

# SAN YSIDRO COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

## NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING

### Location:

San Ysidro School District Education Center  
4350 Otay Mesa Road [north of Beyer Blvd]  
in San Ysidro, California

**Monday, November 18, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.**

Chairman: Michael Freedman (619) 690-3833 [messages only]  
City Planner: Michael Prinz (619) 533-5931

Except for Public Comment, Items Appearing in This Agenda May Be Acted Upon Without Further Notice as Allowed by the Brown Act [California Gov. Code, §54950 et.seq.]
--

**1. Call to Order, Introduction, and Roll Call**

**2. Agenda & Minutes**

**a. Approval of the Published Agenda**

**b. Approval of Minutes.** Regular Meeting of September 16, 2019 (No October meeting)

**3. Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda.**

Any person may address the SYCPG regarding matters which are not shown in this Agenda. Comments and inquiries must be related to the SYCPG purposes (City Council Policy 600-24). The Chair can limit comment to a set amount of time per item, or per speaker. The "Brown Act," a State law, does not allow any discussion of, or action to be taken on, items not properly noticed to the public.

**4. Docket Items:**

**a. San Diego Forward: The 2021 Regional Plan** (Jennifer Williamson, SANDAG). SANDAG will present for discussion a vision for the future of our region's transportation system through the *5 Big Moves* – key strategies that will enhance connectivity, increase safety and sustainability, and improve quality of life. The *5 Big Moves* outline a path forward that builds upon existing infrastructure, with Complete Corridors, Flexible Fleets, Transit Leap, Mobility Hubs, the Next Operating System (Next OS) aiming to provide travelers with transportation choices that are competitive with the car for every trip in the region. Visit [SDForward.com/5BigMoves](http://SDForward.com/5BigMoves) to learn more.

**b. Taskforce on Community Planning Group Reform** (Barrett Tetlow, Chief of Staff, Councilmember Scott Sherman). In April of this year, the Land Use and Housing Committee vote to establish an ad hoc group to review and compile recommendations for revisions to Council Policy 600-24. The Taskforce convened to review existing recommendations that were proposed in the City Audit, the Grand Jury report, and the Democracy in Planning report produced by Circulate San Diego. The Taskforce also considered additional recommendations proposed by its members. The

# **SAN YSIDRO COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

Community Planners Committee (CPC) is currently reviewing the recommendations and has supported some of the recommendations. The Taskforce is seeking additional input from the individual CPGs. The City Council will hold hearings at a time to be determined. See attachments.

## **5. Communications, Announcements and Special Orders**

### **a. Members of the Public**

### **b. Elected Officials and Public Servants.**

- (1) Carlos Lacarra, San Diego Police Department
- (2) Eric Young, Mayor Faulconer's Representative
- (3) Chris Gris, Council District 8 Representative
- (4) Lucero Gonzalez, State Assembly District 80 Representative
- (5) Other Representative in attendance.

### **c. Chairman.**

(1) Elections will be held on March 16, 2020. At the January 27, 2020 meeting I will establish an Election Subcommittee. All the details are in SYCPG Bylaws Exhibit "C" attached.

### **d. Board Members**

## **6. Subcommittee Reports**

- a. No active subcommittees

## **7. Representative's Reports**

- a. SY POE Expansion & Reconfiguration - (Aguirre)
- b. SY Smart Border Coalition – (Flores)
- c. Community Planners Committee – (Meza)
- d. Otay Mesa Planning Group - (Lopez)

## **8. Adjournment.**

**SAN YSIDRO COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

Minutes from SEPTEMBER 16, 2019

1. **Call to order:** At 5:36 p.m. Chairman Michael Freedman called meeting to order.

**Roll Call: Present:** F. Castaneda; C. Clark; D. Flores; M. Freedman; J. Goudeau; R. Lopez; A. Orendain; A. Perez; A. Reynoso (7:00 pm); J. Wells; A. Zermeno.

**Absent:** M. Aguirre; M. Chavarin; A. Jacobo; B. Meza.

Quorum of 10 present at Call to Order, Item #2a, 2.b, 4.a, 4.b, 4.c.

Quorum of 19 present at 4.d

2. **Agenda & Minutes**

**a. Approval of Published Agenda:** A motion was made by J. Wells and seconded by C. Clark to approve the Agenda as Published. Motion Passed (10-0-0). Yes: F. Castaneda; C. Clark; D. Flores; M. Freedman; J. Goudeau; R. Lopez; A. Orendain; A. Perez; J. Wells; A. Zermeno. No: None. Abstain: None.

