front of the Parks and Recreation Commission. I think somebody mentioned programming on that street?

Director Felz: I can probably clarify that. I used it as an introduction for a potential public/private partnership that we would have with the Fender Corporation for them to establish some presence in this area. That's the beginning of the theming of at least a portion of this project or to their history in town and the fact that the electric guitar was essentially born right in this area of town.

That was one part of the theming and that they would locate some retail location that we would jointly operate. Our Cultural Services Division would have some partnership with the Fender Corporation in an ongoing operation down here and potentially some retail space or a service shop or something that we would jointly manage.

Commissioner Van Gorden: All right. But no programming or something in that area off of the street?

Director Felz: No, not in the alleys.

Commissioner Adam: I have questions about the parking. Phase one, you need to complete. There's a lot of concern about parking down in this area. Is it going to meet the needs for the commuters and for the residents? And then if we have the parks in those areas, will it also accommodate those who would like to access the parks? I have a few more questions to follow up, but main concern is parking.

Senior Planner Eastman: We brought in two parking consultants as part of the consideration of parking and we met with OCTA and had a discussion of what our obligation is in terms of their parking and their forecast requirements.

One of our parking consultants looked at shared parking. Currently right now, if you go down at 2:00, which is considered the peak hour during the day, half the parking spaces – not the commuters, but the retail spaces, the one-hour, the three-hour are open and not used. The commuter is completely full. We're not realistically utilizing our parking that we have optimally during the day. So, the parking program is in part to manage that better, paid parking, different times, trying to look at priority locations.

The evening activity and the retail activity, of course, occurs outside of office use and commuter use, so there's an availability of parking that occurs on the commuter properties, in that regard. Really, before anything happens in terms of the construction, the parking garage in SOCO west has to be built. That's 820 parking spaces. That needs to be built to accommodate the shift of the commuters from the lot where the parking garage is going to be built to that location. The timing on that is pretty positive.

Director Zur Schmiede: The contract has been awarded and the funding is in place and we're looking at a start of breaking ground on that sometime later this year.

That's on the site of the former juice plant. What's interesting about that site is the railroad bridge. When you go down Harbor Boulevard, the width of the bridge deck is

sufficient and will have direct pedestrian access from the garage directly onto the train platform. You'll walk across the Harbor bridge past the Spaghetti Factory, because it actually fronts on the train platform, so there's direct platform access from that garage. That is 820 spaces that would also be available evenings and weekends, in addition to the garage that's shown within the FTC specific plan.

Senior Planner Eastman: So the FTC's specific plan would be 810 parking spaces or more. Of that, 300 parking spaces will be available for commuter use. That's our commitment to OCTA based on our agreement with them as to what we need to provide. There would be on-street parking as well. The residential would all be parked on site, so any residential project constructive would have all of it's parking provided below the residential. The 510 parking spaces in the parking garage will accommodate the retail parking needs for the project. That's like build out, so we're basically front-loading all of the parking early in the project development, rather then phasing it in. And then the office would provide for parking on site, office site, but it would be available for public use after hours.

Commissioner Adam: Now, with regards to the retail parking, will there be a charge for parking there for the retail space? First, parking for office space, knowing that there are some locations in our city that this has a concern and I am thinking up at St. Jude with the parking, in the realtor's offices and some of the business. They have parking provided for their customers that people are coming and infiltrating because they're not charged. It's taking up their spaces for their customers. Are we looking at something similar down here?

Senior Planner Eastman: This whole shift to charging for parking is one that may come to the downtown and was in this year's budget hearings. One of the directions given by the Council -- which we're working on as a staff to bring back to them – are some recommendations to introduce some form of paid parking in the downtown area.

We're doing a lot of talking with downtown merchants and we've developed some ideas. For instance, just take the new 820-space garage that we're going to start construction on soon, that's State funded. The people with the State Division Rail that, providing the money, they don't have a problem with introducing a parking charge for commuter users. But, they do want it free at opening, because they want to get the commuters used to using the facility. If a paid parking system is introduced, they want it to be part of an overall plan, not just targeted to that particular garage. And, frankly, we would want the same thing.

I think where Fullerton stands in the continuum of free parking versus paid parking, we currently have one garage facility in the downtown that charges for parking and that's the Plummer parking garage. It's two dollars a day, but because of the cost to operate the parking are pretty substantial, over time, we will migrate to a paid-parking system of some sort. Typically they have validation, where if you patronize a business, you can have a validation stamped and then you get so many hours free. All of those details have not been worked out. I think the short answer to your question is, that at some point will there be a charge for parking in the downtown? I believe there will be. Do I know what it would be exactly tonight, no.

