



Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board Meeting Minutes

May 5, 2010

Attendees: Dan Barker, Jon Becker, Joost Bende, Thom Clark, Bill Diehl, Bill Dumka, John Keating, Jim LaGrone, Lynn Murphy, Jeanine Politte, Keith Rhodes, Charles Sellers, Mike Shoecraft, Dennis Spurr

Absent: Morri Chowaiki, Scot Sandstrom, John Spelta

Community Members & Guests (Voluntary Sign-in): Katt Eaton

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:33pm at the Doubletree Golf Resort located at 14455 Peñasquitos Drive, San Diego, California 92129. A Quorum was present.
2. Agenda Modifications: Move Clearwire Ragweed Street project to 1st position on Business agenda.
3. MINUTES:
Motion: To approve the April 7, 2010 Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board Meeting minutes as presented. M/S/C - LaGrone/Clark/Approved 9 in favor-0 against-4 abstentions (Murphy, Barker, Shoecraft, Politte).
4. Guests: No Public Safety agency representatives were present.
5. NON-AGENDA, PUBLIC COMMENTS:
 - a. Katt Eaton with Institute for Public Strategies shared a handout and discussed the Smoke-Free Outdoor Dining project they are promoting. Brief Q & A; discussion on how IPS is getting the word out on this project.
6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATION ITEMS:
 - a. San Diego City Mayoral Office – Stephen Lew was not in attendance.
 - b. San Diego City Council District 1 Report – Stephen Heverly
 - Council Dist.1 offices are collating community suggestions on FY 2010-11 Budget, cuts or new revenue sources; final budget vote scheduled for 6/14/10. In December, Council approved revisions to the budget and there is now an additional \$28.2M deficit. The Mayor’s May 2010 revise may have additional shortfalls to look at. Council Member Lightner is not promoting cuts in City services as a way to reduce the budget. Looking for cost recovery ideas similar to false alarm reimbursement (fire/police) by the business (site) owner. Heverly acknowledged that Lightner is very concerned for her constituents with the two fire stations (#35 & #40) in her district included in the Brown Out rotation; working to get them removed from the rotation. Lightner requested the Mayor’s Office provide a list of \$11.5M in alternative reductions that were previously submitted by staff and not selected to reduce the budget so Council can review/weigh those options in comparison to Fire Protection Brown Out. This is a huge opportunity for City Council to weigh those items which were never presented at Council and direct the Mayor’s office in restoring fire/public safety services.
 - PPH – Council Member Lightner & Heverly met with community members, PPH, and traffic engineering (Gary Pence) to review traffic concerns at the site. Specific situations were noticed immediately such as traffic not waiting their turn

to get into the turn lanes, driving in the Bike Lanes illegally or jumping the curb onto the sidewalk posing danger to bicyclists/pedestrians.

- Becker & Heverly added that as a result of the meeting, the Traffic Engineer recommended: 1) newer, brighter, larger Bike Lane signage, 2) freshen up the “Keep Clear” paint on the roadway at the entrance into the site plus additional signage. Engineering staff will take an additional look at options to address these issues now.
- Rancho Peñasquitos Fiesta 2010 – Council Member Lightner and Heverly attended. Lightner presented Youth Community Service awards to local youth. Questions about the Fire Protection service cuts were the hot topic of the day.
 - Sellers/Politte suggested more law enforcement writing tickets at PPH entrance area – seeing enforcement during high traffic periods will make an impression on those who are delayed due to others negligence.
 - Susan Stephan is the new Community Relations Officer for Northeastern Police Sub-Station.
- c. San Diego City Planning & Community Investment Report – Michael Prinz was not present.

7. BUSINESS.

- a. **Clearwire Ragweed Street Project (Spindletop Rd x Park Village Rd) Action Item** – Becky Siskowski

Sellers reported that this project has come before Telecomm Committee a couple of times for review.