**b. Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of 8/19/19 - A Motion was made by R. Lopez and seconded by J. Wells to approve the Minutes of August 19, 2019 as published. Motion Passed (10-0-0). Yes: F. Castaneda; C. Clark; D. Flores; M. Freedman; J. Goudeau; R. Lopez; A. Orendain; A. Perez; J. Wells; A. Zermeno. No: None. Abstain: None.

3. **Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda:** NONE.

4. **Docket Items:**

a. **Census 2020.** (Nataly Schlafer, U.S. Census Bureau). The 2020 Census is around the corner. Our community has to be ready to be counted in order for San Ysidro to receive our fair share of federal funding and representation. New internet access [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov) Invitations with information will be mailed out between 3/12/20 and 3/20/20. **INFORMATION ONLY.**

b. **San Diego Bike Coalition.** (Skii Fleeton, Representative). Join the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition and help make bicycling better in San Diego County. We represent everyone who see bicycling as a solution for the traffic, health and environmental challenges we face in our communities. We can't do it alone. The Bike Coalition depends on bicyclists like you to continue our work making cycling a healthier and more sustainable means of transportation and recreation. **CONTINUED [No presenter]**

c. **Howard Lane Park – Time Limit Parking.** (Chris Gris, Council District 8). During the discussion on the Iris at San Ysidro proposed multifamily project presented at the August SYCPG meeting, it was suggested that Time Limit parking could be implemented at Howard Lane Park along the north side of Plantel Way. Due to community interest in this item, the Council District 8 office requested the SYCPG discuss the proposal and make recommendation(s).

**Community Concerns:**

Establish time limit Parking.

Allow parking along Dairy Mart Road.

**DRAFT MINUTES SUBJECT TO CORRECTION & APPROVAL AT A SUBSEQUENT MEETING**

Concerns with Nicoloff School drop off/pick up area and congestion at Plantel Way & Tequila Way intersection.

Add street lighting and pedestrian crossing at Dairy Mart Rd and Vista Lane.

Trolley crossing at Beyer Blvd/DairyMart Rd takes 30 minutes to cross during rush hour due to traffic signals

Traffic and parking concerns with new housing project *Iris at San Ysidro*.

**No motion or vote.**

**d. Vacancy.** (Chairman). Two prospective candidates for the vacant seat for the term ending April 2020 were present and their qualifications were validated in accordance with the SYCPG Bylaws. The two candidates are: Alfonso Reynoso and Paul Arrendondo. Both are Residents. The SYCPG Board submitted written ballots and the results were announced by the Secretary. For A. Reynoso: Castaneda, Clark, Freedman, Goudeau, Lopez, Perez, Wells. For P. Arrendondo: Orendain, Zermeno. Alfonso Reynoso was elected to the vacancy and immediately seated.

**5. Communications, Announcements and Special Orders:**

a. **Members of the Public:** None

b. **Elected Officials and Public Servants:**

**(1) Rafael Castellanos (Port of San Diego Commissioner):**

(a) South Bay/Chula Vista Bay Front Project, which is the largest public/private project ever in SD County. It is an \$1.5B project which is approximately 3 ½ years out and will consist of a convention center and 1,600 room-hotel.

(b) The City of Imperial Beach/Port of San Diego/City of San Diego/City of Coronado are seeking a solution to the Tijuana River Valley sewer issue. Seeking funding for a diversion project.

**(2) Officer Carlos Lacarra (San Diego Police Department):** Not present.

**(3) Chris Gris (Councilmember Vivian Moreno's Office, District 8):**

(a) New Library Opening on September 7<sup>th</sup>. All are invited to visit, open Monday – Saturday (9:30 am to 6 pm).

(b) Old library building could be repurposed as a Teen Center (by Park & Rec).

(c) Clean up on October 5<sup>th</sup> 8 am to 1:30 pm. Drop off bulky trash items at Howard Lane Park, Beyer Blvd & Otay Mesa Rd, E. San Ysidro Blvd., and Cesar Chavez Rec. Center.

c. **Chairman:**

(1) City of San Diego Housing Element Update. Workshop on September 17, 6-8pm at Chavez Rec Center at Larsen Field, 445 Sycamore Road.

(2) Recycle Event on Saturday, Oct 26<sup>th</sup> from 9am to 1pm at Montgomery High.