Commissioner Adam: Okay. So we're looking at wanting people to utilize the space for coming down and shopping and commuting and to have access, but then we also are going to start charging in order to accommodate people to come down and use this facility, which goes right back in, then, to utilizing the parks themselves. I'm thinking of mom's in the strollers or mom's wanting to taking the train down to San Clemente or somewhere down to the Mission or up to Santa Barbara, using the parking spots, using the structure or the schools are using the facility down there for any number of reasons and yet being charged for the parking.

So I just want to make sure that it's noted on record when the Council reads that parking's going to be – our residents that are paying for this project, will be subsidizing other people from outside an area coming and using the facilities for commuting.

Senior Planner Eastman: One of the parking studies that we did looked at transitoriented developments. We brought in someone that's familiar with these types of commuter facilities and his experience is well-regarded in the industry. He has a lot experience on parking-related issues. We looked at paid parking in that study as just a very nominal fee, so it would be a dollar a day, two dollars a day for commuter use for the parking garage and then the west parking garage would be free. All on-street parking would be free, but we'd like to have time limits, because you don't want commuters parking there all day. One of the things that paid-parking does, even if its fifty cents an hour, is that it in part discourages people parking long periods of time.

Let's say you're running to LA and all of the commuter parking spaces are being used and you're only going up there for a meeting and you're coming back and it's a half a day, you may find it worthwhile to park in a one to three hour parking space with paid parking being provided after the first three hours or after the first two hours. At fifty cents an hour, it's cost effective for you to park there. It's convenient to run up, come back, likewise.

The details of the parking management plan will have to be worked out and those types of issues will have to be considered. We have a lot of retailers that are very concerned with that. We need to put in place a validation type of program for the retailers, because they don't want to be impacted. We'd like to include a valet parking program. So the issue is, where do those cars get put and how does that valet program work. Our prospective here is that paid parking is a tool that we can use to help manage parking better and accommodates people's needs.

Director Zur Schmiede: And I think more to the Parks and Recreation Commission, if there are events in which we hope there will be in this transit park, that there would need to be provisions for event parking, we understand that.

Director Felz: If I could just weigh in on both the bigger picture and then the specific situation. Rob is correct; we could make provisions for events. New Year's Eve comes to mind to provide free parking, because we want to encourage the community to come down. So this would all be done in the context of the entire downtown, as Rob mentioned. We've been directed to look at that in detail and come up with a program and it's likely we are moving in that direction. It's something that we are living every single day, and something that will come before the Commission, in the St. Jude area.

Regional medical centers now within Southern California or throughout the State have paid parking.

The St. Jude situation is not a good one, but the last thing that you're going to hear from our Department is a recommendation that the City and the Commisson are going to be the last caretakers of the only free parking in an area, because it's just a disservice to the community to be the last free parking in an area. We don't control all of the parking assets in St. Jude, and our citizens are victims of poaching of the free parking in the area as, again, the City lots are the last free parking. So we think there are ways in that situation that don't penalize our local citizens who are paying for this and a way to create a resource of funds to be able to keep the parking lots well maintained and clean and safe. That's another goal of ours. So you'll be hearing this the St. Jude project first, and we've got some experience with that.

Vice Chair Shanfield: I have a question or I guess comment about these paseos. I'm not clear on really the importance of them, except that they do offer a nice visual, more then just a narrow alleyway between buildings. But I can't imagine really programming. I can imagine some nice landscaping that they're pedestrian friendly and will be great for the business and residents there, but enlighten me a little. I'm not really sure of their importance to us here at Parks and Recreation.

Director Felz: Our thought as a department, Hugo and Danielle and others, is that they are important from a programming standpoint. When we are north of Commonwealth and are getting people on to Commonwealth, the nice pedestrian walkways that have some more width to them, they could be programmed with some small vendors, spots, tables and expand, say a market environment and that the Thursday night market could expand down here potentially - so they are very useable. There are examples where they do get programmed. You could put even a small music group there or something in these areas like an art walk opportunity.

Manager Danielle Mauk: Do you want me to comment, Joe?

Director Felz: Yes, if you want.

