SPORTS ARENA AD HOC COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE REPORT

Final Draft

Submitted To:

Councilman Michael Zucchet
San Diego City Council

Submitted By:

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
(Representing Seven Community Organizations)

Prepared By:

North Bay Association
Joe Mannino, Executive Director
Audrey Thifault, Executive Assistant
(3045 Rosecrans St, Suite 207, San Diego, CA 92110)

January 5, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD 1

COMMITTEE MEMBERS 3

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Future Of The Sports Arena
- Recognize the Sports Arena will be moved 4
- Recommend the Sports Arena be moved 5

The Future Of Kobey's Swap Meet
- Kobey's supported to stay in area 6

Recommended Land Use
- 95 acres to be mostly residential, with some commercial 7
- Adult entertainment should be reduced 8
- No in lieu fees accepted 9

Infrastructure
- Underground electrical wiring 10
- Traffic congestion be mitigated 11
- Oppose increase in DIF Fees 13
- Support the development of parks 14
- Oppose rerouting of Rosecrans traffic 15
- Support a park by the river 16

Building Height
- Support an increase to the height limit 17

Superstores
- Oppose the development of superstores 19

Ownership Of Public Land
- Maintain ownership but sell if better for citizens 20

Process
- Include Midway Planning Group and NBA 21
- Include Midway Planning Group, NBA, Ad Hoc Committee 22

Conceptual Plan

Use North Bay Conceptual Plan as guiding document 23

Maintenance Assessment District
Support establishing a Maintenance Assessment District 24

Administrative Motions 25

APPENDIX

Meeting Agendas 27
Meeting Minutes 28
Correspondence 29
Audio Tapes 30

SPORTS ARENA AD HOC COMMITTEE

FORWARD

Formed by Councilman Michael Zucchet on June 25, 2004, the Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee was comprised of eleven members representing seven local community organizations. Each member was duly elected to their representative organization, and appointed to the Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee by majority vote of their governing body.

Councilman Zucchet charged the Committee with the task of evaluating various land use and other issues relative to ninety five acres (95) of public land anchored by the thirty eight (38) acre Sports Arena property. The specific land use and other issues requested to be evaluated included but were not limited to:

1. The future of the San Diego Sports Arena
2. The future of Kobey's Swap Meet
3. Recommended land uses such as commercial, residential, or industrial
4. Infrastructure issues such as parks, open space, and traffic
5. Building height variances
6. Superstores
7. Ownership of public land
8. Recommended procedural process for development

The Councilman specified that the Committee will meet for four (4) months, and that a final report be prepared containing the recommendations of the Committee, with appropriate supportive documentation included. Noting the report would represent broad based community input, the Councilman indicated it would be distributed to the San Diego City Council and utilized as a tool when considering the aforementioned issues.

With the responsibility of governing itself, and recognizing the significant task at hand, the Committee chose to meet weekly for the four month period. In addition, although not bound by the Brown Act or other regulations, the Committee decided to abide by certain requirements of the Brown Act, and to conduct meetings guided by Robert's Rules of Order. All meetings of the Committee were noticed, open to the public, and public comment was taken. To insure the maintenance of an accurate historical record, meetings were tape recorded and detailed minutes were prepared and distributed weekly.

At its conclusion on October 22, 2004, the Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee had engaged in over forty (40) hours of analysis and debate, and were the recipients of numerous presentations by City Agencies and others, and numerous relevant documents on the area's

history and land use issues. The Committee passed twenty three (23) motions, fifteen (15) of which were unanimous, four (4) recorded only one (1) opposed, with two (2) motions having two (2) opposed, and two (2) motions having three (3) opposed.

On behalf of the Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee I wish to thank Councilman Zucchet for this unprecedented opportunity to submit recommendations from seven (7) local community groups relative to land use and the very future of the Midway community. It is our hope, as well as the hope of the organizations we represent, that the broad based support for the recommendations contained herein will be taken into consideration by the San Diego City Council when deliberating policy decisions that affect our community.

Respectfully Yours,

Joe Mannino
Chairman, Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee was comprised of eleven members from seven local community organizations, as delineated below.

Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee (3 members)

Mr. Lyle Butler	3025 Kona Way, San Diego, CA 92101
Mr. Bob Conley	3340 Kettner Boulevard, San Diego, CA 92101
Mr. Bill Kenton	3235 Hancock Street, San Diego, CA 92110

North Bay Association (2 members)

Mr. Chuck Pretto	PO Box 81492, San Diego, CA 92138
Mr. Ernie Hahn	3500 Sports Arena Boulevard, San Diego, CA 92110

North Bay Project – Project Area Committee (2 members)

Ms. Leslie Sanguinetti	3024 Hancock Street, San Diego, CA 92110
Mr. Joe Mannino	3045 Rosecrans Street, Suite 207, San Diego, CA 92110

Peninsula Planning Board (1 member)

Mr. Jarvis Ross	4352 Loma Riviera Court, San Diego, CA 92110

Point Loma Association (1 member)

Ms. Pat Baker	PO Box 6730, San Diego, CA 92166

Ocean Beach Planning Board (1 member)

Mr. Vance Spurrier PO Box 70184, San Diego, CA 92117

Ocean Beach Town Council (1 member)

Ms. Jere Batten	4690 Greene Street, San Diego, CA 92107

THE FUTURE OF THE SPORTS ARENA

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
July 30	Bill Kenton/Leslie Sanguinetti	The Committee recognizes that the Sports Arena will be moved in the future.

Members in Support (7)	Members in Opposition (2)	Members Abstaining (0)
Bill Kenton	Jarvis Ross	
Leslie Sanguinetti	Jere Batten	
Lyle Butler		
Chuck Pretto		
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Pat Baker		

Statements in Support

A) The San Diego Sports Arena is a thirty eight (38) year old ailing facility, generating little annual revenue ($460,000.00) for the City of San Diego.
B) Competition from newer facilities such as Coors Amphitheatre and Cox Arena will continue to affect revenue and profitability.
C) It is unlikely a new Arena would be built in its present location due to a lack of required infrastructure, poor vehicle and pedestrian access, community opposition to traffic impacts, and a variety of market requirements such as the need for a synergistic location.
D) The desire for a National Basketball Association (NBA) and National Hockey League (NHL) team, coupled with the need for an arena to support the San Diego Convention Center or other facility, will likely mandate a new arena be built downtown or in Mission Valley.

Statements in Opposition

A) The Sports Arena building is a Cell Phone Tower.
B) The current use is a visual relief due to its large parking lot.
C) The current use does not negatively impact the area.

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
July 30	Jere Batten/Leslie Sanguinetti	The Committee recommends that the Sports Arena be moved.

Members in Support (8)	Members in Opposition (1)	Members Abstaining (0)
Jere Batten	Jarvis Ross	
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Chuck Pretto		
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Pat Baker		

Statements in Support

E) The San Diego Sports Arena is a thirty eight (38) year old ailing facility, generating little annual revenue ($460,000.00) for the City of San Diego.
F) Competition from newer facilities such as Coors Amphitheatre and Cox Arena will continue to affect revenue and profitability.
G) It is unlikely a new Arena would be built in its present location due to a lack of required infrastructure, poor vehicle and pedestrian access, community opposition to traffic impacts, and a variety of market requirements such as the need for a synergistic location.
H) The desire for a National Basketball Association (NBA) and National Hockey League (NHL) team, coupled with the need for an arena to support the San Diego Convention Center or other facility, will likely mandate a new arena be built downtown or in Mission Valley.

Statements in Opposition

D) The Sports Arena building is a Cell Phone Tower.
E) The current use is a visual relief due to its large parking lot.
F) The current use does not negatively impact the area.

THE FUTURE OF KOBEY'S SWAP MEET

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Sept 3	Pat Baker/Jarvis Ross	Whereas Kobey's Swap Meet, a prime subleasor at the San Diego Sports Arena since 1980, is a multi faceted positive influence to both the local communities and greater San Diego. As a demonstrated economic engine providing jobs to over 600 vendors, and over 1000 people, acting as an incubator to start up businesses and providing a free venue to over 100 charitable organizations each year. This with minimal traffic impacts at critical times to the surrounding communities. We recommend that Kobey's Swap Meet's continued presence in the area be supported and incorporated into long term planning of the North Bay area.

Members in Support (7)
Pat Baker
Bill Kenton
Lyle Butler
Bob Conley
Joe Mannino
Leslie Sanguinetti
Jere Batten

Members in Opposition (0)

Members Abstaining (4)
Chuck Pretto
Ernie Hahn
Jarvis Ross
Vance Spurrier

Statements in Support

I) With a twenty five (25) year presence in the community, Kobey's Swap Meet is seen as an asset.
J) Kobey's Swap Meet attracts over one million visitors to the community annually.
K) Over two million dollars in annual sales tax is generated by Kobey's vendors.
L) Kobey's Swap Meet provides over one thousand five hundred (1,500) jobs, is an incubator of small businesses, and provides complimentary space for approximately one hundred and fifty (150) non profit entities annually.
M) As an open air market, Kobey's Swap Meet adds an attractive character to the neighborhood, and provides a form of much needed "open space".

Statements in Opposition

RECOMMENDED LAND USE

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Sept 10	Leslie Sanguinetti/Bill Kenton	The Committee recommends that the Sports Arena area, the 95 acres with the exclusion of the Stonewood Apartments and the Orchard Apartments, be approved to allow for primarily residential development, with commercial and mixed use along the commercial corridors, together with open space, and a portion of mixed use/commercial within the project area itself.

Members in Support (9)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Chuck Pretto		
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Pat Baker		
Vance Spurrier		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

N) Investment and development will remove blighted conditions and generate revenue for the City of San Diego.

O) The development of housing will limit or preclude the growth of additional adult entertainment businesses in the area.

P) Midway is an ideal location for housing, close to public transportation, freeways, and work centers.

Q) A walkable community is desired, requiring residential and commercial mixed use in the spirit of the City of Villages.

Statements in Opposition

None

RECOMMENDED LAND USE

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Sept 10	Ernie Hahn/Leslie Sanguinetti	Due to an over abundance of adult entertainment in North Bay, creating a negative image, we recommend that adult entertainment uses as defined by San Diego Municipal Code s141.0601 be precluded from City owned land in North Bay, that redevelopment be used as a tool to reduce adult entertainment locations in North Bay, that development of uses that preclude adult entertainment be supported in North Bay, and that the City's ordinance be increased from 1,000 feet to 2,000 feet.

Members in Support (9)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Ernie Hahn		
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Chuck Pretto		
Joe Mannino		
Pat Baker		
Vance Spurrier		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

R) The Midway community has more adult entertainment facilities than any area of equal size in all of California, baring San Francisco, creating a negative image and an impediment to investment, growth, and improvement.

S) Without actions to preclude the development and/or sighting of additional adult entertainment uses in our area, such as the development of precluding uses like housing, parks, schools, or churches; it is likely more will locate in Midway intensifying the present problem.

Statements in Opposition

None

RECOMMENDED LAND USE

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Oct 22	Pat Baker/ Vance Spurrier	We recommend that any residential development in the City owned 95 acres include affordable housing with no in lieu fees accepted.

Members in Support (7)	Members in Opposition (1)	Members Abstaining (1)
Pat Baker	Bill Kenton	Jarvis Ross
Vance Spurrier		
Lyle Butler		
Chuck Pretto		
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

T) In lieu fees may not result in new affordable housing that is within and benefits the Midway community.

Statements in Opposition

A) Removing the ability to choose the in lieu fee option is too restrictive and may impede investment and development.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
July 23	Lyle Butler/Bill Kenton	The Committee recommends that all electrical wiring in our area be under-grounded as soon as possible.

Members in Support (8)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Lyle Butler		
Bill Kenton		
Chuck Pretto		
Joe Mannino		
Jarvis Ross		
Pat Baker		
Vance Spurrier		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

U) Due to potential residential development, and the present blighted condition of the Midway community, unsightly electrical wiring should be under-grounded.

Statements in Opposition

None

INFRASTRUCTURE

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Sept 10	Bill Kenton/Leslie Sanguinetti	We recommend traffic congestion be mitigated in and around the Sports Arena site by supporting the following: 1. Connect the north side and the south side of Sports Arena Boulevard., allowing a free flow of traffic. 2. Wherever appropriate reestablish or establish a street grid, adding to the travel options of motorists and alleviating the necessity of only using main corridors. 3. Limiting new intersections on Sports Arena Boulevard to improve the efficiency of the free flow of traffic. 4. In residential areas and open space areas, where conditions permit we recommend the use of curved streets to add character and visual appeal.

Members in Support (8)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Bill Kenton		
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Lyle Butler		
Chuck Pretto		
Joe Mannino		
Pat Baker		
Vance Spurrier		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

V) Connecting the north and south sides of Sports Arena Boulevard is a priority of the North Bay/Peninsula Traffic Task Force, the Midway Planning Committee, and the Redevelopment Agency.

W) The reestablishment of the Sports Arena Boulevard connection will improve the area's traffic flow.
X) Additions to the areas street grid will improve traffic flow.
Y) Limiting new intersections on Sports Arena Boulevard will improve the efficiency of the traffic flow.
Z) In new residential areas, curved streets will add character and visual appeal.

Statements in Opposition
None

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Sept 24	Leslie Sanguinetti/Pat Baker	We oppose raising the Midway area DIF Fees, and recommend that the Planning Department specifically omit the cost of freeway projects from the DIF fee basis, and note that the redevelopment of the Sports Arena area property will depend on significant number of residential units, including affordable housing, and exorbitant DIF fees serve only to discourage residential and especially affordable housing.

Members in Support (10)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Pat Baker		
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Bob Conley		
Chuck Pretto		
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Jarvis Ross		
Vance Spurrier		

Statements in Support

AA) Exorbitant increases in Development Impact Fees (DIF) discourage and impede development of market rate and affordable housing.

BB) The Midway area is blighted and requires incentives rather than impediments to investment.

CC) The inclusion of the I-5/I-8 interchange in the DIF basis, adding 155 million dollars is without justification and inconsistent with state law.

Statements in Opposition

None

INFRASTRUCTURE

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Oct 8	Ernie Hahn/Pat Baker	To maintain appropriate consistency with the City's Progress Guide and General Plan, as residential development occurs in North Bay, we recommend City Council support for the periodic development of parks of various sizes, as described in Neighborhood Parks and Facilities in the City of San Diego General Plan.

Members in Support (9)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (2)
Ernie Hahn		Jarvis Ross
Pat Baker		Vance Spurrier
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Bob Conley		
Chuck Pretto		
Joe Mannino		
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

DD) With the number of residents in Midway about to exceed 3,500, and the City's standards calling for a park in communities of over 3,500 residents, the Midway community will soon warrant the development of a park.

Statements in Opposition

None

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Oct 8	Leslie Sanguinetti/Jarvis Ross	The Ad Hoc Committee opposes the Redevelopment Agency's proposal as presented to this Committee to re-route Rosecrans traffic to Camino Del Rio West by way of Hancock Street. The Committee recommends continued study of the traffic congestion at the intersections of Rosecrans, Sports Arena Blvd, and Camino Del Rio West.

Members in Support (11)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Jarvis Ross		
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Bob Conley		
Chuck Pretto		
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Vance Spurrier		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

EE) Rerouting such significant amounts of traffic to Hancock Street, necessitating a three lane left turn and another three lane right turn back onto Camino Del Rio West, will impede traffic flow and require the condemnation of property.

Statements in Opposition

None

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Oct 15	Bill Kenton/Pat Baker	In addition to the recommended park development in North Bay, we recommend that the City Council and the San Diego River Conservancy support the development of a park in the area adjoining the San Diego River north of I-8 and west of I-5, with the development of a walkway access over I-8, and/or other enhancements to pedestrian access connecting the park to the Midway Community.

Members in Support (6)	Members in Opposition (2)	Members Abstaining (0)
Bill Kenton	Jarvis Ross	
Pat Baker	Vance Spurrier	
Lyle Butler		
Chuck Pretto		
Joe Mannino		
Leslie Sanguinetti		

Statements in Support

FF) Consistent with the City of San Diego General Plan, a community consisting of over 3,500 residents warrants a park.

GG) The development of a park by the San Diego River would be cost effective, as the land is already City owned and underutilized.

HH) Developing City owned land into a park would alleviate the possibility that the City would have to condemn property to acquire adequate land for an appropriate sized park.

II) The location of this proposed park is ideal in that approximately thirty percent of the community's residents presently live within a quarter of a mile, and the Sports Arena site is also within walking distance.

JJ) The goal of incorporating land along the San Diego River is consistent with the goals of the San Diego River Conservancy and the Mayor of San Diego.

Statements in Opposition

A) Parks are a gathering place for the homeless.
B) Parking lots are open space, so we should retain parking lots like the Sports Arena lot.
C) A pedestrian access bridge is not needed, and is too costly.
D) Environmental circumstances may cause the park to be closed, such as bird nesting.

BUILDING HEIGHT

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Oct 8	Bob Conley/Bill Kenton	We recommend that the City Council support placing an initiative on the ballot to allow a variance to the 30 foot building height limitation for a particular geographic area or a project within the area, bounded by Midway Drive on the west, highway 8 on the north, highway 5 on the east, and connected by Witherby and Barnett on the south, with the variance in height to be limited to 85 feet and 35 percent of a projects land mass, in instances where: 1. The generation of revenue would result in the creation of public parks and open space amenities in the community. 2. The generation of revenue would contribute to the benefit of San Diego's citizens. 3. The generation of revenue would result in the construction of affordable housing and market rate housing. 4. The generation of revenue would result in a significant improvement to the project area's traffic problems.

Members in Support (7)	Members in Opposition (3)	Members Abstaining (1)
Bob Conley	Jarvis Ross	Bill Kenton
Lyle Butler	Vance Spurrier	
Chuck Pretto	Jere Batten	
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Pat Baker		

Statements in Support

KK) As a declared blighted area, with numerous acres of underutilized land, a variance to the 30' building height limitation is needed to attract development and remove blight.

LL) A variance to the 30' building height limitation would generate significant and much needed revenue for the City of San Diego.

MM) With Midway's location far from the coast, the spirit and intention of the 1972 Ordinance, that limits the height of buildings in the coastal zone, is not violated.

NN) Buildings at 85' height would not be "high rise barriers that would impede or prevent access to the coast," alleviating this specific reason sited in the ordinance's petition.

OO) Buildings at 85', when limited to 35% of a project's or area's land mass, will not cause high population density, or a lack of parking, or increased crime, or noise, or air pollution, or inadequate public utilities, or increased taxes; alleviating these specific reasons sited in the ordinance's petition.

PP) The 1972 Ordinance imposed a height restriction on the Midway community due to the ease of using I-5 as a demarcation line, rather than any specific justification.

QQ) The present height restriction has impeded growth and development in Midway, leading to a sighting of blight, higher crime, an overabundance of adult entertainment uses, big box stores, and decreased revenue generation for the City of San Diego.

RR) A variance allowing 85' buildings on 35% of a project's or area's land mass would result in significant investment and the development of affordable housing, market rate housing, parks, and a significant increase to tax increment, allowing for infrastructure improvements.

SS) The Midway community already has numerous buildings over 30', such as the San Diego Sports Arena, the Cabrillo Hospital Tower, Highways 8 and 5, and SpaWars.

TT) Noting that the needs and will of the people are different in 2004 than in 1972, the recommendation to allow this issue to be decided by a vote of San Diego's Citizens is appropriate and should be supported by San Diego's City Council.

Statements in Opposition

E) When you build over 30' you can not develop affordable housing.

F) No additional vote on this issue should be allowed because it was voted upon in 1972.

G) There is presently a shortage of water which will increase with additional development.

H) Another "Miami" should not be created.

I) If there is a variance in the Midway community, it will be more likely that additional variances will be permitted in other communities.

J) Barriers to the coast should not be built.

K) Increased height would increase traffic.

L) A variance in height would be done just for profit.

SUPERSTORES

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
July 30	Leslie Sanguinetti/Jere Batten	The Committee recommends that there be no superstores built at the Sports Arena site or surrounding areas, with superstores defined as a store with over 90,000 square feet, over 30,000 skews, and selling over 10% non taxable items.

Members in Support (9)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Jere Batten		
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Chuck Pretto		
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Jarvis Ross		
Pat Baker		

Statements in Support

UU) Superstores are a form of unfair competition that drive out small businesses and destroy the character of neighborhoods.

VV) The generation of huge volumes of traffic have a negative impact on the area's infrastructure and the local resident's quality of life.

WW) Superstore development in Midway has been opposed by the Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee, the North Bay Association, and the Business Improvement District Council.

XX) The unbridled and unregulated growth of superstores will result in a monopoly, less consumer choice, and higher prices.

Statements in Opposition

None

OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC LAND

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Sept 10	Chuck Pretto/Bill Kenton	We recommend that the City of San Diego maintain its ownership of City owned land, but that on a project by project basis, decide whether or not to sell individual parcels of public land, such decisions to be made consistent with the greatest benefit to the Citizens of San Diego.

Members in Support (9)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Chuck Pretto		
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Pat Baker		
Vance Spurrier		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

YY) During business negotiations the City of San Diego should have the flexibility to sell public land in instances where such a sale results in the greater good for it's citizens, such as significant long term revenue, affordable housing, market rate housing, traffic mitigation, or the development of parks or other needed community amenities.

