

MY PUBLIC COMMENTS

The updated housing allocations from the California state HCD down through SCAG RNHA allocations report occurs every 8 years. Each of the affected cities then updated their Housing Element Plan accordingly. The proposed map and locations are in response to the new RHNA allocations.

Looking at the proposed sites to meet the City of Chino Hills allocated housing numbers, there is one glaring strategic problem. The excessive concentration of these high density housing into three large areas will amplify the impacts to the surrounding communities in terms of traffic impacts, impacts to local schools, impacts to parking, etc. Excessive concentration of higher density housing creates excessive impacts on traffic, schools, and parking.

An alternative strategy is to spread out the higher density housing units throughout the city to minimize the impact of higher density housing on the surrounding neighborhoods. This will spread out and minimize the impact to traffic, schools, and parking. Examples of other open, buildable areas to consider for higher density is along Grand Ave, along Chino Ave near Chino Hills Pkwy, in Carbon Canyon, etc. Studies are available which demonstrate that higher density housing intermixed within lower density housing areas will minimize the impact of higher density housing in terms of traffic, schools and parking.

My recommendation is to break up the three very large areas proposed for higher density housing into more small discrete areas of higher density, and identify other vacant land areas within Chino Hills to intermix the higher density units more uniformly through the city to minimize the less desirable impacts on traffic, schools, and parking. Some people will say that this vacant land does not exist, but it is obvious by driving around that sufficient vacant plots are visible. This approach will be easier on the city's infrastructure (traffic, parking), and minimize the impact on its residents.

Thank you,

Mike Braun

Dear Commission,

Can the public transportation lanes be looked at to see if there are any opportunities to build housing?

Can we make sure that our city's beauty is not destroyed by throwing up housing in any empty lot?

One suggestion the area adjacent Costco would be a great area for housing.

Best Regards

Theo Hester

February 27, 2021

Dear Planning Commissioners of Chino Hills,

We hope this letter finds you all well and greatly appreciate your hard work for our amazing city. My wife and I are residents of Chino Hills and feel compelled to express our deep concern regarding the proposed locations for high density housing on San Rafael Drive.

We have lived here for 16 years and indeed, moved here because of the unique natural environment of the city. The city is not only special due to its natural beauty, which we believe contributes to a safe, healthy, less toxic environment, Chino Hills is also special because it is safe, peaceful, and provides amazing resources for all residents of all ages. We first moved here as a young married couple and now have 4 young sons. We have been trying to buy our home for several years and just bought it this year in January 2021, an incredible accomplishment for us as we have made an enormous financial sacrifice (i.e., we spent almost every penny that we have) to live here on San Rafael Drive. My wife and I are so proud to own a home in Chino Hills, an American dream in an ideal American city. We are so grateful to raise our sons in an environmentally safe city where they can play outside, where it's quiet enough for them to hear the birds sing, where we can sit out in our backyard and see the breathtaking hills (and maybe catch a glimpse of a beautiful roaming coyote), or drive down Chino Avenue or Chino Hills Parkway and look out the window to see the yellow flowers on the hills in Spring.

We understand and appreciate the need for affordable housing, and we can only imagine the pressure the city is under to build this type of housing. But **PLEASE** continue to consider maintaining the open and natural environment of Chino Hills as well as the enormous financial and economic impact of your current residents. We really believe and desire for Chino Hills to remain a city where people aspire to live-a city of open spaces, of natural beauty, of peace and quiet.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration, and again, thank you for your hard work in planning such a sensitive endeavor. We are confident that you will make the best decision for our city and for those who will be able to live here through affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Eddie and Susy Lee
San Rafael Drive
Chino Hills, CA 91709

Three (3) areas of concern are:

- Chino Ave/ San Rafael Drive South (city-Owned Open Space) 8 acres PD 17-127
- Chino Ave/San Rafael Drive 4 acres PD 17-27
- Rock Springs Drive/Rimrock Ave 3.5 acres PD 17-127

The natural landscape, oak trees, hills, and creeks, along with natural habit : deer, coyotes, snakes, rabbits, hawks, black birds, etc. These areas should be kept natural and no more intrusion by humans. It is best to consider areas that have the least affect on the environment for decades and centuries to come, as this is our duty as caretakers of the land and all the life it supports.