Manager Mauk: You could definitely program any space. We have so much going on in the downtown area now that that would just be an extension of what is currently going on. Like Joe said, it could be a guitarist; it could be just a simple hotdog vendor for somebody walking by grabbing something to eat, grabbing some vegetables. Not an identical imprint of what we are currently doing, but if you provide a view of walkway through, then you can extend it. We do New Year's Eve, but there are a lot of cities that do weekly farmer's markets that are four city blocks. So the potential for growth is there.

Senior Planner Eastman: The issue of the paseos, in part, depends whether it's City owned or whether it's privately owned with a public easement over it. That depends on who develops it, if it's on City property now and there's a development agreement, etc. As a zoning document, it's very broad brush in terms of what our vision is and objective. Either way, those spaces would be potentially programmed through. Private properties work through the City or a combination of both.

As it relates to what the City would look for in terms of programming, a small space like that, it's really a circulation pattern for pedestrians. We've seen other cities that have done small lease agreements with flower stands. Not so much that it generates any revenue or even activity in the sense of entertainment, but it provides for activity and it provides for a lessor on the street at certain hours where we want to have eyes on the street. We want to have activity, we'll want to have people. We just want to have things out there. So that sense of providing for responsibility and activity and viable use, creates a dynamic that's important. The activities, the programming could be from art, it could be just Christmas lights, it could be from a variety of things. The plan is intended to make sure that that flexibility and that visioning is installed as part of the project and what moves forward.

Vice Chair Shanfield: Okay. I have a couple more questions. One is, why not just go for LEED certification rather than the minimum? I mean, you're doing the zero water. It seems like every other aspect of this plan is geared towards it.

Senior Planner Eastman: One of the things we looked at very intently in terms of the process is, how do we create a plan that achieves the vision and reduces development barriers to the extent possible? The plan will be LEED, which is a neighborhood development certification program. That's looking at the entire 39 acres, and we'll have a certification. It requires that certain things be done to achieve that, but that is the City's goal and objective to do.

Each individual project will only be LEED equivalent in part, because we're looking at what we try to achieve. So if it meets the LEED criteria, at least the minimum, we establish minimum and maximums in zoning. So the bare minimum is equivalency, which means that it's achieving the end result. Now, if it actually needs to be certified as a LEED project, which adds cost and it adds time to the development project, which would be something that the developer realistically needs to accept and do, then that's a cost and a burden to them.

From the City's standpoint, all we're doing is receiving recognition. The end product is certification equivalency anyway. You're getting the solar ratings, you're getting the products, you're getting all the good things that that does. A lot of the details in here in terms of bicycle racks, the net zero water, a lot of these things will count towards the LEED point system. So we're getting the results, we're just not mandating as a minimum certification and process.

Vice Chair Shanfield: And my last question, is this the point in time where we would make specifications about these parks, in terms of should they have artificial turf, adequate lighting? Or is that really going to be something later?

Senior Planner Eastman: It's difficult in part for the neighborhood parks primarily to really identify. Obviously, if there's a certain desire of preference by the Commission that would give direction to any developer that's moving forward of what your thoughts are on the plan, it is helpful. We don't know necessarily the size of the parks or where they're located. The south neighborhood park could actually be two smaller parks. The plan allows for that. We'd prefer that it be one, but we may not have that kind of

control based on what's developed, which changes a little bit of the programming that occurs.

The plan identifies that for the neighborhood parks, that the Parks and Recreation Department would be involved in reviewing and approving the planning and the programming for those spaces, even if they're privately owned, because they are community asset. Even though they're intended to be built for that neighborhood and their neighborhood needs.

Vice Chair Shanfield: So a chance to do that will come later?

Senior Planner Eastman: Either through the Parks and Recreation Director, if it's privately owned or you would have a proper opportunity if it's publicly owned. The transit plaza is in fact intended to be publicly owned and the specific plan calls out that there would be, I think, four to six or five to seven community meetings that would be a committee to review and program that space. So as a public facility on the transit plaza, there would be direct involvement by the public and community for that.

Commissioner Chen: I would like to compliment Jay for the thorough and excellent presentation and this excellent job. I only see one parking garage, but you actually clarified that. Every building will have its own parking underneath that will take care of a lot of residents and office buildings that will be there. I understand the north and the south parks have some complications because of the public land and private land situation.

Now, are you able to point out what the private lands are at this point, like the warehouses? You can't just build parks on a warehouse that you don't own, so what are the actual private lands on your whole map here or the public lands, either way.