(3) Boardmember Cinnamon Clark was recognized upon her appointment to the City's *Citizens Equal Opportunity Commission*.

d. **Board Members:** None.

**6. Subcommittee Reports: No Active Subcommittees.**

7. **Representative's Reports:**

- a. **SY POE Expansion & Reconfiguration** (Aguirre): J. Wells gave update: Ped East to be completed by end of September. CBP is proposing to close PedWest northbound from Mexico from 10 pm to 4 am commencing on October 1. Southbound into Mexico has always been closed from 10 pm to 6 am.
- b. **SY Smart Border Coalition** (Flores): No Report.
- c. **Community Planners Committee** (Meza): No Report.
- d. **Otay Mesa Planning Group** (Lopez): Meeting this week.

8. **Adjournment** – Meeting Adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

Next Regular Meeting October 21, 2019.

Minutes submitted J. Goudeau, Secretary

# SAN YSIDRO COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

## ATTENDANCE RECORD

**APRIL 2019 - MARCH 2020**[illegible]

# Taskforce on Community Planning Group Reform

## Draft Findings & Recommendations

### Introduction

In April of this year, the Land Use and Housing Committee vote to establish an ad hoc group to review and compile recommendations for revisions to Council Policy 600-24. The task force consisted of eleven members with the following backgrounds: three representative of the Community Planners Committee (Dike Anyiwo, Barry Schultz, Albert Valasquez), two representatives of small businesses (Carla Farley, Angela Landsberg), a current or past member of the Planning Commission (Vicky Granowitz), a current or past employee of the Department Services Department or Planning Department (Dan Normandin), a member of a Mass Transit/Mobility advocacy organization (Maya Rosa), a member of the Building Industry Association (Matt Adams), a member of an Environment/Climate Change advocacy organization (Matthew Vasilakis), and an Urban Infill developer (Rammy Cortez).

The Taskforce on Community Planning Group Reform convened to review existing recommendations that were proposed in the City Audit, the Grand Jury report, and the Democracy in Planning report produced by Circulate San Diego. The Taskforce also considered additional recommendations proposed by its members. The purpose of the Taskforce is to find recommendations that are supported by diverse stakeholders in land use and transportation issues. Then present the consolidated recommendations to the Community Planners Committee (CPC) for a vote, and ultimately present recommendations that have been vetted by the Taskforce and CPC to the City Council.

To make clear the source of the recommendations, the Taskforce intentionally voted on each individual recommendation, sometimes with modifications, instead of consolidating or writing new recommendations from scratch. The below findings and recommendations were supported by a majority of Taskforce members. Recommendations that were not supported by the Taskforce were not included except for two that were tie votes (located in the Other Recommendations section). There are several recommendations with varying levels of overlap that the Taskforce did not consolidate, and therefore there will be repetition if a specific issue was addressed in more than one of the sources of recommendations.

The Grand Jury report included a number of findings. The Taskforce voted on the findings as well as the recommendations, and those findings are included separately below. The recommendations are broken down into major categories and numbered for ease of reference. The original source is also included with each recommendation. Recommendations that have been modified from the original source will be demarcated by **bold** for insertions.

## Findings

Any request with a marginal **change to a project, outside the scope of the project, must be validated by city staff if requested by the applicant before it can** form the basis for satisfactory compromises between the developer and the CPG. **Appropriate requests will be further defined in the administrative guidelines.** *(A finding by the Grand Jury with minor modifications by the taskforce.)*

**Community Planning Groups that are unable to meet CP 600-24 quorum and attendance requirements should be considered for disbandment or consolidation with a neighboring CPG. While this would be unlikely to increase diversity, as suggested by the Grand Jury, it could facilitate the review and processing of development proposals and community plans.** *(A finding by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce.)*

If members of the City Planning Department attended all CPG meetings **when a discretionary land use item is before them then** issues could be resolved in a timely manner. *(A finding by the Grand Jury minor modifications by the taskforce.)*

In some cases, there are insufficient volunteers to allow CPGs to maintain a diverse membership. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

Membership of some CPGs is not sufficiently diverse to represent their communities. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

Neither the CPGs nor the City has recruitment procedures that meet the stated goal of increased diversity. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

Periodic training **of board members would help them** stay current on the Brown Act and changes in City policies. *(A finding by the Grand Jury with minor modifications by the taskforce).*

Policy, procedure, or development issues sometimes arise during CPG meetings, and if left unanswered or incorrectly answered, it can result in confusion or delays. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