Please consider areas as the Shops and Boys Republic land as these are central locations with flat areas with room to build. Also, it would be cost saving to build more in one area than to build here and there to achieve goals of housing. Please consider these areas of not building on and a reminder, that the reason why so many residents have moved to Chino Hills is for the natural beauty it has to offer.

Thank You,
Karen Mailo

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of The Commons in Chino Hills, please advise on the percentage of the site that needs to be affordable housing. If granted mixed use at the center to include residential, will the zoning change only allow for affordable housing?

Thank you.

Best Regards,

Miriam Peltz | Assistant Property Manager

4030 Birch Street, Suite 100 | Newport Beach, CA 92660

(949) 833-8813

(949) 833-9813 Fax

(714) 763-6405 Cell

This email transmission, including any attachments, may contain material that is confidential, privileged and/or attorney work product for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, reliance, dissemination or distribution by anyone other than the named addressee, or forwarding without the express permission of the sender, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail or telephone, delete this message, and destroy all copies of the message immediately. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

To ensure compliance with Internal Revenue Service Circular 230, we inform you that any U.S. Federal Tax advice contained in this communication is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (1) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matter(s) addressed herein.

Ms Lombardo,

Thank you for your response.

Many of my questions asked for specific responses and details, yet some form of the phrase:

"Response: As stated above, Information regarding the (insert issue or question reference here) were provided during staff's Workshop#1, #2 presentation and are included in the March 2 staff report for Workshop #3."

was used to reply to several of my questions. 6 times to be specific. This is not providing the information in a format the public would find helpful. The tactic of providing an answer by handing over an entire report or stack of papers is often used by attorneys to hide or obfuscate critical information in a clearly adversarial situation. Does the city see public inquiry as an adversarial situation? At the very least, a reference to a section or page of the staff report would make sharing this information with the public helpful. A simple copy and paste from the related section of the reports, slides or notes would be infinitely more helpful, than responding with "it's in the report."

Here is the perfect example of a lack of completeness and specificity, which you responded below:

1. Question: This question has been asked previously, but Ms Lombardo and legal staff gave general non-specific information in response. "Significant negative impact" is not an adequate response. So here are the questions: What SPECIFICALLY are the consequences of not meeting our RHNA numbers? Do we lose state funding? How much specifically? Do we lose Federal funding? How much specifically. Do we face a fine of some significance? How much specifically? What are other cities who are past buildout or near buildout, doing to reduce or ignore this mandate? How much will it cost us to work with other cities and sue the state in court? Dollar amount please. Please prepare and present an impact comparison showing what we anticipate if we ignore the mandate or take the issue to court.

Response: As stated above, Information regarding the penalties of noncompliance and options for legal challenge were provided during staff's Workshop #2 presentation and are included in the March 2 staff report for Workshop #3.

This is not encouraging public involvement and personally very disappointing. Perhaps there is another reason for this type of response? Does the city not wish to be transparent with this situation so as to avoid confrontation or delay? Perhaps its related to me personally? Is my desire to be an active citizen not what the city wishes? Perhaps its because I brought up the issue of systemic racism or because I am a minority? Or maybe the city does not want to do the work required to answer these questions from the public thoroughly because its

extra work? Regardless of the reasons, if the city fails to provide adequate information and transparency, it may result in circumstances that put the city at risk of future legal action.

Please include this written response as part of the public record for the Housing Element Workshop.

As can be read below, my questions requested specifics and details, yet staff report was also severely lacking in both and was far from complete.

Sincerely
Luis Esparza
Chino Hills resident.

For the sake of full disclosure and to help keep the public informed, the March 2 staff report is copied below:

(I have made some comments to the Staff report noted below. Please review those changes and comment. Also, for some reason the last page, Page 10 of the staff report could not be copied. Please make all information provided to the public open to "copy and paste" processes so that specific information can be posted in Social Media and news outlets.)

