

City of San Diego
Parks and Recreation Board Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 16, 2024

“TO PROVIDE HEALTHY, SUSTAINABLE, AND ENRICHING ENVIRONMENTS FOR ALL”

Meeting Held by In Person and Teleconference:

This meeting was held at the Balboa Park Club Ballroom and remotely using the Zoom Webinar platform and was streamed online. The public was invited to join the meeting by phone or computer, as well as invited to submit “Public Comments” in writing via a webform. The form was made available on the Parks and Recreation website at <https://www.sandiego.gov/park-and-recreation/general-info/boards>.

NOTE: Both verbal and written communication were used by Board Members, City staff, and presenters during the meeting. City staff also used the screen-share function to allow viewers to view content shared by the speaker which included PowerPoint presentations and websites.

Before the meeting was called to order, City staff read instructions to the public regarding technical procedures for making live public comment during the webinar.

Members Present	Members Absent	City Staff Present
Nick Anastasopoulos Marcella Bothwell Shaina Gross Daniele Laman Evelyn Smith Allison Soares	Jon Becker Rick Gulley Dennis Otsuji René Smith Pita Verdin	Anthony Avila Ryan Barbrick Kathleen Brand Shannon Corr Karen Dennison (Virtual) Ashley Dulaney Sara Erazo Andy Field Ilisa Goldman (Virtual) Anthony Hackett Suchitra Lukes Salome Martinez Sameera Rao Elvi Ricafort Andre Smith Gabriela Verendia Ashley Zinn (Virtual)

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order by Chair Marcella Bothwell at 2:08 pm.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 2

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 18, 2024

MOTION/SECONDED:

Ms. Laman/Ms. Soares

A motion was made by Ms. Laman to approve the minutes and seconded by Ms. Soares. The motion was approved 5-0-1 and passed unanimously with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Daniele Laman, and Allison Soares. Recused: None. Abstained: Evelyn Smith. Not Present: Jon Becker, Dennis Otsuji, Rick Gulley, René Smith, and Pita Verdin.

Public Comments:

No public comments on the meeting minutes.

Board Comments: None

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

Katie Kepner asked about permitting for community-based wellness activities including yoga. There is confusion when there are large groups at park locations. She requested information on how permit revenue is used. She asked about enforcement and how that would be handled.

Tom Mullaney asked about community plan updates. He noted examples of information that he believes was withheld, citing the approvals of the Kearny Mesa and Mira Mesa Community Plan updates while the recreation value point system was being developed. He urged the Board to strengthen its effort to communicate conditions set by the Board when the plans are considered by the City Council

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE: None.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- Community Parks I Area Committee – Mr. Otsuji was absent, so there was no update.
- Community Parks II Area Committee – Mr. Smith was absent, so there was no update.
- Balboa Park Committee – Ms. Soares reported that the committee met on May 2, 2024. No major updates to report.
- Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens' Advisory Committee – Mr. Gulley was absent.
- San Diego Parks Foundation – Chair Bothwell reported that on Saturday, May 18, 2024, is the third annual I Love My Park Day. This year it will be held at Golden Hill Recreation Center from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. All are welcome to attend. Linda Vista Community Garden needs volunteers for the next several Saturdays in May from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. Come Play Outside did not lose its funding thanks to a change in the May Revision to the Mayor's Proposed Budget.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 3

CHAIR COMMENTS:

No report from the Chair.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Ms. Laman asked about the Robb Field parking lot closure. Play Day at the Lake will be June 8, 2024, with activities for the family.

Ms. Gross asked about the renewal of the seats of the Board and whether there is a one seat per City Council District standard. Chair Bothwell and Director Field noted that this is not required by San Diego Municipal Code or the bylaws, but it is desirable to have representation from across the City when possible.

Ms. Smith noted vendors must have permits to sell in the park, but at Emerald Hills Park, there are some vendors who do not have a permit to vend. Churches are not exempted. Some vendors leave trash and belongings in the park rather than clean them up. The vendors are there on the second and fourth Sundays of each month. Director Field will ask Park Ranger Chief Ruiz to address this.

DIRECTORS REPORT: Director Field provided the Board with the following updates:

Board Appointments:

On May 9, 2024, Mayor Gloria announced Board appointments and reappointments. Ms. Ricafort sent the memo to the Board members on the same day.

The following five Board members are reappointed by this action: Mr. Anastasopoulos, Chair Bothwell, Ms. Gross, Mr. Gulley, and Ms. Laman. Both Ms. Smith and Ms. Soares are midterm so they do not need to be reappointed currently.

The following four Board members are ending their Board service: Mr. Becker, Mr. Otsuji, Mr. Smith, and Ms. Verdin. We thank them for their service to the Parks and Recreation Board.

Replacing them are:

- Martin Armstrong, a landscape architect, and urban planner
- Dr. Andrea Dooley, the Assistant Dean of Education Administration for the Division of Medical Education at UCSD School of Medicine
- Dr. Judith Muñoz, chair of the Mission Bay Park Committee and retired Vice President of the Scripps Research Institute
- Agatha Wein, local government, and community liaison at the California Public Utilities Commission

This action would bring the Board back to 11 members and no vacancies. The City Council is scheduled to consider these appointments in June 2024.

Budget Update: Mayor Gloria released the May Revision to the Proposed Budget on Tuesday, May 14, 2024. The City Council's Budget Review Committee is reviewing the Mayor's changes

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 4

to the proposed budget concurrently with this meeting (on the afternoon of Thursday, May 16, 2024). Key changes related to parks and recreation follow:

