

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

**FROM:** JOEL ROJAS, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR 

**DATE:** NOVEMBER 7, 2012

**SUBJECT:** POLICY DIRECTION RELATED TO THE UPDATE OF THE CITY'S TRAILS NETWORK PLAN (SUPPORTS 2012 CITY COUNCIL GOAL – TRAIL SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT).

**REVIEWED:** CAROLYN LEHR, CITY MANAGER 

Prepared by: Ara Mihranian, Deputy Community Development Director 

**RECOMMENDATION**

Provide Staff with policy direction on 4 of the 11 recommendations made by the Open Space Planning Recreation and Parks Task Force related to the forthcoming update of the City's Trails Network Plan.

**BACKGROUND**

In November 1984, the City Council adopted a Trails Network Plan (TNP) which was intended to serve as a guide for implementing and funding pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails throughout the City. In January 1990, the City Council adopted a Conceptual Trails Plan (CTP) and Conceptual Bikeways Plan (CBP) which were intended as a first step toward revising the 1984 Trails Network Plan. The Conceptual Trails Plan was subsequently revised by the City Council in December 1991 and September 1993 and the Conceptual Bikeways Plan was revised by the City Council in October 1996. With the exception of the recent adoption of the Preserve Trails Plan, no further updates to the TNP, CTP or CBP have been made since 1996.

Subsequent updates to the TNP were not completed for a number of reasons, primarily because of Recreation & Parks Department staff layoffs in the 1990's. When responsibility for the two plans was transferred to the Community Development Department in 1992, the focus switched to implementing the existing CTP with respect to the new development

projects at that time, namely Ocean Trails, Tramonto, Seabreeze and Ocean Front Estates.

In 2002, an Open Space Planning and Recreation & Parks Task Force was formed by the City Council. Updating the 1993 CTP was identified as part of the Task Force's scope of work. As such, a four member Open Space sub-committee of the task Force (composed of current Councilman Knight, Sunshine, Mike Juneau, and Jo Woods) was formed and given the assignment of updating the CTP. While the sub-committee was unable to complete a comprehensive update of the CTP, the sub-committee did make four recommendations that were presented to the City Council on March 29, 2005 (see attached Staff Report and excerpted minutes). At that time, the City Council directed Staff to re-draft the CTP into a document that is updated and more user friendly and clarified its intent that Staff should consider the 11 recommendations made by the Task Force sub-committee on the format and composition of a revised Trails Network Plan.

Over the past several years, Staff was unable to embark on an update of the City wide TNP as its limited resources were directed by the City Council to focus on the acquisition and preservation of permanent open space and the creation of a Public Use Master Plan (which includes a Preserve Trails Plan) related to said open space. Thus, the City adopted a trails plan for the Forrestal Nature Preserve in 2001 and then for the greater Palos Verdes Nature Preserve (Preserve Trails Plan) in 2008 (amended recently on October 2, 2012). Also, in 2008 the City developed a trails plan for the Coast Vision Plan, which is "a modern vision to unify the [City's] coast through design," providing a framework of connectivity of public amenities within and adjacent to the City's coastal zone.

With the Preserve Trails Plan (PTP) now in place, beginning in January 2013, the City's Community Development Department will begin a comprehensive update of the City wide Trails Network Plan. Given the City Council's previous direction in 2005 for Staff to consider the 11 recommendations made by the Task Force sub-committee on the format and composition of a revised Trails Network Plan, Staff is now seeking City Council policy direction on 4 of the 11 recommendations before embarking on an update of the TNP.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Update of Trails Network Plan**

The focus of the upcoming update to the TNP will be on the City's non-Preserve trails as the Council adopted PTP will be integrated into the final TNP. Furthermore, the update will include the following tasks:

- Consolidating all of the existing trails plans and documents into a single, comprehensive TNP;
- Identifying all the existing approved trails that have been dedicated and/or implemented since the last updates to the CTP and BTP;
- Identifying all existing recorded public trail easements in the City; and,
- Providing new updated and clear trail mapping

As a part of the preparation of the TNP, the City will conduct outreach to stakeholder groups to refine the scope of the TNP and identify the unique issues of concern to the various constituencies with an interest in trails access and planning in the City outside of the Preserve. Public workshops on the TNP update will be conducted before being presented to the City Council for adoption. The update of the TNP is expected to be completed by 2014.