February 25, 2021 Agenda Item No.: 6b TO: CHAIR AND PLANNING COMMISSIONERS FROM: JOANN LOMBARDO, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SUBJECT: 6 th CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE – PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3 RECOMMENDATION That the Planning Commission hold a public workshop to receive public input, discuss and provide staff direction on the Housing Element Update process. BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS Housing Element Update Public Workshop #2 At the Housing Element Public Workshop #2 on February 16, staff presented information regarding the following topics: • Penalties to cities for Housing Element non-compliance • Housing Element requirements override Measure U provisions • Zoning tools required to implement Housing Element Update • Housing Element Update Workshop Schedule • Accessory Dwelling Unit projections • Preliminary Review of Potential Sites. The primary focus of the second Housing Element Update workshop was on city compliance requirements and on potential sites to satisfy the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) very low- and low-income unit RHNA requirements. Housing Element Update Public Workshop Comments During the first and second Housing Element Workshops, members of the community discussed a variety of issues. Some of these issues were addressed through staff presentations during the meeting. To summarize public comments received during the workshops to date, the comments and staff's responses are listed below: Meeting Date: March 2, 2021 Page: 2 SUBJECT: HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE – PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3 • Comment: Concern for high density units in the canyon because of fire hazards and increased traffic, especially when trying to evacuate during a fire. o Response: Fire safety and traffic concerns will be applied to the RHNA potential site selection criteria and will be an integral part of the

subsequent General Plan update process. • Comment: Can housing be permitted on nonresidential sites, such as commercial or institutionally zoned properties? o Response: Staff will be considering a housing overlay zone as a tool to help meet state RHNA requirements. The overlay zone would assign a specified number of RHNA units and density to a portion of a nonresidential site, allowing the remainder of the site to continue to develop under the existing non-residential zone. • Comment: Concern regarding loss of open space. o Response: Under state law, open space properties are held in trust for the public under the “public trust doctrine.” The City cannot use these properties for incompatible purposes. The City Attorney’s office has opined that using open space properties for housing would be an incompatible use. Additionally, many of these properties are subject to deed restrictions from the developer. City-owned open space sites will be removed from consideration. • Comment: Concern that Western Hills golf course serves as open space for adjacent mobile home park. o Response: In reviewing potential sites that include private open space, such as golf courses, staff will research property entitlements to determine any development restrictions. • Comment: The 1979 Chino Hills Specific Plan allowed clustered developments to protect open space; and concern with balancing state requirements for development of housing with the rural heritage of the community. o Response: Clustering and protection of open space will be an integral part of the Housing Element Update site selection process and subsequent General Plan update process. • Comment: Concern for continued removal of trees associated with more development. o Response: Future development will be subject to the City tree preservation ordinance requirements.

Meeting Date: March 2, 2021 Page: 3 SUBJECT: HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE – PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3 • Comment: Concerns regarding regional and local roadway improvements, and transit availability for both trips within Chino Hills and to regional connectors. o Response: Local and regional traffic impacts from the additional housing and transit will be an integral part of the Housing Element Update and subsequent General Plan update process. The Planning Commission plans to hold a public workshop on traffic and transit issues later this year. • Comment: Concern about challenging the RHNA allocation in court. o Response: The California Court of Appeal has held that the statutes governing the RHNA allocation procedure reflect the Legislature’s clear intent to prevent the courts from intervening in the RHNA process. Therefore, the courts do not have jurisdiction to review the City’s RHNA allocation. This decision binds the lower courts across the state, so any lawsuit by the City challenging the City’s RHNA allocation would be dismissed. Further, there is no mechanism for the City or any local agency to challenge the determination by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) of the RHNA allocated to the southern California region. SCAG appealed its RHNA allocation administratively but lost. SCAG has not filed legal action challenging its RHNA Allocation. Explanation: In the case of *City of Irvine v. Southern California Assn. of Governments* (2009) (“Irvine”) 175 Cal.App.4th 506, the Fourth District Court of Appeal held in a published opinion that the courts lack jurisdiction to review the propriety of a local agency’s RHNA allocation. The case arose during the 2006-2014 planning period when SCAG’s draft RHNA allocation plan allotted over 35,000 residential units to the city of Irvine—a number equal to 43 percent of the entire regional housing need for Orange County. After an unsuccessful appeal to SCAG, Irvine sued seeking to vacate and set aside