- Removal of 2.00 Associate Department Human Resources (HR) Analysts, one-time and on-going non-personnel expenditures and associated revenue for a total of \$231,434 to serve as the liaison between the participants (interns), the interns' supervisors, and the Human Resources Department to meet program objectives. Only intern positions are eligible for the Employ and Empower grant.
 - -2.00 FTE
 - \$(231,434) expense
 - \$(231,434) revenue
- Restoration of 1.75 Pool Guard 2-Hourly, .55 Swimming Pool Manager 1-Hourly, 1.00 Swimming Pool Manager 1, and 1.00 Pool Guard and 1.0 Swimming Pool Manager, and non-personnel expense totaling \$301,263. Reduction of 0.95 Pool Guard 2-Hourly and 0.30 Swimming Pool Manager 1-Hourly, and non-personnel expense totaling \$78,237. Restoration of pool fee revenue totaling \$49,306. Reduction of pool fee revenue totaling \$21,131.
 - 5.55 FTE
 - \$421,468 expense
 - \$70,437 revenue
- Restoration of 1.00 Recreation Leader II-Benefited, .50 Recreation Leader-Hourly, and .53 Recreation Aide-Hourly and non-personnel expenditures totaling \$151,694. This program specializes in After School and Teen Center sites for pre-teen and teens.
 - 11.53 FTE
 - \$757,900 expense
 - \$0 revenue
- Restoration of ongoing non-personnel expenditures totaling \$335,675 and reduction of on-going expenditures totaling \$78,125 for Recreation contractual program equity and the San Diego Back to Work initiative in the Community Parks II and Community Parks I Divisions.
 - 0.00 FTE
 - \$78,125 expense
 - \$0 revenue
- Restoration of Wi-Fi Access at Parks and Recreation sites. This adjustment (in the Department of Information Technology budget) will restore continued wireless internet services for existing infrastructure at the 59 Parks and Recreation sites previously funded by the San Diego Parks Foundation.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 5

- 0.00 FTE
- \$500,000 expense
- \$0 revenue

Three financial reports were issued this week:

- May Revision to the Fiscal Year 2025 Proposed Budget Report:
https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2024-05/fy2025-may-revision-report_final.pdf
- Fiscal Year 2024 Third Quarter Budget Monitoring Report:
<https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2024-05/fy24-third-quarter-budget-monitoring-report.pdf>
- Fiscal Year 2024 CIP Year-End Budget Monitoring Report:
<https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2024-05/fy2024-cip-year-end-budget-monitoring-report-full-report.pdf>

Final budget decisions are slated to occur at the City Council meetings on June 7, 2024, and June 10-11, 2024.

DeAnza Master Plan Update:

- The City Council approved the plan update on May 14, 2024.
- De Anza Natural provides broad plans to enhance recreational activities in the area with new and improved programs, such as an extensive multi-use waterfront trail, a nature center, and a small non-motorized boat area on the cove. The area would also remain a recreational hotspot offering a variety of active sports and recreation facilities, such as golf facilities, tennis courts and ball fields. The proposal includes space for low-cost visitor accommodations like camping and recreational vehicle facilities.
- In future phases, the City will hold additional public workshops and meetings through the General Development Plan (GDP) process to develop detailed design plans for site-specific uses. The amendment also provides opportunities to partner and collaborate with the Kumeyaay Nation on the planning and restoration of the area in a manner that recognizes their past and present traditional cultural use of Mission Bay Park and ensures continued traditional cultural use into the future.
- The GDP effort will be funded in a future year by the Mission Bay Improvement Fund. The next step for the DeAnza Natural Plan is for regulatory agency input including the California Coastal Commission. Then the plan will return to City Council with a proposal that is reflective of that input, and the GDP would follow that approval.

Parks Master Plan Update: Staff is preparing a formal update on the status of implementing all recommendations embedded in the Parks Master Plan. This update should be ready later this year. The draft Environmental Justice Element will be presented to the Land Use and Housing Committee tomorrow, on May 17, 2024.

Recreation Programs:

- **Come Play Outside and Parks After Dark:** Planning continues underway for this summer's recreation programs in consultation with the San Diego Parks Foundation and Price Philanthropies. Summer kick-off planned around June 20, 2024.
- **Water Safety Proclamation Event:** Coming tomorrow, May 17, 2024, at 9:30 a.m. at City Heights Swim Center.
- **I Love My Park Day:** Coming this Saturday, May 18, 2024, at 11:00 a.m. at Golden Hill Recreation Center.
- **North Park Tennis Courts Plaque Dedication:** Coming Friday, May 31, 2024, at 1 p.m. at North Park Recreation Center.
- **Linda Vista Community Garden Grand Opening:** Coming June 8, 2024, at 10 a.m. at Linda Vista Recreation Center.
- **Chollas Play Day at the Lake:** Coming June 8, 2024, at 8 a.m. at Chollas Lake.



Street Vendor Ordinance Expressive Activity Zones: Media outlets have reported on yoga classes not allowed at certain beach area parks. This is due to capacity issues and public safety concerns at these parks. The Department's Park Ranger team is committed to finding alternate permissible locations for yoga practitioners elsewhere in the park system. Fees collected go to the general fund and local community recreation fund. Enforcement is via the park rangers and police.

Upcoming P&R Board Agenda Items:

- AgeWell and Therapeutic Recreation Services Update – June
- Animal Services Update – June
- Semi-Annual Regional Park Improvements Fund Projects Update – June or July
- Parks Master Plan Update – September
- Open Space and Canyonlands Update – TBD
- Mid-City Communities Plan Update – TBD

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE: None

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 7

CONSENT ITEMS:

For these items, staff will provide a report only upon request by Board members. The Board may move to approve or deny these requests individually or as a group. Board members may ask questions of staff members or project proponents even if no presentation is given.

Ms. Gross asked for Item 102 to be placed on the consent agenda, but since there is public comment, this item remained on the discussion agenda.

101. Plaque Dedication Ceremony and Grant Reopening Celebration to honor three tennis legends

Presenters: Geoff Griffin, Board Member, The Greater San Diego City Tennis Council (GSDCTC)
David Gill, Board President of the GSDCTC

The Greater San Diego City Tennis Council was available to respond to questions about the proposed plaques to be placed at North Park Recreation Center's tennis courts.

MOTION/SECONDED:

Mr. Anastasopoulos/Ms. Laman

Mr. Anastasopoulos moved to approve item 101 and was seconded by Ms. Laman. The motion was approved 6-0-0 and passed with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Daniele Laman, Evelyn Smith, and Allison Soares. Nay: None. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Absent: Jon Becker, Rick Gulley, Dennis Otsuji, René Smith, and Pita Verdin.