**San Diego City Council Policy 600-24 DOES NOT provide sufficient guidelines on appropriate additions or modifications to development projects.** *(A finding by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce).*

**Council Policy 600-24 and the Administrative Guidelines shall be updated to define the acceptable scope of additions and/or modifications that may be requested by a CPG, as well as an appropriate range of ancillary requests. If after reviewing the guidelines the parties still cannot reach an agreement, the Planning Department will make a final determination on the efficacy of a CPG request(s).** *(A finding by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce)*



The degree to which members of CPGs are representative of the geographic sections of the community and diverse community interests cannot be determined. *(A finding by the Grand Jury).*

The work of some Community Planning Groups can be **impaired** by a lack of diverse membership and citizen interest. *(A finding by the Grand Jury with a minor modification by the taskforce).*

DRAFT

# Recommendations

## Conduct of Meetings

- 1) Ensuring that Community Planning Group (CPG) rosters, annual reports, and meeting minutes contain all the required elements as described in Council Policy 600-24 through proactive monitoring of those documents. *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*
- 2) Establishing a **72-hour** due date for receipt of CPG **formal action** recommendations **to the** Development Services Department Project Managers. *(A recommendation from the City Audit with minor modifications by the taskforce).*
- 3) Developing a formal mechanism for recording and posting CPG project review recommendations, either using a revised annual report that includes all project recommendations or using the Bulletin 620 Distribution Forum revised to include the number of times the applicant presented to the group per project and any major **conditions** to the project proposed by the group. **The reporting mechanism should be uniform and mandatory for all CPGs.** *(A recommendation from the City Audit with minor modifications by the taskforce).*
- 4) Identifying deadlines for CPGs to provide the Planning Department with rosters, minutes, and annual reports, so that the Planning Department can post them online to ensure this information is available to the public in a centralized location *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*
- 5) Including election results in the record retention *requirements.* *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*
- 6) Making member applications mandatory, subject to record retention requirements, **and submitted to the City Clerk.** *(A recommendation from the City Audit with minor modifications by the taskforce.)*
- 7) Require that CPGs determine a maximum duration for meetings, with the ability to extend the time by a majority vote of the CPG. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*
- 8) The Planning Department should coordinate with the Development Services Department to communicate a consistent message to project applicants of the role of CPGs in the project review process. *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*

## Development Process

9) CPG meetings, when discretionary land use items are on the agenda, must be taped (either video or audio). *(A recommendation by the taskforce).*

10) For a development project that requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the CPG must submit their recommendations before the public review period closes. If a CPG doesn't provide recommendations during the public review period their recommendations will not be considered for the project. *(A recommendation by the taskforce).*

11) Prioritize action items that inform City decision making in the order of the agenda. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

12) **We determine** that members of the Planning Department staff **should attend when a discretionary land use item is before the CPG.** *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce.)*

## Elections

13) Candidates should not be required to have attended more than one meeting in the past 12 months to be eligible to join a CPG board. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

14) Community members should not be required to have attended previous CPG meetings to be eligible to vote. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

15) Define CPG **resident** representation as **renters or homeowners** *(A recommendation from the City Audit with major modifications by the taskforce).*

16) In-person voting should be available for at least two hours and should run at least two hours after the stated time of a CPGs regularly scheduled meeting **if voting can run concurrently with the meeting.** *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning with minor modifications by the taskforce)*

17) Make explicit that CPGs are allowed to use social media. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

18) The City shall develop and implement a robust outreach plan to publicize CGP elections. *(A recommendation by the taskforce).*

## Membership

19) **Community Planning Groups that are unable to meet CP 600-24 quorum and attendance requirements should be considered for disbandment or consolidation with a neighboring CPG.** *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury with major modifications by the taskforce).*

20) Gather relevant demographic data of CPG board members in an audit immediately and require new CPG board members to complete a demographic survey at every election or time of appointment. **The survey should include: Age, Business Owner or Property Owner, Ethnicity, Gender, Length of Residence, Neighborhood, Professional Background, Race, Religion, Renter or Owner, Years of Service on CPGs.** *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning with major modifications by the taskforce).*

21) Require a termed-out board member to wait two years until they can run for their CPG again without exceptions. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*

22) The Planning Department should develop methods and provide resources to improve recruiting that could result in more diverse CPG membership. *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury)*

## Training

23) **All** CPG members should be required to complete the eCOW **or** COW training **annually** each time they are reelected or reappointed. *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury with minor modifications by the taskforce).*

24) Provide required ongoing education for decision-making processes and planning. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning)*

25) Requiring annual training for all CPG members, not just new members.