Senior Planner Eastman: Let me get to the aerial photograph up here.

Director Zur Schmiede: While Jay is getting to the slide, one piece of information is that the City and/or the Redevelopment Agency own and control somewhere around nine acres of the study area. And the study area is around 40. So we own, roughly, 25 percent, not including the streets, which would add a little more. So Jay's going to kind of show you where those are.

Senior Planner Eastman: So we'll start in this corner and work our way to the southeast. All the parking lots that are provided for the one-hour, three-hour commuter parking is all Agency-owned, actually, as is the parking garage here.

The OCTA bus facility is also Agency-owned, but there's a lease agreement with OCTA. All of these properties through here, are within the control of the Agency. So a development agreement would be part of a development of that property.

Director Zur Schmiede: The build out of this is over quite a few years and there's no expectation that the Redevelopment Agency is going to be involved in any additional land acquisition. For instance, the warehouses to the south of the railroad track, those are under private ownership. That private owner could choose to develop under this

plan. There's no need for the Agency to become involved in that. It would be just a development review through the Community Development Department.

Senior Planner Eastman: The properties east of Lemon, the City currently owns the fire station building and these vacant properties. They're not vacant; they're paved areas for fire trucks and training facility and storage. The City owns a portion of this property. Development on that property would require a development agreement with the City that the developer would have to relocate the fire facility, build another facility on another property and then provide for a park.

There are questions as to whether or not a pro forma works out in that regard. And so in part, that's why the park isn't just proposed in one location. It has four different alternatives because of the other properties that would probably be acquired and brought into that development agreement of that process, so there's certain flexibility. But the City does own these properties as well.

On the south side of the tracks, the City only owns the strip of land – well, we have the alley, but there's a strip of land that runs along the south side of the warehouse buildings that is former Union Pacific Railroad right of way. The Agency acquired that property when the underpass was built. It used to be that the railroad tracks crossed Harbor and then came straight through here, and then linked up to the south side of the BNSF (Burlington-Northern-Santa Fe) road right of way.

When the underpass was built, they included in this bridge, a railroad – or the Walnut Avenue included a railroad crossing as part of that and they re-oriented the train to go through here and the Agency ended up with this strip of land. Part of it went into making the alley wider then the normal 20-foot. It's currently about 25, 28 feet. It has parking on one side and it has a greenbelt with a sidewalk that really doesn't go anywhere.

So part of the development of the south park includes this alley, which would be redone with the decorative paving and it would be a 30-foot width. The remaining property of what the Agency owns and the alley combined, which is whatever is left out of those 30 feet, totals about 27,600 square feet.

This specific plan says that the Agency would give that property to a developer to build a 27,600 square foot park, so that they have access to the alley with their development on the south side. They don't actually lose that 27,600 square feet, we're just basically swapping it, because along the lineal strip, it doesn't do us any good and it doesn't provide them access to that alley. The specific plan allows for that trade to take place. The problem that Planning identified is, it doesn't require that trade to take place. So we've identified that some language needs to be in there so that we don't end up with that strip of land remaining and no park being built and just development.

Those are the properties that the Agency and the City own. Actually, we do own the Spaghetti building. The Agency owns the Old Spaghetti Factory as well as the Santa Fe Depot. Does that answer your question?

Commissioner Chen: With that, what's the Department vision of expanding from 25 to 100 percent? Was it through eminent domain? Was it through the Agency acquiring or developers acquiring or everything just is open and it may not even happen at all?

Director Zur Schmiede: The Agency's power of eminent domain in this project area expires at the end of this year, so there will be no eminent domain. If there was additional acquisition, it would more then likely be a developer coming in under the plan and accomplishing that acquisition and site assembly. The Agency would more then likely – I'm just looking ahead as there could be a situation where the Agency might become involved financially in the transaction if it was warranted. But there's really no plan to acquire additional property. If the specific plan is approved and the developer submits a plan that the Agency approves and we are successful in getting either a state grant or the Agency decides that they want to fund this parking garage, which I don't think they would, then we would begin moving forward on the phase one properties that is basically to the west of Lemon.

Commissioner Chen: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Morgan: If it's okay with the Commission, I was going to come forward with some comments about the park recommendations specifically, because I am assuming from the staff Report that's where you're really looking for some recommendations from us for tonight, knowing we'd see some other things later as things move forward.

Director Zur Schmiede: It seems like the significant one for this Commission is the Transit Park and how that provides access to the train station and that ring road.