Public Comments: None

Board Comments:

Ms. Laman asked whether other locations have tennis recognition plaques. Jeff Griffin from the Greater Tennis Council noted that there are plaques at other locations that celebrate tennis pioneers in San Diego, including Balboa Tennis Club and Barnes Tennis Center.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

102. Pasatiempo Park and Open Space Dusk to Dawn Curfew Proposal

Presenters: Anthony Hackett, Senior Community Representative, Office of City Councilmember Raul Campillo (Council District 7)
Keith Simmons, Del Cerro Resident
John Fernandez, Del Cerro Resident

Mr. Hackett presented the proposal to implement a curfew at Pasatiempo Park and Open Space in the Navajo community.

MOTION/SECONDED:

Ms. Soares/Ms. Gross

Ms. Soares moved to approve the staff recommendation along with a restriction on alcohol use in the park and was seconded by Ms. Gross. The motion was approved 6-0-0 and passed with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Daniele Laman, Evelyn Smith, and Allison Soares. Nay: None. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Absent: Jon Becker, Rick Gulley, Dennis Otsuji, René Smith, and Pita Verdin.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 8

Public Comments:

Terry Cords from the Allied Gardens Community Recreation Group noted the poor conditions and illegal activity witnessed at Pasatiempo Open Space. He agrees with the proposed curfew.

Michael Cutri, a long-term resident of Del Cerro, also experienced some of the illegal activity at Pasatiempo Open Space, including a situation where underage minors and adults were partying and drinking beer. He agrees with the proposed curfew.

Bob Hickman, who is the committee head for the neighborhood watch program, noted the concerns raised about illegal activity at Pasatiempo Open Space. He agrees with the proposed curfew.

Written public comment was received and is provided in the attachments to the minutes.

Board Comments:

Ms. Laman asked how many park rangers are able to enforce this proposed ordinance, where stations nearby and what are their hours and are they allowed to give tickets. Director Field responded that we have around 70 budgeted Park Rangers. However, there is about maybe 15 to 20 vacancies, and the department is currently in the middle to hire those positions. Their jurisdiction begins and ends with the park. As public officers they are able to offer minor citations.

Ms. Laman also asked if there are rangers stationed in Lake Molly nearby. Director Field responded that Park Rangers are currently deployed in all open space areas. He also pointed out that the Park Rangers duty hours are from 7am to 7pm. Many of the issues described are related to overnight issues and these are in the jurisdiction of the SD Police Department.

103. Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment

Development Project Manager Jonathan Avila and Senior Planner Shannon Corr from City Planning Department presented the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.

MOTION/SECONDED:

Ms. Laman/Mr. Anastasopoulos

Ms. Laman moved to send the proposal back to Planning Department staff so that the focused area recreation value points table can be updated and return to the Board at a future date with that information and was seconded by Mr. Anastasopoulos. The motion was approved 6-0-0 and passed with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Daniele Laman, Evelyn Smith, and Allison Soares. Nay: None. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Absent: Jon Becker, Rick Gulley, Dennis Otsuji, René Smith, and Pita Verdin.

Public Comments:

Susan Baldwin is co-chair of the Parks and Recreation Coalition, which was involved in the development of the Parks Master Plan. She expressed concerns with both the University Community Plan and Hillcrest Focused Plan do not have the level of service promised by the Parks Master Plan.

Tom Mullaney was the chair of the plan update committee between 2009 and 2016. Deirdre Lee, Denise Bradshaw, and Julie Hyde ceded their time to Mr. Mullaney. Since the Parks Master Plan is centered on serving the population, the park goals cannot be met given the high increase in population and housing within the Hillcrest neighborhood. Adding 79,000 people would more than double the population of Hillcrest. He noted that population estimates associated with the plan are not accurate. He urged the Board not to recommend the plan and ask staff to address the flaws in the plan.

Lu Rehling had time ceded to her by James Walsh. Ms. Rehling submitted written comments to the Board. She is concerned that there are not enough parks planned for Hillcrest nor a recreation center in the entire Uptown Community Planning Area. Balboa Park is a regional park that does not substitute for a community park. She asked that the Board not approve the plan.

Dennis Selsun hopes the plan can be changed to include more recreation space.

Written public comment was received and is provided in the attachments to the minutes.

Board Comments:

Ms. Laman asked whether the Board should focus on the entire Uptown Community Plan or the Hillcrest Focused Plan area. Ms. Rao stated it would be for the focused plan area only. Ms. Laman then asked where the recreation value points calculation table is and expressed concerns about making a decision when not all the information is available. Ms. Laman asked for the table showing recreation value park points? Mr. Avila responded that table was not developed today. Ms. Laman responded that they cannot make a decision if they do not have the data. Ms. Rao responded that they would look into it.

Ms. Soares asked whether the recreation value information is available in a different format. Ms. Rao responded that the goal of the community plan amendment update focused area amendment plan is to increase capacity and to provide for capacity for development. She also pointed out that as development comes along the City will continue to identify park opportunities to provide for the recreation required for the added population.

Chair Bothwell asked if the City already requires developers to provide parklands giving the specific square footage area. Ms. Rao responded this is an update to the focused plan area and their requirements and they identify the community plan implementation of overlay zones and in those areas have requirements for two things, one by providing additional public spaces and the other is to pay the park Development Impact Fee.

Chair Bothwell asked about current City requirements without this overlay zone. Mr. Avila responded that without the overlay zone requirements then the developers are only subject to the park standards, 100 points per 1000 acre or pay the Development Impact Fee. Ms. Rao also responded that the public space requirements is an addition to the amendment. There are now two requirements one, for public space requirements and the other one is the Development Impact Fee which helps provide for the parks.

Chair Bothwell asked about the difference between parks and promenades/public spaces. Mr. Avila responded that parks and public spaces are two different items. Public spaces like promenades, plazas, and corridors are based on square footage. Chair Bothwell asked if this

requirement item is separate from their actual square footage area. Ms. Rao responded that this requirement item is separate from their footprint.

Ms. Soares asked why the amendment was being presented now, and what the timeline would be for the plan update? Ms. Corr stated that the City Council requested an examination of impacts of increased density on the Hillcrest neighborhood.

104. University Community Plan Update

Associate Planner Ashley Dulaney, Development Project Manager Jonathan Avila and Senior Planner Suchitra Lukes from the City Planning Department presented the University Community Plan Update.

Ms. Soares moved to approve staff recommendation and was seconded by Mr. Anastasopoulos. The motion failed 2-4-0 with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, and Allison Soares. Nay: Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Daniele Laman, and Evelyn Smith. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Absent: Jon Becker, Rick Gulley, Dennis Otsuji, René Smith, and Pita Verdin.