**The COW will include:**

**A mandatory Brown Act training for all members.**

**A separate advanced curriculum for returning members**

**There should be specific training at the COW and/or offered during the year which might include:**

**For Chairs and Vice-Chairs of CPG's and any CPG subcommittee/Ad Hoc Committee.**

**Advanced training in the Development Review Process specific to CPG responsibilities and limits.**

**CEQA review training.**

**An interactive component where new members can learn from experienced CPG members.**

*(A recommendation from the City Audit with major modifications by the taskforce).*

26) The Planning Department, in conjunction with relevant City departments, should provide a comprehensive training program that includes:

1) Mandatory training segment focused entirely on project development reviews

2) Sessions **for** CPG members and the public to increase understanding of the review process and roles and responsibilities.

*(A recommendation from the City Audit with minor modifications by the taskforce).*

## Oversight

27) CPG members must file statements of economic interest, per the Political Reform Act. *(A recommendation from the taskforce).*

**28) Direct** the San Diego City **Planning** Department staff to closely monitor CPG actions and provide timely guidance to preclude requests for inappropriate project additions or modifications. *(A recommendation by the Grand Jury with minor modifications by the taskforce).*

29) If a CPG violates the Brown Act then the CPG will be referred to the City Attorney's Office for disciplinary review. *(A recommendation from the taskforce).*

30) Revise the bylaws shell in 600-24. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*

31) The annual report should be a **standardized electronic fill-in template** with expanded components for the annual report, **a member summary would include: number of members and member categories (i.e. homeowners, renters, property owners, and business representatives), turnover, mid-term election** *(A recommendation from the City Audit with major modifications by the taskforce).*

32) The City Auditor should conduct a review of CPGs **every five years**. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning with minor modifications by the taskforce).*

33) The Planning Department, in conjunction with the Development Services Department, should improve its documentation of CPG recommendations and post all CPG documents, including project review recommendations on the City website. *(A recommendation from the City Audit).*

### **Other Recommendations that the Taskforce deadlocked on:**

Councilmembers should appoint new board members when a CPG vacancy occurs in their council district. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*

Consider incorporating appointed positions to CPGs by Councilmembers to provide balance with the elected board members. *(A recommendation from Democracy in Planning).*

DRAFT



## Notes from CPC meeting on 10.22.19

Motion to support Recommendation #1, #2, #4, #5, #8, but to change “72 hours” in #2 to “Seven calendar days.”

#2 Establishing a **seven calendar day** due date for receipt fo CPG formal action recommendations to the Development Services Department Project Managers.

Vote 25-2 Passed

Motion to support Recommendation #15.

Vote 17-10 Passed

Motion to support Recommendation #18

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to reject Recommendation #19

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to support Recommendation #23 but to remove “annually”.

#23 All CPG members should be required to complete the eCOW or COW training ~~annually~~ each time they are reelected or reappointed.

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to support Recommendation #24 but insert “Planning Department or DSD...”

#24 **Planning Department or DSD will** provide required ongoing education for decision-making processes and planning.

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to Support Recommendation #25 but remove “annual”

25) Requiring ~~annual~~ training for all CPG members, not just new members.

The COW will include:

- A mandatory Brown Act training for all members.

- A separate advanced curriculum for returning members

There should be specific training at the COW and/or offered during the year which might include:

- For Chairs and Vice-Chairs of CPG’s and any CPG subcommittee/Ad Hoc Committee.

- Advanced training in the Development Review Process specific to CPG responsibilities and limits.

- CEQA review training.

An interactive component where new members can learn from experienced CPG members.

Vote Unanimous- Passed

Motion to Support Recommendation #26 but remove “mandatory” and add “#3 All trainings will be in online or in-person.”

#26 The Planning Department, in conjunction with relevant City departments, should provide a comprehensive training program that includes:

- 1) ~~Mandatory~~ Training segment focused entirely on project development reviews
- 2) Sessions for CPG members and the public to increase understanding of the review process and roles and responsibilities.
- 3) **All trainings will be online or in person.**

Vote Unanimous- Passed

# Executive Summary

Public participation is a cornerstone of city planning and a pillar of democracy. Everyone should have a voice in how decisions are made, especially in local government. In the City of San Diego, City-sponsored community planning groups (CPGs) serve as the primary vehicle to facilitate public participation in the planning process. CPGs provide a space for community members to serve their City, and their input frequently improves development and transportation projects.