Commissioner Morgan: And I'm working on the assumption that the sizes that I have gleaned out of the report are somewhat fixed and the locations particularly with the Transit Plaza is fixed. I mean, that's where you would see it going and that's a very reasonable and good location. If we get to 30,000 square feet, that's a decent size. It's about three-quarters of an acre. It's centrally located and I think that would be a very good public space that would have a lot of potential for a variety of gatherings, whether they were regularly scheduled or some special event.

My comments, just to kick this part of it off, if the Commission is ready for that, is that when I look at the alternatives for the North Park, I see where it's split in half on either side of Santa Fe, north and south. It sort of divides in half and achieves less. So putting it in the middle of the street, I don't really see that and I don't prefer the alley. The one that is on the top right-hand corner where we've got the entire 13,000 square feet in basically a square on the south side of Santa Fe, that's the northern edge of the park. I would prefer that one. So I will just throw that out there.

My final comments are, when it comes to the South Park and it was referred to earlier by Joe, that if you put it down there towards the west, it's kind of isolated. And then the other one way down at the end is isolated. I would like to see the South Park property, which is approximately, 28,000 square feet, be a single-site, rather than two parks and be located centrally somewhere on either side of what is – and help me – is that Walnut or is that Lawrence? Lawrence – either side of Lawrence in the middle of those yellow

buildings that would be the south development. So I think you create a triangular effect between the Plaza up to Santa Fe, down to Lawrence and back again and you get the most out of what is a grand total of about an acre and a half.

Director Zur Schmiede: And you key off of Truslow Park?

Commissioner Morgan: Yes. Those are my comments about the specific things about the park proposal for tonight's discussion on that element of this.

Commissioner Hayes: You had suggested Option 4, but I'm not clear which Option 4 is. Is that the one on the top right or the bottom?

Senior Planner Eastman: It's Option D. This is "A" and then there's "B". There's "C" and "D".

Commissioner Morgan: I'm going for "B", because I didn't want the park bordering on the alley.

Commissioner Van Gorden: My question, if I may jump in there, is it the plan of Santa Fe to be closed if that park was located on the alley? That would be "A"?

Director Zur Schmiede: You mean if they put the park in the middle of Santa Fe?

Commissioner Van Gorden: Yes.

Director Zur Schmiede: No.

Senior Planner Eastman: The plan for this came out of our framework plan. Originally, there was a concept that it be one way with a narrow one-way road that went around the park. There was a lot of concern expressed through staff on different Departments as well as just the functionality of that. The road actually jogs to the south. It's a two-way road. It has parking and then heads up this way. It has a fire lane so this would not be accessible on the north side. It would essentially be a large 26-foot wide pedestrian walkway, tree-lined, as shown here in the plan, tailed off for fire department access to the buildings on the north side.

Commissioner Van Gorden: They're not barricades, then, they're crosswalks?

Senior Planner Eastman: Those are graphically shown as beautiful lines in pavement, yes.

Commissioner Van Gorden: Okay. Thank you, that helps.

Commissioner Morgan: So going back to that Option B and Option D, I like both of them because they're off the street and you don't have the traffic going around them. Now, you guys have put a lot of thought into this, so what was your thought as to Option D, being the best Option?

Director Felz: We weighed in on "D" versus "B" in that it was a closer situation to Commonwealth and the paseo served off of Commonwealth for a little more public access, in our opinion. Not a significant difference between the two, but that pedestrian access off of Commonwealth, led us to land on this Option.

Commissioner Adam: With Option D, with the alley going down, and if I understand correctly, the alley's going to be widened. Will it have the same type of decorative pavers as the SOCO area so that skaters and skateboarders won't utilize it?

Senior Planner Eastman: The details of the paving of the alley have not yet been determined. The plan for a variety of reasons would likely have permeable pavement, so that water can saturate through it to the degree that that's beneficial. But the intent is that it would have either pavers similar to SOCO or different design or a solid treatment that's permeable so they have permeable concrete and asphalt. The details have not been worked out beyond that. It would just be decorative.

Director Zur Schmiede: If the Commission had some suggestions about that, we would certainly like to hear them.

Commissioner Adam: Having been here for awhile, when they open up comments, the community wants to know, well, are the skaters going to be there? Are they going to have access to the area? I keep telling Commissioner Hayes, oh great, another Venice Beach area.