Statements in Opposition

None

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Oct 15	Lyle Butler/Bill Kenton	Regarding projects on non-City owned land, generating significant community impact and requiring a competitive bidding process, we recommend the Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee and the North Bay Association be considered stakeholders representing the North Bay community, and be afforded the opportunity to offer input and advice on the choice of a potential developer in an RFQ process, or the choice of a potential project in an RFP process.

Members in Support (8)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Lyle Butler		
Bill Kenton		
Chuck Pretto		
Joe Mannino		
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Jarvis Ross		
Pat Baker		
Vance Spurrier		

Statements in Support

ZZ)The Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee is the sanctioned elected advisory body relative to land use issues in the Midway Community Plan area, and therefore is the area's key stakeholder warranting their inclusion in the decision making process.

AAA) The North Bay Association manages Midway's Business Improvement District, established by City Ordinance by a vote of the 700 plus affected business owners, and therefore is a key stakeholder warranting their inclusion in the decision making process.

Statements in Opposition

None

PROCESS

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Oct 15	Lyle Butler/Leslie Sanguinetti	Regarding projects on City owned land, generating significant community impact and requiring a competitive bidding process, we recommend the Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee and the North Bay Association be considered stakeholders representing the North Bay community, and be afforded the opportunity to offer input and advice on the choice of a potential developer in an RFQ process, or the choice of a potential project in an RFP process, and that the affected neighboring communities be afforded the opportunity to offer input and advice through the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee, similar to the 2004 Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee.

Members in Support (8)	Members in Opposition (0)	Members Abstaining (0)
Lyle Butler		
Leslie Sanguinetti		
Bill Kenton		
Chuck Pretto		
Joe Mannino		
Jarvis Ross		
Pat Baker		
Vance Spurrier		

Statements in Support

BBB) The Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee is the sanctioned elected advisory body relative to land use issues in the Midway Community Plan area, and therefore is the area's key stakeholder warranting their inclusion in the decision making process.

CCC) The North Bay Association manages Midway's Business Improvement District, established by City Ordinance by a vote of the 700 plus affected business owners, and therefore is a key stakeholder warranting their inclusion in the decision making process.

DDD) In instances where public land is involved, a broader level of community input is appropriate and the formation and involvement of an Ad Hoc Committee allows for such an enhanced level of input.

Statements in Opposition

None

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Oct 22	Chuck Pretto/Ernie Hahn	We recommend the use of the North Bay Conceptual Plan as a guiding document for the improvement and development of North Bay.

Members in Support (8)	Members in Opposition (1)	Members Abstaining (1)
Chuck Pretto	Vance Spurrier	Jarvis Ross
Ernie Hahn		
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Bob Conley		
Joe Mannino		
Pat Baker		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

EEE) The North Bay Conceptual Plan is a grass roots effort, supported and endorsed by the Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee and the North Bay Association.

FFF) As a guiding document, the North Bay Conceptual Plan specifies and generates a continuity and consistency in the area's architecture, landscaping, lighting, and other impacting features, allowing for an improved and enhanced identity.

GGG) A conceptual plan paints a vision for the long term beautification and improvement of a community, minimizing confusion and focusing resources on community goals.

Statements in Opposition

None

MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENT DISTRICT

Motion Passed

Date	Maker/Seconder	Motion
Oct 22	Chuck Pretto/Bob Conley	In order to improve and beautify the North Bay community, we recommend the City Council support the establishment of a North Bay Maintenance Assessment District.

Members in Support (8)	Members in Opposition (1)	Members Abstaining (1)
Chuck Pretto	Jarvis Ross	Vance Spurrier
Bob Conley		
Bill Kenton		
Lyle Butler		
Ernie Hahn		
Joe Mannino		
Pat Baker		
Jere Batten		

Statements in Support

HHH) The establishment of a Maintenance Assessment District will improve and beautify our community by generating revenue that will be used for a variety of services, including but not limited to general maintenance, tree planting, landscaping, safety and security, trash removal, and cleaning.

III) Landscaping of public spaces such as street medians is not permitted unless the maintenance of such areas are undertaken by Maintenance Assessment Districts.

JJJ) A Maintenance Assessment District can only be formed by a majority vote of the affected property owners, making subsequent support of the San Diego City Council appropriate.

Statements in Opposition

A) These services are the responsibility of the City of San Diego.

ADMINISTRATIVE MOTIONS

The following motions are administrative motions, dealing with housekeeping and/or procedural issues. Without having a direct affect on recommendations made by the Committee, these motions are listed without "Statements in Support," or "Statements in Opposition."

June 25	Ms. Sanguinetti moves to elect Joe Mannino as Chair. Mr. Kenton seconds the motion. The motion carries 11-0-0.
June 25	Mr. Pretto moves to have North Bay Association's staff take minutes and provide various necessary services. Mr. Butler seconds. The motion carries 11-0-0.
June 25	Mr. Kenton moves to schedule meetings weekly, on Fridays from 7:30AM to 9:30 AM at the Peninsula Community Service Center. Mr. Spurrier seconds. The motion carries 11-0-0.
July 16	Mr. Kenton moves that the Committee forbid any unauthorized recordings of the Ad Hoc meetings, and requests that the City record all proceedings. Mr. Conley seconds. The motion passes 5-2-1. Mr. Ross and Mr. Spurrier oppose. Mr. Hahn abstains.
July 16	Mr. Butler moves the Committee audio record the meetings if the City does not. Mr. Hahn seconds. The motion passes 8-0-0.
September 3	Ms. Batten moves that the Chair should vote on all issues, even when a tie does not exist. Mr. Ross seconds. The motion passes 9-1-1. Mr. Hahn opposes. Chairman Mannino abstains.
October 15	Mr. Pretto moves the Committee recommend that the Chair write a report summarizing the various positions and motions made by this Committee, and that such report be distributed to Committee members with enough time to be able to provide comment on such report. This Committee would then meet to finalize the report sometime in November. Upon approval of the final report by this Committee, such report would then be forwarded to Councilman Zucchet and the City Council. Mr. Kenton seconds. The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 7-0-0.
October 15	Ms. Sanguinetti moves that the Chair, Joe Mannino, summarize the Committee's activities in an introduction, and include a listing of the motions, that the motions be dated, and that all minutes be attached as reference to the motions, with a summary or conclusion. Mr. Kenton seconds. The motion passes with a vote of 4-3-0. Mr. Ross, Mr. Spurrier, and Mr. Pretto oppose.

October 22	In recognition that the Chair refrained from voting on all previous motions to maintain neutrality and facilitate the orderly administration of the meetings, and that that goal is no longer required, the Chair should inform the Committee of his position on all motions passed, and make such positions a matter of record in the Committee's report. Ms. Baker seconds. The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 9-0-0.
October 22	Ms. Baker moves to request Councilman Zucchet recognize and commend the North Bay Association for their efforts in support of the Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee. Mr. Kenton seconds. The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 8-0-0.
November 19	Mr. Pretto moves to approve the report as submitted with the approved changes. Mr. Kenton seconds. The motion passes with a vote of 8-1-1. Mr. Ross opposes. Mr. Spurrier abstains.
November 19	Mr. Kenton moves that the Committee recognize the note taker. Mr. Ross seconds. The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 10-0-0.

Motions approving minutes were all unanimous. Tabling motions or adjournment motions were not recorded in this summary of administrative motions

AGENDA

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

8:30 AM on Friday, July 2, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – June 25, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of receipt of communications

IV. New Business
   1. Future of Sports Arena and Kobey's Swap Meet
      A. Presentation: Ron Hahn, Sports Arena Group 2000
   2. Recording of meetings
   3. Agenda Items – July 9th Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, July 9, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – July 2, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

IV. New Business
   1. Recording of Meetings
   2. Meyer Mohades Associates Study
      A. Presentation by: Alex Greenwood, Project Manager, North Bay Redevelopment
   3. Calthorp Associates Study
      A. Presentation by: Chad Johnston, Calthorp Associates
   4. Kobey's Swap Meet
      A. Presentation by: Kimberly Kobey, President, The Kobey Corporation
   5. Agenda Items – July 16th Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, July 16, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – July 9, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

IV. New Business
   1. Recording of Meetings
   2. Ownership of Public Land
   3. Infrastructure
   4. Agenda Items – July 23rd Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, July 30, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – July 23, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

IV. New Business
   1. Specific Types of Land Use
   2. Superstores
   3. Agenda Items – August 6th Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, August 13, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – July 30, 2004 Meeting

III. Approval of Minutes – August 6, 2004 Meeting

IV. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

V. New Business (Action Item)
   1. Report on North Bay Traffic Study – Alex Greenwood, Redevelopment Agency
   2. General Traffic Issues – Julio Fuentes, Senior Traffic Engineer, City of San Diego
   3. Specific Types of Land Use
   4. Building Height Limitations
   5. Agenda Items – August 20th Meeting

VI. Old Business

VII. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, August 20, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – August 13, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

IV. New Business (Action Items)
   1. Specific Types of Land Use
   2. Building Height Limitations
   3. Agenda Items – August 27th Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, August 27, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – August 20, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

IV. New Business (Action Items)
   1. August 24th Meeting (Review of Public Comment)
   2. Specific Types of Land Use
   3. Building Height Limitations
   4. Agenda Items – September 3rd Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, September 3, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – August 27, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

IV. New Business (Action Items)
   1. Specific Types of Land Use
   2. Future of Sports Arena and Kobey's Swap Meet
   3. Infrastructure (Traffic, Parks, Open Space)
   4. Superstores
   5. Height
   6. Ownership of Public Land
   7. Agenda Items – September 10th Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, September 10, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – September 3, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

IV. New Business (Action Items)
   1. Specific Types of Land Use
   2. Future of Sports Arena and Kobey's Swap Meet
   3. Infrastructure (Traffic, Parks, Open Space)
   4. Superstores
   5. Height
   6. Ownership of Public Land
   7. Agenda Items – September 17th Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, September 17, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – September 10, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

IV. New Business (Action Items)
   1. Overview of Redevelopment Agency Issues
      A) Presentation: Hank Cunningham, Director, Community and Economic Development
      B) Question and Answer
   2. Specific Types of Land Use
   3. Future of Sports Arena and Kobey's Swap Meet
   4. Infrastructure (Traffic, Parks, Open Space)
   5. Superstores
   6. Height
   7. Ownership of Public Land
   8. Process
   9. Agenda Items – September 24th Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. Adjourn

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee

7:30 AM on Friday, November 19, 2004
Peninsula Community Service Center
3740 Sports Arena Boulevard, Suite 2

AGENDA

I. Call to Order / Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – October 22, 2004 Meeting

III. Communications and Public Comment
   1. Public Comment
   2. Reports of Receipt of Communications

IV. New Business (Action Items)
   1. Review and Approve Ad Hoc Committee Report
   2. Presentation of Completed Report to Councilman Zucchet (Meeting Date)
   3. Miscellaneous Old Business

V. Adjourn

MEETING MINUTES

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, August 13, 2004

MEETING MINUTES

Present:	Bill Kenton	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Chuck Pretto	North Bay Association
	Ernie Hahn	North Bay Association
	Joe Mannino	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Jarvis Ross	Peninsula Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Pat Baker	Point Loma Association
	Vance Spurrier	Ocean Beach Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Jere Batten	Ocean Beach Town Council
Absent:	Lyle Butler	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee
Guests:	Drew Ector	District Two Representative
	Alex Greenwood	Redevelopment Agency
	Joe Wojdowski	Epsteen and Associates
	Moises Aceves	USP
	Bert Decker	North Bay PAC
	R.A. Politte	Midas Muffler
	Maggie Valentine	North Bay PAC

Minutes:

Mr. Ross opens the meeting at 7:35 AM, welcomes everyone, and asks everyone to introduce themselves, which they do. Mr. Ross notes that Chairman Mannino is currently on his way to the meeting from the San Diego Airport and will arrive shortly to Chair the meeting.

Mr. Ross asks for the corrections and approval of the July 30th meeting minutes.

Mr. Kenton moves to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Conley seconds and the motion passes 8-0-0.

Mr. Ross asks for the corrections and approval of the August 6th meeting minutes.

Mr. Kenton moves to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Pretto seconds and the motion passes 8-0-0.

Mr. Ross then opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. Decker recommends that the Committee read an article published in the current issue of the SD Reader and states that this article pertains to this Committee.

Mr. Ross asks for additional public comment, and with none moves on to Report of Receipt of Communications. He suggests that the Committee could return to Report of Receipt of Communications upon the Chairs arrival and all agree.

Mr. Ross moves on to New Business and introduces Mr. Alex Greenwood of the Redevelopment Agency for his report on the North Bay Traffic Study.

Mr. Greenwood begins his traffic presentation and welcomes Mr. Rob Olson with Meyer Mohaddes Associates and commends the work that Meyer Mohaddes and Mr. Olson have done with this study noting that fees were lowered in order to accommodate the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Greenwood notes that he has covered most of this already in broad strokes and that Mr. Olson's presentation today will focus more on street grid. Mr. Greenwood's introduction notes the following:

1. The components involved in the redevelopment of the area:
   a) Freeway
   b) Mass transit
   c) Land use
   d) Street grid

2. The various studies previously done and their lack of feasibility

Mr. Greenwood then introduces Mr. Olson.

Mr. Olson begins his presentation on street grid and covers the following:

1. Study area
2. Goals
3. Elements to consider
4. Opportunities
5. Existing issues and problems
6. Concept plan goals
7. Alternative development considerations
8. Trade offs
9. Alternatives
   a) Alternative J – Full grid set of streets, one-way pair, Greenwood expansion, two-way Rosecrans
   b) Alternative J problems – Big change, less east west continuity, staging, Camino Del Rio right of way
   c) Alternative B – Retain Camino Del Rio corridor, simplify intersections with one-ways, reduced right of way impact on area
   d) Alternative B continued (transit) – Transit center access, circulation options, pedestrian scaled streets, Rosecrans continuation
10. East side
    a) Create grid streets
    b) Pacific Highway access
    c) Pacific Highway Blvd
    d) Collector streets
11. West side

a) Grid streets
b) Access options
c) Hancock/Kurtz collectors
d) Kemper extension

12. I-8 access
    a) New connector street
    b) Assumes I-8/I-5 ramps are built
    c) Alternative to Sports Arena and Camino Del Rio
13. Costs
    a) Alternative B – 15-16 million
    b) East side – 14-15 million
    c) West side – 14-15 million
    d) Excludes right of way, major utilities, contingencies
14. Further refinement

Chairman Mannino thanks Alex Greenwood and the Redevelopment Agency for being the key agency aiding and supporting the Ad Hoc Committee. He then introduces Mr. Julio Fuentes, Senior Traffic Engineer for the City of San Diego, noting that his presence is due to the request the Committee made of Ms. Patty Boekamp. Chairman Mannino thanks Mr. Fuentes for his time and expertise.

Chairman Mannino then reminds the Committee of the specific requests of Councilman Zucchet and how that relates to this traffic presentation and opens the floor to question and answer.

Mr. Kenton indicates that he would like clarification on a portion of the presentation in regards to the widening of Kurtz and Hancock and making them two way streets.

Mr. Olson notes that the current right of way width for that portion of Hancock Street is approximately 45 ft and that the typical standard is 60 ft. He notes that the proposed alternative would have a width in some areas of approximately 75-80 ft.

Mr. Kenton asks for the proposed time frame.

Mr. Greenwood notes that he estimates the completion of the project to take 5 to 7 years.

Ms. Batten notes that during portions of the presentation, she noticed that additional lanes have been added for the specific use of right hand turns and indicates that she has seen an example in this community where that change has actually made traffic worse. Ms. Batten asks if any follow up studies have been completed at the West Point Loma / Sports Arena Boulevard intersection to see if that lane has negatively impacted traffic instead of helping it. A Q and A ensues.

Chairman Mannino briefly explains his knowledge of the history of this lane from the North Bay Traffic Task Force meetings.

Mr. Olson discusses what the results of the study shows regarding the impact that the I-8/I-5 connection ramps would have on that specific intersection.

Mr. Kenton questions why this Committee is even taking these ramps into consideration when they are over 20 years away from completion.

Mr. Olson replies to Mr. Kenton and notes that their studies and recommendations must take into account both scenarios; if the ramps are built and if they are not. The recommendation must provide the flexibility.

Mr. Greenwood replies to Mr. Kenton and notes that the budget for the Redevelopment Agency is growing and it may be that this project could see fruition sooner than that.

Chairman Mannino notes that this community was fortunate enough to have three million dollars for this project placed on the TransNet list of projects and thanks both Alex Greenwood of the Redevelopment Agency and Councilman Zucchet for their instrumental role. The Chair indicates that these funds will only be available if TransNet passes, but that it brings the possibility of this project happening that much closer.

Mr. Ross notes that he would like to see these studies focus more attention to public transportation and away from the automobile.

Mr. Hahn questions whether funds could be allocated to improve the way in which current light signals communicate. He notes that they don't seem to function in sync such as the downtown signals.

Mr. Fuentes notes that the signals along Rosecrans and Midway Drive have recently been completed and that Sports Arena Boulevard has yet to be completed.

Chairman Mannino reiterates the same and notes that the Traffic Task Force was looking for an update on the signal correction for Sports Arena Boulevard.

Mr. Kenton questions the benefit of the rectal linear design.

Mr. Olson responds that part of it is the ease and notes that the uniform block for development lends itself to a more urban, walkable, development friendly area.

Mr. Greenwood notes that this design creates more land for development and that if you are new to an area, it makes it easier to find your way around.

Ms. Batten notes that long linear streets allow for speeding and that contradicts with the walkable neighborhood goal.

Mr. Olson indicates that speeding was considered in the study and that the design is such that it includes deterrents.

Mr. Ross notes that he believes this Committee is trying to accomplish a live/work area and that public transportation is a necessary factor in that.

Mr. Spurrier indicates that he does not see anything in this plan allowing for future trolley expansion.

Mr. Pretto notes that the proposed Sports Arena grid is quite elaborate and would cost a tremendous amount of money. He questions whether that grid was taken into account when figuring the previously mentioned costs, or would that cost be passed onto the developer.

Mr. Greenwood replies that yes those costs would be passed on.

Mr. Pretto notes that if indeed the costs are to be passed onto the developer, then he would imagine that the residential developers would prefer to see more a meandering street grid and asks Mr. Hahn if that is the case.

Mr. Hahn agrees that this proposed grid is elaborate.

Mr. Pretto notes that he is concerned that we would be saddling an enormous amount of infrastructure costs onto the back of developers.

Mr. Olson notes that much of the cost in regards to utilities would have to be incurred by the developer anyway.

Ms. Baker indicates that the Committee has already been told that the street grid will be determined by the actual land use.

Mr. Kenton asks Mr. Pretto if this proposed grid system would blow out Kobey's Swap Meet.

Mr. Pretto replies that if we were to implement this specific grid then yes it would.

Mr. Kenton notes that the Committee has already motioned that we want to keep the Kobey's Swap Meet and yet this grid system does not allow for that kind of usage.

Mr. Olson notes that Kobey's was considered when looking at design and that perhaps one option might be street closures.

Chairman Mannino indicates that he would like to take public comment on this topic at this time and opens the floor.

Mr. Bert Decker indicates that perhaps the Committee when discussing public transportation might consider looking into Magnetic Levitation and notes that it has tremendous potential.

Mr. Robert Politte notes that he owns property in this area and is upset with the City and their clear abuse of taking land.

Ms. Maggie Valentine asks how much of this area is public land.

Mr. Greenwood approaches the map and shows Ms. Valentine the ninety five acres involved.

With no further public comment Chairman Mannino opens the floor to the Committee for further discussion.

Ms. Batten notes that in regards to Mr. Olson's comment regarding Kobey's and street closures, she believes that closing intersections would not be feasible for a number of different reasons.

Chairman Mannino reminds the Committee that Mr. Julio Fuentes is here for any questions relating to infrastructure.

Ms. Batten asks Mr. Fuentes whether a street grid is affected by density and does this proposed grid look to be designed for maximum density.

Mr. Fuentes notes that this design looks to him like super blocks. He notes that with this land we have a good opportunity for transit and that should be considered.

Mr. Greenwood notes that he senses concern with the street grid being excessive and that if a portion of downtown were placed over this street grid, you would see that these streets are actually longer and spaced farther apart. He notes that a walkable community was a goal but that they didn't want to include too many streets in the design.

Mr. Kenton asks Mr. Fuentes if the City Traffic Department has looked at this Meyer Mohaddes study or if they have decided to accept it or reject it.

Mr. Fuentes indicates that they have not reviewed the study at this time.

Chairman Mannino asks for further comment, and with none, thanks Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Fuentes for their time.

Chairman Mannino indicates that he would like to go back and complete the Report of Receipt of Communication's portion of the agenda. He directs the Committee to review the packet of correspondence and briefly goes through the packet. Chairman Mannino indicates that he thought it might be a good idea for the Committee to consider calling for an evening meeting for the public to provide feedback, at 6:00 PM. The Chair notes that in anticipation of that, and at the suggestion of Ms. Cynthia Conger, he contacted Mr. Don Mullen regarding public noticing and indicates that Mr. Mullen suggested working with the Redevelopment Agency or the City Clerk.

Ms. Batten indicates that she is in favor of an evening meeting and that the Committee should consider expediting this meeting since we are in the action taking stage of this process.

Mr. Spurrier notes that perhaps the local planning boards could help in the noticing.

Chairman Mannino notes that the Committee could ask the City for some assistance in noticing the public.

Mr. Ross notes that he too is in favor of an evening meeting for public comment.

Mr. Pretto notes that if the Committee does in fact agree to have this meeting, he also feels that it should take place as soon as possible.