MOTION/SECONDED:

Chair Bothwell/Ms. Soares

Given the staff recommendation was not approved, Chair Bothwell moved that staff should conduct additional public outreach and return to the Board in the fall with its recommendation. This motion was seconded by Ms. Soares. The motion was approved 6-0-0 and passed with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Daniele Laman, Evelyn Smith, and Allison Soares. Nay: None. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Absent: Jon Becker, Rick Gulley, Dennis Otsuji, René Smith, and Pita Verdin.

Public Comments:

Susan Baldwin indicated that the recreation value point model has deficiencies that do not address the issues of recreation centers and aquatic facilities in the University community plan. The plan is not acceptable and should not be adopting increased housing capacity when there are significant parks and recreation shortcomings. Ms. Baldwin also requested clarification of how the fee payment process works. Ms. Dulaney indicated that developers must fund development impacts fees or provide parkland on the development site.

Pablo Lanatta noted the need for parks and recreation amenities. He noted that the draft environmental impact report is inadequate and that the plan does not meet Parks Master Plan requirements including park acreage per resident.

Bonnie Kutch noted that two-thirds of University City would not have sufficient park space under this proposed plan. The new park space proposed on North Torrey Pines Road is too far from University City residents. She is concerned this plan continues a park deficit.

Karen Arden agreed that the planned park space is inadequate. The leased property on North Torrey Pines Road does not end until 2043. This property is unlikely to become a community space, and it is far from residents.

Mansi Patel is in support of the update.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 11

Written public comment was received and is provided in the attachments to the minutes.

Board Comments:

Ms. Laman asked if the table matches the map in the report. She asked if the Torrey Pines Golf Course is within Torrey Pines City Park. Ms. Dulaney stated yes to both questions. Ms. Laman asked if additional recreation centers are needed? Ms. Dulaney noted there is one proposed on North Torrey Pines Road, and another could be at the Mandel Weiss Eastgate Park. The Mandel Weiss Eastgate Park lease expires in 2047. Those two locations are the proposed aquatic centers currently contemplated.

Ms. Gross noted that there are multiple recreation centers in University but not in Uptown/Hillcrest.

Chair Bothwell asked which community groups were involved in the creation of this plan. Ms. Lukes noted there were 43 meetings with the planning group over the five-year course of work. The community recreation groups in University were not consulted on this plan update.

Chair Bothwell stated that given the years the community has devoted to collaboratively come together to make the best possible community plan recommendation, documentation, vote, and further recommendations from community recreation groups in University City and from the University Planning Group need to be included in staff presentation to the Parks and Recreation Board for the Board to consider voting on staff recommendations.

INFORMATION ITEMS

201. Fiscal Year 2025 Recreation Center Fund Budgets, Opportunity Fund Budget and 2024 Recreation Equity Report

Deputy Director Sarah Erazo and Program Manager Salome Martinez from the Parks and Recreation Department presented the Fiscal Year 2025 Recreation Center Fund budgets, Opportunity Fund Budget and 2024 Recreation Equity Report.

Public Comments:

No public comments were received on this item.

Board Comments:

Ms. Laman requested that the Council Districts be added to the table showing the Opportunity Fund distributions.

Chair Bothwell noted the Opportunity Fund is not bringing enough funding. She asked for a report outlining why it is not meeting the financial goals. Ms. Erazo stated this report would come in the fall. Chair Bothwell asked about the need to audit the Recreation Center Fund (RCF) expenditures and need for training on budget management for City staff. Ms. Erazo stated that training is continuous especially with staff turnover. She noted that some RCF fund balances are carried over for specific purposes such as capital projects, maintenance activities, events, and specific programs.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 12

Copies of the reports, attachments, PowerPoint presentations, and audio-video recordings can be found on the Parks and Recreation Department website at

<http://www.sandiego.gov/parkandrecboard/reports>.

Next Calendared Meeting: June 20, 2024 at 2:00 p.m.

Submitted by,

Andy Field

Director

Parks and Recreation Department

Attachments follow on the next page.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 13

ATTACHMENT – WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

ITEM 102 – Pasatiempo Park and Open Space Dusk to Dawn Curfew Proposal

NAME: Lawrence Morrow

EMAIL: lawmorrow@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 6446 Pasatiempo Avenue San Diego, California 92120

PHONE NUMBER: (619) 265-8867

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 102a

COMMENTS: Dusk to dawn Pasatiempo Avenue Del Cerro: One should not underestimate the very real danger of fire evening pyrotechnics represent. Setting a curfew allows the proper authorities to inquire of a person's presence, especially after the close of daylight when fireworks I'm more likely to be present. I assure you, that fireworks in the warmer months at that location are very common enough. As well, the cover of darkness is a timely invitation for alcohol and other intoxicants. Simply speaking, parties on the street and the Open Space must not occur any longer. Moreover, the darkness is a subterfuge for other lawlessness.

NAME: Diane Lints

EMAIL: Dlints1@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 6131 Caminito Estrellado San Diego, California 92120

PHONE NUMBER: (619) 972-4314

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 102

COMMENTS: Dear Parks & Rec Board:

I am in support of the approval for signage at the Pasatiempo Park and Open Space and limiting the Public from Dusk till dawn.

This area has become a place for Late night visitors, noise, dealings of drug, consuming of drugs, drinking (underage too), tagging on private property, littering everywhere (even when a trash container is available), fights, smashing bottles against rocks leaving the glass everywhere, leaving behind drug paraphernalia, smoking, burning fires, eating food, and

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 14

throwing the garbage in the street. After these people/including teenagers sit up there and consume their alcohol/drugs they drive off in their vehicles possibly intoxicated, which is very dangerous for everyone.

Since the cameras have been installed it has made a HUGH difference in the amount of litter. I am a morning walker on this street, and for many years have been concerned/disgusted for the lack of respect for nature. I often picked up the trash and would end up with a couple of bags. I do not see that happening anymore since the cameras have been installed. Thank you very much for installing the cameras, it has made a BIG difference.

Please approve the request for signage and limiting the Public from Dusk till dawn at Pasatiempo Park & the Open Space.

Thank you ALL for your hard work on this issue, it is much appreciated.