the draft allocation, the RHNA appeals board's denial of its appeal, and SCAG's final allocation plan. The city also sought recalculation of its allocation in accordance with state law. The trial court dismissed the lawsuit. The Court of Appeal affirmed, holding that although the RHNA statutes do not expressly bar a municipality from judicially challenging its RHNA allocation, the statutory procedure and the intricacy of the process created to determine a municipality's RHNA allocation "reflects a clear intent on the part of the Legislature to render the process immune from judicial intervention." Although Irvine insisted it was only seeking to correct its own RHNA allocation and that its lawsuit would not derail other municipalities from timely revising their housing elements, the Court noted that it would be impossible to adjust the RHNA allocation of a single municipality without potentially affecting every other local jurisdiction in the region. Under the Meeting Date: March 2, 2021 Page: 4 SUBJECT: HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE – PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3 RHNA statutes, once HCD determines the housing need for the region, that number cannot change. Consequently, the reduction in RHNA allocation for one local government would necessarily require the regional council to make upward adjustments to the allocation of other local governments in the region. Because one local agency's challenge to its allocation could potentially affect the allocation of every other agency in the region, every local jurisdiction in the region would necessarily have to be named in any judicial action as an interested party, thereby precluding each affected municipality's completion of its housing element revision and creating gridlock while a particular city's case winds through the courts. In reaching its decision, the Court also noted that the 2004 amendments to the RHNA statutes eliminated a provision that authorized judicial review of a regional council's determination concerning a city or county's share of the state housing need. This, the Court found, evidenced the Legislature's intent to withdraw that right. More recently, four cities in San Diego County—Coronado, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, and Solana Beach—sued the San Diego Association of Governments on September 24, 2020 seeking to lower their respective RHNA allocations. Citing the Irvine case, the San Diego Superior Court dismissed the lawsuit on February 5, 2021. • Comment: Concern that potential sites could fall upon minority and/or low-income communities. o This response is inadequate. LE Response: The State Housing and Community Development (HCD) Site Inventory Guidebook (May 2020) outlines the criteria for determining consistency with "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing", which HCD defines as "taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and fosters inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics". The City is required to follow these criteria in its identification of potential RHNA housing sites. The City has invited all members of the community to participate in the Housing Element Update process, including religious facilities, fair housing groups and low-income housing providers. • Comment: Question regarding how a potential site is rejected as an appropriate high density housing site. o Response: As noted above and discussed in this staff report, below, cities are required to follow the criteria outlined in HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook. Local issues also are considered, including neighborhood compatibility, roadway access and capacity, protection of biological resources and native species, and protection of ridgelines, slopes, and Meeting Date: March 2, 2021 Page: *5 SUBJECT: HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE – PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3

open spaces. Site availability and property owner interest are additional criteria that are considered. • Comment: Support for moving units from Tres Hermanos. o Response: Decisions regarding residential zoning on Tres Hermanos will be considered by the City. These decisions will require compliance with state of California "no net loss requirements". Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 2041 (DUTRA) and Senate Bill (SB) 330, a jurisdiction must ensure that a decision to downzone or remove residential units from a site results in no net loss in total housing units. The Tres Hermanos Conservation Authority is the landowner and makes decisions for the property pursuant to the procedures in its Joint Powers Agreement. • Comment: Support for rezoning a portion of the Boys Republic site for residential development. o Response: The City has informed Boys Republic of the Housing Element update process and requested that they consider adding housing on their site. • Comment: Can the Aerojet property be a potential housing site? o Response: The property is subject to the state Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) review for required clean up from its past munitions operation. Aerojet's DTSC review status would not meet the criteria outlined in HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook. • Comment: Are sites such as Vellano and Hidden Oaks being considered and concern regarding the Galstian property behind Jade Tree. o Response: All potential sites are being considered through the Housing Element Update process and will be recommended based on the criteria outlined in HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook as well as local issues, such as neighborhood compatibility, roadway access and capacity, protection of biological resources and native species, and protection of ridgelines, slopes and open spaces. • Comment: Encourage greater use of social media to inform the community regarding the Housing Element Update workshops. o Response: Information about the Housing Element Update process is posted on the City's Facebook, Twitter and Instagram accounts. The City has issued Press Releases and "pushed out" notifications to the public through its e-notify system about the Housing Element Update workshops. The City has dedicated a page on its website to the Housing Element Update process to make it easy for the public to obtain information about these workshops. Meeting Date: March 2, 2021 Page: 6 SUBJECT: HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE – PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3 • Comment: Desire for City to avoid incurring penalties from the state due to Housing Element non-compliance. o Response: Information about the potential penalties for Housing Element non-compliance are posted on the City's Housing Element Update webpage: <https://www.chinohills.org/HousingElementUpdate>. • Comment: Community statistics support the need for more rental units. o Response: The Housing Element Update will include current demographic information for Chino Hills, and an analysis of housing need, including the need for additional rental housing. Goals and policies of the Housing Element Update will be established to address identified housing need. • Comment: Support for placing high-density units on commercial center properties, vacant and underutilized properties. o Response: Potentially available commercial center properties, vacant and underutilized properties are being considered in the RHNA potential site selection inventory. • Comment: Concern for losing commercial business. o Response: Focus of the RHNA potential site selection inventory will be on vacant and underutilized properties. Commercial centers considered will be those that have currently underutilized buildings or land. • Comment: Concern regarding the access to sites and the requirement for a