Ms. Batten notes that each Committee member could take the initiative and notice the organizations which they represent.

Chairman Mannino asks Mr. Alex Greenwood if the Redevelopment Agency would be willing to assist the Committee in the public noticing of this evening meeting.

Mr. Greenwood indicates that the Redevelopment Agency will notice the public. A Q and A regarding dates and times ensues.

Mr. Pretto questions whether this meeting would be solely for public comment.

Chairman Mannino notes that the public notice will lay out the seven (7) key items laid out by Councilman Zucchet.

Ms. Batten notes that perhaps this notice can indicate that there will be no voting taking place, just public comment.

Mr. Kenton notes that the Committee should be specific that this meeting is in regards to the Sports Arena only.

Chairman Mannino reiterates that he will specifically note the Councilman's seven (7) items.

The Committee determines the evening public comment meeting will take place on Tuesday, August 24, at 6:00 PM.

Mr. Ross notes that the guests that have signed in during previous meetings should be noticed as well.

Mr. Hahn indicates that he will be absent next week.

Chairman Mannino then notes that with time expiring, he would like some direction on next week's agenda items and notes that Ms. Baker has indicated that if the Committee would like information regarding affordable housing, she has been in contact with a gentleman who would be able to do so.

Ms. Baker indicates that if the Committee would like, she can attempt to have this man present at next week's meeting.

Mr. Hahn notes that an information based presentation on affordable housing could be very useful.

Ms. Batten recommends that the Committee should also attempt to have the City come in for a presentation to provide two different perspectives.

Chairman Mannino notes that he will attempt to agendize these presentations, but that the City would probably require more notice. He then asks what additional items the Committee would like to agendize. A Q and A ensues.

Various Committee members voice their support for again agendizing both Land Use and Height.

Chairman Mannino notes that he will agendize Land Use and Height Limit.

Chairman Mannino then asks if there is any further comment and with none, the Chair adjourns the meeting at 9:38AM.

Respectfully submitted by:

Audrey Hyde
Volunteer Secretary

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, August 20, 2004

MEETING MINUTES

Present:	Bill Kenton	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Lyle Butler	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Chuck Pretto	North Bay Association
	Joe Mannino	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Jarvis Ross	Peninsula Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Pat Baker	Point Loma Association
	Vance Spurrier	Ocean Beach Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Jere Batten	Ocean Beach Town Council
Absent:	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Ernie Hahn	North Bay Association

Guests: Mignon Sherrer

Minutes:

Chairman Mannino opens the meeting at 7:33 AM, welcomes everyone and asks everyone to introduce themselves, which they do.

Chairman Mannino asks for the corrections and approval of the August 13th meeting minutes.

Mr. Pretto moves to approve the minutes. Mr. Ross seconds and the motion passes 5-0-1 with Mr. Butler abstaining due to his absence at the last meeting.

Chairman Mannino then opens the floor for public comment.

Ms. Mignon Sherrer reads a statement regarding her opposition to changing the Height Limit Ordinance.

Chairman Mannino thanks Ms. Sherrer for her comment. With no further public comment the Chair makes a public comment, noting that the North Bay Association has chosen to recognize the Ad Hoc Committee members for their tremendous commitment and dedication and award them with the 2004 Community Volunteers of the Year award. He indicates that each Committee member is invited and encouraged to attend the North Bay Association 2004 Awards Banquet on Friday, September 10th, gratis compliments of the North Bay Association. He also notes that the Committee could choose one person to accept the award and represent the Committee.

Chairman Mannino moves on to Report of Receipt of Communications. He directs the Committee to review the packet of the various email correspondence received throughout the

week and indicates that he will take note to number the correspondence next time. The Chair directs the Committee to review the public notice flyer enclosed, and indicates that the Redevelopment Agency had adequately noticed everyone and that he also personally sent out blast emails. He also notes that enclosed is Mr. Tony Kempton's response to the Committee's request for explanation of the zoning abbreviations. Chairman Mannino also notes that he included two articles in the correspondence packet; an article printed in the Beach and Bay Beacon regarding DIF fees and the other an article regarding housing prices included in the San Diego Economic Bulletin.

With no further Report of Receipt of Communications, Chairman Mannino moves onto New Business and opens the floor to discussion, reminding the Committee of their decision to remain in information gathering mode especially in light of the upcoming evening meeting scheduled for Tuesday, August 24th.

Mr. Pretto suggests that the Committee discuss the logistics of this upcoming evening meeting.

Chairman Mannino notes that the floor is open to discuss the evening meeting details.

Mr. Spurrier indicates that he is disappointed that the Committee took action regarding the fate of the San Diego Sports Arena and that he would have liked to see the Committee wait on this decision.

Mr. Kenton notes that in regards to the upcoming evening meeting, he thinks that the Committee should impose a time limit, perhaps limiting each comment to two to three minutes. Mr. Kenton also notes that he thinks each speaker should submit their name, and that the Committee should try to enforce that individuals stick to the seven items laid out by Councilman Zucchet.

Ms. Sanguinetti suggests dividing the meeting into different segments of discussions; for example perhaps allocating 20 minutes for each of the seven topics.

Mr. Pretto indicates that the Committee would be best served hearing comment on these seven items only, but that he does not necessarily believe that the Committee should cut individuals off in the middle of non related comment.

Mr. Ross questions how the Committee would like to deal with providing space for a larger than expected turn out.

Chairman Mannino indicates that individuals normally make comment and generally begin to leave and notes that he does not see that being a problem. A Q and A ensues regarding the seating layout.

Ms. Baker indicates that she does not believe Ms. Sanguinetti's suggestion would work since the Committee had previously discussed the public arriving at different times and still being able to make comment on any of the seven topics at any given time.

Mr. Spurrier notes that perhaps the Committee could provide index cards and pencils for those unable to speak due to lack of time indicating that at least the Committee would still be able to read the comments at a later time.

Mr. Pretto suggests the Chair in the beginning of the meeting might want to consider the number of public wishing to speak and then allocate a specific amount of time per speaker depending on that number.

Chairman Mannino notes that as Ms. Baker pointed out, members of the public are going to arrive at different times, and expect to be able to speak, and speak on any of the seven topics that they wish to, so perhaps the Committee could decide to allocate 2 minutes per speaker and then allow individuals to speak again if time permits and there is no one else wishing to make comment.

Mr. Kenton suggests that perhaps the Chair should encourage those who have already spoken to leave so as to make room for those still wishing to make comment.

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that she does not agree with Mr. Pretto's suggestion to let individuals speak on topics not pertaining to this Committee, noting that she feels that the Committee should interrupt members of the public if they do not stay on point.

Chairman Mannino asks the Committee for a decision on the timing element and asks if the two minute allotment is acceptable, and then allowing individuals to speak again if time permits.

Mr. Pretto asks if the Committee should make the decision that evening depending on the turnout.

Chairman Mannino notes that he feels the Committee should decide immediately since there is no way to tell how many people will show up after the meeting has commenced.

Mr. Spurrier indicates that perhaps the Committee on a case by case basis could use discretion and allow certain individuals to continue beyond the two minutes.

Ms. Batten notes that the Committee might want to consider extending the time limit for those individuals who are representing an organization.

Chairman Mannino notes that if the Committee desires, he can allot individuals representing organizations the latitude to go beyond the two minutes.

Mr. Ross notes that he supports Ms. Batten's suggestion and indicates that the Chair could use his discretion.

Chairman Mannino asks if the Committee agrees then to allow individuals to speak for a maximum of 2 minutes but allowing individuals representing organizations the flexibility to go beyond that time limit to the Chair's discretion, and if time permits allowing individuals to speak again.

All Committee members agree.

Chairman Mannino notes that in response to Mr. Kenton's comment regarding the check in process or submitting of the name, perhaps the Committee could use a speaker slip, and then the Committee would have a record of those who made comment.

Mr. Butler inquires about a sign in sheet.

Chairman Mannino indicates that in his experience, a sign in sheet is not as efficient as a speaker slip.

Mr. Ross indicates that the San Diego City Council does something similar to a speaker slip.

Chairman Mannino notes that we will do a speaker slip and in regards to subject matter, he feels that it might be inappropriate to interrupt individuals who deviate from the seven items.

Ms. Baker suggests including a space for individuals to include the subject matter of their comment.

Mr. Kenton agrees and suggests also including a statement on the slip noting that individuals should please confine your comments to the following seven items to be discussed.

The Committee agrees and Chairman Mannino notes that the slip will include this statement.

Mr. Ross suggests that the Committee might want to be a little more lenient regarding timing on item number three, the issue of traffic, since this topic affects surrounding communities as well as this one.

Ms. Baker suggests setting up the room so that there are two side aisles instead of one center aisle. Ms. Baker also suggests noting our recording policy in the Chair's opening statement.

Chairman Mannino notes that perhaps someone could come early to help set up the room. A Q and A ensues regarding the setup of chairs and aisles.

Mr. Pretto asks if the Committee should consider some sort of microphone system.

Chairman Mannino notes that the tape recorder will be placed next to the speaker and that this Committee does not have the resources for any sort of microphone system.

Mr. Ross notes that he would prefer a center aisle as it is more accessible.

Ms. Baker indicates that her suggestion of two side aisles was in reference to the best possible set up so that all could hear.

Mr. Kenton notes that he would prefer the side aisles as well.

Mr. Ross asks what time will the room be set up.

Chairman Mannino indicates that the room needs to be set up by 6:00 PM.

Ms. Batten indicates that she will be unable to arrive early for set up, but that she is willing to stay later for break down of the room.

With no further discussion on the Tuesday evening meeting logistics, Chairman Mannino moves on to discuss agenda items.

Mr. Spurrier indicates that it reflects poorly on this Committee to hold a public meeting and already have made a decision regarding the fate of the San Diego Sports Arena.

Mr. Spurrier moves to overturn the original motion regarding moving the Sports Arena until such a time that the public has had a say.

Mr. Ross seconds the motion.

Ms. Batten notes that all the previous nine meetings were public meetings. She also notes that in using Mr. Spurrier's argument, the Committee should then overturn the big box motion as well.

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that due to Mr. Spurrier's absence at that meeting, she would like to explain how that decision came about, noting that the Committee felt that it could not continue to discuss any of the issues until the fate of the San Diego Sports Arena was determined.

Mr. Pretto indicates that the Committee should go back to the minutes and read the motion in order for Mr. Spurrier to fully understand what was voted on.

Ms. Batten notes that this Committee was charged to make a recommendation on the future of the San Diego Sports Arena, and that is what the Committee has done. She notes that this Committee discussed and voted on this issue and that it was never a foregone conclusion.

Mr. Ross notes that he opposed that motion, and that what the City wants and what the public wants are two different things.

Mr. Spurrier notes that specific types of land use is also one of the seven items, and that if the public recommends that the land use be the Sports Arena, then this Committee should consider that comment.

Ms. Sanguinetti reads the opening statement in the Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee binder indicating that this land is to be redeveloped. She notes that in light of the information that was given to this Committee in regards to the viability of the facility in its current use, the decision was made to recommend that it be moved.

Mr. Pretto requests finding the motion and notes that he would consider accepting Mr. Spurrier's motion due to the fact that perhaps it is best for the Committee to hold all decisions until after the upcoming public meeting.

Ms. Baker indicates that the motion is located in the Friday, July 30th meeting minutes on page 4 and reads the motion. "With the question having been called, the Chair restates the motion that the Committee recognizes that the Sports Arena will be moved in the future. Mr. Kenton, the maker of the motion agrees and Ms. Sanguinetti the second of the motion agrees as well."

Chairman Mannino notes that the motion on the floor is to revoke that original motion.

Mr. Kenton calls for the question.

Ms. Sanguinetti seconds the calling of the question.

Chairman Mannino asks if all are in favor of calling for the question and all agree.

Chairman Mannino restates the motion asking for all in favor of repudiating the specific motion regarding the Sports Arena.

The motion does not carry with a vote of 3-5-0, with Mr. Kenton, Mr. Butler, Ms. Sanguinetti, Ms. Baker, and Ms. Batten in opposition.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to public comment.

Ms. Sherrer comments regarding the meeting time for the Tuesday evening meeting.

With no further public comment, the Chair opens the floor to discuss specific types of land use.

Mr. Kenton asks the Committee's what their position would be if a large store like Sears were to want to build a store on the land and notes that he sees more of a residential community but that he isn't necessarily opposed to it.

Mr. Pretto notes that he too envisions development to be primarily residential. Mr. Pretto indicates that he represents over 900 small businesses and so he would oppose such a large store coming into this community noting that he sees more of a mixed use for the land.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she supports Mr. Pretto's view.

Mr. Ross notes that he also agrees with Mr. Pretto and indicates that the Committee should consider traffic impacts of such a large store. Mr. Ross states that he sees residential for the Sports Arena Square area, and more of an open space for the actual Sports Arena sight.

Mr. Kenton indicates that he is unclear of the traffic implications questioning whether or not 1500 residences would create more or less traffic than that of a large store. He notes that traffic will be impacted either way.

Ms. Sanguinetti suggests that perhaps the Committee would benefit by hearing from each member individually regarding their vision for the land.

Mr. Butler notes that he also likes smaller retail, but to keep in mind that if the Committee is discussing putting limitations on size, they should understand what a 30,000 to 40,000 square foot store looks like.

Mr. Ross notes that this area has an abundance of grocery stores and drug stores, which is why he leans more towards residential and smaller retail development.

Chairman Mannino notes that perhaps the Committee should consider Ms. Sanguinetti's suggestion of describing what they see for this land and community. The Committee agrees and the Chair opens the floor to discuss their vision for the community.

Ms. Sanguinetti begins and notes that she views this land as well as the entire Midway area as a catalyst for a more walkable community and notes the following:

- Important to maintain open space
- Important to maintain some land as public land
- Would like some sort of water feature
- Does not want to see square blocks
- Does not want to see the entire street grid reestablished
- Would like the open space be non uniform and have shape
- Sees small stores and retail, some homes, many different things
- Would like to see height variations
- Friendly open walkable community with a gathering space

Mr. Spurrier states his vision for the area noting the following:

- Maintaining the frontage as retail pads
- Behind that frontage, perhaps a rail corridor
- Underground parking structure that is slightly above ground with park and open space on top making it visually appealing on both sides
- Perhaps behind that is where the housing could go
- Using out of the box thinking

Mr. Kenton notes the following for his vision:

- Immediate Sports Arena area as limited access streets, not the rectal linear design seen thus far. Limitation to the number of cuts on Sports Arena Boulevard.
- Encourage the City to support park space on the other side of the freeway noting the amount of park space that this community has in Mission Bay and other various parks
- Mid level mid priced housing particular in the eastern edge Sports Arena Square area
- Other kind of development, possibly more residential or commercial, or some sort of mixed use towards the west
- Perhaps commercial/office development along Kurtz Street
- Variations in building height to add a visually appealing character

Mr. Ross states his vision noting the following:

- Does not support changing the height limit due to the impact it would have on the law
- A macadam area used for the Kobey's Swap Meet but implementing some visual enhancements perhaps without interfering with the economics of Kobey, like the planting of trees and such
- Would like to see both the Sports Arena and Kobey's stay
- South area by Black Angus to be redeveloped

Ms. Baker notes the following for her vision of the area:

- The commercial corridor to be developed right along Sports Arena is appropriate
- To see Kobey's Swap Meet stay in this area perhaps implementing some of the concepts used in the presentation to make it look more permanent and visually appealing
- Would like to see a fair amount of housing in the area such as town homes and multi family units some of which should be market rate and some moderate income

- Would like to see flexibility on the height limit
- Some retail and small stores serving the residential
- Would like to see a gathering place like some sort of plaza or amphitheatre noting that it does not have to be huge sighting Coronado park as an example of an effective park space that does not take up a lot of land

Ms. Batten states the following as her vision for the area:
- A unique park like setting
- Small unique retail stores
- Loft style housing above
- Large open space and perhaps open space like Kobey's Swap Meet
- Bike trails
- Does not want to see tract development
- Not much more commercial, but instead a unique walkable residential and shopping community

Mr. Pretto notes that he agrees with many of the comments and has already made a presentation on how his family would like to see Kobey's develop and then notes the following:
- Sports Arena Square developed with mixed use and to the extent that it is successful that model could then be used as development continues.
- Mixed use development on the commercial corridors, perhaps retail along the bottom and condos or apartments on top and behind
- Swap meet continued as a more permanent feature and community asset to this community
- Perhaps support grandfathering the height of some existing buildings. Possibly taking the floor plate of the Sports Arena, whatever that acreage is, and allowing the same height for that amount of land. For example, if the current amount above 30 ft is five acres, then allowing for 5 acres of development above 30 ft but not necessarily all five acres in one piece, perhaps breaking it up to encourage diversity.
- Opposes the linear street grid, would want more meandering streets
- Does not want to see the UTC design that uses block condominiums and notes that it will be hard to avoid that design with the current restriction on height

Mr. Butler states the following as his vision:
- An increase to the height limit and he notes that in reviewing the minutes from a previous meeting he would like to note that it is not necessarily more expensive to build up
- More residential due to the need in this City, some of which can be low income housing

Chairman Mannino notes that Ms. Sanguinetti suggestion was beneficial and enjoyable noting that everyone on this Committee cares about this community and share some of the same visions for this community. The Chair notes that the challenge this Committee faces is that this large piece of land is not going to be developed all at once and this challenge requires great vision. Chairman Mannino notes the following as his ideas for this land:
- Remain commercial along the commercial corridor
- Housing to soften this hard edged community, inviting parks, open space, churches, schools which would limit the adult entertainment facilities

- Open space that is broken up throughout the community and placed in appropriate areas instead of one giant park
- Mitigate traffic and provide alternate routes. Not necessarily widening streets, sighting Little Italy as an example of how narrowing streets make a community more warm, and walkable
- Support of Kobey's Swap Meet staying in the area and the incubation of small businesses
- Walk over bridge to access the tremendous amount of land that can be used as park space

Chairman Mannino opens the floor for discussion.

Mr. Ross notes that in regards to the need for park and open space, this community has a tremendously large shortage of park space.

Ms. Batten notes that she likes Mr. Pretto's suggestion regarding the height limit and spreading the five or so acres throughout the community.

Chairman Mannino notes that he believes it is important to try to support a community that has many small businesses. He notes that this is critical if we are trying to achieve a more walkable community as it is the small businesses which encourage window shopping.

Mr. Kenton notes that the Committee must realize that the economics are what will drive what happens to this land. He notes that the City will not pay for it, and so the Committee must make this plan desirable.

Ms. Sanguinetti sights Santa Barbara as a charming community that is designed so that is it income producing for a developer but it is still visually appealing.

Ms. Batten notes that she agrees with Ms. Sanguinetti. This Committee needs to make sure we have an impact on what happens in this community to avoid what has happened at Liberty Station.

Mr. Ross notes that there are other factors that encourage improvement in the community such as the length of lease. He states that investment could be made more appealing to a leaser just as it could to a developer.

Mr. Pretto notes that he has enjoyed the dialogue today and thanks Ms. Sanguinetti for her suggestion.

Chairman Mannino asks for further discussion and with none, opens the floor for public comment.

Ms. Sherrer comments that if the height limit is changed, there could be numerous consequences. She also notes that increasing housing in this City is irresponsible as we already have shortages especially noting the water shortage.

With no further public comment and time expiring, Chairman Mannino notes that he would like some direction on next week's agenda items and reminds the Committee of the Redevelopment Agency tour scheduled for the end of this meeting.

Mr. Pretto suggests agendizing the discussion of the public comment from the Tuesday, August 23, 2004 evening meeting.

Mr. Ross agrees and notes that perhaps the Committee could set aside the five meetings in October for decision making.

Mr. Pretto notes that he would like to see the Committee start making decisions in September and indicates that he will be absent for the first two weeks in October.

Chairman Mannino reminds the Committee that each member has the ability to make a motion at any time and notes that up to this point the Committee had decided it would be best to remain in an information gathering mode up until this evening meeting. The Chair notes at the conclusion of this evening meeting this Committee will have the opportunity to move forward with decision making.

Ms. Batten agrees with the Chair and notes that once this evening meeting occurs, the Committee should begin moving forward.

Mr. Ross indicates that he will be absent for the September 10th and September 17th meeting.

Chairman Mannino asks for direction on next week's agenda.

Chairman Mannino notes that he will agendize the evaluation of the evening public meeting and the discussion of future agendas. He then asks what additional items the Committee would like to agendize. A Q and A ensues.

Various Committee members voice their support for again agendizing both Land Use and Height.

Chairman Mannino notes that he will also agendize Land Use and Height Limit.

Chairman Mannino then asks if there is any further comment and with none, the Chair adjourns the meeting at 9:34 AM.

Respectfully submitted by:

Audrey Hyde
Volunteer Secretary

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, August 24, 2004

MEETING MINUTES

Present:	Bill Kenton	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Chuck Pretto	North Bay Association
	Ernie Hahn	North Bay Association
	Joe Mannino	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Jarvis Ross	Peninsula Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Pat Baker	Point Loma Association
	Vance Spurrier	Ocean Beach Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Jere Batten	Ocean Beach Town Council
Absent:	Lyle Butler	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee

Minutes:

Chairman Mannino opens the meeting at 6:06 PM, welcomes everyone and reads the following opening statement:

"The Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee was formed by Councilman Zucchet, and is comprised of eleven volunteer members from seven local community groups, each of whom will be introduced at the start of this meeting.