#### Open Space Planning and Recreation & Parks Task Force Recommendations

As noted earlier, in 2004, the Open Space Sub-committee of the Open Space Planning and Recreation & Parks Task Form made 11 specific recommendations regarding the format and composition of a revised TNP. In 2005, the City Council directed Staff to consider the Sub-committee's 11 recommendations. Staff has reviewed the Sub-committee's 11 recommendations to TNP format and composition and agrees that 7 recommendations should be incorporated into the updated TNP since they are mostly formatting changes. However, there are 4 recommendations where Staff is seeking direction from the Council at this time since they involve policy decisions to be made by the City Council.

#### Recommendations Requiring City Council Direction

Listed below are the Subcommittee's recommendations that Staff believes are policy decisions (in **bold**) followed by a brief Staff discussion. Staff is seeking City Council direction on these four recommendations.

1. **Since the policies which determine which type of trail users are precluded from using portions of specific trails at any given time are more flexible than the TNP and since enforcement of said policies is not addressed, said use determinations should be left unrestricted until established by deed restriction, emergency closure or City Council action.**

While this is a policy issue that requires direction from the City Council, Staff is of the opinion that similar to the trails plan for the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve, trail use designations should be included in the updated TNP for City trails outside of the Preserve. Section 12.16.080 of the RPVMC establishes enforceable trail user designations and there is now enforcement ability that didn't exist at the time the Subcommittee formulated this recommendation.

Therefore, Staff seeks the Council's concurrence that trail use determinations be a part of the updated TNP.

2. **Since many of the trail and other landmark names used in the document have been selected arbitrarily for purely communication purposes, a policy for establishing names of trails should be included for use when a trail is implemented.**

Naming City facilities, such as parks or public trails, is ultimately up to the City Council. In the case of the Preserve Trails Plan, proposed trail names were based on historic use, landmarks, geologic features, site characteristics or existing City documents (such as the trail names identified in the CTP). The trail names were eventually adopted by the City Council. Staff is of the opinion that a similar approach be used for the trails (outside the Preserve) that are being reviewed as part of the update to the TNP. During the public workshops, trail names will be identified and ultimately presented to the Council for ultimate approval.

Therefore, since the City Council will have the ultimate say in all trail names, Staff seeks the Council's concurrence that the TNP not have a policy for establishing trail names.

- 3. Since the "safety" of any given trail is determined more by the users' capabilities than the physical infrastructure improvements, the "TYPE" of improvements (see proposed Guidelines Matrix) should be established based on the best user opportunities available and a direction included so that they can be adjusted according to demand. For instance, narrow prisms should be provided in native habitats with routine inspections so that they can be widened, rerouted or more turnouts provided should a particular section start to become crowded ...without having to modify the TNP.**

The current CTP and TNP both make reference to trail standards. As reported to the City Council when addressing the amendments to the PTP, when reviewing trails within the Preserve, the City ultimately decided that every trail situation is different and that common sense should be the main guideline when it comes to identifying trail locations and user designations for unimproved trails as opposed to rigid standards. However, since many of the City's trails outside of the Preserve are improved to a certain degree, there may be a benefit to have trail criteria that can be referred to particularly when new trails are proposed to be constructed. This is a policy issue that requires direction from the City Council prior to updating the TNP.

Staff seeks the Council's concurrence that the TNP include criteria for new trails and to allow maximum flexibility when assessing trails on a case-by-case basis, said criteria should be in the form of trail guidelines as opposed to trail standards.

- 4. Since the recommendations in the "Categories" in the Status: factor of the specific trail descriptions have not been implemented by Staff, language should be added to make them more specific directives. (Proposed language has been submitted to General Plan Update Steering Committee since this portion of the CTP was added to the General Plan as Amendment 22.)**

General Plan Amendment No. 22 was adopted by the City Council in 1991 which, among other things, establishes recommendations for each of the trail "categories" such as how to acquire future trails. The Subcommittee is requesting that the recommendations be made into a directive which is a City Council policy decision.