Best Regards,

Diane Lints

NAME: Mark Allan

EMAIL: Camelot.racer@icloud.com

ADDRESS: 6188 Caminito Plata San Diego, California 92120

PHONE NUMBER: (619) 997-8158

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 102 Request approval for appropriate signage in support of Dusk to Dawn Curfew at Pasatiempo open space

COMMENTS: Please accept my comments of support of for dusk to dawn curfews at Pasatiempo Open Space in Del Cerro. This has been an ongoing problem for years with drugs and alcohol use of minors from some Patrick Henry High School students, drug dealers, and others doing illicit activities in the residential neighborhood of Del Cerro. With appropriate ordinances and signs prohibiting this behavior, we hope this greatly curtails this nuisance of illegal behavior.

NAME: Steven Behar

EMAIL: stevebehar@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 6254 Caminito Buena Suerte San Diego, California 92120

PHONE NUMBER: N/A

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 15

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 102

COMMENTS: I am writing in support of the Dawn to Dusk Ordinance at the Pasatiempo Open Space. I live a few blocks from this area and have witnessed increasing drug activity in this area over the last few years. At times there are large groups of people, mostly high school age students, using alcohol and cannabis. The groups are noisy and engaging in illegal behavior. Thank you in advance for considering my support of this ordinance.

NAME: Michael Cutri

EMAIL: mcutri@gmail.com

ADDRESS: San Diego, California 92120

PHONE NUMBER: (619) 933-7862

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 102c

COMMENTS: I am writing as a concerned resident of Del Cerro. My family lives near the Del Cerro Park and Open Space ("Open Space") at Pasatiempo Ave. We have serious concerns about the rampant use of drugs and alcohol by visitors to the Open Space, many of which are local high school students and other minors.

Since we have lived in the neighborhood, we have seen Pasatiempo Ave. at the Open Space nearly impassable in evenings due to gathering high school students, with open use of alcohol by minors and dozens of cars leaving the area after the party. Impaired driving is our primary concern.

The Open Space is a regular stop for individuals and groups to use alcohol and legal and illicit drugs after school and work, and on weekends and at night. This use is open and notorious and none appear to be concerned about passersby noticing their activities or asking them to leave. Neighbors have donated trash and recycling bins in hope of containing the trash, to no avail. The Open Space is constantly littered with drug paraphernalia and empty containers of alcohol.

There are many pedestrians in the neighborhood, including children, and it seems likely that one or more of them will be the eventual victim of a dangerous driver after consumption of intoxicants at the Open Space.

I respectfully request that the City of San Diego will undertake measures to curb the use of drugs and alcohol at the Open Space by restricting use after dark and any other available SDPD resources. Thank you for your consideration.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 16

NAME: Eric Wilson

EMAIL: dch.ericwilson@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 6496 Caminito Estrellado San Diego, California 92120

PHONE NUMBER: N/A

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 102a/b: Pasatiempo Open Space Dusk-Dawn (Sunset to Sunrise)
Ordinance and Signage Request

COMMENTS: I've lived in Del Cerro since 2005, and have found it to be an ideal place to settle and raise a family. Unfortunately, that has changed over the last few years with the increasing rates of illegal and dangerous activity happening routinely in the Pasatiempo open space park. The west park has long been known as a place to watch the sunset and enjoy the city view, but the last few years it has routinely become the focal point for illegal drug use and distribution. You cannot walk in the west park any more without encountering broken alcohol bottles, expended vape cartridges, and fire pits. People show up there, get drunk/high, and then get in their cars to drive intoxicated through the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Do I think that the Dusk-to-Dawn ordinance and signage will completely solve all the issues? No, but I firmly believe that it is a good start and will allow the residence who care to partner with the police in curbing the bulk of this activity, which as we know predominately happens in the dark of night. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Eric Wilson

NAME: Robert Henry Hickman

EMAIL: bobhickman66@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 6183 CAPRI DR SAN DIEGO, California 92120

PHONE NUMBER: (619) 318-2294

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 102a and 102b

COMMENTS: Hello, Please seriously consider ratifying items 102a and 102b regarding the Pasatiempo Open Space to mitigate and increasingly dangerous situation in the area. Letters and statements that you have or will receive from other concerned Del Cerro residents will attest to the dangerous activity that occurs there that includes disruptive and dangerous activity such as having open flame barbequing, smoking, dangerously fast, reckless, driving,

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 17

racing and doing burnouts, selling and using drugs, littering that includes broken glass, crowded and obstructive parking and otherwise creating an intimidating situation for families who might walk the area in the evening.

The posting of signs and the restriction of the open space use from dusk to dawn would facilitate the ability of the police to simply have violators move along instead of tying up their limited resources making arrests and writing reports. We generally have very little police coverage in the community at any one time, so they cannot possibly regularly patrol this area enough to deter people from their current activity. If the police can be called upon to easily get violators to clear out without any additional time commitment, there is an improved probability of enhancing the safety in the area.

In summary, the current situation is wrought with hazards in terms of fire and personal safety of all and limits the ability of residents to move about freely about without fear. A dusk to dawn restriction would be an important step in mitigating what has been an unacceptable situation for some time.

Very respectfully,

Bob Hickman
Neighborhood Watch Committee
Friends of Del Cerro

NAME: Tori B Cepak

EMAIL: toribcepak@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 5982 Caminito De La Taza San Diego, California 92120

PHONE NUMBER: (619) 876-0036

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 101 and 102

COMMENTS: Urgent Support Needed: Preserve Pasatiempo Open Space

Dear San Diego City Council Members,

I am writing to urgently request your support for the preservation of Pasatiempo Open Space in District 7 and to address the pressing issues affecting this vital community asset. Pasatiempo Open Space, designated as a Passive Open Space Park in the Navajo Community Plan, holds immense significance for the residents of Del Cerro Heights HOA and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Pasatiempo Open Space is currently facing significant challenges that threaten its integrity as a natural sanctuary and recreational area. The pervasive presence of drug-related activities, illicit substance use, and unsanctioned gatherings not only jeopardize public safety but also degrade the environment and quality of life for nearby residents. Instances of

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 18

broken glass and drug paraphernalia strewn across the area have become distressingly common, creating an atmosphere of discomfort and concern for families seeking to enjoy the tranquility of this space.