Unfortunately, not all voices have equal access to participate in CPGs. The structure of CPGs has allowed certain voices to become amplified, while excluding others. The CPG system in San Diego creates barriers to participation from new residents, and those residents that work, care for family members, or who have other obligations. These barriers undermine the purpose of CPGs to collect diverse and representative public input and to advance democratic participation.

Nationwide, jurisdictions have adopted a variety of mechanisms to form neighborhood-level planning groups to solicit input on planning and transportation choices. The structure of these local groups are as diverse as the jurisdictions themselves. Many also implement policies to ensure that a representative set of voices can access the community planning process.

In the City of San Diego, a City-wide policy sets the framework for how CPGs operate through Council Policy 600-24. Bylaws of individual CPGs must comply with 600-24. Nevertheless, wide discretion is left to individual CPGs for the actual mechanics of their election processes, and how to organize their meetings and agendas. This local control allows CPGs to adopt—or continue—policies that may have the effect of excluding certain voices from the CPG process. If CPGs become too insular and resistant to new voices, they can become weighted in favor of the status quo. CPGs that are not open to all voices cannot fairly advocate for policies that benefit everyone.

When CPGs are closed off to new and diverse voices, there can be real consequences. Neighborhood planning groups that make it difficult for new residents, often renters, from participating tend to oppose new housing construction, which artificially inflates rents. Restricting housing supply short-changes the housing needs of younger generations who don't currently occupy seats at the table. Similarly, CPGs that oppose new bicycle lanes in favor of preserving parking spaces put the lives of bicycle riders in danger.

This report recommends that the San Diego City Council update Council Policy 600-24 to require that CPGs meet certain minimum thresholds for how elections are structured and how meetings operate. Such changes will allow more diverse participation in San Diego's land use and planning decisions. With more diverse participation, local input on planning and transportation will be more likely to embrace policies that benefit wider segments of the population. Champions of the status quo deserve a voice in local planning policies, too, but they should not be allowed to exclude the voices of others.

- Prohibitions against policies that restrict the right of community members to vote in and stand for CPG elections.
- Agenda reform to ensure land use and transportation items are heard at the beginning of CPG meetings.
- Changes to term limits and continuing education to ensure new CPG members have an opportunity to serve as informed citizen planners.

Community input is essential to local land use and transportation decisions. CPGs should be structured to ensure that all community members have equitable access to the decisionmaking process. Common sense changes to the rules that govern CPGs can open up the planning process, improve outcomes, and advance our shared goals for democratic participation.



# SAN YSIDRO COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

## PUBLIC NOTICE OF ELECTIONS (March 16, 2020)

An election will be held for eight (8) of the fifteen (15) seats on the San Ysidro Community Planning Group. The term is four (4) years, ending in April 2024. The election is on Monday, March 16, 2020. The poll opens at 5:30 p.m and closes at 6:30 p.m.

The polling place is at: San Ysidro School District Governing Board Room, 4350 Otay Mesa Road (north of Beyer Blvd) in San Ysidro.

The SYCPG was formally recognized in 1967 by the City Council of the City of San Diego to make recommendations to the City Planning Commission, City Council, City staff, and other governmental agencies on land use matters, specifically concerning the preparation of, adoption of, implementation of, or amendment to, the General Plan and/or the *San Ysidro Community Plan*. The SYCPG also advises on other land use matters as requested by the City of San Diego, other governmental agencies, or other interested persons.

The community plan boundaries are generally described as: starting at the intersection of I-905 and I-5; southeast along I-5 to Dairy Mart Road; south to Camino De La Plaza, Tijuana River Levee, and International border; east to the top of the mesa hillsides; northwest to the intersection of I-805 and I-905; west along I-905 to its intersection with I-5.

**TO VOTE IN THE ELECTION:** must be a General Member who is: (1) at least 18 years of age; AND (2) a property owner, or designee of the property owner; OR (3) a resident; OR (4) a local businessperson or not-for-profit with a business address in the community and employees or operators of the business at that address. **Eligibility must be verified by the Election Subcommittee.**

**TO BE A CANDIDATE FOR ELECTION** a person who is not already a General Member must be verified as attending one of the last 12 meetings as of February 24, 2020 and have a Membership application on file by the February 24, 2020 regular meeting.