However, Staff believes that the descriptions should remain as a recommendation because based on current case law future trail acquisition requires cooperation by private property owners willing to grant public trail easements to the City. Moreover, contrary to this recommendation, historically the City has worked with developers in implementing conceptual trails identified in the CTP for new large development proposals such as Ocean Front Estates, Trump National, Seabreeze, and most recently Terranea Resort. This is because these major projects are located on large pieces of property which facilitate trail implementation and developers seeking support of their project voluntarily strive to provide as many public trails as possible.

However, for small infill development projects, the City has found it to be more challenging in implementing conceptual trails identified in the CTP. This is primarily because current case law prohibits the City from imposing conditions on development projects requiring the property owner to provide irrevocable offers or dedicate easements for public trails. The City must compensate property owners' fair market value for any desired easements, unless the property owner agrees to donate said easement to the City. However, it's been Staff's experience that property owners are typically opposed to donating or seeking compensation for easements on their property if it results in granting permission to the general public to access portions of their property. Notwithstanding, Staff tries to work with such property owners to secure public access easements for trail purposes.

Staff seeks the Council's concurrence that trail descriptions should remain as a recommendation as opposed to a requirement in the TNP.

#### Recommendations involving Formatting Changes

Listed below are 7 Subcommittee recommendations involving formatting changes or document composition (in **bold**) followed by a brief Staff discussion. These recommendations are being presented solely for informational purposes as no City Council direction is being sought with regards to these recommendations.

- 5. Since the Conceptual Trails Plan (CTP) and the Conceptual Bikeways Plan (CBP) were generated as Phase 1 of the TNP update, they should not appear to be "stand alone" documents. The Introductions, Implementation Policies, Existing Trails/ Bikeways Inventories, Conceptual Trails/Bikeways and Appendices should be inserted into the appropriate sections of the primary document.**

Staff is in agreement with this recommendation and believes that this is a formatting matter that can be accomplished as part of the overall update to the TNP. The objective with the update to the TNP is to create a comprehensive trails plan for the entire City.

- 6. Since the Plan includes directives to the Planning Dept., the Recreation & Parks Dept., the Public Works Dept., and the Finance Dept., the Definitions"**

**section should be expanded to include the esoteric terms of each of these professions that are used and called: A GLOSSARY OF TERMS.**

Staff believes that this recommendation is a formatting matter that can be accomplished as part of the overall update to the TNP with a comprehensive "Glossary of Terms" at the back of the updated TNP.

- 7. Since the California Coastal Trail (CCT), the Palos Verdes Loop Trail (PVLT) and bikeways in major transportation corridors extend beyond the City's jurisdiction and plans for their implementation are being addressed by other bodies, direction should be included to coordinate improvements and signage with the more global concepts.**

Staff recognizes that several trail routes, including the CCT and the PVLT, need to seamlessly connect to neighboring jurisdictions. This is typically accomplished with uniform signs (logo, insignia, etc.) and similar trail surface material. As such, Staff intends to coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions and other agencies to integrate this recommendation into the updated TNP.

- 8. Since miscommunications have occurred about reference points, GPS points should be included.**

Since this recommendation was made in 2005, advances in technology, including GPS points, make it much easier and common today to digitally map trails. Additionally, many smart phones today are equipped with "QR" (quick reader) applications that allow trail users to download trail information including trail maps. Staff intends to maximize the use of current technology with the updated TNP. However, it should be noted that use of such technology may have budget constraints which would eventually be subject to approval by the City Council.

- 9. Since Category VI in the Status: factor of the specific trail descriptions does not provide the same type of information and directives as the other categories, it should be eliminated. The "special circumstances" presently described here should be described in the text of the status of the specific trails that have them.**

According to the CTP, "Category VI" trails are proposed trails and trail segments which have special circumstances, considerations, or constraints. Staff is in agreement with this recommendation and agrees that the "special circumstances" can be described in the text of the specific trails as part of the overall update to the TNP.

- 10. Since the development of certain trails have been made conditions of proposed projects without the destinations that make the trail appropriate, an Objectives: factor should be added to each trail description.**

Staff is of the opinion that the "objectives" of a trail route can be described for each trail segment without having to create an additional "factor." In fact, the current CTP essentially includes an objective description for each trail when it describes the specific trail course and connections. As such, Staff is of the opinion that this recommendation can be integrated into the update to the TNP without having to create another "factor."