potential residential development to have two points of access. o Response: Wherever feasible, development is required to provide two points for vehicular access. Exceptions are considered based on Fire District and City reviews. • Comment: Lack of support for high density housing all over the City. o Response: Community input, including concerns about high density housing, are being considered throughout the Housing Element Update process. The State of California has mandated the City zone for high density housing. • Comment: Potential that the RHNA requirements would be overturned with a change in the state's government. o Response: The City is obligated to follow current legislative requirements including the State's RHNA and Housing Element Update requirements. Meeting Date: March 2, 2021 Page: 7 SUBJECT: HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE – PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3 • Comment: Suggestions to offer developer incentives such monetary incentives for developers, land donations, fee reductions and in-lieu housing fees. o Response: Incentives for encouraging affordable housing development will be considered during the Housing Element process. • Comment: Recommendation that residential density ranges be 40 dwelling units per acre to a minimum of 25 units per acre. o Response: A variety of housing densities and development standards will be considered through the Housing Element Update process. • Comment: Concern regarding increased height restrictions. o Response: Neighborhood compatibility, including building height compatibility, will be considered through the potential RHNA site selection process. • Comment: Concerns regarding Measure U impact on RHNA. o Response: State RHNA allocations override local residential growth control ordinances, including Measure U. In addition, the City of Chino Hills adopted Measure U contains language recognizing the mandate to comply with State RHNA obligations: Measure U states: Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City Council may increase residential density as necessary to meet the City's minimum mandated Housing Element requirements as set forth in California Government Code §65580, et seq., as amended from time to time, including, without limitation, the City's share of regional housing needs. • Comment: Request for a map of all proposed locations for high-density residential building projects. o Response: Maps of all the potential sites considered through this Housing Element process are presented in the Housing Element Workshop PowerPoint presentations, available on the City's Housing Element Update webpage: <https://www.chinohills.org/HousingElementUpdate>. Site Inventory Criteria HCD's Site Inventory Guidebook outlines a multi-step process through which to identify suitable potential housing sites that will satisfy the State's RHNA requirements. These primary steps are outlined below. Staff will be applying this process in its review of potential RHNA sites. In addition, as mentioned previously, local issues also are considered, including neighborhood compatibility, roadway access and capacity, protection of biological resources and native species, and protection of ridgelines, slopes, and open spaces, site availability and property owner interest. Meeting Date: March 2, 2021 Page: 8 SUBJECT: HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE – PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3 HCD Site Inventory Criteria: Step 1: Identification of Developable Sites Generally, a site is a parcel or a group of parcels that can accommodate a portion of a city's RHNA. A city must identify, as part of an inventory, sites within its boundaries that could have the potential for new residential development within the timeframe of the housing element planning period. Types of sites include: • Vacant sites zoned for residential use. • Vacant