The Councilman asked the Committee to meet for four months and evaluate and offer advice on seven issues as they pertain to approximately 95 acres of City owned land, anchored by the Sports Arena site. The seven issues are:

1. Specific types of Land Use, i.e. retail, commercial, residential, etc., and at what density
2. The future of the San Diego Sports Arena and Kobeys Swap Meet
3. Infrastructure issues such as parks, open space, and traffic
4. Height Limit
5. Superstores
6. Ownership of public land
7. Proposed process to be used if development is desired.

Since this was a significant task, and there was a lot of information to review, the Committee decided to meet weekly for the four month period. We have had nine meetings so far. All of our meetings are and will continue to be open to the public. We also take public comment at all meetings. However, even though we have received public comment at each of the previously held nine meetings, we wanted to solicit additional public comment, so we decided

to hold this special meeting, special because it is an evening meeting, accommodating those that can not attend our 7:30 AM meetings, and special because the Committee will allocate the entire meeting to public comment.

It should be noted that the Ad Hoc Committee has no authority to make decisions on these issues. We are only an advisory body, and we are only one of the many sources of advice available to Councilman Zucchet. The Councilman may receive advice from agencies like the City's Planning Department, the Redevelopment Agency, local planning groups, the Redevelopment Citizens Advisory Body- the PAC, and from local residents and community groups.

As for the procedure tonight, those wishing to offer their advice may do so by filling out and submitting a speaker slip. You will be called in the order in which slips are submitted.

Each speaker will be afforded two minutes. We will inform you when you have 30 seconds left, and then again when you have 10 seconds left. At the 10 second notification, please begin concluding your remarks. When your time is up, the next speaker will be called. If all speakers have had the opportunity to speak, and time is still remaining, you are welcome to speak again for another 2 minutes.

To be effective, the Committee suggests you offer comments on the seven issues mentioned earlier, and recorded on the speaker slips. These are the seven items that the Councilman requested the Committee evaluate and make recommendations upon.

Thank you for your interest, and for being a part of the public input process."

Chairman Mannino then introduces Councilman Michael Zucchet and opens the floor for his comments.

Councilman Zucchet thanks the Committee for providing this forum and thanks everyone for coming, noting that he is somewhat disappointed in the flyers that attracted many of the people who are in attendance. He notes that the flyers distributed used language such as "Stop another giveaway, developers, insiders, and arena lessee Hahn are conspiring to swing an NTC ballpark style redevelopment deal on our 95 acre publicly owned property". Councilman Zucchet briefly explains the history of the process thus far, noting that when he took office in December of 2002, he expressed concern for the lack of community input in the process up to that point. He indicates that his office as well as the entire City Council voted 9-0 to kill that plan entirely and start over. The Councilman goes on to describe the thought process that took place in forming this Ad Hoc Committee and each of the seven elected body community groups that encompass it, also noting that he had no control over who from those seven groups were chosen to sit on this Committee. Councilman Zucchet also notes that he has already taken a position on some of the issues laid out for the Committee to discuss, for example upholding the thirty foot height limit, but that the Committee will lay out recommendations on these issues. Councilman Zucchet concludes his statement by noting that for those who have said that this is some sort of rigged conspiracy behind closed doors, each of the meetings held thus far have been public meetings, and that this process is the exact opposite method that was used the first time around. Councilman Zucchet once again thanks everyone in attendance.

Chairman Mannino thanks Councilman Zucchet for his time and for coming this evening and then opens the floor to the public.

The comments given were as follows:

Speaker #1: Traffic mitigation should be top priority
Speaker #2: Opposes a change to the height limit
Speaker #3: Opposes selling public land
Speaker #4: Opposes selling public land
Speaker #5: Wants to keep Kobey's in this community
Speaker #6: Opposes a piecemeal approach to development
Speaker #7: Encourages the Committee to consider the Airport EIR when discussing land use
Speaker #8: Concerned with the process and eminent domain
Speaker #9: Supports affordable housing that caters to seniors
Speaker #10: Concerned with the process and eminent domain

Mr. Jarvis Ross thanks Councilman Zucchet for creating this Committee and everyone who attended this public meeting but especially thanks Chairman Mannino and notes it was his idea to hold this evening meeting for those members of the public who are unable to attend the public meetings in the morning.

Speaker #11: Wants the process to be preserved and notes that there needs to be a balance between the public interest and the developer.
Speaker #12: Opposes a change to the height limit
Speaker #13: Opposes selling public land and wants traffic mitigation
Speaker #14: Opposes selling public land
Speaker #15: Wants redevelopment and removal of adult entertainment
Speaker #16: Wants to keep Kobey's in this community and warns of the economic impact losing Kobey's would have on this community and in this City
Speaker #17: Wants affordable housing
Speaker #18: Wants to keep the San Diego Sports Arena and Kobey's
Speaker #19: Voices concern of the conflict of interest on this Committee and notes that a music and sports venue is what this community needs
Speaker #20: Traffic mitigation and the consideration of public opinion
Speaker #21: Prefers mixed use development and notes that infrastructure should be considered first
Speaker #22: Opposes housing of any kind
Speaker #23: Wants to keep the San Diego Sports Arena and notes that the facility brings in customers for surrounding businesses
Speaker #24: Wants redevelopment, removal of adult entertainment, and Kobey's to remain
Speaker #25: Wants no net gain in traffic and notes disappointment in the City's ability to make money
Speaker #26: Opposes selling of public land but notes that if selling is necessary it should be at fair market value
Speaker #27: Opposes selling public land and would like the San Diego Sports Arena building to be recycled
Speaker #28: Opposes housing and wants traffic mitigation
Speaker #29: Wants park space and traffic mitigation and notes that community input is necessary in order for development to be successful
Speaker #30: Concerned with water shortage

Speaker #31: Wants to keep the San Diego Sports Arena and to leave this neighborhood the same

Speaker #32: Notes that NTC was a terrible deal for San Diego and is concerned about the same thing for this public land

Speaker #33: Concerned that this Committee is a business group and not a community group and wants traffic mitigation

Speaker #34: Notes that the fair market value of the land should be approximately eight hundred and thirty six million dollars

Chairman Mannino thanks everyone for attending and caring so much about their community and reminds everyone that this Committee voted unanimously to hold all of their meetings as public meetings and to take public comment at the beginning of all of the meetings. Chairman Mannino also notes that Ad Hoc Committee meetings take place every Friday morning at 7:30 AM at the Peninsula Community Service Center and adjourns the meeting at 7:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted by:

Audrey Hyde
Volunteer Secretary

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, August 27, 2004

MEETING MINUTES

Present:	Bill Kenton	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Chuck Pretto	North Bay Association
	Ernie Hahn	North Bay Association
	Joe Mannino	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Jarvis Ross	Peninsula Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Pat Baker	Point Loma Association
	Vance Spurrier	Ocean Beach Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Jere Batten	Ocean Beach Town Council
Absent:	Lyle Butler	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee
Guests:	Joe Wojdowski	Epsteen & Associates
	Megan Gravlich	McMillin
	Greg Robinson	PCPB
	Mignon Scherer	PCPB
	Michel Morlas	Unforgettable Dessert
	Bert Decker	North Bay PAC
	Moises Aceves	UCSD Student
	Greg Finley	

Minutes:

Chairman Mannino opens the meeting at 7:37 AM, welcomes everyone and asks everyone to introduce themselves, which they do.

Chairman Mannino asks for the corrections and approval of the August 20th meeting minutes.

Ms. Batten moves to approve the minutes. Mr. Kenton seconds and the motion passes 6-0-0.

Chairman Mannino asks for the corrections and approval of the August 24th meeting minutes.

Mr. Kenton moves to approve the minutes. Ms. Batten seconds and the motion passes 6-0-0.

Chairman Mannino then opens the floor for public comment.

Ms. Mignon Scherer reads a statement regarding her opposition to changing the Height Limit Ordinance noting that if it is changed, developers would have carte blanche to build high rises

and skyscrapers. She also notes that we are in the midst of a looming water shortage and that building more residential housing would be irresponsible.

Ms. Baker replies that with all do respect to Ms. Scherer she opposes the use of the word "high rise" noting that no one on this Committee has ever used that kind of terminology and briefly explains to Ms. Scherer the history of the discussion on height limit thus far.

Mr. Bert Decker comments on NTC.

Mr. Greg Finley notes that he would like the Committee to keep in mind that Lindbergh Field will be going away, and that that will make the Midway area one of the most desirable areas in San Diego for housing.

Chairman Mannino thanks Mr. Finley for his comment. With no further public comment, the Chair moves on to Report of Receipt of Communications. He directs the Committee to review the packet of the various email correspondence received throughout the week including the flyer that was distributed prior to the Tuesday evening meeting noting that Councilman Zucchet referenced this flyer during his introduction noting its inaccurate and false statements. Chairman Mannino also notes the draft Airport Authority EIR submitted to the Committee by Doris Chan.

Ms. Baker inquires as to the status of that EIR.

Chairman Mannino replies briefly explaining the current status. A Q and A ensues.

Mr. Hahn responds to the flyer enclosed in the correspondence noting that he is disappointed in the statements depicted in the flyer. Mr. Hahn goes over each of the inaccurate statements.

Ms. Batten thanks Mr. Hahn for his involvement on this Committee and in this community and notes that she respects Mr. Hahn for being in this position and taking the personal attacks.

Ms. Baker notes that in similar tone to what Councilman Zucchet stated about everyone on this Committee being a volunteer, it is unfortunate when anyone on this Committee comes under personal attack. Ms. Baker also notes that one particular flyer stated that certain issues had been barred from discussion at prior meetings and she notes that she is disappointed with the inaccurate statement and in the language used in these flyers.

Chairman Mannino states that he takes personal offense to the lack of integrity of certain individuals who have intentionally lied and those who have supported those lies. He specifically notes that it has been implied that people who own businesses should not be able to offer their view on these subjects and in representing the business community the Chair notes that he takes offense to this position, and that "freedom of speech" and the right to offer opinions is the right of all Americans.

Chairman Mannino also points out that on local AM radio, he heard that the press has indicated that the last nine Ad Hoc Committee meetings were closed door meetings. Chairman Mannino notes that one would expect the press to operate at a higher level and ethical standard, and not publish such lies.

With no further Report of Receipt of Communications, Chairman Mannino moves onto New Business and opens the floor to discussion, reminding the Committee of their decision to discuss and review the public comment received at the evening meeting on Tuesday, August 24th.

Ms. Batten questions a comment made by a gentleman against housing as a land use for this area and asks if the Committee documented his organization affiliation. She notes that perhaps the Committee should look into housing presentations.

Ms. Baker agrees and notes that presentations from both sides is necessary since there are so many varying opinions on the issue.

Mr. Kenton notes that he was surprised of the lack of public comment regarding adult entertainment noting that it is clearly a cancer in this community that needs to be eradicated. He also notes that being in such close proximity to these establishments, he also sees the affect that these facilities have on traffic in the area.

Chairman Mannino notes that a few people did speak against adult entertainment, and that the lack of additional response on this subject can be attributed to the flyers that were distributed regarding the sale of public land. The Chair notes that if flyers regarding adult entertainment had been distributed prior to the meeting, in a similar fashion as the other flyers were, there probably would have been more comment on the issue.

Ms. Batten questions the status of the affordable housing speaker that Ms. Baker had mentioned.

Ms. Baker notes that the speaker is unfortunately not available until September 24.

Ms. Batten notes that she would like the Committee to receive education on the issue of affordable housing. Ms. Batten also notes that in response to the issue of adult entertainment and the minimal comment, she states that if adult entertainment had been one of the seven items specified for discussion, it probably would have been, but that people might of felt it wasn't open for discussion.

Mr. Hahn agrees that education on the issue of affordable housing would be helpful, and he also notes that it would tie into the issue of adult entertainment noting their direct relationship. Mr. Hahn also suggests inviting Mr. Hank Cunningham of the Community and Economic Development Department so that the Committee could have a clear picture of how tax increment works in a redevelopment area. He states that along with the affordable housing presentation, a presentation from someone who could explain exactly how redevelopment works could be extremely beneficial.

Chairman Mannino requests direction on what the Committee would like staff to do regarding presentations. Chairman Mannino notes that even Professor Robinson could offer insight on the affordable housing issue.

Mr. Ross indicates that he took note to the comment made regarding no net gain in traffic. He states that all of the issues seem to tie into traffic impacts and that the affordable housing might be a wise choice when considering traffic.

Ms. Batten again indicates that she would like education on the issue of affordable housing.

Ms. Baker notes that this Committee could benefit from more than one presentation on the issue of affordable housing since no one on the Committee seems to have any specific personal experience. She also indicates that the reason she suggested her contact is because some of the projects that he has been involved in are mixed use integrated retail and affordable housing development, similar to what this Committee has been considering.

Mr. Hahn notes that Mr. Hank Cunningham would be a perfect choice to explain the process and tax increment.

Mr. Pretto notes that in response to Mr. Ross' comment regarding no net gain in traffic, Mr. Pretto indicates that he viewed that public comment differently, almost as a fact that this Committee is not able to solve all of the traffic problems in and out of Point Loma.

Mr. Kenton agrees with Mr. Pretto and adds that traffic is a solvable problem that can be resolved over time, and so this Committee should focus on the permanent long range additions and changes to this community, such as adding housing.

Chairman Mannino points out that one of the things that this Committee was asked to evaluate and make a recommendation on is traffic, noting that this Committee is making recommendations on both housing and traffic while taking into account the affects each have on one another. He also notes that this Committee is only an advisory body and that the City may or may not implement these recommendations.

Mr. Ross indicates that he disagrees with Mr. Kenton, noting that traffic problems do not just get solved and to say that it will be resolved in due time is not responsible. He also notes that in the past, infrastructure used to be built by the developer, and now it is left to the public sector.

Chairman Mannino indicates that the Peninsula Community Service Center is asking if the Committee could conclude at nine o'clock instead of nine thirty due to a scheduling conflict. Chairman Mannino notes that perhaps in light of the courtesy that this City agency is extending to this Committee, we need to accommodate them. All Committee members agree.

Ms. Batten notes that the infrastructure should be in place first.

Ms. Baker indicates that the public comment that struck her was from the Kobey's vendors and others who were in support of the Kobey's Swap Meet. She notes that she sensed fear from the vendors and states that their fear impacted her. Ms. Baker then suggests that the Committee consider making a recommendation as soon as possible.

Mr. Pretto thanks Ms. Baker for her concern and notes that there are definitely fears and concerns amongst the Kobey vendors, and that with all of the publicity that the evening meeting attracted, his office is currently drafting personal letters to each of the vendors in the efforts to calm the panic that has been created.

Mr. Ross notes that the public comment from the vendors truly shed light on how much of an incubator of small business Kobey's is and that such an asset to this community should be

encouraged noting that he is a very strong supporter of Kobey's. He also states that its current location is ideal as it keeps the area as open space, indicating that many things can be done to beautify the swap meet.

Ms. Batten notes that all of the discussion that this Committee has had thus far indicates support of maintaining the Kobey's Swap Meet.

Ms. Batten moves that the Committee recommend that Kobey's stay in its current location and add improvements as necessary.

Mr. Ross seconds the motion.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to discussion of the motion.

Mr. Pretto notes that he appreciates the support and indicates that he will abstain from voting on this issue whether that vote take place today or any other day.

Ms. Batten questions whether or not she should rescind her motion due to the lack of a qourem.

Mr. Pretto indicates that he meant no disrespect to Ms. Batten's motion, but that he felt it necessary from a public aspect, to abstain from voting.

Chairman Mannino explains the rules regarding a quorum and notes that we are not losing a quorum. He also notes that Ms. Batten's could still rescind her motion if she felt if better to wait for a larger Committee member presence.

Ms. Baker notes that she doesn't think that the motion should be rescinded and that she also had a motion written out regarding Kobey's that she was prepared to make when the Committee was discussing land use. She notes that it is a consensus of the Committee that the Kobey's Swap Meet should remain in this community and be retained as part of any redevelopment. Ms. Baker also notes that that recommendation would not limit the Committee in any way as to other recommendations on land use.

Chairman Mannino notes that Ms. Baker's statement is different than the motion on the table.

Mr. Kenton moves that the Committee table the motion until we have more Committee members present.

Mr. Hahn seconds the motion.

Chairman Mannino calls for the vote.

The tabling of the motion passes 4-1-1, with Mr. Ross opposing, and Mr. Pretto abstaining.

Mr. Ross notes that he disagrees indicating that not all Committee members are going to be present at every meeting.

Ms. Batten notes that once this Committee determines what a quorum is, moving forward and taking action is acceptable.

Mr. Hahn notes that he agrees with Ms. Batten as has been discussed at previous meetings.

Chairman Mannino asks if the Committee would like staff to reestablish that fact via correspondence indicating to all that this Committee is in a decision making mode and that their absence will not preclude any action from taking place. The Committee agrees.

Chairman Mannino also briefly explains Robert's Rules of Order regarding quorum as he understands it.

Mr. Kenton reiterates that the Chair should notify everyone that commencing at the next meeting and thereafter, this Committee may begin adopting motions regardless of absences.

Chairman Mannino notes that he will do so, as well as contact Mr. Hank Cunningham of Community and Economic Development and anyone else that can discuss the affordable housing issue.

Ms. Baker requests research regarding Robert's Rules of Order and its position regarding the Chair's ability to vote.

Chairman Mannino notes that he believes that the rule is and what is appropriate is that the Chair only votes when there is a tie. The Chair indicates there is an importance in the Chair remaining neutral in facilitating the comments of the Committee and that the Chair would be happy to go on record when writing the report.

Ms. Baker notes that she was curious of the process since the organization that the Chair is representing might want to know how their representatives voted or intend to vote.

Chairman Mannino notes that the responsibility of the Chair overrides that.

Mr. Ross notes that he believes that the rule changes when the Chair is an elected representative, noting that elected members are obligated to vote superseding Robert's Rules of Order.

Ms. Batten notes that the Committee should define this now and that she agrees with the Chair that he should remain neutral except in cases where there is a tie.

Chairman Mannino indicates that he would ask for input and help with Robert's Rules of Order noting that in the absence of some legal precedent he will follow the Rule as he understands it.

Mr. Pretto notes that he would diverge to the Chair's conscience but states that he would like the Chair to be able to vote on issues that he feel comfortable in doing so.

Chairman Mannino notes that he is not necessarily in opposition, but that he is merely trying to maintain a sense of neutrality.

Ms. Batten notes that she appreciates Chairman Mannino's concern and desire to avoid conflict.

With time expiring, Chairman Mannino opens the floor for additional public comment.

Mr. Pretto suggests discussing the agenda prior to public comment as to accommodate the Peninsula Community Service Center nine o'clock meeting. The Committee agrees.

Chairman Mannino notes that the Committee is looking to agendize the issues related to Robert's Rules of Order.

Chairman Mannino also notes that it is important to indicate on the agenda the items in which this Committee might be taking action on. He notes that perhaps the Committee might consider, at this point in time, placing all of the items on the agenda to allow the Committee the opportunity to make a variety of decisions. The Chair states that the only item that has yet to be discussed is the issue of process, and so perhaps only six (6) of the seven (7) should be agendized.

Chairman Mannino notes that he will attempt to place Mr. Kempton on the agenda, as well as any other affordable housing presentations.

Mr. Hahn notes that it would behoove the Chair and the Committee to educate themselves thoroughly prior to making recommendations.

Chairman Mannino agrees and notes that hearing from someone like Mr. Hank Cunningham would be beneficial, but states that the Committee might not be able to get Mr. Cunningham on such short notice.

Chairman Mannino asks for further direction and with none, opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. Decker suggests agendizing a presentation on the water shortage and mass transportation such as magnetic levitation.

Professor Robinson comments on the need to address traffic.

Chairman Mannino then asks if there is any further comment and with none, the Chair adjourns the meeting at 9:03 AM.

Respectfully submitted by:

Audrey Hyde
Volunteer Secretary

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, September 3, 2004

MEETING MINUTES

Present:	Bill Kenton	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Lyle Butler	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Chuck Pretto	North Bay Association
	Ernie Hahn	North Bay Association
	Joe Mannino	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Jarvis Ross	Peninsula Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Pat Baker	Point Loma Association
	Vance Spurrier	Ocean Beach Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Jere Batten	Ocean Beach Town Council

Absent:

Guests:	Alex Greenwood	Redevelopment Agency
	Bert Decker	North Bay PAC
	Greg Robinson	PCPB
	Joe Wojdowski	Epsteen & Associates
	Craig Brouk	
	Joel Calhoun	

Minutes:

Chairman Mannino opens the meeting at 7:32 AM, welcomes everyone and asks everyone to introduce themselves, which they do.

Chairman Mannino indicates that Mr. Ernie Hahn is present via speakerphone.

Chairman Mannino asks for the corrections and approval of the August 27th meeting minutes.

Mr. Pretto moves to approve the minutes. Ms. Batten seconds and the motion passes 8-0-1, with Mr. Spurrier abstaining.

Chairman Mannino then opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. Bert Decker comments on the current West Coast water shortage. He also encourages the Committee to consider magnetic levitation. Mr. Decker then commends Chairman Mannino and Volunteer Secretary Ms. Audrey Hyde for the excellent minutes.

Chairman Mannino thanks Mr. Decker for his comment. With no further public comment, the Chair moves on to Report of Receipt of Communications. He directs the Committee to

review the packet of the various email correspondence sent out and received throughout the week.

Mr. Pretto notes that he had forwarded an article from the San Diego Daily Transcript and requests that the Chair include it in next week's correspondence.