**11. Since the change in the Status: of any given trail is not circulated "in house" a section should be added where such changes can be posted on an ongoing basis. (See the proposed TABLE OF CONTENTS.)**

Unlike year's past when updating City documents were a word processing challenge, with the use of current computer software and technology it is much simpler to track and update City documents when changes occur. Since the update to the TNP will occur in a digital format, Staff is of the opinion that this recommendation can be integrated into the updated TNP, but perhaps not exactly as described in the recommendation. Essentially, this recommendation is a formatting issue that will be addressed prior to finalizing the updated TNP for Council approval.

Additional Open Space Subcommittee Recommendations

In 2005, the City Council only addressed the above 11 recommendations to TNP format and composition. The City Council did not address the Subcommittee's other three general recommendations which are listed below:

1. Proposed modifications to the wording of General Plan Amendment No. 22
2. A draft introduction to a revised Trails Network Plan, which would incorporate the Conceptual Trails Plan and the Conceptual Bikeways Plan back into a single document
3. A sample revised format for a geographic section of the Conceptual Trails Plan.

In regards to the recommended amendment to the General Plan, that will be considered by the City Council when the updated General Plan is presented to the Council in 2013. As for the remaining two recommendations, Staff also agrees with the above Subcommittee's recommendations which will be incorporated into the final TNP when presented to the City Council.

**CONCLUSION**

Staff for the most part agrees with the Subcommittee's recommendation to revise and update the City's TNP. Staff also feels that many of the Subcommittee's recommendations can be incorporated into the updated TNP that will make the document more user friendly, and will reflect current City Council policy preferences and changes in case law that have occurred since the TNP was first adopted. It is Staff's opinion that these changes will ultimately make the TNP more understandable and usable for decision-makers, City staff and the general public.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The update to the TNP will primarily occur in-house by Staff in the Community Development Department. The Community Development Department has included in its 2012/2013 budget \$7,220 for components of the update that will be outsourced, such as graphics, GIS services, and public outreach.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Open Space Subcommittee Report to Task Force on May 12, 2004
- March 29, 2005 Staff Report
- March 29, 2005 City Council Meeting Minutes

The Open Space Subcommittee of the RPV OSP and R&P Task Force recommends that the Task Force approve or disapprove of each of the following proposed substantive changes to the City's Trails Network Plan (TNP) prior to the updating of the specific text:

1. Since the Conceptual Trails Plan (CTP) and the Conceptual Bikeways Plan (CBP) were generated as Phase 1 of the TNP update, they should not appear to be "stand alone" documents. The Introductions, Implementation Policies, Existing Trails/Bikeways Inventories, Conceptual Trails/Bikeways and Appendices should be inserted into the appropriate sections of the primary document.
2. Since the policies which determine which type of trail users are precluded from using portions of specific trails at any given time are more flexible than the TNP and since enforcement of said policies is not addressed, said use determinations should be left unrestricted until established by deed restriction, emergency closure or City Council action.
3. Since the Plan includes directives to the Planning Dept., the Recreation & Parks Dept., the Public Works Dept., and the Finance Dept., the "Definitions" section should be expanded to include the esoteric terms of each of these professions that are used and called: A GLOSSARY OF TERMS.
4. Since many of the trail and other landmark names used in the document have been selected arbitrarily for purely communication purposes, a policy for establishing names of trails should be included for use when a trail is implemented.
5. Since the California Coastal Trail (CCT), the Palos Verdes Loop Trail (PVLT) and bikeways in major transportation corridors extend beyond the City's jurisdiction and plans for their implementation are being addressed by other bodies, direction should be included to coordinate improvements and signage with the more global concepts.
6. Since the "safety" of any given trail is determined more by the users' capabilities than the physical infrastructure improvements, the "TYPE" of improvements (see proposed Guidelines Matrix) should be established based on the best user opportunities available and a direction included so that they can be adjusted according to demand. For instance, narrow prisms should be provided in native habitats with routine inspections so that they can be widened, rerouted or more turnouts provided should a particular section start to become crowded ... without having to modify the TNP.