Siskowski stated that this project demolishes an existing light standard and places a new standard with a 3-12” flat panel antenna, 50’ east of existing location. The panels will be covered by 2 PQ banners. Equipment will be above ground in right-of-way, surrounded by retaining wall on 3 sides with cabinets & wall painted green to blend with landscaping.

i. Planning Board Member Comments:

- Bende asked for clarification on location; existing standard is approx. 200’ from intersection, new location is approx. 250’ from intersection. Siskowski also added that there are trees in the median that obstruct direct line to nearest antenna, so the new antenna was moved approx. 50’ further east. Bende asked why demolish, just add an additional light standard; Siskowski stated the City requires that light standards be at least 100’ away from each other. Sellers added that the issue of leaving the existing and adding an additional was discussed in Committee. Siskowski stated that there is a traffic light at Ragweed with a light standard and their new standard can’t be closer to that standard.
- Sellers stated that the neighbors were concerned with this placement (contacted by Keating).
- Rhodes inquired if this is a City Ordinance that determines distance, adding that it was senseless to remove an existing light standard. Sellers stated that the City won’t let the applicant leave the existing and add an additional one. Engineering has reviewed their site.
- Sellers stated that on the photo sym that equipment is inside the retaining wall which is painted green with landscaping on 3 sides that will mask the wall. The Committee asked the applicant to increase the height of the wall from 3’ to 5’ to hide the 5’ high equipment boxes and they agreed to that modification. Sellers

added that Becker reviewed the landscaping plan; what is planned will grow to cover the wall and will be maintained by the LMAD once established.

- Bende asked why Clearwire was not undergrounding the equipment. Siskowski stated that there are underground utilities at this location, they cannot underground this installation.
- Sellers reminded RPPB that at our meeting a couple months ago, Karen Lynch-Ashcraft stated that carriers are not proposing to underground which would be a Process 1 and all above ground installations in residential areas are now Process 4. He added that the Committee has reviewed, the applicant has agreed to increase the wall height to 5', it is off the sidewalk.
- ± Karen Lynch-Ashcraft, DSD, notified RPPB Chair via email 6/17/10 of correction to the statement above. "All telecom projects in the ROW with above ground equipment are process 3 Cup's, not process 4."
- Keating asked what the lifespan of the banner district is. Sellers stated that the Banner District is perpetual, PQ Town Council owns all banners and must replace; locations are authorized. Sellers stated that the applicant is already working with the Town Council's banner person.
- Murphy asked Siskowski if she had supplied enough coverage maps for the full Board? Siskowski replied, no.
- The Telecomm committee approved the following motion on this project, 4 in favor – 0 against. Murphy read the motion.

Motion: To recommend approval of the design as submitted with the exception that the wall be raised to 5' and that vegetation be allowed to grow to the height of the wall and the landscaping must be maintained by the applicant until botanically established. M/S/C – Murphy/Sellers/discussion.

- Spurr wondered if adding 2' to the wall doesn't make it more noticeable as the vegetation once mature will hide the equipment. Sellers stated that was discussed in committee and the wall will eventually disappear, whereas if the wall is just 3' high, you will see 3' of vegetation and 2 additional feet of equipment above the wall and reduce its potential as a graffiti magnet.
- Clark asked for clarification on painted wall & equipment, is the wall a standard precision block wall that will be painted green and what about repainting? Applicant will have to maintain the interior wall, but the landscape should cover the wall, not painting needed. Becker stated that the committee did discuss additional painting of the landscaped side of structure, but LMAD will be maintaining once established.

Sellers called for the vote on the motion as presented. Approved 12 in favor - 2 against (Bende/Politte) - 0 recusals - 0 abstentions.

b. **YMCA Expansion Project (Information Item)** – Cindi Phellan

Phellan shared some history of the joint use facility (parcels are leased from the City). Phase I was built in 1995 adjacent to the Peñasquitos Library. Phase II was the amin facility that included the pool and wellness center. The CUP was approved for a 2-story building. Phase III which adds the 2nd floor and includes a bridge to the Program Center. The YMCA also owns the land on Salmon River Rd.(donated to YMCA by Newland) where they have a parking lot which accommodates the additional parking needed for the additional square footage. The Dog Park area was deeded back to the City and the land behind the fire station was approved to be a childcare center.