To address these urgent concerns and restore Pasatiempo Open Space to its intended purpose as a safe and peaceful natural habitat, I urge the council to take the following actions:

Implementation of Dusk to Dawn Restrictions: Enforce dusk to dawn restrictions to deter unauthorized individuals from loitering in the open space after hours. Empower law enforcement officers and park rangers to intervene and address violations promptly.

Enhanced Enforcement Efforts: Allocate resources for increased police patrols and park ranger surveillance within Pasatiempo Open Space. Authorize officers to issue tickets and make arrests for individuals engaged in illegal activities, including drug use and distribution.

Installation of Deterrent Signage: Erect prominent signs throughout the open space to discourage alcohol and drug consumption, as well as other prohibited behaviors. These signs will serve as a visual deterrent and reinforce the commitment to maintaining a safe environment.

Restoration and Beautification Initiatives: Initiate comprehensive efforts to restore Pasatiempo Open Space to its pristine condition. Remove litter, debris, and hazardous materials such as broken glass and drug paraphernalia. Implement landscaping and habitat restoration projects to enhance the natural beauty of the area.

By taking decisive action to address these issues, the council can ensure that Pasatiempo Open Space remains a cherished resource for the community, fostering a sense of security and well-being for residents and visitors alike. Safeguarding this open space aligns with the city's commitment to environmental stewardship and the preservation of green spaces for future generations to enjoy.

I implore the council to prioritize the preservation and revitalization of Pasatiempo Open Space, recognizing its importance as a valuable asset to the Del Cerro Heights community and the broader San Diego region. Your swift attention and action on this matter are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Tim & Tori Cepak
5982 Caminito De La Taza
San Diego, CA 92120
619-742-5602

NAME: Carolyn Corey

EMAIL: chcorey7@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 6436 Rancho Park San Diego, California 92120

PHONE NUMBER: (619) 286-0578

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 19

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-17

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 102-8

COMMENTS: I am in strong support of closing the Pasatiempo open space from dusk to dawn. This will contain illegal activities and preserve protected species which the city has already spent time and money.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 20

ATTACHMENT – WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

ITEM 103 – Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment Proposal

NAME: Lu Rehling

EMAIL: lurehling@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 3510 Park Boulevard San Diego, California 92103

PHONE NUMBER: (650) 208-8678

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-21

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 103

COMMENTS: Hello, I ask you not to approve the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment to Uptown's Community Plan. Instead, recommend against City Council approval and request that the project return to this board after needed changes are made (to increase parks and recreation, reduce density, or both).

When the Uptown Planners Community Planning Group voted not to approve the city's proposed FPA, it noted that Uptown did not have a recreation center and has a deficit of parks. Hillcrest itself has no park or open space at all, yet the FPA would double its population.

Uptown Planners recommended adding "recreation centers" and "green spaces" that increased density requires, with specific requests to designate "paper streets" as "recreational infill" and plan "for increasing tree canopy and protecting existing mature trees."

Uptown Planners previously had requested that the Planning Department receive feedback from this board before publishing a second draft of the FPA, which the Planning Department did not do.

Uptown is counting on you to ask the city respect you as a board and to respect our needs for parks and recreation facilities.

Thank you for your service to our city.

Lu Rehling

Former member of Uptown Planners and its Plan Hillcrest Committee

NAME: JULI HYDE

EMAIL: jphyde18@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 845 Fort Stockton Dr San Diego, California 92103

PHONE NUMBER: N/A

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 21

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: Item 103.

COMMENTS: I urge the Parks & Rec Board to oppose the Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment. According to SANDAG demographics the current population of all of Uptown is 50,000 residents. Plan Hillcrest proposes to add 35,000 residents to Hillcrest alone. Added density requires improvements to infrastructure for safety services, public utilities, recreation centers, green spaces, and other basic community needs that are not being proposed or adequately considered in this Plan.

Uptown already has a deficit of parks and other public facilities and Hillcrest is the only one of the six neighborhoods in Uptown without a park or open space of any kind. Yet, the draft Plan does not provide for this while seeking to increase the population in Uptown by 70%. There must be a plan for parks and other substantially sized public spaces (outside of existing canyons), including playgrounds, potential joint use opportunities, recreational centers, playing fields, etc. as well as a plan for increasing tree canopy and protecting existing mature trees.

It is essential that the Plan provide for parks and public facilities, at the outset, prior to approval, as it will not/cannot happen after the fact once the developers begin building massive high-density projects. Failure to provide for parks and other public facilities in the plan will have a significant negative impact on the well-being of everyone in Uptown, especially its most vulnerable citizens.

I urge the Board to say NO, oppose the Plan and require the needed parks and recreation areas.

NAME: Tom Mullaney

EMAIL: UptownUnited3@gmail.com

ADDRESS: N/A

PHONE NUMBER: 619-889-5636

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: Item 103.

COMMENTS: The draft Hillcrest/ Uptown Community Plan Amendment project is highly flawed. The Parks and Recreation Board should recommend to the City Council that it not be approved.

A. PREVIOUS COMMUNITY PLANS were approved improperly

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 22

It's important for the Parks and Rec Board members to realize: The Planning Department repeatedly hides important information from decision makers.

1. The Kearny Mesa draft community plan contained a Recreation Element which was based on the newly devised "points system". The Planning Department wanted to rush through the approval of the Kearny Mesa plan. They presented the plan to the City Council and got the plan approved, without telling councilmembers that it wasn't ready, that the Recreation Element was built on a new system which hadn't been approved yet.

2. The Mira Mesa Community Plan was brought to the Parks and Rec Board on Oct. 22, 2022. This was the first community to be replanned under the new Parks Master Plan.

The planning group chair, Jeff Stevens, explained that the Recreation element was short 3000 points. (That would be enough Recreation Value for 30,000 residents!) He presented 13 specific recommendations for fixing the plan, including the elimination of the Park Value deficit.

Board member Mr. Rene Smith wrote a comment letter questioning the draft Community Plan. He wrote:

"This being the first CPU through the gate of the new PMP, I think we should ask that at the worst, the recreation values cannot be negative. To me, to accept this plan means that we accept that we can never be more than we are today. Plans should set our sights higher, I believe."