At the SYCPG regular meeting on February 24, 2020, qualified candidates will be announced. Other nominations will be considered at that time only if qualification can be determined. Thereafter, nominations will be closed, and the ballot finalized for the March election.

Regular monthly meetings, generally lasting up to 2 hours, are held on the third Monday of each month starting at 5:30 p.m.

A boundary map (Exhibit A), General Membership application (Exhibit B), and Election Procedures (Exhibit C) are available at the website:

<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/pdf/bylaws/sybylaws.pdf>

### FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Chairman: Michael Freedman: (619) 690-3833 ([michaelf@cox.com](mailto:michaelf@cox.com))  
Secretary: Jennifer Goudeau: (760) 942-3437 ([jgoudeau@barobgroup.com](mailto:jgoudeau@barobgroup.com))  
City of San Diego Planner: Michael Prinz: (619) 533-5931 ([MPrinz@sandiego.gov](mailto:MPrinz@sandiego.gov))

Also visit: <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpg/>

## EXHIBIT “C”

### ELECTION PROCEDURES

#### A. AUTHORITY

The procedures in this Exhibit “C” include all of the requirements contained in Article V, and Article VIII, Section 1(e) of the bylaws, and the *“Administrative Guidelines for Implementation of Council Policy 600-24: Standard Operating Procedures and Responsibilities of Recognized Community Planning Groups”* provides general guidance for the election process. Where revisions to the procedures in those documents conflict or are inconsistent with the procedures in this Exhibit “C”, the revisions shall take precedence and shall have the same effect as if this Exhibit “C” were amended to conform to those referenced procedures, except where options to the procedures are permitted.

#### B. ELECTION SUBCOMMITTEE

1. No later than January of an election year, the Chairperson shall establish an Election Subcommittee of at least three (3) but no more than five (5) persons not standing for election. The subcommittee may include “eligible community members” so long as the majority of the subcommittee are elected members. A subcommittee chairperson shall be responsible for the conduct of the committee’s business.

2. The subcommittee shall:

- select a subcommittee chairperson
- solicit “eligible community members” to become candidates
- develop and implement a process for the promotion of the March election
- prepare a sample ballot for distribution with the Public Notice of Election
- prepare the two official ballots with names randomly placed for the March election
- supervise the election process
- review each voter’s qualification (see paragraph “D”)
- cross-check eligible voters with the master membership list
- issue one (1) official ballot for each qualified voter
- tabulate the ballots
- determine the legality of all ballots cast
- convey the results of the election to the SYCPG Chairperson
- collect and seal all ballots cast, defaced, replaced or disqualified

3. At the February meeting, the Election Subcommittee shall present to the planning group a complete list of interested candidates collected up to that point in time. Development and promotion of “slates” of candidates is contrary to the intent of Council Policy 600-24 and is not allowed. Candidates may be added at the February meeting. The February SYCPG agenda may docket as an information item a “Candidate Forum.” The SYCPG Chairperson may limit the time for each candidate to speak. Candidates failing to participate in a “Candidate Forum” shall no longer be considered.

4. The Elections Subcommittee shall be disbanded twenty-four (24) hours after the election is final unless a challenge is filed in accordance with the Challenge Criteria herein.

#### C. CANDIDATE REQUIREMENTS

1. Must be at least 18 years of age, and
2. Must be an “eligible community member” (Art. III, Sect. 2):
  - property owner, who is an individual identified as the sole or partial owner of record, or their designee, of a real property (either developed or undeveloped), within the community planning area, or
  - resident, who is an individual whose primary address of residence is an address in the community planning area, or
  - local business person, who is a local business or not-for-profit owner, operator, or designee at a non-residential real property address in the community planning area.

and,

3. Must have an *Application for General Membership* on file with the Secretary, and
4. Must have attended at least one of the SYCPG’s last 12 meetings prior to the February regular meeting preceding the election, documented by the Secretary. A candidate may be added at the February regular meeting provided the candidate can establish eligibility.

5. Council Policy 600-24 requires that elected members shall, to the extent possible, be representative of the various geographic sections of the community, and diversified community interests. Not-for-profits that are representative of the diversified community interests can be included among the elected members of the SYCPG. The governing body or chief executive must designate in writing the person who will be their candidate. An *Application for General Membership* will be required from the designee indicating the organization and its address in the community.