7. Since miscommunications have occurred about reference points, GPS points should be included.

8. Since the recommendations in the "Categories" in the Status: factor of the specific trail descriptions have not been implemented by Staff, language should be added to make them more specific directives. (Proposed language has been submitted to General Plan Update Steering Committee since this portion of the CTP was added to the General Plan as Amendment 22.)

9. Since Category VI in the Status: factor of the specific trail descriptions does not provide the same type of information and directives as the other categories, it should be eliminated. The "special circumstances" presently described here should be described in the text of the status of the specific trails that have them.

10. Since the development of certain trails have been made conditions of proposed projects without the destinations that make the trail appropriate, an Objectives: factor should be added to each trail description.

11. Since the change in the Status: of any given trail is not circulated "in house" a section should be added where such changes can be posted on an ongoing basis. (See the proposed TABLE OF CONTENTS.)

# MEMORANDUM



# RANCHO PALOS VERDES

**TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL**

**FROM: ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER**

**DATE: MARCH 29, 2005**

**SUBJECT: UPDATE OF THE CONCEPTUAL TRAILS PLAN**

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Direct staff to: 1) Redraft the Conceptual Trails Plan into a document that is more reader-friendly and usable by the City and the public; and 2) Prepare a status report describing the current status of trails acquisitions.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Although the Conceptual Trails Plan (CPT) is the document most often referred to whenever trails issues are discussed, the City Council has adopted a number of planning documents related to providing a safe and efficient system of public trails and paths since the City's incorporation in 1973. In order to place the Conceptual Trails Plan in context with these other documents, staff has prepared the timeline presented below:

June 26, 1973	Adoption of the City's General Plan, which identifies conceptual bikeway, pedestrian and equestrian networks in the Infrastructure section (page 100 and pages 124 to 138)
December 19, 1978	Adoption of the City's Coastal Specific Plan, which identifies public trails and pathways in the Corridors Element (pages C-5 through C-7) and as part of the discussion of each Coastal Subregion
June 15, 1982	Adoption of the Trail Standards Study, which contains conceptual design criteria for equestrian and pedestrian trails, as well as bikeways
November 27, 1984	Adoption of the Trails Network Plan
January 22, 1990	Adoption of the Conceptual Trails Plan and Conceptual Bikeways Plan, as two separate documents.

- November 6, 1991            Adoption of General Plan Amendment No. 22, which incorporated the trail and bikeway development policies, included in the two conceptual plans and the trails category definitions into the City's General Plan.
- September 7, 1993        Adoption of the most recent revisions to the Conceptual Trails Plan. The Plan was previously revised on May 21, 1991, September 16, 1991 and October 29, 1991.
- October 15, 1996         Adoption of revisions to the Conceptual Bikeways Plan

## **BACKGROUND**

In 1990, the Recreation & Parks Department was responsible for the preparation of both the Conceptual Trails Plan and the Conceptual Bikeways Plan. A specific five-member Trails Committee was formed to oversee the effort and the City hired a staff Trails Coordinator to facilitate the effort. Further, the adoption of the Conceptual Trails Plan and the Conceptual Bikeways Plan was intended to be the first step in revising the 1984 Trails Network Plan. However, this project was never completed. This situation is due in large part to the fact that the Trails Committee was disbanded shortly after the plans' adoption in 1990 and the Recreation & Parks Department's Trails Coordinator was laid off during the state budget crisis during the same time period. Instead, responsibility for the two plans was transferred to the Planning Department in 1992. In the intervening years, the Conceptual Trails Plan and the Conceptual Bikeways Plan have each been updated once, although it has been over 10 years and nearly 8 years, respectively, since this has been done.

The purpose of the Conceptual Trails Plan is to identify the trail opportunities within the community so that the acquisition and development of new public trails could take place as private development proposals and public works projects were constructed or as other opportunities presented themselves. The CPT specifically stated that the inclusion of a trail or trail segment in the plan did not legally authorize the use of these trails by the public or in any way guarantee their eventual implementation.