Chairman Mannino notes that he will indeed include the article in next week's correspondence and apologizes for omitting the article.

With no further Report of Receipt of Communications, Chairman Mannino moves onto New Business and opens the floor to discussion, reminding the Committee of their decision to list all items on the agenda due to the proclivity of the Committee to go from subject to subject and begin taking action on these subjects. The Chair notes that the only item not included on the agenda is process, since the Committee has chosen to not discuss this item up to this point in time.

Ms. Baker indicates that she hopes that the gentleman from San Diego State University will be able to make a presentation on affordable housing or perhaps Professor Robinson will be able to do so. Ms. Baker also indicates that Mr. John Seymour is still available on September 24 and encourages the Committee to schedule both presentations.

Chairman Mannino directs Ms. Baker to schedule Mr. Seymour and inform the Chair when a confirmation is made so it can be agendized.

Chairman Mannino again opens the floor to discussion.

Mr. Ross indicates he would like to make a motion and reads the following: "Whereas Kobey's Swap Meet, a prime subleasor at the San Diego Sports Arena since 1980, is a multi faceted positive influence to both the local communities and greater San Diego. As a demonstrated economic engine providing jobs to over 600 vendors, and over 1000 people, acting as an incubator to start up businesses and providing a free venue to over 100 charitable organizations each year. This with minimal traffic impacts at critical times to the surrounding communities. Be it resolved that the Ad Hoc Committee recommends to the City of San Diego that any redevelopment of Sports Arena have no negative impact upon their continued operations at the current level thereof. This does not preclude that the site might be enhanced with islands of foliage and structures that contribute to Kobey's operations."

Mr. Spurrier seconds the motion.

Mr. Pretto notes that while he appreciates the motion and the support, he will be abstaining from any votes pertaining to Kobey's Swap Meet.

Mr. Kenton notes that the motion seems very long and perhaps this Committee should consider making motions which are more concise and to the point.

Mr. Conley indicates that he agrees with Mr. Kenton.

Ms. Baker indicates that she has an opposing view noting that since this Committee is going on record, and the public is following the decisions of this Committee, she feels justification is appropriate.

Mr. Ross indicates that his motion is indeed lengthy, but that individuals outside of this Committee do not have the benefit of hearing all of the discussions that have taken place, and so he felt it necessary and beneficial to have an explanation of the pertinent facts.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she agrees that justification is appropriate.

Mr. Kenton suggests that perhaps condensing the actual motion and then having a separate explanation that justifies the motion would be more appropriate.

Mr. Conley notes that the minutes are extremely thorough and that all documentation of justification is reflected there and sufficient.

Mr. Ross agrees that the minutes are thorough, but notes that his goal was to condense the information documented in the minutes to one explanative motion.

Mr. Hahn states that he and the Kobey family have maintained a strong relationship but notes that he feels it inappropriate to make such a motion without first determining what the best possible use is for this land. Mr. Hahn indicates that it is indeed a goal to have Kobey's in this community, but that making this motion without first considering land use would be handcuffing this Committee and making all future decisions contingent upon Kobey's.

Mr. Butler questions the wording of the motion and indicates that the Committee had previously discussed the option of using a smaller parcel of land.

Mr. Ross notes that he took that fact into consideration when wording the motion and indicates that he phrased it in such a way so there be no negative impact to Kobey's, but not specifying the size of the parcel.

Chairman Mannino suggests the motion be reread since it is so lengthy.

Mr. Hahn requests the motion be reread.

Mr. Ross repeats the motion.

Mr. Hahn notes that he too feels the motion is quite lengthy and questions whether or not such a motion can even be implemented with all of the structures that are currently in place such as leases, etc.

Chairman Mannino indicates that in terms of procedure, Robert Rules of Order provide the tools to accept, oppose or amend a motion and that it is up to each individual Committee member to do so.

Mr. Spurrier states that if a motion is considered lengthy, Roberts Rules of Order state that the motion can be submitted in writing, noting that Mr. Ross has done so.

Ms. Baker indicates that she understands Mr. Hahn's concerns relative to leasing noting that this Committee would be making a motion to recommend a specific business to be a potential leaser on a specific piece of property. Ms. Baker notes that in preparing for this meeting she too had prepared a motion in support of Kobey's and that her motion is more general than Mr.

Ross'. Ms. Baker reads the following: "We recommend that Kobey's Swap Meet's continued presence in the area be supported and incorporated into long term planning of the North Bay area."

Ms. Baker notes that her motion is perhaps less restrictive than Mr. Ross' in that it does not specify what parcel of land Kobey's will occupy.

Mr. Ross notes that in general, he concurs with Ms. Baker, but his only problem is that in it's current location, Kobey's does not have the negative traffic impacts that other development in it's place might have.

Ms. Batten indicates that she likes the terminology used in Mr. Ross' motion regarding no negative impact.

Ms. Baker suggests that we could have separate motions regarding traffic, rather than linking the two issues together.

Ms. Sanguinetti questions the wording in the original motion and asks Mr. Ross if his motion is stating that Kobey's should remain on the 95 acres or in its current location.

Mr. Ross replies that his motion is recommending that Kobey's remain in the Sports Arena area.

Ms. Baker suggests changing the wording in the motion to a more general term instead of mentioning the Sports Arena.

Mr. Ross reiterates that his motion was meant to say that Kobey's remain in the 95 acres subject to not having a negative impact on Kobey's. He also notes that he is not supportive of using the North Bay area terminology.

Mr. Hahn questions how that specific motion can be made when there is a lease involved. He states that our goal is to either keep it where it is or somewhere in this community.

Mr. Conley indicates that while he respects Mr. Pretto's abstention, he would appreciate hearing from Mr. Pretto in regards to the motion.

Mr. Ross calls for point of order and notes that Ms. Sanguinetti had called for the question.

Chairman Mannino apologizes noting that he did not hear Ms. Sanguinetti. The Chair notes that the question has been called and asks for a second.

Mr. Ross seconds.

The Chair then calls for the vote. The calling of the question fails to pass with a vote of 4-5-1, with Ms. Baker, Mr. Butler, Mr. Conley, Mr. Kenton, and Ms. Batten opposing the question being called. Mr. Pretto abstains.

With the question not being called, Chairman Mannino opens the floor for more discussion.

Ms. Batten indicates that she would like to hear from Mr. Pretto before taking a vote.

Mr. Kenton agrees with Ms. Batten.

Mr. Pretto thanks the Committee for requesting his input. Mr. Pretto notes that clearly it is his family's strongest desire to find a permanent future home for their business. He notes that having been said, he would like to fashion some sort of compromise that the Hahn's could embrace if possible, and that having a positive vote in favor of Kobey's and that the Hahn's could support, is important to him. Mr. Pretto suggests broadening the language in order to accomplish that goal.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that this Committee did pass a motion regarding the Sports Arena moving and that this Committee has recognized that redevelopment will take place. Ms. Sanguinetti then questions why Mr. Pretto is favoring working with the Hahn's when the Sports Arena will be moving anyway and the original motion does not even specify the exact location.

Mr. Hahn states that the original motion as he understands it, specifies the Sports Arena 95 area.

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that Mr. Hahn is correct.

Mr. Hahn notes that the North Bay redevelopment area is much larger than that. Mr. Hahn also states that he appreciates Mr. Pretto's comment. He notes that he does not feel that the Committee should make a motion that will preclude the best vision for this property, whatever that may be. He states that the motion is too specific.

Ms. Batten states that she agrees with Ms. Sanguinetti and also notes that the motion is to maintain Kobey's in this area, and that eventually the ties between the Hahn's and the Sports Arena and the Kobey's Swap Meet will no longer be.

Mr. Spurrier notes that this Committee is charged with making a recommendation on specific types of land use, and that Mr. Ross' motion is doing just that.

Mr. Ross notes that he is suggesting that Kobey's remain in the 95 acres, and that doing so would be a community benefit. He states that ultimately both the Sports Arena and Kobey's are tenants and that public use of this land is a top priority. He concludes that the Kobey's Swap Meet is in his opinion, in the public's best interest for all the reasons stated in his motion.

Ms. Baker notes that she understands Mr. Ross' point regarding lessor, lessee, and that the current relationships involved could disappear in the future, but that there could definitely be legal entanglements in predetermining a lessee at this point in time.

Mr. Butler notes that this motion would be putting the master tenant, Mr. Hahn, in a position where he is subject to his subtenant, Mr. Pretto. Mr. Butler notes that the motion is making it so that the subtenant can tell the master tenant what can be done with his property which is inappropriate, stating that Mr. Hahn could just as easily end the Kobey's lease. He notes that that is the reason Mr. Pretto wants to work with the Hahn's.

Mr. Spurrier notes that perhaps a friendly amendment omitting the Kobey name would solve that problem.

Chairman Mannino asks the maker of the motion if he would accept the friendly amendment.

Mr. Ross accepts the friendly amendment.

Ms. Batten notes that she does not agree with the amendment. She also states that Mr. Butler's previous statement implies that this is personal, and states that this Committee is simply recognizing the desire to keep Kobey's in this community.

Chairman Mannino notes that from a factual standpoint, he feels it appropriate to note that the North Bay Association has addressed this issue in the North Bay Association Conceptual Plan with having both the interests of the Sports Arena and Kobey's Swap Meet intertwined. The Chair indicates that the friendly amendment, in removing the Kobey name from the original motion, is opposing the position taken by the North Bay Association. He notes that the North Bay Association took a position that due to Kobey's involvement in this community for over 25 years, that that particular entity should be supported and remain in this community, and in taking that position, the NBA was sending a message that it wants Kobey's to remain in this community.

Ms. Sanguinetti reminds the Committee that each member is very fortunate and lucky to have been placed in a position to be visionary and encourages the Committee to not be short sided.

Mr. Ross indicates that Mr. Spurrier's friendly amendment was merely to move around the problem that some Committee members had with the relationship between the Hahn's and Kobeys. Mr. Ross reiterates that this Committee wants to keep Kobey's in this community.

Mr. Pretto notes that he would appreciate keeping the original motion, noting that Mr. Hahn's objection was not with the operator, but with the location.

Ms. Baker agrees with Mr. Pretto.

Mr. Kenton moves to table the motion, noting that the current motion needs to be refined.

Chairman Mannino states that he has a motion on the table and calls for the second.

Mr. Butler seconds the motion.

With a second of the motion to table being made, the Chair calls for the vote.

The motion to table fails to pass with a vote of 4-5-1, with Ms. Baker, Mr. Spurrier, Mr. Ross, Ms. Batten, and Ms. Sanguinetti opposing. Mr. Pretto abstains.

With the motion to table failing to pass, Chairman Mannino opens the floor to continue discussion.

Mr. Spurrier withdrawals his friendly amendment in light of the comments made.

Ms. Batten notes that perhaps before continuing discussion on this matter, the Committee should determine the status of the Chair's ability to vote.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that Kobey's has a vested interest in this community and indicates that she is pleased with the exciting ideas put forth by Kobey's in their presentation.

Mr. Pretto notes that he and his family intend to continue in this community for many years to come and states that he is appreciative of the support being afforded to Kobey's.

Mr. Ross calls for the question.

Chairman Mannino notes that the question has been called and asks if there is a second.

Mr. Spurrier seconds the calling of the question.

Chairman Mannino calls for the vote.

The calling of the question passes with a vote of 8-1-1, with Mr. Hahn opposing. Mr. Pretto abstains.

Chairman Mannino asks for the motion to be restated.

Ms. Hyde reads the following: "Whereas Kobey's Swap Meet, a prime subleasor at the San Diego Sports Arena since 1980, is a multi faceted positive influence to both the local communities and greater San Diego. As a demonstrated economic engine providing jobs to over 600 vendors, and over 1000 people, acting as an incubator to start up businesses and providing a free venue to over 100 charitable organizations each year. This with minimal traffic impacts at critical times to the surrounding communities. Be it resolved that the Ad Hoc Committee recommends to the City of San Diego that any redevelopment of Sports Arena have no negative impact upon their continued operations at the current level thereof. This does not preclude that the site might be enhanced with islands of foliage and structures that contribute to Kobey's operations."

With the motion read and the question being called, Chairman Mannino calls for the vote.

The motion fails to pass with a vote of 4-5-1, with Ms. Baker, Mr. Butler, Mr. Conley, Mr. Kenton, and Ms. Batten opposing. Mr. Pretto abstains.

Chairman Mannino calls for a five minute adjournment.

Chairman Mannino calls the meeting back to order at 8:54 AM and notes that Councilman Zucchet had previously indicated that he would love to see this Committee work together and come to a compromising consensus. The Chair states that this Committee is operating with that kind of spirit.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor for public comment on the issue of Kobey's Swap Meet.

Professor Robinson suggests combining Kobey's with some sort of park setting.

Mr. Wojdowski suggests the Committee consider an indoor facility for Kobey's. Mr. Wojdowski also questions why this Committee feels that Kobey's is the best use of this land.

Mr. Decker notes that he would like to remind this Committee that all 95 acres of this land belongs to the City.

Mr. Alex Greenwood notes that he likes the fact that Mr. Ross' motion addressed Kobey's by name. He notes that he also liked the wording regarding redevelopment not harming Kobey's. Mr. Greenwood points out that the discussion thus far has not taken into account possible surrounding land use and suggests that the Committee consider this fact.

With no further public comment Chairman Mannino opens the floor for discussion.

Ms. Baker makes the following motion: "Whereas Kobey's Swap Meet, a prime subleasor at the San Diego Sports Arena since 1980, is a multi faceted positive influence to both the local communities and greater San Diego. As a demonstrated economic engine providing jobs to over 600 vendors, and over 1000 people, acting as an incubator to start up businesses and providing a free venue to over 100 charitable organizations each year. This with minimal traffic impacts at critical times to the surrounding communities. We recommend that Kobey's Swap Meet's continued presence in the area be supported and incorporated into long term planning of the North Bay area.

Mr. Ross seconds the motion.

Mr. Spurrier notes that this Committee should be concerned that the public is currently using the words NTC and Sports Arena in the same breath. He states that the Committee must remember that compromise is important to avoid the same public reaction.

Mr. Kenton asks Mr. Hahn for his response regarding the new motion.

Mr. Hahn notes that he thinks that having the Kobey name in the motion is important. Mr. Hahn also states that he can support that wording but would like to hear it once again.

Chairman Mannino asks for the motion to be reread.

Ms. Baker restates the motion.

Mr. Hahn questions the wording "North Bay area", and asks what that implies.

Chairman Mannino notes that he can give the actual North Bay boundaries, but perhaps the Committee wants to consider defining that.

Mr. Ross questions what Mr. Pretto thinks and feels is appropriate as far as boundaries go in order to maintain a positive continued operation.

Mr. Pretto notes that he clearly appreciates everyone's support. He states that he is comfortable with the language "North Bay area". He also notes that he would like to see something more specific, but in the efforts of acquiring full and unanimous support, he is comfortable with the language in Ms. Baker's motion. Mr. Pretto states that Kobey's does not necessarily have to be on the same exact parcel of land in order to maintain the operation.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she feels that the use of the term "North Bay area" is too vague and that she would like to see the recommendation use the 95 acres so as to not exclude Kobey's.

Ms. Batten agrees with Ms. Sanguinetti noting that she too would like Kobey's to be part of the public land.

Chairman Mannino notes that if the Committee would recommend that Kobey's remain on the 95 acres, and something were to happen to preclude this, then the Committee would be left with no recommendation that Kobey's should remain in this community.

Ms. Batten states that she liked the no negative impact wording in Mr. Ross' original motion.

Ms. Baker restates the entire motion.

Mr. Kenton calls for the question.

Mr. Conley seconds the calling of the question.

Chairman Mannino calls for the vote on the calling of the question.

The calling of the question passes, with a vote of 7-1-2. Mr. Ross opposes. Mr. Pretto and Mr. Spurrier abstain.

With the question being called, the Chair asks for the motion to be restated.

Ms. Baker restates the motion.

Chairman Mannino calls for the vote on the motion.

The motion passes with a vote of 6-0-4. Mr. Hahn, Mr. Pretto, Mr. Ross, and Mr. Spurrier abstain.

With the motion passing, the Chair opens the floor for discussion.

Mr. Ross notes that he abstained because he would have liked to see the motion give priority to the 95 acres, and that he was unable to make a friendly amendment due to Mr. Kenton calling the question.

Ms. Batten moves that the Chair be allowed to vote as a representative of the organization he is serving.

Mr. Ross seconds the motion.

Ms. Baker indicates she would like to make a friendly amendment that the Chair should vote in order to represent his organization and preserve the structure that was originally envisioned for the Committee.

The Chair asks the maker of the motion if she accepts the friendly amendment.

Ms. Batten accepts the friendly amendment.

Mr. Ross seconds the friendly amendment.

Mr. Ross notes that as he understands it, legally, as an elected representative, the Chair is obligated to vote.

Mr. Spurrier indicates that he would like some consistency in the matter of the Chair voting.

Mr. Pretto notes that he agrees, that the Chair should be allowed to vote, but that the Committee should allow him the option of abstaining if he feels necessary.

Mr. Conley questions the motion on the table.

Ms. Baker notes that the friendly amendment states that the Chair should vote but that she considers abstention a vote.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that the Chair should be allowed to vote as a representative of an organization.

Chairman Mannino indicates that he appreciates the Committee's concern, but that it is and has been his intention to avoid any potential criticism relative to running the meeting and influencing the vote. The Chair states that although that is obviously not the case, there are still those who are not bound by truth and integrity who will be making comments about the process of this Committee. The Chair states that that is the basis under which he has chosen to play the role of Chair.

Chairman Mannino asks for additional input, and with none calls for the vote.

The motion passes with a vote of 9-1-1. Mr. Hahn opposes. Chairman Mannino abstains.

With time expiring, Chairman Mannino notes that he will agendize the same items with the philosophy that this Committee is open to discuss all items at any time and make decisions, unless the Chair is directed to do otherwise.

Ms. Baker notes that the Chair should look to schedule the presentations.

Mr. Hahn agrees that the presentations should be scheduled as soon as possible.

Mr. Ross indicates that he will be absent at the next 2 meetings.

Chairman Mannino reminds Mr. Ross that he is welcome to be present via speakerphone.

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that she does not like the speakerphone option noting that it is more of a burden and distraction.

Chairman Mannino notes that he will inquire about a hard phone line.

Mr. Ross notes that he agrees with Ms. Sanguinetti.

Mr. Conley notes that he will absent next week as well.

Mr. Hahn states that the speakerphone option is an accommodation to all Committee members and is valuable.

Chairman Mannino then asks if there is any further comment and with none, the Chair adjourns the meeting at 9:31 AM.

Respectfully submitted by:

Audrey Hyde
Volunteer Secretary

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, September 10, 2004

MEETING MINUTES

Present:	Bill Kenton	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Lyle Butler	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Chuck Pretto	North Bay Association
	Ernie Hahn	North Bay Association
	Joe Mannino	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Pat Baker	Point Loma Association
	Vance Spurrier	Ocean Beach Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Jere Batten	Ocean Beach Town Council
Absent:	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Jarvis Ross	Peninsula Community Planning and Advisory Committee
Guests:	Alex Greenwood	Redevelopment Agency
	Greg Robinson	PCPB
	Joe Wojdowski	Epsteen & Associates
	Mignon Scherer	PCPB
	John McNab	

Minutes:

Chairman Mannino opens the meeting at 7:35 AM, welcomes everyone and asks everyone to introduce themselves, which they do.

Chairman Mannino asks for the corrections and approval of the September 3rd meeting minutes.

Mr. Kenton moves to approve the minutes. Mr. Spurrier seconds and the motion passes 7-0-0.

Chairman Mannino then opens the floor for public comment.

With no public comment, the Chair moves on to Report of Receipt of Communications. He directs the Committee to review the packet of the various email correspondence sent out and received throughout the week.

Chairman Mannino notes that he has included the article that Mr. Pretto submitted last week regarding housing, also a copy of the General Plan Update and Redevelopment Policy packet from the Redevelopment Agency, and a letter from the Ocean Beach Planning Board.

He also notes that Mr. Hank Cunningham has indicated that he will be able to attend next week's meeting.

With no further Report of Receipt of Communications, Chairman Mannino moves onto New Business and opens the floor to discussion, reminding the Committee of their decision to list all items on the agenda as action items. The Chair notes that the only item not included on the agenda is process, since the Committee has chosen to not discuss this item up to this point in time.

Mr. Pretto moves that this Committee oppose development of superstores in the North Bay community, with superstores defined as stores with over ninety thousand square feet under one roof, and that also sell over thirty thousand products (skews), and sell over ten percent non taxable items.

Mr. Spurrier seconds the motion.

Ms. Batten indicates that she believes this motion was already made.

Ms. Sanguinetti agrees with Ms. Batten.

Chairman Mannino notes that regardless, this Committee can still vote on the motion, and with no further discussion calls for the vote.

The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 7-0-0.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to discussion.

Ms. Sanguinetti moves that the Committee recommend that the Sports Arena area, the 95 acres, be approved to allow for primarily residential development, with commercial and mixed use along the commercial corridors, together with open space, and a portion of mixed use/commercial within the project area itself.

Mr. Kenton seconds the motion.

Mr. Butler questions the term mixed use.

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that she felt the term "mixed use" would allow for more of a Santa Barbara type feel.

Mr. Kenton questions whether the motion precludes or allows commercial development along Kurtz Street for example.

Ms. Sanguinetti restates the motion in regards to development along commercial corridors, noting that it would not preclude.