To their credit, Parks and Rec Board did listen to the Planning Group chair. They agreed with Mr. Smith not to set a precedent for huge park deficiencies. They accepted the 13 recommendations from the Planning Group and agreed that they should be included in the plan.

MINUTES of Parks and Rec Board meeting, 10/20/22.

The approved motion was "to approve the staff recommendation with a condition to incorporate the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group (CPG) recommendations for the Mira Mesa Community Plan Update."

STAFF REPORT to City Council dated 11/8/22.

Park & Recreation Board Recommendation: On October 20, 2022, the Park & Recreation Board voted (6-0-1) to recommend approval of the Mira Mesa Community Plan Update and to consider incorporation of the parks and recreation-related recommendations proposed by the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group.

City Council, December 5, 2022. They approved the plan with the 3000 point park deficit, having never seen the real recommendation from the Parks and Recreation Board.

I urge the current Parks and Recreation Board not to let that happen again— not to "approve with conditions", because that will get misrepresented, but to disapprove any bad plans, and not give an approval until the plans are amended.

B. PROMOTION, NOT PLANNING

The above two incidents reinforced the impression belief that the current Planning Department does not engage in professional urban planning. Instead, they are given direction from the Mayor’s administrators about a new program that is desired. Then they adjust the facts to fit that goal, and work to get the program approved. When problems are unearthed by others, the Planning officials invent figures, oppose viable alternatives, establish artificial deadlines, and push for program approval. It is promotion, not planning.

C. EXCESSIVE DENSITY

When creating a park plan, the proposed housing capacity and population cannot be ignored, because the park needs are determined from the planned population. An unrealistic number of housing units and population will lead to unrealistic park plans.

The following information is taken from the May 7 letter from Uptown United to the Uptown Planners group. (available on request)

1. The 2016 Uptown Community Plan contained allowable capacity for more than 50% growth. That was a 70 year supply. There is no need for a new community plan, and no urgency.
2. The proposed density categories and overall development authorized by the draft plan is excessive in many ways. First of all, we can review the figures.

Proposed Plan, March 2024

	Draft Plan, from 2020 Census (Existing)	Draft plan, (Future buildout projection)	Increase	Percent Increase
Housing units	23,800	52,800	29,000	122%. Over double the existing.
Population	39,000	109,800	79,800	181%. Almost triple the existing.

3. This plan is not to “add 17,000 housing units” as stated by the city staff.

It would re-authorize 11,000 already allowed by the 2016 plan (but not yet built) plus 17,000 additional units, equals about 28,000 or 29,000 more units. (rounding)

How can you measure the amount of excess?

***The plan being proposed would more than double the existing number of housing units in Uptown.**

***The projected buildout population of 109,800 is more than the entire City of El Cajon. (105,000)**

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – DRAFT

Page 24

***The projected buildout is equivalent to 5 times the current population of the City of Coronado. (22,000)**

***The planned increase in population, 79,800, is about equal to two downtowns. (42,000 in downtown now)**

If this board were doing a community plan for two new downtowns, wouldn't that warrant an extensive review?

D. COMPARISON OF PLAN TO FORECAST

1. Recent forecasts from the California Department of Finance and SANDAG predict slow growth in the state and San Diego region until 2040, then a declining population. These forecasts are not speculative. The large cohort of Baby Boomers is ageing. Later generations are smaller in number, and have lower birth rates.

2. Between 2022 and 2050, the City of San Diego is expected to add just 65,345 in population, a growth rate of only 0.17% per year.

3. As one last measure of lunacy:

***The projected increase in population at buildout, 79,800 additional residents, is more than the forecast increase for the entire city! (65,345)**

E. UNREALISTIC PARK REQUIREMENTS

An unrealistic number of housing units and population in the community plan will lead to unrealistic park requirements which can't be met. Rational planning requires that the plan be based on update forecast figures.

F. EXCESSIVE ALLOWABLE DENSITY: HARMFUL to PARK PLANNING

It is apparent that the number of units and allowable population targets in the plan are completely unrealistic, and will never happen. What's the harm in planning for more than will be built? Here are two consequences of excessive allowable density (unnecessary upzoning) which relate to park planning.

***Inability for the city to plan infrastructure, including parks.**

***The massive upzoning which is proposed will increase land values, and make it nearly impossible for the City to acquire some targeted parcels. For example the Rite Aid site at 5th Ave and Robinson is seen as an ideal site for a park.**

The draft Hillcrest/ Uptown plan would increase the allowable density on that block from 109 du/ac (about 10 stories) to 218 du/ac (about 20 stories).

How can the city buy land for parks after doubling the allowable density?

G. GROSS ERRORS in the DRAFT UPTOWN PLAN and STAFF REPORT

The Hillcrest/ Uptown plan cannot be approved at this time because it contains serious errors.

1. In 2022 the Planning staff was displaying a slide which stated that the Uptown population increased from 39,000 to 49,000 in just a few years.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 25

It didn't pass the reasonableness test. 10,000 more people would be equivalent to 100 more apartment buildings, each holding 100 residents. We know that Uptown did not get 100 new apartment buildings in a few years.

The staff was informed that that this was a mistake, and they should correct it. They continued to use it.

2. See page IN-11 of the revised Uptown plan. The figure for existing population has been corrected, from 50,600 to 39,000.

3. The Recreation Element was not corrected. See the table on page RE-185. The population figure of 50,593 is wrong, and the Recreation Value Points Goal (1/10 the population) is also wrong.

4. This mistake was duplicated in the Staff Report for the Parks and Rec meeting, and the slide presentation.

The figures should be corrected in the Draft Plan and the Staff Report, and the plan brought back to the Parks and Rec Board.

H. INSUFFICIENT PARKS PLANNED.

The draft plan and the staff report show a serious deficit in current and planned parks.

Recreation Value Points Goal 10,980

Current + Planned Recreation Value Points Total 4,293 (39%)

DEFICIT (calculated) 6,687 (61%)

The draft plan contains only 39% of the points needed to serve the planned population. The plan is 61% park deficient. The deficiency of 6,687 is equivalent to 66,000 people having NO park and rec facilities. This cannot be allowed.

I. SOLUTIONS

There are some straightforward solutions to this mess.