Although the City has done a good job applying the CPT to new development proposals, such as Ocean Trails, Seabreeze and Ocean Front Estates, the City has been inconsistent in consulting the CPT for small infill developments or when street projects were designed that should have included trail segments. Although a number of factors have contributed to the uneven implementation of the plan, staff has identified the following primary obstacles:

- Considerable private development has taken place, particularly along the coastline, and the City has acquired many additional acres of public parkland since the CPT was last revised in 1993. These changes and their impact on the identified trails are not identified in the document

- The Administrative Procedures for Trails Implementation that was adopted at the same time as the Conceptual Trails Plan did not assign responsibility for completing the trail system to any single City Department.
- Implementation is hampered by the fact that the plan is very difficult to read and understand and is familiar to only a few City staff members.
- The Cities of Palos Verdes Estates and Rolling Hills are not signatories to the "Peninsula Loop and Spoke Trail System" identified in Appendix 2 of the CPT and have objected to some of the trails that imply an entry into their respective cities.
- Over the years, there has been strong public opposition to implementing trails, especially equestrian trails, through established neighborhoods. This concern was partially addressed in the 1993 update of the CPT when many equestrian trails located outside of Equestrian Overlay Districts were eliminated from the plan. However, friction over this issue still exists in the community.
- Recent case law has severely limited the City's ability to condition small development projects to provide irrevocable offers or dedicate easements for public trails.
- Other than performing annual maintenance on existing dedicated trails, the City budget has not included funds to acquire new trail easements from private property owners, make significant improvement to existing trails or to construct new trails in existing easements.

## **DISCUSSION**

When the Open Space Planning and Recreation & Parks Task Force was initially formed in 2002, updating the Conceptual Trails Plan was identified as part of the Task Force's scope of work. Shortly after its formation, the Task Force broke itself into a series of subcommittees and the assignment of reviewing the CPT was given to the four-member Open Space Subcommittee. The Open Space Subcommittee spent a considerable amount of time reviewing existing City documents, conducting site visits to study actual conditions in the field and preparing specific recommendations to update the CPT. In the course of this effort, the Subcommittee presented two specific actions to the Task Force. The first related to recommending that the canyon areas on the Grandview Park property be included in the NCCP preserve Area and the second related to the implementation of public trails in conjunction with the future development of the Crestridge property. Both of these recommendations are included in the draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Strategic Plan presented to the Council this evening.

However, the Subcommittee was unable to complete a comprehensive update of the Conceptual Trails Plan, as it originally intended, prior to the scheduled joint workshop with the City Council. Instead, the Subcommittee submitted its draft recommendations to the Task Force on May 12, 2004. The Task Force continued the matter to tonight's workshop and requested staff to review and comment on the Subcommittee's recommendations.

The Open Space Subcommittee's draft recommendations consist of the following items:

1. Eleven specific recommendations regarding the format and composition of a revised Trails Network Plan
2. Proposed modifications to the wording of General Plan Amendment No. 22
3. A draft introduction to a revised Trails Network Plan, which would incorporate the Conceptual Trails Plan and the Conceptual Bikeways Plan back into a single document
4. A sample revised format for a geographic section of the Conceptual Trails Plan.

Staff has reviewed the work presented to the Task Force by its Open Space Subcommittee and feels that it contains several valuable suggestions. For example, staff agrees that it would be beneficial to combine the CPT and the Conceptual Bikeways Plan back into a single document; incorporate GIS mapping technology to identify the location of specific trails; and, develop a less complicated matrix to identify trail types and appropriate development standards. However, staff also feels that the existing CPT is difficult to use because the document breaks the City into five geographic sections, making overall comprehension of the trail systems and the interrelation between individual trail segments difficult to understand. At a minimum, staff recommends that the CPT include a comprehensive trails map that identifies all the trails included in the plan, similar to the City's General Plan and Zoning Maps. Further, both the staff and the public have had difficulty in the past understanding the various trail categories (six are currently identified in the CPT). Although the Subcommittee recommends eliminating one of these categories and refining the definition of the remaining five, staff feels that a simpler and more practical system could be developed.