Chairman Mannino indicates that he has a question regarding the motion, noting that some commercial property, like properties K, L, and M, may not be suitable for residential.

Mr. Spurrier questions whether or not the Orchard Apartments and Stonewood Apartments are included in the 95 acres. A Q and A regarding residential development ensues.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she could perhaps amend her motion to note that it would exclude areas F, N, and G on the map.

Mr. Kenton suggests not using the letters in the motion but mentioning the area specifically instead.

Ms. Sanguinetti makes a friendly amendment adding the wording "with the exception of Stonewood Apartments and Orchard Apartments".

Mr. Kenton accepts the friendly amendment.

Mr. Spurrier questions whether or not this motion precludes the Committee from recommending percentages of open space.

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that this motion does not preclude the Committee from making a separate motion in regards to open space.

Ms. Batten requests that the motion be restated.

Ms. Sanguinetti restates the motion: "We recommend that the Sports Arena area, the 95 acres with the exclusion of the Stonewood Apartments and the Orchard Apartments, be approved to allow for primarily residential development, with commercial and mixed use along the commercial corridors, together with open space, and a portion of mixed use/commercial within the project area itself.

Ms. Sanguinetti explains the reasoning behind recommending mixed use/commercial within the project area, noting that she is trying to avoid square development. A Q and A ensues regarding possible commercial development.

Chairman Mannino requests additional comments, and with none the Chair calls for the vote.

The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 8-0-0.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to discussion.

Mr. Kenton indicates that he has prepared a motion regarding infrastructure and reads the following:

"We recommend traffic congestion be mitigated in and around the Sports Arena site by supporting the following:

1. Connect the north side and the south side of Sports Arena Boulevard., allowing a free flow of traffic.
2. Wherever possible reestablish or establish a street grid, adding to the travel options of motorists and alleviating the necessity of only using main corridors.
3. Limiting new intersections on Sports Arena Boulevard.
4. In residential areas and open space areas, where conditions permit we recommend the use of curved streets to add character and visual appeal."

Ms. Sanguinetti seconds the motion.

Chairman Mannino suggests restating the motion due to its length and the Committee agrees.

Chairman Mannino restates the motion.

Ms. Sanguinetti questions what intersections the motion speaks of, and how many intersections would be added.

Mr. Butler notes that Kemper Street is one of the only major streets currently, noting that Duke would not be one of them. Mr. Butler asks the Committee for input.

Mr. Pretto indicates that there are currently three existing lights along Sports Arena Boulevard and notes that he can not envision adding any additional intersections. Mr. Pretto indicates that he would like to see language that precluded adding any additional intersections along Sports Arena Boulevard.

Chairman Mannino notes that the motion does state the limiting of new intersections on Sports Arena Boulevard.

Mr. Kenton states that he agrees with Mr. Pretto in principle, but that the Committee should not preclude new intersections.

Mr. Pretto agrees, noting that might be too forceful.

Mr. Kenton notes that the motion states that the Committee does not want to see any more intersections if we can help it.

Ms. Baker suggests changing the wording to reflect no more than the existing controlled intersections.

Mr. Kenton notes that he wrestled with the wording and that was the best he could come up with.

Mr. Hahn requests that numbers two and three be restated.

Chairman Mannino reads number two as follows: "Wherever possible reestablish or establish a street grid, adding to the travel options of motorists and alleviating the necessity of only using main corridors;" and number three as follows: "Limiting new intersections on Sports Arena Boulevard."

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that she feels that the word "limiting" might be too vague.

Ms. Batten notes that the motion should be somewhat vague since this Committee does not know what development will be or how it will lay out.

Mr. Hahn agrees with Ms. Batten. He also notes that the current grid clearly does not work, and that the term "limiting" is strong enough.

Chairman Mannino suggests changing the wording from "limiting new intersections" to "limiting any additional intersections".

Ms. Sanguinetti states that she is opposed to adding any additional intersections.

Ms. Batten states that this Committee has discussed in the past it's desire to create a more walkable community, and notes that limiting or precluding additional intersections is contradictory or in opposition to that desire.

Mr. Butler notes that this Committee is merely suggesting and that developers will also suggest where they feel one more or one less is appropriate. He notes that ultimately it will be up to City Council, so being that specific is not necessary.

Mr. Pretto reiterates that he tends to agree with Ms. Sanguinetti, and that he would prefer that no additional intersections be added. He states that this community has major commercial development, such as Target and Home Depot, that will not be moving anytime soon and that adding the intersections would slow down traffic immensely.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. Alex Greenwood notes that he has just submitted to the Committee a written report of the Calthorpe studies. He also notes that in regards to intersections, perhaps the language of the motion should not focus on the number of intersections, but instead focus on the desire for free flow of traffic. Mr. Greenwood asks Mr. Pretto if preserving the free flow of traffic along Sports Arena Boulevard is his ultimate concern.

Mr. Pretto indicates that yes that is his concern. The commercial development across the street is not going anywhere and needs to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Butler states that perhaps we can add the synchronizing of lights.

A Q and A ensues regarding existing intersections.

Mr. Hahn suggests including wording such as "preserving traffic flow".

Ms. Baker suggests "preserving traffic flow and cross street pedestrian access".

Ms. Batten states that "increasing the efficiency" would be better then the word "preserving" since all on this Committee would agree that it is currently functioning poorly.

Chairman Mannino apologizes to Professor Robinson and re-opens the floor to public comment.

Professor Robinson states that the Committee should focus on sending a message to the community that they do not want any net overall deterioration in total level of service. Improvement would be great, but as a result of all development, all mitigation should have no net deterioration of overall service. He also states that mitigation is necessary before increasing the density.

Chairman Mannino asks for additional public comment, and with none opens the floor for discussion.

Mr. Kenton notes that he agrees with Professor Robinson, but does not understand how we can mitigate when we don't know what will be developed, stating that is putting the cart before the horse.

Chairman Mannino asks the Committee if they would like to add to number three of the motion, indicating the desire to maximize the flow of traffic, and perhaps something referencing the pedestrian dynamics.

Ms. Sanguinetti agrees.

Ms. Batten suggests using a word other than "maximize", noting that perhaps "improving the efficiency of the flow of traffic" would be clearer. The Committee agrees.

Ms. Batten makes a friendly amendment to add the following to number three of the motion: "to improve the efficiency of the free flow of traffic".

Mr. Kenton accepts the friendly amendment.

Ms. Sanguinetti also accepts the friendly amendment.

Chairman Mannino restates number three of the motion: "Limiting new intersections on Sports Arena Boulevard to improve the efficiency of the free flow of traffic."

Ms. Baker requests the street grid portion of the motion be restated.

Chairman Mannino reads the following: "Wherever possible reestablish or establish a street grid, adding to the travel options of motorists and alleviating the necessity of only using main corridors".

Chairman Mannino then restates the entire motion.

Ms. Baker notes that she is concerned that the street grid portion of this motion could be interpreted that this Committee is advocating establishing the full street grid presented by the Redevelopment Agency and that she does not believe that that was Mr. Kenton's intention. Ms. Baker notes that clarification is in order so that the language can not be misinterpreted.

Ms. Sanguinetti agrees with Ms. Baker but notes that perhaps this motion could be left as is, and that an additional motion regarding the street grid could be made.

Chairman Mannino suggests that perhaps changing the wording "wherever possible" to instead read "wherever appropriate" would solve the concern.

Ms. Baker makes a friendly amendment to change the word possible to appropriate.

Mr. Kenton accepts the friendly amendment.

Ms. Sanguinetti also accepts the friendly amendment.

Chairman Mannino asks for additional comment, and with none restates the motion as follows:

"We recommend traffic congestion be mitigated in and around the Sports Arena site by supporting the following:

1. Connect the north side and the south side of Sports Arena Boulevard., allowing a free flow of traffic.
2. Wherever appropriate reestablish or establish a street grid, adding to the travel options of motorists and alleviating the necessity of only using main corridors.
3. Limiting new intersections on Sports Arena Boulevard to improve the efficiency of the free flow of traffic.
4. In residential areas and open space areas, where conditions permit we recommend the use of curved streets to add character and visual appeal."

With the motion restated, the Chair calls for the vote.

The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 7-0-0.

Ms. Sanguinetti requests the Chair reflect in the minutes that Mr. Hahn stepped out of the room and was not present for the vote.

Chairman Mannino indicates he will do so, and opens the floor to discussion.

Mr. Spurrier indicates that he has prepared a motion reflecting the views of the Ocean Beach Planning Board, and reads the following:

"We recommend that public land should not be sold, and that if public land must be sold, it should be sold for fair market value based upon current community real estate pricing at the time of sale. If any land is seized using eminent domain, fair market value should be paid using the same criteria."

Mr. Hahn reenters the room and the Chair requests the motion be restated on his behalf.

Mr. Spurrier restates the motion.

Mr. Butler seconds the motion.

Mr. Kenton notes that this motion is running in the face of the law.

Mr. Pretto notes that he appreciates Mr. Spurrier motion and the view of the Ocean Beach Planning Board, but notes that he too prepared a motion on this issue and would like to read his version, and reads the following:

"We recommend that the City of San Diego maintain its ownership of City owned land, but that on a project by project basis, decide whether or not to sell individual parcels of public land, such decisions to be made consistent with the greatest benefit to the Citizens of San Diego."

Mr. Spurrier notes that if this issue was not open for debate the Councilman would not have asked this Committee to discuss it.

Ms. Batten states that Mr. Pretto's motion is clearer and not contradictory, noting that Mr. Spurrier states that public land should not be sold and then in the same breath states that if it is sold.... Ms. Batten notes that Mr. Pretto's motion states that all efforts to maintain ownership should be a priority. Ms. Batten also suggests stating that the negative impact of eminent domain should be minimized.

Chairman Mannino briefly explains eminent domain and notes that it seems to be less of an issue when dealing with public land. The Chair states that he is uncertain if it needs to be part of this particular motion.

Mr. Spurrier agrees, and withdrawals his motion.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. McNab states that if selling of public land is being considered, then there should be a motion stating that whatever the public gets for the Sports Arena land, there should be a standard put in place for the selling of the surrounding private property, noting that everybody is on the same level. Mr. McNab also notes that all uses of public land should be thoroughly investigated.

Professor Robinson suggests specifying a percentage of the land that should not be sold.

With no further public comment, Chairman Mannino opens the floor for discussion.

Mr. Pretto notes that he appreciates the public comment and states that perhaps he can add wording such as "with public use a priority" to his proposed motion.

Mr. Pretto moves that this Committee recommend that the City of San Diego maintain its ownership of City owned land, but that on a project by project basis, decide whether or not to sell individual parcels of public land, such decision to be made consistent with the greatest benefit to the Citizens of San Diego.

Mr. Kenton seconds the motion.

Mr. Pretto notes that we can add a friendly amendment regarding giving public use a priority if the Committee chooses to do so.

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that she is concerned that the wording jeopardizes quality of the project by limiting developers from selling the land. A Q and A regarding selling and leasing land ensues.

Ms. Baker indicates that this Committee is still awaiting presentation regarding housing and that perhaps we should revisit this issue afterwards. Ms. Baker also states that she likes Mr. Pretto's original motion with any amendments for the same reasons Ms. Sanguinetti stated.

Mr. Hahn states that he too supports Mr. Pretto's motion.

Mr. Butler comments on the selling of units on leased land and the difficulties experienced in trying to sell that property.

Mr. Kenton also comments on the difficulties of selling such units from his experience and notes that this Committee should not recommend such restrictions.

Mr. Pretto asks Mr. Hahn for some background on the original RFQ.

Mr. Hahn indicates that one of the possibilities that the RFQ looked into was fee simple versus leasing, noting the tremendous differences between the two. Mr. Hahn states that he likes Mr. Pretto's motion because it gives the City some flexibility.

Ms. Batten states that this Committee should be leery of making a contradiction when saying we want to keep this land public, but are concerned with the outcome of the project if no land is sold. Perhaps the Committee should lay out a specific percentage that should be maintained as public land.

Mr. Butler indicates that it could work if the units are rentals.

Chairman Mannino states that this motion is sending a message that this Committee is recommending that the City maintain its ownership of public land.

Ms. Batten states that this motion is recommending that it is left up to the City's discretion, instead of actually making a specific recommendation.

Ms. Baker notes that this motion is clear in stating that this Committee's priority is to keep it as public land.

With no further discussion, Chairman Mannino restates the motion as follows: "We recommend that the City of San Diego maintain its ownership of City owned land, but that on a project by project basis, decide whether or not to sell individual parcels of public land, such decision to be made consistent with the greatest benefit to the Citizens of San Diego."

Chairman Mannino then calls for the vote.

The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 8-0-0.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor for discussion.

Mr. Hahn indicates that he has prepared a motion regarding adult entertainment and reads the following:

"Due to an over abundance of adult entertainment in North Bay, creating a negative image, we recommend that adult entertainment uses be precluded from City owned land in North Bay, that redevelopment be used as a tool to reduce adult entertainment locations, and that the City's ordinance be increased from 1,000 feet to 2,000 feet."

Ms. Sanguinetti seconds the motion.

Chairman Mannino briefly explains the current City Ordinance and sighting process.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that this is an admirable motion but is concerned that it will be overlooked because the City has recently had their hand slapped on this issue. Ms. Sanguinetti suggests adding to the motion to prevent that.

Ms. Sanguinetti makes a friendly amendment adding that in the event that it can not be increased from 1000 feet to 2000 feet, that the Committee request support of the development of uses that preclude adult entertainment.

Mr. Hahn accepts the friendly amendment.

Mr. Kenton questions the definition of adult entertainment.

Chairman Mannino notes that the Committee can say adult entertainment as defined in the City of San Diego code, and then goes on to explain the code as he understands it.

Mr. Pretto notes that he is concerned with the adult entertainment that has defined this community and would like to send a message that these types of facilities are no longer welcome here.

Ms. Batten questions what happens with the existing businesses.

Chairman Mannino explains the trigger clause.

Mr. Spurrier notes that he is concerned with the portion of the motion recommending change to the ordinance from 1000 to 2000 feet, noting that he is concerned that it infringes upon first amendment rights.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that the adult entertainment facilities will surely call it discrimination, but that she supports the motion.

Mr. Kenton notes that he supports the motion as submitted as it sends a clear message to City Council how this community feels about such facilities.

Ms. Batten asks if there are any current signage restrictions.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that the Midway Community Plan and the North Bay Association Conceptual Plan both address signage. A Q and A ensues regarding signage.

Chairman Mannino points out that we have more adult entertainment facilities in this area than any area of equal size in all of California except for San Francisco and so a strong message is appropriate.

Mr. Butler questions whether or not the Committee should or could recommend that this area reject any new business licenses from these types of businesses.

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that such a restriction is possible only if you have a planned district ordinance and that the City does not allow that anymore.

Ms. Batten notes that from her experience in Ocean Beach, it is very difficult to restrict businesses from entering your community.

Mr. Hahn notes that this community has voiced its opposition to these facilities and yet they still continue to sight and open new facilities. Mr. Hahn states that is why he included a change to the ordinance in his motion.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to public comment.

Ms. Mignon Scherer questions what constitutes adult entertainment, asking if Krispy Kreme donut is considered an adult entertainment facility. Ms. Scherer states that with obesity and diabetes on the rise, places like Vons and Ralphs, due to the sale of food that contributes to obesity should classify them as adult entertainment.

Mr. Wojdowski notes that perhaps the Committee should look into the possibility of condemning land.

With no further public comment, Chairman Mannino opens the floor and restates the motion with Ms. Sanguinetti's friendly amendment.

Ms. Sanguinetti makes an additional friendly amendment requesting that the Ordinance number be stated in the motion.

Mr. Hahn accepts the friendly amendment.

Chairman Mannino restates the motion: "Due to an over abundance of adult entertainment in North Bay, creating a negative image, we recommend that adult entertainment uses as defined by San Diego Municipal Code s141.0601 be precluded from City owned land in North Bay, that redevelopment be used as a tool to reduce adult entertainment locations, that development of uses that preclude adult entertainment be supported, and that the City's ordinance be increased from 1,000 feet to 2,000 feet."

Ms. Batten questions whether the motion makes specific mention of North Bay.

Chairman Mannino restates the motion indicating that there are points in the motion that do not specify North Bay.

Mr. Spurrier makes a friendly amendment to add the North Bay wording to the motion as follows: "that redevelopment be used as a tool to reduce adult entertainment locations in North Bay, that development of uses that preclude adult entertainment be supported in North Bay".

Mr. Hahn accepts the friendly amendment.

Ms. Sanguinetti accepts the friendly amendment.

Chairman Mannino restates the motion: "Due to an over abundance of adult entertainment in North Bay, creating a negative image, we recommend that adult entertainment uses as defined by San Diego Municipal Code s141.0601 be precluded from City owned land in North Bay, that redevelopment be used as a tool to reduce adult entertainment locations in North

Bay, that development of uses that preclude adult entertainment be supported in North Bay, and that the City's ordinance be increased from 1,000 feet to 2,000 feet."

Mr. Kenton calls for the question.

Ms. Sanguinetti seconds.

Chairman Mannino calls for the vote to end debate.

The call for the questions passes 8-0-0.

With the question having been called and the motion been restated, Chairman Mannino calls for the vote.

The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 8-0-0.

With time expiring, Chairman Mannino requests guidance on agenda items, noting that he will agendize the same items as well as Mr. Hank Cunningham's presentation.

Ms. Baker notes that the Chair should look to schedule the SDSU presentation.

Professor Robinson indicates that he will speak with Mr. Richard Lawrence as joint speaker.

Ms. Baker indicates that Mr. John Seymour has confirmed the date of September 24, and that perhaps Professor Robinson and Mr. Lawrence could also present that day.

The Chair agrees, and Professor Robinson indicates that would work.

Mr. Kenton suggests adding process to the agenda items, so that all seven items laid out by the Councilman will be open for discussion and action.

Chairman Mannino then confirms that he will agendize all seven items, as well as Mr. Hank Cunningham.

Ms. Sanguinetti requests a list of all motions passed thus far. Chairman Mannino notes staff will accommodate the request.

With no further discussion, Chairman Mannino opens the floor to public comment.

Ms. Scherer comments on the height limit.

Mr. Wojdowski recommends the Committee consider joint venture when discussing the ownership of land.

Chairman Mannino then asks if there is any further comment and with none, the Chair adjourns the meeting at 9:28 AM.

Respectfully submitted by:
Audrey Hyde
Volunteer Secretary

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, September 24, 2004

MEETING MINUTES

Present:	Bill Kenton	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Lyle Butler	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Chuck Pretto	North Bay Association
	Ernie Hahn	North Bay Association
	Joe Mannino	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Jarvis Ross	Peninsula Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Pat Baker	Point Loma Association
	Vance Spurrier	Ocean Beach Community Planning and Advisory Committee
Absent:	Jere Batten	Ocean Beach Town Council
Guests:	Professor Robinson	PCPB
	Richard Lawrence	S.D. Housing Coalition
	John Seymour	Southern California Housing Development Corporation
	Joe Wojdowski	Epsteen & Associates
	Bert Decker	
	Moises Aceves	

Minutes:

Chairman Mannino opens the meeting at 7:36 AM, welcomes everyone and asks everyone to introduce themselves, which they do. Chairman Mannino indicates that there are four (4) meetings remaining after today's meeting.

Chairman Mannino asks for the corrections and approval of the September 24th meeting minutes.

Mr. Conley moves to approve the minutes. Mr. Butler seconds and the motion passes 9-0-0.

Chairman Mannino then opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. Decker comments on various articles in San Diego publications. Mr. Decker also notes that he would like to remind the Committee that the Sports Arena was paid for by the citizens of San Diego and leased to the Hahn's.

Mr. Butler replies that the building was actually paid for by Mr. Bob Breitbart.

Mr. Hahn agrees noting that private dollars paid for the building and that the City owns the land.

With no further public comment, the Chair moves on to Report of Receipt of Communications. He directs the Committee to review the packet of the various email correspondence sent out and received throughout the week including a list of the motions passed thus far.

With no further Report of Receipt of Communications, Chairman Mannino moves onto New Business and opens the floor to discussion, introducing Professor Robinson and Mr. Richard Lawrence, Coordinator for the San Diego Housing Coalition.

Professor Robinson distributes documentation regarding affordable housing and briefly explains the handout. Professor Robinson then introduces Mr. Richard Lawrence.

Mr. Lawrence reports on the following points:

- Affordable housing crisis in San Diego
- Only 10 percent of the families in San Diego can afford a median priced home
- Waiting list for emergency housing assistance is at least seven (7) years long
- Rental prices have increased 63% over the last seven (7) years
- Recommendations made by the Affordable Housing Task Force and the Coalition include increasing supply and additional public funding.
- Requests support for TOT, so that it can be used to support affordable housing
- Affordable housing is considered to be housing that you can pay for while not spending more than 30 percent of your gross income toward housing.

Professor Robinson notes that currently, as defined by the San Diego Affordable Housing Coalition, families of four making up to $80,000 to $90,000 can be considered needing of affordable housing in San Diego.

Chairman Mannino thanks Professor Robinson and Mr. Richard Lawrence and introduces Mr. John Seymour of Southern California Housing.