The idea is to move the fitness area upstairs of the old program area which opens up the downstairs for multipurpose.

YMCA has completed a market study funded by the City (Scripps Ranch Community Groups funds). Results will be completed by next week. The expansion is a capital development project which will update the PQ structure and build a new facility in Scripps Ranch (west end near Nokia offices off Scripps Poway Parkway). Presently the Scripps Ranch site is used for sports activities. Feasibility study on fundraising - goal of fundraising is \$20M.

i. Planning Board Member Comments:

- Both sites are leased through the City at reduced rates (PQ is leased for \$1 per year, SR site is slightly higher). Sellers asked if all phases were approved, were all permits approved or will YMCA need to go back to City for approval of new and expansion? Phellan stated that they were approved, but they must go back to City for permits (come back to RPPB for approval). She believes the CUP has expired. Keating confirmed that they would need to go back to City for approval.
- Rhodes added these are not new ideas for RPPB, originally presented to Board years ago; are there any major changes to original plan? No. When they are ready to do the Childcare center, there might be changes based on the age that will be cared for.
- Sellers requested that YMCA do outreach to local neighbors (just up the hill), prior, informing them of plans, lighting, construction/timeline, etc. to head off any concerns.
- Diehl requested clarification: moving fitness to new addition (2nd floor); yes. And yes, the YMCA will still plan to use Canyonside Park facilities for some of their activities (presently use for gymnastics classes).
- Becker asked if there would be a need for additional parking. Street parking, small lot on Fairgrove (next to building) and parking lot on Salmon River Rd. provide the spaces required for all phases. Sellers suggested that we make the push for angled parking on Salmon River Rd. simultaneously as there will be the additional demand for parking.
- Becker asked if their fundraising campaign did not reach their goal, how would they decide what gets done 1st. Phellan stated that a decision would be based on the donations (may be restricted or designated for specific portions of project).
- Politte requested more information about Teen Center activities. Phellan stated that the program center was originally designed for teen use, but they are only doing teen concerts (local garage bands) at this time. Politte added that there have been inquiries about things for youth to do locally and recommended that they advertise more.

c. **City of San Diego CDBG Action Plan (Information Item)** – Laura Black

Laura Black, Project Manager, CDBG Program Specialist distributed the City of San Diego's Draft FY 2011 Annual Action Plan (CDBG funds) for review. The 30-day comment period runs April 13, 2010 through May 12, 2010, 5:00pm. The City is required to prepare and submit an Annual Action Plan each year to the Dept. of Housing and Urban Development which identifies its allocations of CDBG monies & Shelter Grant funds. Recommendations will go to City Council for approval; estimated amount \$15M (approved by City Council) plus \$1.3M differential (\$1.3M needs approval). HUD entitlement amount is \$16.3M for 2011, starting July 1st 2010.

i. Planning Board Member Comments:

- Members did not have any questions about the plan that was just distributed; would like to review materials prior to meeting, in the future.
- Sellers inquired about the status of HUD audit, referencing the allocation/use of CDBG monies by the Redevelopment Agency (RDA); have their claims been substantiated, will we need to pay back, how? Black stated that the audit by HUD and the audit by the Inspector General's Office at the same time; research showed loans to the Redevelopment Agency. The Agency will pay approx. \$78M back to CDBG program, repatriated to HUD over 10 years. This will not restrict future requests to HUD. All applications will be approved by full Council. CDBG minimum allocation request is now \$50,000, asking service providers to come with a plan and funds be expensed within 18 months. A Commission (to be setup) will review all applications; set up to avoid conflicts of interest.
- Rhodes noted the newspaper article today stating that the Governor will take monies from CDBG funds. Black stated that 20% goes to administrative and Housing, addressed in set aside monies. RDA will pay back HUD by putting the monies into CDBG to be used as it was originally suppose to be used. Will pay off Section 108 funds 1st.
- Sellers stated if there is a legal obligation to pay off this liability from Redevelopment, the Governor may not be able to take.
- Black stated that her department will be coming to us each year to ask for review of plan.

d. **CA High Speed Rail Briefing (Information Item)** – Linda Culp (Planner with SANDAG) & Mike Sedahn (Project Director, LA/Inland Alignment) & Greg Parks (Katz & Associates)

Update on High Speed Rail through inland corridor to San Diego, PowerPoint presentation showed more details. Projects will combine High Speed Rail, BART systems, Amtrak/Coaster systems into one cohesive transit system in multiple segments through the state; 800 mile system.