sites zoned for nonresidential use that allow residential development. • Residentially zoned sites that are capable of being developed at a higher density (nonvacant sites, including underutilized sites). • Sites owned or leased by a city, county, or city and county. • Sites zoned for nonresidential use that can be redeveloped for residential use and a program is included to rezone the site to permit residential use. Projects that have been approved, permitted, or received a certificate of occupancy since the beginning of the RHNA projected period may be credited toward meeting the RHNA allocation based on the affordability and unit count of the development. For these projects, affordability is based on the actual or projected sale prices, rent levels, or other mechanisms establishing affordability. For projects yet to receive their certificate of occupancy or final permit, the element must demonstrate that the project is expected to be built within the planning period, which is June 30, 2021 – October 15, 2029. Step 2: Inventory of Sites HCD requires a parcel specific inventory of sites that includes the following information for each site: • Assessor parcel number(s). • Size of each parcel (in acres). • General plan land use designation. • Zoning designation. • For nonvacant sites, a description of the existing use of each parcel. • Whether the site is publicly owned or leased. Meeting Date: March 2, 2021 Page: 9 SUBJECT: HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE – PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3 • Number of dwelling units that the site can realistically accommodate. • Whether the parcel has available or planned and accessible. • The RHNA income category the parcel is anticipated to accommodate. • If the parcel was identified in a previous planning period site inventory. Step 3: Infrastructure Availability HCD requires that parcels included in the inventory have sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities available. Dry utilities include, at minimum, a reliable energy source that supports full functionality of the home and could also include access to natural gas, telephone and/or cellular service, cable or satellite television systems, and internet or Wi-Fi service. Step 4: Map of Sites HCD requires that cities provide a map that shows the location of the sites included in the inventory. While the map may be on a larger scale, such as the land use map of the general plan, the more detailed the map, the easier it will be to demonstrate the sites meet HCD requirements. Step 5: Determination of Consistency with Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing HCD requires that sites be identified throughout the community in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing opportunities. Specifically, affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws. For purposes of the Housing Element site inventory, this means that sites identified to accommodate the lower-income need are not concentrated in low-resourced areas (lack of access to high performing schools, proximity to jobs, location disproportionately exposed to pollution or other health impacts) or areas of segregation and concentrations of poverty. Instead, sites identified to accommodate the lower income RHNA must be distributed throughout the community in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing. One resource recommended by HCD is the California Tax Credit Allocation/California Department of Housing and Community Development Opportunity Maps, which can be accessed at

<https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp>. As required by the State, this analysis will be incorporated into an Environmental Justice element or equivalent environmental justice-related policies as part of the subsequent General Plan Update. (Page 10 omitted)

Dear Commission members and staff,

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend some or most of tonight's workshop. Please consider the following as my public statement on the issue.

I previously sent a list of questions and comments regarding the proposed properties and their negative effects. Some residents are concerned that certain properties were allocated to be public parks are now being considered for low-income housing requirements. Are all open areas being considered for housing even land previously or currently zoned as park land? Please specify which properties they are for the record.

I have requested a CITY MAP showing all of the properties being considered for zone changes and overlays to meet the low income housing mandates. Ms Lombardo has referred me to the slides presented by staff which shows each property individually, but this is inadequate. A map should be created showing all the properties being considered, perhaps with a color coding for level of zone change being proposed. Having a large picture of what is happening across the entire city will give the public a better understanding of how this update may directly impact their neighborhoods and quality of life. Individual maps are akin to looking thru a microscope to identify an animal. You would see skin cells, maybe hair, and a few microscopic critters, but you would not likely realize you are staring at an elephant without seeing the entire animal.

Finally, as discussed in my previous emails and public comments, policies enacted by our city, often have unintended consequences. One of those can be Systemic Racism. The city may decide that the most logical places to increase zoning and allow construction of Very High and High density projects may also impact predominantly lower income and minority neighborhoods. Systemic Racism does not require intent, malice or hatred. Proceeding with a direction that places an abnormal concentration of these zones in just one or a few neighborhoods may inadvertently create a Systematically Racist policy, causing negative effects in minority neighborhoods or non-affluent communities. Please explain how the city is going to measure and ensure that the decisions we make will not result in unwanted, unintended systemic racism. Please be specific: What variables are you measuring? for example minority household density maps, income density maps, average or median distances from a given zone to minority households, etc. What would be considered acceptable and unacceptable levels of impact, especially if it targets minority communities?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

And don't forget, the public would benefit from a citywide map showing all proposed sites.

And don't especially forget,

Systemic Racism does not require intent, malice or hatred towards others for a policy to be discriminatory.

Luis Esparza
Chino Hills Resident.