Mr. Seymour passes out some information documenting current San Diego affordable housing rents and income levels, and briefly informs the Committee of his background and current position with Southern California Housing noting that they are a 501c3 non profit affordable housing developer, owner and manager. Mr. Seymour then shows the Committee a brief video on San Diego affordable housing, and goes on to note the following points:

- Majority of affordable housing being developed today in San Diego is rental housing
- Gives multiple examples of development that his organization has completed
- Explains what a funding "gap" or deficiency is, noting that it is defined as what remains after all income sources are used up
- Explains the financing procedures and how the funding "Gap" is filled noting that one of the sources the City uses to fill that gap is redevelopment funds
- States that there is a misconception about who occupies affordable housing, noting that families who make $50,000 or less are considered in need of affordable housing
- Southern California Housing uses strict guidelines when selecting occupants noting that applicants with misdemeanors, eviction records, bad credit, etc. are denied

A Q and A ensues.

Chairman Mannino notes that this Committee recognizes the need for affordable housing in San Diego, and that the goal from today's presentations was to focus more on the economics and how it actually gets done.

Mr. Ross indicates that he has two questions for Mr. Seymour. He notes that there is a connection between affordable housing and the reduction in the number of automobiles per family. He questions if it is feasible to build these affordable housing developments with no garages. He also asks if these can be built with the current height limit in place.

Mr. Seymour indicates that it is a myth that low income families have fewer automobiles. He states that the company that he represents will not build units without parking, noting that the parking allotted is approximately 2.8 – 3 per unit. Mr. Seymour notes that seniors generally are the only group that use less of the automobile. He also states that regarding height limitations, this community is limited to a low density garden style walk up community, similar to the existing apartments in this community. He notes that single story developments would not be an efficient use of the land.

Mr. Kenton asks if the developments that Southern California Housing builds are exclusively affordable, or do they offer a mixed housing development.

Mr. Seymour indicates that they do both.

Mr. Kenton questions whether Southern California Housing is limited by location, asking if this community poses challenges due to the cost of land.

Mr. Seymour indicates that he does not believe the cost of land would deter affordable housing in this community, and notes that Southern California Housing is currently building developments in downtown San Diego. He states that this community is ideal for affordable housing.

Mr. Pretto questions if these developments downtown are two story developments.

Mr. Seymour replies that they are not.

Mr. Kenton notes that this Committee is concerned with the challenges that this community faces, and if and how affordable housing can work.

Mr. Seymour indicates that the funding gap that would be created can be filled by the City through redevelopment funds.

Chairman Mannino points out that this community would be faced with other challenges that other communities might not, for example the cost of implementing eminent domain which can increase the required subsidy levels substantially. He notes that there are existing businesses in place where in other instances a developer may have undeveloped land. Chairman Mannino also notes that he would like to hear Mr. Seymour's opinion regarding the height limit and its effect on affordable housing.

Mr. Seymour responds that the higher the density the lower the funding gap that needs to be filled by the City. He states that there are other sources that can be used to trim down a funding gap, such as federal and state housing credits, tax exempt bonds, Prop 46 monies, etc.

Mr. Butler questions whether Mr. Seymour has developed any of these properties on leased land and how that affects the affordable housing component.

Mr. Seymour explains that leased land for a variety of reasons can reduce the cost to a developer substantially.

Chairman Mannino questions whether the presenters would support a height limit increase in order to make an affordable housing project work.

Professor Robinson indicates that it would have to be on a project by project basis, but that he feels that the height limit and affordable housing are not related.

Mr. Lawrence indicates that personally he might consider extending the current height of the San Diego Sports Arena to any new development.

Mr. Seymour notes that unless you are in a CCDC area, going over four stories is not practical due to costs. He states that the most economical development of affordable housing would be two to three stories, and would require approximately three to five acres of land.

Chairman Mannino notes that three stories would be above the height limit.

Ms. Baker notes that the proposed increase in Development Impact Fees (DIF) will increase the funding gap as well.

Chairman Mannino explains DIF fees noting that there is currently an effort to increase DIF fees in the Midway community from $500 per dwelling unit to $8,300.00. He notes that there were complaints made by various organizations, including the North Bay Association about the increase which resulted in a fee reduction so that the proposed fee per dwelling unit is now $6,800.00. The Chair indicates that the proposed increase has just passed Land Use and Housing, and that City Council will be voting on the increase.

Mr. Seymour agrees that this increase to DIF fees is in direct conflict to the ability to build affordable housing.

Mr. Conley questions what the difference in the funding gap is when staying under the height limit versus going over the height limit.

Mr. Seymour notes that going over four stories requires type two construction which adds approximately twenty percent (20%) to construction costs.

Mr. Butler questions if four stories is the most efficient.

Mr. Seymour indicates that the most desirable situation is two to three stories, noting that a developer would rather have more unanimous community support, then to build higher than the height limit causing controversy.

Mr. Ross notes that he would like to clarify Mr. Seymour's statements, indicating that going over 30 feet is in Mr. Seymour's opinion not necessary in order to build affordable housing. Also, leased land is considered a benefit when building affordable housing due to the decrease in cost. Mr. Ross also asks Mr. Seymour how much land is required for an ideal development.

Mr. Seymour confirms Mr. Ross' statements, and indicates that 5 acres would be ideal.

Chairman Mannino asks when determining the funding gap, what return on investment does the developer factor in as a non profit.

Mr. Seymour notes that there is no return on investment. He states that what all developers get is a one time development fee that is capped at approximately 2 million dollars, but that it usually ends up being around 1.5 million.

Chairman Mannino asks if that is a percentage or a set fee per one hundred (100) units.

Mr. Seymour replies that it is per one hundred (100) units. He notes that there are also management fees collected when the developer also manages the facility, which are approximately $50 per month as well as general contractor fees.

Mr. Conley indicates that he is confused regarding Mr. Seymour's position in relation to ideal developments and number of stories, noting that the company he represents has built 13 story developments successfully.

Mr. Seymour notes that he personally does not like 13 story developments, stating that it is a matter of personal preference that he would not like his family living in such an unhealthy living environment.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that this Committee has shown interest in mixed use development which would include a retail factor and questions how that would affect the height limit.

Mr. Seymour indicates that you could have mixed use by having free standing retail inside a residential community.

Mr. Hahn questions the five (5) acre figure previously mentioned, questioning what that would include.

Mr. Seymour indicates that allows for a pocket park, 1500 sq ft community room, two to three tot lots, laundry facilities, and parking.

Mr. Pretto questions the non profit organization dynamics.

Mr. Seymour briefly explains, noting that a not for profit developer focuses on funding sources available.

Chairman Mannino questions how Mr. Seymour's firm goes about finding ideal locations, and determining feasibility.

Mr. Seymour states that sites are usually found through community member recommendations and that the preferred method of finding feasibility is through RFQ, noting that the feasibility can be determined through a redevelopment loan.

Ms. Baker questions RFQ is versus RFP.

Mr. Seymour briefly explains.

Mr. Pretto questions whether partnering with a private developer is an option.

Mr. Seymour replies that the ideal scenario is to select one developer whether they are for profit or not for profit.

Mr. Kenton asks what produces better for the City, market rate housing or affordable housing.

Mr. Seymour notes that market rate housing is definitely better from an economic standpoint, and goes on to describe his vision for the land.

Mr. Kenton notes that this Committee is looking to do what is best for this City, and is not looking for personal preference or opinion.

Mr. Ross notes that the City is the people, stating that this Committee's charge is not to the politicians, it is to the people.

Chairman Mannino asks if the Committee has anything further to ask of the presenters and with no further questions or discussion, the Chair thanks Mr. Lawrence, Professor Robinson, and Mr. Seymour for their time.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to New Business.

Ms. Sanguinetti moves that the Committee recommends that the City Council oppose raising this community's DIF fees, that the redevelopment of the Sports Arena property will depend on significant number of residential units, including affordable housing, and exorbitant DIF fees serve only to discourage residential and especially affordable housing.

Ms. Baker seconds the motion.

Chairman Mannino explains that the DIF fees are being increased at such a tremendous amount, from $500 to $6800, because the basis for DIF has been inappropriately inflated by adding the I-5/I-8 Connection project.

Ms. Sanguinetti amends the motion to read: We recommend that the City Council oppose raising this community's DIF fees from $500 to $6,800, that the Planning Department specifically omit the cost of freeway projects from the DIF basis, because the redevelopment of the Sports Arena property will depend on significant number of residential units, including affordable housing, and exorbitant DIF fees serve only to discourage residential and especially affordable housing.

Ms. Baker the seconder of the motion accepts the amendment.

Chair Mannino notes that DIF fees are for the entire area, not just for the Sports Arena site.

Ms. Sanguinetti amends the motion to read "Sports Arena area property" instead of "Sports Arena property".

Ms. Baker accepts the amendment.

Mr. Kenton notes that he would rather hear that we oppose, instead of recommending that the City Council oppose.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that City Council will be voting on this issue next Tuesday and recommends that this motion, if passed, be forwarded to City Council as soon as possible.

Mr. Conley notes that he would prefer that the motion did not include the dollar amount, indicating that opposing a raise of DIF fees is specific enough.

Chairman Mannino notes that perhaps changing the wording relative to "community" to be more specific might also be more concise.

Mr. Hahn recommends that Committee members attend City Council to voice opposition.

Ms. Sanguinetti amends the motion to read the following: "We oppose raising the Midway area DIF Fees, and recommend that the Planning Department specifically omit the cost of freeway projects from the DIF fee basis, and note that the redevelopment of the Sports Arena area property will depend on significant number of residential units, including affordable housing, and exorbitant DIF fees serve only to discourage residential and especially affordable housing."

Ms. Baker accepts the amendments.

Mr. Pretto questions why the Midway community is being targeted, noting that this increase is cause for concern.

Chairman Mannino notes that City Council is considering one community at a time, and that eventually all communities will be faced with such increases.

Mr. Hahn notes that these funds are either widening the funding gap, or being passed onto the consumer. He states that the increase to DIF fees are detrimental to the future of this area.

Mr. Kenton states that this motion should be given to the Councilman ASAP.

Mr. Spurrier calls for the question.

Mr. Ross seconds the motion.

Chairman Mannino calls for the vote on ending debate, and the calling of the question passes with a vote of 9-0-0.

Chairman Mannino asks if anyone would like the motion reread, and with no requests made, calls for the vote.

The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 9-0-0.

With time expiring, Chairman Mannino requests guidance on agenda items, noting that without objection he will agendize the same items as well as the presentation on the North Bay Conceptual Plan.

With no further discussion, Chairman Mannino opens the floor to public comment.

With no public comment, the Chair adjourns the meeting at 9:25 AM.

Respectfully submitted by:
Audrey Hyde
Volunteer Secretary

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, October 1, 2004

MEETING MINUTES

Present:	Lyle Butler	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Chuck Pretto	North Bay Association
	Ernie Hahn	North Bay Association
	Joe Mannino	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Jarvis Ross	Peninsula Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Pat Baker	Point Loma Association
	Jere Batten	Ocean Beach Town Council
	Vance Spurrier	Ocean Beach Community Planning and Advisory Committee
Absent:	Bill Kenton	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee

Guests:	Professor Robinson	PCPB
	Mignon Scherer	PCPB
	Bert Decker	North Bay PAC
	John McNab	
	Moises Aceves	
	Craig Ten Braeck	

Minutes:

Chairman Mannino opens the meeting at 7:37 AM, welcomes everyone and asks everyone to introduce themselves, which they do. Chairman Mannino indicates that there are three (3) meetings remaining after today's meeting.

Chairman Mannino asks for the corrections and approval of the September 24th meeting minutes.

Mr. Pretto moves to approve the minutes. Mr. Conley seconds and the motion passes 6-0-1, with Ms. Batten abstaining.

Chairman Mannino then opens the floor for public comment.

Ms. Scherer comments on the height limit.

Mr. Decker comments on various articles in San Diego publications as well as the abuse of eminent domain. Mr. Decker also notes that Ms. Donna Frye is running for mayor.

With no further public comment, the Chair moves on to Report of Receipt of Communications. He directs the Committee to review the packet of the various email correspondence sent out and received throughout the week including the letters that the Committee requested staff send to all City Council members including the Mayor regarding DIF fees. Chairman Mannino indicates that an email from Mr. Adam Wexler is also included regarding the docketing of the DIF fee issue at City Council. Also included is an updated list of the motions passed thus far.

With no further Report of Receipt of Communications, Chairman Mannino moves onto New Business. Chairman Mannino opens the floor for a presentation from Mr. Marco Li Mandri of New City America, noting that the City Planning Department no longer has a policy to respond to grass roots and community desires in regards to creating standards above those that are in the general plan. Such standards include architecture, certain kinds of landscaping, signage, etc. Chairman Mannino notes that with the help of involved community members such as Leslie Sanguinetti, and the help of New City America, the North Bay Association has developed a Conceptual Plan which includes input from many sources such as the Redevelopment Agency, Midway Community Planning Group, Councilman's Office, and the Traffic Task Force, as well as the expertise of New City America and Marco Li Mandri.

Chairman Mannino then introduces Mr. Li Mandri.

Mr. Li Mandri reports on the following points:

- The North Bay Conceptual Plan is reflective of the communities needs and input.
- There are certain areas in San Diego poised for tremendous change and Midway is one of them.
- The North Bay area in its current state is a result of failed land use policies.
- The North Bay Conceptual Plan considers what is the best use for this land.
- It deals with concepts, and shaping concepts of this area. What will this area become, what should it look like, what are the design standards, architect standards, lighting standards, landscaping standards, traffic standards, etc.
- When removing Bay to Bay from the Midway Community Plan, the North Bay Conceptual Plan will be used to further amend the community plan.

Chairman Mannino thanks Mr. Li Mandri for his presentation, and notes that some of the specific recommendations being used by the Redevelopment Agency in amending the Community Plan in order to maintain a continuity and consistency in the community are to adopt 3 forms of architecture, use similar type trees, street furniture recommendations, lighting recommendations, etc. Chairman Mannino opens the floor to Q and A.

Mr. Hahn thanks Mr. Li Mandri for his vision and his instrumental role in forming the North Bay BID.

Mr. Ross asks Mr. Li Mandri if he is familiar with BRT, and how he feels about it.

Mr. Li Mandri notes that the trolley system in San Diego is a failure, and that what is needed is dedicated bus lanes. He notes that dedicated transit is key.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to public comment.

Mr. Bert Decker comments on the need for park space, and asks the Committee to consider magnetic levitation when discussing transit.

Ms. Scherer comments on "Friends of San Diego" and the E.I.R. that is required to avoid potential lawsuit.

With no further public comment Chairman Mannino opens the floor to Q and A from Committee members.

Mr. Spurrier questions Mr. Li Mandri's comments on the trolley system failure.

Mr. Li Mandri notes that his comment reflected his personal opinion, noting that he believes that the design of the trolley system was not very well thought out. He notes that it does not even run to the airport.

Mr. Butler notes that there used to be rail to and from the airport.

With no further questions or comments for Mr. Li Mandri, Chairman Mannino thanks Mr. Li Mandri for his time.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to new business, and recognizes Mr. Conley.

Mr. Conley moves:

We recommend that the City Council support placing an initiative on the ballot to allow a variance to the 30 foot building height limitation for a site or a project within the Midway Planning area, with the variance in height to be limited to 85 feet and 50 percent of a projects land mass, in instances where:

1. The generation of revenue would result in the creation of public parks and open space amenities in the community.
2. The generation of revenue would contribute to the benefit of San Diego's citizens.
3. The generation of revenue would result in the construction of affordable housing and market rate housing.
4. The generation of revenue would result in a significant improvement to the project area's traffic problems.

Mr. Butler seconds the motion.

Mr. Ross indicates that he has a problem with the wording of the motion, noting that it justifies breaking the height limit for the sole purpose of generating money. He states that he speaks for the majority of the Peninsula Planning Board in opposing a change to the height limit.

Mr. Spurrier notes that of all the issues that this Committee has discussed, this is the one that he has struggled with the most. He notes that after much thought and consideration about what this would mean for his community, he has decided that he can not support such a motion.

Mr. Conley notes that he sees nothing wrong with trying to make this community the best that it can possibly be.

Chairman Mannino notes that before the Committee makes any decision on this issue, he would like to take public comment, and opens the floor to the public.

Mr. Mcnab notes that this motion makes a lot of assumptions on the City's cash flow. He notes that public land should have different criteria than commercial land, noting that it is not all about generating revenue. He states that this land should be preserved for the people. Above all, the will of the people should be considered.

Professor Robinson notes that after last week's presentation, the Committee is aware that residential development can be done under 30 feet. He questions why the Committee would want to open themselves to so much criticism from the public on this issue, when it is not necessary.

Mr. Decker notes that the Height Ordinance is the law, and that the City should abide by it.

Ms. Scherer lists all of the reasons for the original petition, noting that these desires reflect the will of the people and that the reasons still apply today.

With no further public comment, the Chair opens the floor to continued discussion.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she agrees with many aspects of the motion, such as the 85 feet, but that she is concerned with the 50 percent figure. She states that she would rather see the figure around 30 percent.

Ms. Baker agrees with Ms. Sanguinetti, noting that a figure around 25 to 35 would be better.

Mr. Conley notes that the motion speaks of this property, and a change in the height limit for this property would not block coastal views.

Mr. Hahn questions the area the motion speaks of.

Chairman Mannino notes that the motion states the Midway Planning area. A Q and A ensues regarding what that encompasses.

Mr. Ross notes that the motion does not take into account precedent, sighting SeaWorld as an example. He also notes that increasing the height limit would increase the density and then in turn increase the traffic impact.

Mr. Spurrier questions why the motion is making recommendations on areas that are not part of the 95 acres.

Mr. Pretto notes that the spirit of the height ordinance is something that he has no desire to break. He notes that his concern is in the artificial barriers that were set up, which is highway 5, noting that it is in itself higher than the height limit. He states that this area needs substantial improvement, and that a change in height limit needs to be taken into consideration. Without a change in the height, this area will see more of the same for years to come.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she would like to see the motion be specific to the Sports Arena area / 95 acres. She also notes that she believes it is important to this community to keep SPAWAR as it is a community asset that generates money for the area. She notes that a 10 mile radius is required for all vendors of SPAWAR, and that this Committee should consider an environment where these vendors could operate. She states that currently these vendors are being forced to work out of Mission Valley due to the lack of office/industrial space in the area.

Mr. Hahn notes that he likes the wording of the motion in regards to the area it encompasses. He notes that the spirit of the people in 1973 might not be the same as the will of the people in 2004. He states that if there were a vote and the height limit were to be changed, it would reflect the will of the people.

Ms. Baker makes a friendly amendment to lower the percentage from 50 percent to 35 percent.

Mr. Conley, the maker of the motion, accepts the friendly amendment.

Mr. Butler, the seconder of the motion, also accepts the amendment.

Mr. Conley states that we are long away from the original ordinance, noting that the freeway is so much above the surrounding property.

Ms. Batten states that she feels it would be wrong to raise the height limit. She notes that she could only support the grandfathering of the Sports Arena height, perhaps spreading the footprint throughout the 95 acres.

Mr. Spurrier makes a friendly amendment to limit the motion to the Sports Arena area only.

Mr. Conley does not accept the amendment.

Mr. Ross notes that an idea from 1973, with such an increase to population over the years, is all the more reason to maintain the ordinance.

Mr. Butler states that he was present at the time, and the Planning Department at that time was opposed to the ordinance, noting that they preferred to see diversity in height, to allow for open space, and avoid a row of buildings all 30 feet. He states that this area was never considered when setting the boundaries, even though this was a coastal issue and this area would not affect the coastal views. He also notes that this area is close to the largest transit area in Old Town, and we are not taking advantage of it, stating that people who live in this area would never have to access the freeway to commute to downtown or the beaches.

Mr. Hahn states that in this area, tax increment dollars are required in order to achieve the desired parks and open space. He notes that he did not hear the affordable housing presentations address this issue. Mr. Hahn states that these parks will not build themselves, and that this community needs a change in the height to in order to achieve an ideal vision for this area.

Mr. Ross notes that he agrees that this area will not block coastal views. He states that his concern lies in the traffic impacts. He also agrees that this area is ideal for transit, but notes that he received nothing but opposition when suggesting building residential without parking.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she agrees with Mr. Hahn that an increase to the height limit is necessary in order to have the desired amenities, but that she would like to restrict the area in order to make the recommendation more palatable. She notes that a unanimous vote on this issue is critical, and a palatable motion is necessary in order for City Council to consider it.

Chairman Mannino notes that each project would require a vote of the people.

Ms. Sanguinetti states that a motion recommending such a process is not feasible either, noting that such a process is too expensive for the City.

Chairman Mannino explains the process and the wording of the motion.

Ms. Batten states that an increase in density would lead to an increase to traffic, using Mission Valley as an example of how the increase has gridlocked Friars Road. She states that the focus was no negative impact on traffic. She notes that in regards to the project by project wording, SeaWorld is an example of how that process did not work. Surrounding communities were bombarded with misleading propaganda.

Mr. Conley states that Pacific Highway is an underutilized asset, and that he sees no reason to exclude the pacific corridor from this motion.

Mr. Pretto states that this Committee is not changing the height limit; we are merely recommending the City consider it in order to provide some much needed development in this area. He also notes that we are relatively close in the recommended 35 percent in the footprint of the Sports Arena, and that in regards to traffic, there is no better place to add density due to the close proximity of the transit hub in Old Town.

Mr. Ross calls for the question.

Ms. Sanguinetti seconds calling the question.

With the question having been called, Chairman Mannino calls for the vote to end debate.

The motion fails with a vote of 3-5-0 with Mr. Hahn, Ms. Batten, Mr. Conley, Mr. Pretto, and Mr. Butler opposing. Ms. Baker was not present for the vote as she had stepped outside.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor for continued discussion.