High Speed rail trains will travel at approx. 220 miles per hour mainly along Highway corridors on dedicated tracks, no crossings, steel wheel on steel tracks, 100% electric. Trip time requirement between San Diego and LA: 120 minutes (express trains). This causes design issues, curves will slow down trains.

They are also looking into possible linkages to other airports, like Ontario (in 48 minutes), for when Lindbergh Field in San Diego is at capacity. SANDAG estimates that with population growth, Lindbergh will need 9 additional runways/60 gates which is not feasible at its existing site. We'll also need 3,000 lane miles of freeway by year 2030. Plan is that 7% of all trips to northern CA are by High Speed Rail.

Alternative analysis and recommendations will be completed/released by August 5, 2010. Comment period will be through January 2011, followed by a full EIR/EIS over 2 years culminating in Record of Decision. The project will be a private design build project; have already received letters of interest. Once approved, could begin building in 2016, operable in 2020.

Eight (8) segments include LA to San Francisco, San Diego to LA (via Riverside/San Bernadino); another section maybe Sacramento to unknown hub. There are 2 variations

in LA. The San Diego section has a couple of variations (alternative routes) that are being reviewed terminating at either the Airport or Downtown. The SoCal Inland segment has the potential for largest ridership. Tier I segment from San Francisco to LA is in queue to be completed 1st right now). The segment between LA & San Diego is a Tier II.

i. Planning Board Member Comments:

- Keating asked about the type of rail. Steel tracks, raised above grade and as straight as possible; not Kattenary (3rd Rail). Sims show 3 stations in San Diego. The study will weigh additional commuter trains to link to other hubs at key locations within the City. The rail can do a 3% variation on elevation or turn without losing speed.
- Politte asked about the noise emitted by the train going 220 mph and use of eminent domain to acquire parcels for tracks and barriers. Electric train is quieter, but the noise will be from wheels on rail with the speed. Unless SANDAG can resolve issues about noise and the impact on property values, residents along the rail line will not support it. Property values will fall along the rail line and owners won't be able to sell their homes. Representatives could not provide information on noise. Politte thinks that this project is a waste of time because of the additional noise that will be generated, affecting people's quality of life; would prefer to drive for an extra hour instead.
- Rhodes inquired about the cost to operate, noting that people would need to get to the train station and park their vehicles. Would there be parking available? Trains going 120 mph will create noise and the residents will want the trains undergrounded to eliminate the noise. The cost just goes up and there seems to be an assumption that development will grow up concentrating populations in smaller areas around the stations. The need to create redevelopment agencies and the residents fighting them when they take properties through eminent domain.
- Bende stated we live in a culture where people rely on and prefer to drive their cars instead of carpool, take the trolley, train, etc. He asked how they are planning to change that, adding that the train will not be faster than flying. These maximum times will not beat aviation travel time. Sedahn stated that there are limits to aviation expansion and we need to make changes. He also stated that the costs will be comparable to travel.
- Rhodes added that Communities will kill their plans and legislators will not be reelected if this goes through. Rhodes stated that the SouthBay Tollway is bankrupt, what makes SANDAG think that this will be profitable.
- Bende added that there was 40 years of planning before State Route 56 was opened; highly optimistic that they can complete this in 20 years.
- Becker asked if the Tier I segment (LA to San Francisco) gets shot down for any reason, what happens to our segment? Sedahn stated that if we can get this segment approved and into the queue and the others fail, we can get this one completed.
- Bende asked if there is any rail system in CA that runs at a profit? Sedahn stated that you cannot compare High Speed Rail to existing rail systems. Bende stated that if the culture is not supporting existing rail systems, how will they get people to change and use the high speed rail system? Example: Amtrak to LA in 2 hrs minutes on 10-12 trains per day; whereas the High Speed Rail trains will run every 10-15 minutes at its peak along I-15, in both directions, taking 120 minutes

at a cost that is competitive; a different kind of operation. Bende reiterated that there would be trains running down I-15 every 10-15 minutes going in both directions. Politte added, let's stop wasting our money right now and look at other automobile alternatives.