#### D. VOTER REQUIREMENTS

1. Must be an “eligible community member” (see C.1, 2, 3 and 5, above). (Attendance at a meeting per C.4. is NOT a requirement for voting eligibility).
2. Eligibility must be established prior to the March election or at the time of voting.
3. Must be on the Master Membership List maintained by the Secretary, or identity and eligibility can be verified at the time of voting by the Election Subcommittee.
4. Must present proof of identity at the polling location. The following are some of the documents that may be used to prove eligibility:
  - California driver’s license or identification card
  - lease, rental agreement or rent receipt
  - most recent utility bill
  - deed to real property
  - property tax bill
  - current Business License
  - letterhead document stating that you have been selected by the member not-for-profit as its voting representative
  - any other documents or materials that the Election Subcommittee may deem acceptable

## E. BALLOTS AND VOTING

1. Voting shall be by secret written ballot.
2. Proxy, mail-in, and/or write-in balloting shall not be permitted.
3. Candidates with less than eight (8) consecutive years of service shall be seated in order of the plurality of total qualified votes cast.
4. If there are any seats remaining, they shall be filled, in order of plurality, by candidates with more than eight (8) consecutive years of service, provided first that they receive at least a two-thirds majority of the total qualified votes cast. The number of individuals serving more than eight (8) consecutive years shall in no case exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the voting committee membership.
5. Any remaining open seats shall be declared vacant, and the procedures for vacancies in Article IV shall apply, but not earlier than the next regular meeting.
6. Sample and official ballots shall clearly identify:
  - which seats individual candidates are running for
  - how many candidates can be selected
  - any limitations on which candidates the various categories of “eligible community members” can vote for
  - which candidates must receive a two-thirds (2/3rds) majority vote due to service beyond eight consecutive years
7. Only members of the Election Subcommittee shall handle and count the ballots. The tabulation shall include:
  - the total number of ballots cast
  - the number of illegal ballots
  - the number of disqualified ballots
  - the total qualified ballots counted
  - the number of total qualified votes cast for each candidate by name
  - the percentage of the total qualified votes cast for each candidate by name

## F. POLLS

1. Polls shall be located so as to be accessible to the general public and to persons with physical limitations.
2. In general, the poll location should be at the same place and time as the SYCPG holds its regular meetings, unless circumstances warrant a change in location or time. Another location or additional locations or times shall be announced in the March agenda.
3. All polls shall be operated on the same day, but may stagger times.
4. Where more than one polling place/time is necessary, additional procedures regarding the handling and transportation of ballots and other procedures relating to the election process shall be developed by the Election Subcommittee with the advice and assistance of City staff and the City Attorney.
5. The polling place(s) and time(s) shall be posted at each location at least 72 hours prior to the opening of a polling location.
6. The SYCPG should not permit "electioneering" within 100 feet of the polling place(s).

## G. ELECTION RESULTS AND REPORTING

1. The Election Subcommittee will present the results to the SYCPG Chairman.
2. At the conclusion of the March meeting, the Chairperson will announce the election results. The election then becomes final unless a challenge is filed within a 24-hour period after the announcement. See H below.
3. The Chairperson is responsible for preparing, certifying and forwarding an election report to the City.
4. Newly elected members shall be seated in April at the start of the regular meeting in order to allow their full participation as elected members at that meeting.
5. The sealed ballots shall be retained by the chairperson of the Elections Subcommittee for a period of sixty (60) days.

## H. CHALLENGE CRITERIA

1. A challenge to the election results must be filed with the chairperson of the Election Subcommittee in writing within twenty-four (24) hours of the counting of the ballots and announcing the result in order to allow enough time to resolve the issue. The Election Subcommittee should discuss the challenge to determine if there is any substance provided by the individual filing the challenge and whether: either there is no substance to the challenge and the election results can be certified, new members can be seated in April, and a ratification vote of the Subcommittee's findings can be placed on the April agenda for a majority vote of the voting members of the community planning group; OR, whether there is substance to the challenge and the SYCPG officers should discuss with the Subcommittee the appropriate resolution, including declaring a seat vacant and determining how to fill it, or declaring a new election is needed.
2. The Election Subcommittee chairperson shall within ten (10) business days prepare a written appraisal of the challenge and submit any documents to City staff or City Attorney as appropriate.
3. If it is determined that a recount of the ballots cast is required, then the Election Subcommittee chairperson will submit the sealed ballots to City staff or City Attorney, as applicable, for an independent recount or other disposition.
4. If a challenge is found to be valid, then City staff or the City Attorney should advise options that could cure the challenge.