So after listening that we can have people coming down here and vendors and hotdog stands or the little trolley thing and all of that, I'm just hoping that we are not going to impede pedestrian's usage with skaters. Is that alley the bikeway?

Senior Planner Eastman: This is a 30-foot wide alley that provides access to the private property.

Commissioner Adam: But is that a bike path?

Senior Planner Eastman: It's not a bike path officially, but, yes, bicyclists would use it. And this is the paseo that could occur here.

Commissioner Morgan: My concern about the alley is that's where the garage doors would be.

Senior Planner Eastman: Because all the residential parking would probably subterranean, there would be a ramping that occurs, yes.

Commissioner Morgan: Yes, but that's where they go to park. They use that alley to get to their parking, the residents.

Senior Planner Eastman: Yeah, it's hard to really know for certain.

Commissioner Morgan: Yeah, I know. It's too soon.

Senior Planner Eastman: It provides that ability for them to do that. I would suspect that they will have two points of access, egress and ingress. Both from Santa Fe and the alley or from Lawrence and Santa Fe.

Director Zur Schmiede: For us tonight, we just need to approve your recommendation for the revised figure of 4.2 and adding any additional language in; is that correct? We don't have to be specific on Option B or Option D?

Director Felz: No, what you've done is great. And that's to give us some good solid feedback appropriate for this level of the planning stage and then those are two specific technical things that we're asking you to do. So you will do all of those three things.

Vice Chair Shanfield: I'd just like to make one last request. Since it sounds like it's going to be a lot of hardscape, we can have as much landscaping in terms of trees and bushes and greenery? It can be low-drought tolerant kind of things, but it looks to me it's going to be very urban and the visual aesthetic relief of some green would be really nice. You guys always do very well with that in our city. We are the tree city, so I would hope to see greenery there and not just hardscape. We would need to make a motion on this?

Director Felz: Having taken all of your comments, those will be included in the reports that then get forwarded to the Planning Commission and the Council. We have a recorded version of the meeting and will be getting all of those in detail forwarded. If we could ask for a motion on the two specific items or if there are any other questions, we would be happy to answer.

Vice Chair Shanfield: You guys have done a great job on presenting. Thank you, very much. Anybody want to make a motion?

Commissioner Hayes MADE A MOTION and Commissioner Morgan SECONDED the motion to recommend that the Parks and Recreation Commission approve the proposed Fullerton Transportation Center Specific Plans including the revised figure of 4.2 to the City Council, subject to revisions related to Civic Spaces and add language that assures the South Neighborhood Park is implemented, including land acquisition/dedication and construction.

AYES: Adam, Chen, Hayes, Morgan, Shanfield, Van Gorden

NOES: None

ABSENT: Stanford

The MOTION PASSED unanimous

#### 7. SUMMER PROGRAM WRAP-UP

Director Felz noted summer programming for the Parks and Recreation Department has ended and stated the report summarizes summer programs and completed capital projects and highlights some of the fall programs.

Commissioner Van Gorden asked about Lions Field recreational trail on the North Slope being too steep and noted it needed to be leveled out at the top of the hill.

Director Felz acknowledged the trail would need some work by the maintenance department.

Commissioner Morgan said the water feature at Lemon Park is wonderful for the neighborhood.

#### 8. REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

Director Felz updated the Parks and Recreation Commission on the following City Council and Planning Commission Agenda Items:

- West Coyote Hills Project
- City Budget

#### 9. DIRECTOR'S UPDATE

Fall Program Updates

Director Felz said the fall brochures have been mailed out; that staff discovered some pages missing, and that staff is investigating the source. He also noted the Market is busy and Halloween activities are starting.

Capital Projects Update

Director Felz stated that the Hiltscher Park legal settlement changed the boundary as an abandonment of the 80-foot path and does not affect the project in any significant way. He also noted that the Lemon Park contract has been signed with NUVIS to complete the construction documents and will be out to bid; and that Hillcrest Park is moving forward with input to neighbors, and will address circulation of the park, including egress and ingress.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the meetings (Hillcrest Park Advisory) have been very active and email communication has been excellent to organize the meetings.

#### 10. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Hayes commended staff and commissioners' work in completing Lions Field. Commissioner Adam inquired if there is an acting Parks and Recreation Director in line to take over the position.

Director Felz indicated there are additional staff resources available; however, a plan is not approved at this time.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Shanfield adjourned the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Felz, Secretary

JF/nb/cr