- Rhodes added that planners need to rethink this.
- Bende asked if any urban area studies from other countries have been reviewed. Sedahn stated that others are posted on the High Speed Rail Authority website. Portugal is a good reference for noise. <http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/>
- Keating felt that the studies should be done so we have a shelf ready project as an option in the future.
- On property values, Bende added that property owners/real estate agents would need to disclose the potential for High Speed Rail adjacent to properties.
- Politte asked about the planning stage costs through 2013 through the EIR process; \$87M (Prop 116 monies, State transportation money and Prop A and Stimulus money). Culp stated there is a pot of planning monies coming up that we are all competing for from Feds. Sedahn stated that the feds are looking to create a nationwide high speed rail system.
- Patricia (BMR) questions, asked for a straight answer. 24 stations along segment from San Diego to San Francisco, no service or baggage check for travelers, real costs to travel, who can afford it. Travelers will have to handle all their bags, their children and moving from one station to another transportation mode. Real cost to travel is unknown. Felt the project is ridiculous, people will not use it.
- Spurr stated that East Coast cities have acclimated to rail travel but cities were built around rail stations; cars on the east coast are a liability or difficult to find parking. West coast residents live in a car culture, but the aging baby boomers will want/need public transportation. Politte added that they would still have to get to the train stations; by car.

8. REPORTS.

a. Chair Report – Charles Sellers

June meeting, Sellers will possibly not be in attendance. Cresta Bella Monument signs are on the agenda and possibly another Wireless project.

- Bende stated that now that we have approved this 4G project, we will probably see a lot of them coming forward as we have set precedent; recommends collocation if possible.
- Meeting date changes were made per email distributed to members for July meeting on June 30th and the September meeting on the 8th; no August meeting.

b. Vice-Chair Report – Jon Becker, no report.

c. Secretary Report – Jeanine Politte, no report.

d. Standing Committee Reports:

➤ Land Use (Jon Becker)

- Cresta Bella signs next month, no other projects presently on our agenda.

➤ Telecomm (Lynn Murphy)

- Sellers noted the only active project is the Evergreen Nursery “Pineapple” wireless project; waiting for the applicant to come back to us.
- Diehl reported that the Rec Council voted on the Canyonside Park Wireless project, approving 6 in favor – 0 against – 1 abstention. In their approval they asked for bark and 180' of split rail fencing to go around the corner. Applicant

accepted and is purchasing materials and Park & Rec will arrange installation, possible Scout project.

e. Ad Hoc Committee Reports:

- Cresta Bella/Doubletree (Dan Barker)
 - Politte has not received any additional complaints about the grading. Becker stated it looks like grading is complete.
- Our Lady of Mt. Carmel (Joost Bende)
 - OLMC had some outstanding issues (paleontological & environmental) to complete.
- PPH Community Wellness Campus (Jon Becker)
 - Becker reiterated earlier report (Heverly) that while at the meeting on site, Pence reported that there have only been 2 reported incidents over the last 5 years. There have been hostile drivers seen jumping the curb; City staff will look at remedies to mitigate.
 - LaGrone stated that the sheer volume of traffic on Black Mtn. Rd. at State Route 56 interchange and at the entrance to PPH is an issue during heavy traffic times which backs up Black Mtn. Rd. If PPH ends business during the heavy traffic period, it will only exacerbate the traffic. Politte added that accidents along S.R 56 will cause additional backups and people will be creative using the median on S.R 56 to turn around or jump curbs, etc.
- Santa Fe Summit II & III (Scot Sandstrom) – no report
- Bylaws/Elections (Joost Bende) – no report

f. Liaison and Organization Reports:

- Black Mountain Open Space Park (Bill Diehl) – no meeting to report.
- CPCI Facilities Financing (Bill Diehl)
 - CIP Projects Update showed no major changes except that the Bicycle Bridge at Black Mtn. Rd. increased about \$2M to complete.
 - They claimed that the Torrey Del Mar South Park (behind Westview H.S.) is in the planning stages, but nothing has come forward to Park & Rec or Planning. PUSD may have abandoned building the adjacent elementary school.
 - 5 PQ Monument signs - cost has increased to \$117,000.
- CalTrans/SANDAG - Transportation (John Keating) – no report
- MCAS Miramar Community Leaders Forum (Dennis Spurr)
 - Rosecrans Annex to cemetery at Miramar is 314 acres on the west end of field. Half will be open space and interments begin September 2010.
 - Osprey facility construction is estimated to cost \$290M, to be completed by 2014.
 - Looking for uses of methane gas created by the landfill, purchase from the City and may provide 100% of base needs.
 - Osprey will fly vertically, usually in the last 90 seconds of flight to land; they will rarely fly the regular helicopter routes.
 - In June, Air Force aircraft will be coming in to base. F-15's will be repaired on base for a long time to come. Updating facilities to accommodate additional usage by military.
 - Helicopters were training from Pendleton to Miramar yesterday in mass flights.
 - Diehl added that the military is going green with conversions to solar. Spurr added that Barstow is another green base.
- PQ Fire Safe Council (Dennis Spurr)

- Chief Mainar was at the last meeting to discuss the Brown Out of Station #40 and listen to resident's concerns. Resource Information was distributed at the Fiesta and Spurr will be making a presentation to Park Village area residents this Saturday.
- PQ Town Council (Mike Shoecraft)
 - Chief Mainar will be the guest speaker at Town Council meeting May 6th to discuss the Brown Out of Station #40 again.
 - Fiesta had a great turn out. Shoecraft felt the turnout was smaller than prior years; attendance seemed to peak around 1pm.
- Recreation Council (Bill Diehl)
 - Vision Makers program (Teen Leadership) has been approved.
 - \$2,145 was approved for the purchase of dugout tarps (34) in PQ.
 - \$3,100 approved for new batting cage fencing (green vinyl).
 - Time Warner Movie in the Park is scheduled for July 31st at Canyonside.
 - Dog Park benches have been installed (cost - \$345 per bench).
 - Received an email from VFW, scheduling Flag Day ceremony at Hilltop for June 13th.
 - In process to change municipal code to allow bicycles in the park (ride around park on sidewalks).
 - Views West Park contractor has changed.
 - Upcoming RPPB agenda action item – proposal to upgrade Canyonside Park and Rolling Hills Park tot lots (approx. \$350,000 each park) using Community Funds.
 - Politte asked Diehl about the Handball Court signage at Rolling Hills Park; residents concerned about language giving usage priority to Handball players, etc. – looking for clarification. Will email a photo of sign to Diehl to check on.
- Los Pen Canyon Psv CAC (Jon Becker)
 - Missed the recent meeting, but talking with Council Member Lightner and Heverly about getting the Bylaws changed to include a rep from RPPB. Pressed his concern that the fuel load in the park is a hot topic.
- Park Village LMAD (Jon Becker)
 - Existing contractor still has issues, the City won't discuss possible pending litigation. Smaller projects are getting done intermittently; contractor only is working the projects that he can accomplish by himself.
- Peñasquitos East LMAD (Bill Diehl) – no report
- Torrey Highlands LMAD (Morri Chowaiki) – no report

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeanine Politte, RPPB Secretary

Approved 6/2/10, 10 in favor – 0 against – 3 abstentions (Chowaiki, Sandstrom, Spelta)
± Minutes amended 6/17/10 to reflect correction to statement on Telecom project processes in *Business item a, Clearwire Ragweed Street project* per Karen Lynch-Ashcraft, Development Services Dept., email.