Mr. Ross notes that the traffic problems created when increasing density will not be solved by an EIR.

Chairman Mannino notes that this Committee is moving forward in a spirit of compromise and that the Councilman did express the need for compromise. He notes that when discussing 85 feet, we are not speaking of high rises, and that this limitation is in itself a compromise. He notes that the motion itself is reflective of many compromises, as it addresses many

issues of concern heard at many community meetings, such as the generating of parks and open space; improvement of traffic problems; affordable housing, etc. Chairman Mannino states that in leaving things the way they are, inertia takes hold, leading to more of the same. More big box, more traffic, and more adult entertainment. Compromise is necessary in order to improve this community.

Mr. Hahn states that it is easier to say no to everything, but that bold vision through change is required in order to shape this community, much like downtown and Horton Plaza. He explains the vision his grandfather had when redeveloping downtown. He notes that to use NTC as an excuse to do nothing in this community is unfair.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that the maker of the motion seems unwilling to accept amending the motion, so calling for the question might be in order so as to make a new motion.

Chairman Mannino restates the motion as follows:

"We recommend that the City Council support placing an initiative on the ballot to allow a variance to the 30 foot building height limitation for a site or a project within the Midway Planning area, with the variance in height to be limited to 85 feet and 35 percent of a projects land mass, in instances where:

1. The generation of revenue would result in the creation of public parks and open space amenities in the community.
2. The generation of revenue would contribute to the benefit of San Diego's citizens.
3. The generation of revenue would result in the construction of affordable housing and market rate housing.
4. The generation of revenue would result in a significant improvement to the project area's traffic problems."

Ms. Sanguinetti indicates that she would like a narrowing of the area recommended in the motion.

Chairman Mannino displays a map showing the area that was passed by the North Bay Association, which recommends an area smaller than that of the motion, but larger than Ms. Sanguinetti's recommendation, and passes the map to the Committee.

A Q and A ensues regarding boundaries and the map.

Mr. Ross notes that he disagrees with Mr. Hahn's comment that change in this community is contingent upon a change to the height limit.

Ms. Sanguinetti comments on the map, and makes a friendly amendment to accept the boundaries of the North Bay Association map, but excluding the area south of Rosecrans and west of Sports Arena Boulevard.

Mr. Conley questions the objection to including the pacific corridor.

Ms. Sanguinetti states that excluding these areas would make the motion more reflective of the majority and more likely to pass.

Mr. Conley notes that he still feels that the pacific corridor should be included and therefore can not accept the friendly amendment.

Ms. Batten notes that she agrees with Mr. Ross that change in this community can not hinge on a change to the height limit.

Mr. Hahn notes that more of the same is to be expected without a change to the height; more big box, more adult entertainment.

Mr. Ross questions the connection between adult entertainment and the height limit.

Mr. Hahn explains that housing discourages adult entertainment facilities from sighting new locations.

Mr. Ross states that he agrees that this area needs housing.

With time expiring Chairman Mannino restates the motion:

"We recommend that the City Council support placing an initiative on the ballot to allow a variance to the 30 foot building height limitation for a site or a project within the Midway Planning area, with the variance in height to be limited to 85 feet and 35 percent of a projects land mass, in instances where:

1. The generation of revenue would result in the creation of public parks and open space amenities in the community.
2. The generation of revenue would contribute to the benefit of San Diego's citizens.
3. The generation of revenue would result in the construction of affordable housing and market rate housing.
4. The generation of revenue would result in a significant improvement to the project area's traffic problems."

With the motion read, Chairman Mannino calls for the vote.

The motion fails to pass with a vote of 4-5-0. Mr. Spurrier, Mr. Ross, Ms. Batten, Ms. Sanguinetti, and Ms. Baker oppose.

With time expiring, Chairman Mannino requests guidance on agenda items, noting that without objection he will agendize the same items.

With no further discussion the Chair adjourns the meeting at 9:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted by:
Audrey Hyde
Volunteer Secretary

Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, October 15, 2004

MEETING MINUTES

Present:	Bill Kenton	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Lyle Butler	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Chuck Pretto	North Bay Association
	Joe Mannino	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Leslie Sanguinetti	North Bay Project Area Committee
	Jarvis Ross	Peninsula Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Pat Baker	Point Loma Association
	Vance Spurrier	Ocean Beach Community Planning and Advisory Committee
Absent:	Bob Conley	Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee
	Ernie Hahn	North Bay Association
	Jere Batten	Ocean Beach Town Council
Guests:	Dale Pursel	North Bay PAC
	Kris Hartnett	San Diego Building Trades Council
	Debora Greene	
	Grace Ferrero	
	Joel Calhoun	
	Moises Aceves	UCSD Student
	Bert Decker	
	Joe Wojdowski	Epsteen and Associates
	Professor Robinson	
	Seth Litchney	Representative of Mayor Dick Murphy

Minutes:

Chairman Mannino opens the meeting at 7:36 AM, welcomes everyone and asks everyone to introduce themselves, which they do.

Chairman Mannino asks for the corrections and approval of the October 8th meeting minutes.

Mr. Kenton moves to approve the minutes. Mr. Pretto seconds and the motion passes 6-0-0.

Chairman Mannino then opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. Decker comments on various articles in the Peninsula Beacon and Union Tribune, noting that he would like to submit these articles for the record.

Ms. Debora Greene states that she is in opposition to last week's motion on height.

Mr. Joel Calhoun states that he opposes development of the Sports Arena.

Mr. Kris Hartnett requests that the organization that he is representing, the San Diego Building Trades Council, be kept informed of development in the area.

Ms. Grace Ferrero notes that if development above 30 feet is to occur, safeguards must be taken into account.

With no further public comment, the Chair moves on to Report of Receipt of Communications. Chairman Mannino indicates that there is only one (1) meeting remaining after today's meeting.

He directs the Committee to review the packet of the various email correspondence sent out and received throughout the week including an updated list of the motions passed thus far, as well as a letter submitted from Professor Robinson.

With no further Report of Receipt of Communications, Chairman Mannino moves on to New Business, opens the floor for discussion, noting the three items under New Business are process, the tabled motion, and the City Council report.

Mr. Butler states that he has prepared two motions regarding process and submits the typed motions to the Secretary for reading.

Mr. Butler moves:

"Regarding projects on non-City owned land, generating significant community impact and requiring a competitive bidding process, we recommend the Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee and the North Bay Association be considered stakeholders representing the North Bay community, and be afforded the opportunity to offer input and advice on the choice of a potential developer in an RFQ process, or the choice of a potential project in an RFP process."

Mr. Kenton seconds.

Mr. Pretto questions the dynamics and differences between private land and non-city owned land, asking whether or not private land would have to go through a bidding process. He also notes that he supports involvement of the North Bay Association and the Midway Community Planning Group.

Chairman Mannino clarifies the wording of the motion and explains the process as he understands it, sighting an example of when a private owner would have to go through such a process. Chairman Mannino states that the Midway Community Planning Group had no opportunity to give input during the first RFQ process.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she supports the motion and comments on process and eminent domain.

Mr. Butler states that these community groups should have an opportunity to provide input.

Mr. Ross notes that he also supports the motion, stating that citizen input is crucial. He also states that without such, the risk of eminent domain increases.

Chairman Mannino asks for additional comment and with none opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. Decker comments on the recent Supreme Court of Michigan decision finding it unconstitutional for a Redevelopment Agency to condemn/take land.

Mr. Dale Pursel states that he supports the motion, noting that community input is key.

With no further public comment, Chairman Mannino opens the floor to the Committee.

Ms. Sanguinetti calls for the question.

Mr. Kenton seconds.

With the calling of the question, Chairman Mannino calls for the vote to end debate.

The calling of the question passes with a vote of 7-0-0.

Chairman Mannino restates the motion and calls for the vote.

The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 7-0-0.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor, and reads Mr. Butler's second motion regarding process.

Mr. Butler moves:

"Regarding projects on City owned land, generating significant community impact and requiring a competitive bidding process, we recommend the Midway Community Planning and Advisory Committee and the North Bay Association be considered stakeholders representing the North Bay community, and be afforded the opportunity to offer input and advice on the choice of a potential developer in an RFQ process, or the choice of a potential project in an RFP process, and that the affected neighboring communities be afforded the opportunity to offer input and advice through the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee, similar to the 2004 Sports Arena Ad Hoc Committee."

Ms. Sanguinetti seconds.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to public comment.

Ms. Debora Green states that she applauds the Committee for the motions.

With no further public comment, the Chair opens the floor to the Committee.

Mr. Kenton calls for the question.

Mr. Pretto seconds.

Chairman Mannino calls for the vote to end debate.

The calling of the question passes with a vote of 7-0-0.

With the question called, Chairman Mannino calls for the vote.

The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 7-0-0.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor for New Business, and asks the Committee if they would like to make any other motions regarding Process. He also notes that the Committee has agendized the tabled motion regarding the river park.

Mr. Kenton moves:

"We recommend that the City Council support the development of a park in the area adjoining the San Diego River north of I-8 and both east and west of I-5, with the development of a walkway access over I-8 connecting the park with the Midway Community."

Mr. Butler seconds.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that her concern with the motion is that this park will be used in lieu of park space on the 95 acres.

Mr. Spurrier notes that he agrees with Ms. Sanguinetti and that he is concerned with the environmental impact of the park, as well as possible flooding risks. He states that this motion is premature.

Mr. Ross states that this recommendation may interfere with the Mayor's plan for the area. He also states that the walkway access over I-8 recommendation poses ADA problems.

Mr. Kenton states that regarding habitat and environmental issues, the City will address those issues. He also states that ADA concerns are not valid as those are also addressed upon designing and building a bridge. Mr. Kenton notes that he would rather not see the 95 acres tied to this motion, as the recommendation for this park should not depend on development of the 95 acres.

Ms. Baker notes that perhaps there is wording that would satisfy both, and makes a friendly amendment adding the wording "in addition to the recommended park development in North Bay".

Mr. Kenton, the maker of the motion accepts the friendly amendment.

Mr. Butler also accepts the friendly amendment.

Ms. Sanguinetti states that perhaps the Committee should encourage that this park development be a part of the San Diego River Project, noting that this partnering could allow for more funding from the City.

Chairman Mannino approaches the map. A Q and A ensues.

Chairman Mannino then opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. Pursel states that it would be an advantage to have this proposal be a part of the San Diego River Project due to the additional funding sources available.

Mr. Ross states that he can not support the bridge concept, noting that it would be another visual obstruction.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she too can not support the bridge concept, stating that it is unnecessary as there is already sufficient access. Ms. Sanguinetti notes that the area can be made more accessible and visually appealing, and that the bridge is not needed.

Mr. Butler states that easy access is essential so that it can be fully utilized by the public.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor for public comment.

Mr. Decker comments that bridges pose safety hazards as there are individuals who might throw objects from the bridge and damage the vehicles below.

Ms. Ferrero notes that the current access is sufficient and recommends landscaping be done to beautify the access area.

Mr. Butler states that this Committee is recommending easy access.

Ms. Sanguinetti makes a friendly amendment adding wording that states that this project would be "in conjunction with the San Diego River Project".

Chairman Mannino points out that the Committee is not privy to the particulars of that project.

Mr. Ross states that he could support wording that suggested facilitating access to the area, but not the bridge concept.

Mr. Spurrier states that he likes the area as it is today.

Ms Baker makes a friendly amendment changing the walkway wording to "with improved pedestrian access connecting the park to the Midway community".

Mr. Kenton accepts the friendly amendment.

Mr. Butler also accepts the friendly amendment.

Chairman Mannino states that this Committee has recommended redevelopment with predominantly residential housing, and also supported parks and open space, and questions why this body would even discuss limiting access to such an area. The Chair notes that there are many examples of wonderful walkway bridges, and that one can be built in this community. He states that the access to this area is clearly not sufficient.

Mr. Kenton makes a friendly amendment to add the walkway wording back to the motion.

Mr. Butler accepts the amendment.

Mr. Ross states that this park and bridge would be a misuse of money when park land directly in this community is what is preferred.

Ms. Baker indicates that her friendly amendment did not preclude a bridge.

Chairman Mannino states that this is an opportunity for park space where the City would not have to buy land, or give up land that is currently in a revenue producing situation.

Mr. Kenton states that there could be multiple funding sources available for the development of this park.

Ms. Sanguinetti makes a friendly amendment to add language in addition to the walkway access stating "and/or other enhancements to pedestrian access".

Mr. Kenton accepts the friendly amendment.

Mr. Butler accepts the friendly amendment.

Chairman Mannino states that he could support such wording as it is still strong enough to recommend the walkway access.

Mr. Kenton calls for the question.

Mr. Butler seconds the calling of the question.

With the question having been called, Chairman Mannino calls for the vote to end debate.

The calling of the question fails to pass with a vote of 4-3-0. Mr. Ross, Mr. Spurrier, and Mr. Pretto opposed.

Mr. Pretto states that it is important to recognize that we are all in support of this park.

Mr. Ross states that he supported Ms. Baker's original amendment, but that he can not support the motion as it stands.

Chairman Mannino notes that Ms. Sanguinetti's friendly amendment adding the "San Diego River Conservancy" wording was never accepted and asks Mr. Kenton and Mr. Butler if they accept such an amendment.

Both Mr. Kenton and Mr. Butler accept the friendly amendment.

Mr. Butler states that the freeway wording needs to be corrected to read north of I-8 and west of I-5.

Mr. Kenton accepts the friendly amendment to correct the freeway wording.

Chairman Mannino asks for additional comments, and with none restates the motion as follows:

"In addition to the recommended park development in North Bay, we recommend that the City Council and the San Diego River Conservancy support the development of a park in the area adjoining the San Diego River north of I-8 and west of I-5, with the development of a walkway access over I-8, and/or other enhancements to pedestrian access connecting the park to the Midway Community."

The Chair calls for the vote and the motion passes with a vote of 5-2-0. Mr. Ross and Mr. Spurrier oppose.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to New Business, noting that the Committee has agendized the City Council report.

Mr. Pretto indicates that he has prepared a motion regarding the report and moves:

"We recommend that the Chair write a report summarizing the various positions and motions made by this Committee, and that such report be distributed to Committee members with enough time to be able to provide comment on such report. This Committee would then meet to finalize the report sometime in November. Upon approval of the final report by this Committee, such report would then be forwarded to Councilman Zucchet and the City Council."

Mr. Kenton seconds.

Mr. Pretto explains the motion stating that he feels that the onus of writing the report should be given to the Chair as all of the minutes and documentation have been compiled by the Chair thus far.

Chairman Mannino notes that the Committee should set a meeting date. The Chair states that he feels it important that the report also include a supporting document section where minutes and correspondence would be attached. He also notes that he feels it important that each Committee member have an opportunity to voice support or opposition to the motions passed, stating that this Committee has endured unfounded criticism and personal attacks, and therefore we should welcome as much input from Committee members as each member desires.

Ms. Sanguinetti states that weighty comments made after the fact concern her. She notes that the Committee had the opportunity to make arguments for or against motions, and that the minutes do a great job reflecting such arguments.

With no additional comments, the Chair calls for the vote.

The motion passes unanimously with a vote of 7-0-0.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor to discussion.

Mr. Kenton notes that he supports Ms. Sanguinetti's statement and that the report should be concise and to the point, with as little editorial as possible.

Mr. Ross states that he is inclined to agree with the Chair, but that he also understands Ms. Sanguinetti's point. He notes that the report should not preclude individual expression.

The Chair requests clarification from Mr. Ross.

Mr. Ross states that each Committee member has the opportunity to express their positions in writing to Councilman Zucchet if they choose.

Mr. Pretto states that individual comment is essential, and that he could not support a motion that stifles Committee member's ability to provide comment. Mr. Pretto states that the length of the report should not be a concern. Each Committee member should have the right to submit their comments in the report.

Chairman Mannino states that staff could go back and review all of the minutes, using the additional comments as additions to the minutes, and as a last opportunity to craft information, noting that all comments would not necessarily be included in their entirety, but simply used as a tool for the brief summary of the reasons why a motion was either supported or opposed.

Ms. Sanguinetti moves:

"I move that the Chair, Joe Mannino, summarize the Committee's activities in an introduction, and include a listing of the motions, that the motions be dated, and that all minutes be attached as reference to the motions, with a summary or conclusion."

Mr. Kenton seconds.

Chairman Mannino references and briefly explains a sample layout design of the report as an example.

Mr. Spurrier asks that the Committee avoid scheduling the meeting near Thanksgiving as many will be out of town.

Mr. Butler notes that if the minutes are included, and the recordings are made available, why do we need more.

Mr. Pretto states that the motion on the floor does not preclude Committee comment, which is the determining factor of whether or not he could support such a motion. Mr. Pretto states that he could not a support a motion that stifled any type of Committee member comment.

Mr. Ross requests clarification. A Q and A ensues.

Mr. Kenton states that he supports Ms. Sanguinetti's motion.

Ms. Sanguinetti states that she is opposed to including post meeting comment.

Chairman Mannino states that perhaps a solution to this is to allow this final week for Committee members to go back and review motions and submit any additional comment in document form so they can be included in Report of Receipt of Communications. This way, their final comments would be made a matter of record and therefore could be included in the report.

Ms. Sanguinetti notes that she could not support such an amendment, stating that the minutes are sufficient.

Mr. Kenton states that he agrees entirely, noting that individuals can reach out to the Councilman if they choose.

Mr. Ross notes that Committee members would know better than to raise new issues, and that that goes without saying. He notes that Committee members should be allowed additional opportunity to convey their opinions regarding the topics already discussed.

Ms. Sanguinetti states she is opposed to adding additional comment of any kind, stating again that the minutes are sufficient.

Ms. Baker states that Ms. Sanguinetti's motion does not seem to preclude the summary of a motion, noting that the logical outline of the report as she sees it, would include the motion, the date, the vote, who voted for or against a particular motion, and then a summary of the reasons why the motion was supported or opposed.

Chairman Mannino requests a restating of the motion.

Ms. Sanguinetti restates the motion.

A Q and A ensues regarding the layout of the report.

Ms. Sanguinetti states that she supports the Chair's summary taken from the minutes and correspondence only, and that she can not support including any additional comments.

Mr. Pretto notes that we as Committee members have a right to be able to submit comments for or against any of the motions, even if it is included as part of an appendix.

Ms. Sanguinetti clarifies.

Chairman Mannino clarifies the motion and the report process as understood, stating that the Committee would have the opportunity to submit any additional comments this week as communication, and that these comments would be included in the report as the report will include all Receipt of Communications as an addendum. The Chair states that all of the Minutes and Receipt of Communications will then be used by the Chair to summarize the Committee views opposing or supporting a particular motion.

Mr. Ross calls for the question.

Mr. Kenton seconds.

The calling of the question passes with a vote of 7-0-0.

With the question having been called, Chairman Mannino asks the Secretary to restate the motion as follows:

"I move that the Chair, Joe Mannino, summarize the Committee's activities in an introduction, and include a listing of the motions, that the motions be dated, and that all minutes be attached as reference to the motions, with a summary or conclusion."

With the question having been called, and the motion restated, Chairman Mannino calls for the vote.

The motion passes with a vote of 4-3-0. Mr. Ross, Mr. Spurrier, and Mr. Pretto oppose.

Chairman Mannino opens the floor for discussion.

Mr. Ross states that he is still unclear as to what the motion is recommending.

Ms. Sanguinetti states that she also does not feel the motion to be correct.

Chairman Mannino asks Ms. Sanguinetti if the motion read by the Secretary is in fact an accurate reflection of the motion that Ms. Sanguinetti made.

Ms. Sanguinetti agrees, but states that she did not word the motion as she intended to.

Mr. Kenton suggests a review of today's discussion, and perhaps addressing the issue again next week.

Chairman Mannino clarifies whether Ms. Sanguinetti feels the motion was read correctly.

Ms. Sanguinetti states that the motion was stated correctly, but that her intention when using the word "summary" was to suggest a summary to the report as a whole. She notes that although she is not opposed to a summary of each motion using the minutes and correspondence, her motion was not recommending that.

Mr. Butler clarifies whether or not Committee members can submit written correspondence this week and have it included in the report.

Chairman Mannino indicates that anything submitted this week will be a part of Receipt of Report of Communications and be used as a tool when summarizing the arguments for or against a particular motion

With time expiring, Chairman Mannino notes that the Committee can continue to discuss this topic next week, and notes that we can agendize the scheduling of the final meeting for next week as well. Chairman Mannino also notes that without objection he will agendize the same seven items.

Mr. Ross notes that he would like an opportunity to speak first thing next week as he has prepared a motion.

With no further discussion the Chair adjourns the meeting at 9:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted by:
Audrey Hyde
Volunteer Secretary

CORRESPONDENCE

Documentation of all correspondence sent to the Committee is housed with the San Diego Redevelopment Agency.

AUDIO TAPES

Audio tapes of Committee meetings are housed with the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Committee wishes to express its gratitude to Councilman Zucchet for the opportunity to be part of this broad based community input process, and to offer recommendations on the critical issues which will affect out community's future.

The Committee also wishes to acknowledge the support provided by Alex Greenwood and Hank Cunningham of the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency, as well as the North Bay Association and it's staff, Joe Mannino and Audrey Thifault.

Lastly, although self serving, the Committee acknowledges the sacrifice of each of it's volunteer members, noting their efforts in support of an open and democratic process, and the betterment of the Midway Community.