## **CONCLUSION**

Staff agrees with the Open Space Subcommittee that the City's Conceptual Trails Plan is in need of revision and updating. Staff also feels that many of the Subcommittee's suggestions should be incorporated into the effort of updating the CPT. However, as a first step, staff recommends that the process begin with conducting a basic records search to identify all of the City's existing trail assets and then mapping them based on a new system of categorization. Once these initial steps are completed, staff recommends that the CPT document be revised to make the format more user friendly, reflect current City Council policy preferences and changes in case law that have occurred since the plan was first adopted. These changes will ultimately make the plan more understandable and usable for decision-makers, City staff and the general public.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

The Planning Department budget currently includes \$32,000 that had been earmarked for updating the Conceptual Trails Plan. Staff has received an estimate from one of the City's on-call consultants to complete the update for an estimated cost of \$29,400, which would include the creation a GIS database layer for trails. If the City Council

directs staff to proceed with the update, the expenditure of these funds would have no additional impact on the City's General fund balance. However, Council authorization and a budget adjustment would be required for any funds requested in excess of this amount.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolynn Petru  
Assistant City Manager

Reviewed,

Les Evans  
City Manager

Attachments:

Open Space Subcommittee Report to Task Force on May 12, 2004  
Conceptual Trails Plan

having the maintenance yard in their areas. With regard to the underground parking facility, he noted that such a structure would be cost-prohibitive to build.

Councilman Gardiner asked that ingress/egress to this site be improved.

Mayor Clark noted that Council had reached a consensus on the major components to be considered for the Upper Point Vicente site, including a remodeled City Hall with new Council Chambers, a new facility for the Palos Verdes Art Center, an outdoor pool, a gymnasium, a village green, an amphitheater, a band shell and trail heads; and asked staff to look at the site map and determine how it might all fit together and report back to Council. Without objection, Mayor Clark so ordered. He asked that staff work with the representatives from the Palos Verdes Art Center to bring in an architect to help out in this initial planning phase, and noted that this was not intended to be a full scale development project at this time.

On behalf of Council, Mayor Clark thanked everyone involved for their efforts and input on this item.

#### **Parks, Recreation and Open Space Strategic Plan (1201)**

The staff report of March 29, 2005 recommended the approval of the Updated Open Space, Planning and Recreation and Parks Strategic Plan, which would replace the 1999 Parks Master Plan, and serve as a guiding document for the future of recreation and open space planning in the City.

Councilman Long moved, seconded by Councilman Gardiner, to continue this item to a future Council meeting. Without objection, Mayor Clark so ordered.

#### **Update of the Conceptual Trails Plan (701)**

The staff report of March 29, 2005 recommended that Council direct staff to 1) Redraft the Conceptual Trails Plan into a document that was more reader-friendly and usable by the City and the public; and 2) Prepare a status report.

Mayor pro tem Wolowicz indicated that the Conceptual Trails Plan was a patchwork document that had been developed and changed over many years. He highlighted that staff was asking Council to direct it to redraft the Conceptual Trails Plan into a document that was more reader-friendly and useable by the City and the public before embarking on a larger policy analysis of the document.

Barbara Sattler, Rancho Palos Verdes, noted her confusion with the City's Trails Map and applauded Council's motion to have the map clarified.

Sunshine, Rancho Palos Verdes, asked that Council address each of the 11 policy items recommended by the Task Force's Open Space Subcommittee and

forwarded to the City Council by the Task Force, as reflected on Circle Page No. 6 of the staff report.

City Manager Evans indicated that staff wanted the opportunity to clarify the trails map before asking the Council to comment on the 11 policy issues.

Councilman Long moved, seconded by Councilman Gardiner, to adopt staff recommendation to direct staff to rework the Conceptual Trails Plan to clarify the maps in the Conceptual Trails Plan regarding uses, locations, ownership, conditions, status, type, etc.

Without objection, Mayor Clark so ordered.

Councilman Stern clarified that he would like staff to review the 11 policy issues as part of this effort in preparation for the next phase of the update to this plan. Mayor Clark confirmed that this was part of Council's intent.

**CLOSED SESSION REPORT:**

City Attorney Lynch advised that no action was taken with respect to the Abrams or Kay matters; that a status update was given with respect to potential litigation; that Council agreed to refund money to the Whites for their deposit on the foliage removal/trimming and to give the foliage owner until April 29<sup>th</sup> to have the work performed. She advised that Councilman Long was not in attendance during Closed Session. The vote was 4-0 to approve the refund to the Whites.

Mayor Clark thanked staff and Council for their time and efforts at the numerous meetings held during the month of March.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 P.M.

/s/ Larry Clark  
Mayor

Attest:

/s/Carolynn Petru  
City Clerk