1. Fix the errors. The mistake described in section G above need to be corrected.
2. Scale back the plan. Based on the latest forecasts from the California Dept. of Finance and SANDAG, the Hillcrest/ Uptown plan should be revised – to contain realistic densities and buildout capacity.
3. Plan the needed parks and rec facilities which can now be realistically planned and provided.
4. Charge adequate impact fees. Acquire land where needed.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 26

Uptown United, page 6

J. CONCLUSION

The Hillcrest plan needs correct figures, a scaled-back plan, and more parks.

That will create a balance between the park facilities and the number of residents. One indication of a balance will be indicated by meeting the standard in the Parks Master Plan of 100 RV Points per 1000 population.

For the Hillcrest plan, we ask this from the Parks and Rec Board:

1. To recommend that the City Council not approve the proposed plans until the following are completed:

a. The population figures and Point Goal figures are corrected.

b. The overall density and buildout of the plan are scaled-back to correspond to recent forecasts. This will result in a level for which adequate parks can be provided, and PMP requirements met.

c. Identify additional parks and recreation facilities in the plan.

2. We also urge the Board to request that the plan be brought back after needed revisions are made.

Thomas G. Mullaney

Executive Director

Uptown United

UptownUnited3@gmail.com

619-889-5636

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – DRAFT

Page 27

ATTACHMENT – WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

ITEM 104 –University Community Plan Amendment Proposal

NAME: Bonnie Lou Kutch

EMAIL: bkutch@kutchco.com

ADDRESS: 3541 Stetson Avenue San Diego, California 92122

PHONE NUMBER: (619) 299-1010

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: Item 104

COMMENTS: Under the direction of Mayor Gloria, the San Diego Planning Department wants to add more than 65,000 people to University City on top of the existing 64,000 residents, without adding adequate park space and enough recreation centers to meet the physical needs and support the mental wellbeing of its residents.

I am deeply concerned about the large parks deficit proposed in the revised UC Plan Update. Even with roughly 3,350 recreational value points attributed to urban public space requirements for residential redevelopment, the plan proposes a final recreational points deficit of 4,100 – a shortage of facilities for 41,000 people. This means that roughly two-thirds of UC's population would suffer from a shortage of outdoor space and recreation.

The City's revised University CPU proposes only two new park areas, both of which are far away from residential areas and unusable for normal recreational activities such as soccer and baseball. The plan discusses ways that will be sought to create "more places to walk, bike, play and interact with each other," but it doesn't provide sound solutions to accommodate sports nor come close to improving UC's current park deficit.

University City's proposed population increase also warrants at least 2.8 more recreation centers. However, the City has only proposed there be one new recreation center by converting the Scripps Shiley Center, which sits on city-leased land. This proposed new site is unacceptable since it's located in La Jolla along Torrey Pines Road, too far from any UC residential neighborhoods and the very residents it's supposed to serve.

Studies have shown time and again that people need wide-open park space and plentiful recreational opportunities in order to maintain their physical health and wellbeing. University City has always served as an ideal place for families to raise their children. To deprive residents of adequate parks and recreation centers would have extreme detrimental impacts on UC's population, particularly our youth. For the City to ignore this important fact represents exceptionally poor planning.

Either more parks and recreation centers need to be added to the UC Plan Update, or the City must dramatically scale back its high-density plan to a level that can be supported by an adequate parks and recreation system.

NAME: Henrietta Parnell

EMAIL: henriettapt@gmail.com

ADDRESS: San Diego, California 92122

PHONE NUMBER: N/A

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 104

COMMENTS: University city parks are already small, and lack trees and shade. Adding to the population (aiming to double the population) without provision of parks and recreation centers within walking distance of these areas is completely farcical, given that the supposed purpose of expansion in University City is to enable a walkable, livable, environment. The proposal to develop a recreation center to serve University City that isn't even within the main neighborhood (located in La Jolla) is laughable, and makes it ever more blatant that the residential construction and expansion is for monetary purposes, without thought for the livability of existing and future residents.

The neighborhood (north and south) is already fast becoming an overheated, concrete jungle, this needs to be reversed (walk on Regents/Nobel and it's hot and bright and crowded). The proposed developments continuously cite walkability as a reason to develop, but to not provide walkable provisions to parks or shady spaces.

Please insist on provisions to develop adequate green spaces (with meaningful trees and shade), and recreation centers to serve the community. I request a minimum of one park in the north and one in the south, and a recreation center that is located IN the heart of University City.

NAME: Tom Cartier

EMAIL: tomcartier@gmail.com

ADDRESS: N/A

PHONE NUMBER: 858.888.0265

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 104

COMMENTS: The San Diego Planning Department wants to add more than 65,000 people to University City on top of the existing 64,000 residents. There is not currently enough adequate park space nor enough recreation centers to meet the recreational needs and support the University City Community.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 29

The proposed University Community Plan (UCP) update does not meet the minimum standards of the current city of San Diego Park Master plan guidelines. The UCP allows 65,000 additional residents. The proposed additional recreational parkland UCP does not meet the minimum requirements in the city of San Diego Park Master Plan. The UCP plan proposes a final recreational points deficit of 4,100 Master Plan points equating to a shortage for 41,000 people. Additional land must be dedicated for recreational activities to comply with the minimum requirements of the city Park and recreation master plan.

The City's revised University UCP proposes only two new park areas, both of which are far away from residential areas and unusable for normal recreational activities such as soccer and Little League baseball. University City's proposed population increase also warrants at least 2.8 more recreation centers. However, the City has only proposed only one new recreation center by converting the Scripps Shiley Center, however the area does not have many residential units. If converted as planned, the recreational activities will be an island in the vast area of commercial space.

Either add more recreational acreage and add additional park and recreation centers in the UC Plan Update, or drastically reduce the high-density plan.

NAME: Louis Rodolico

EMAIL: lourodolico@yahoo.com

ADDRESS: N/A

PHONE NUMBER: N/A

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 104

COMMENTS: Avia Senior Apartments east of Gulfstrand represent a substantial increase in density in South UC. The golf course associated with it was human recreational space but it has been redesignated as "Open Space" which is now closed off for humans. This represents a net reduction in public recreational space along with an increase in population density. Cities are areas designated for human habitat but planning seems to prefer adding density and at the same time subtracting recreational space in order to add wildland. In my opinion the city continues to fear the Crossroads Arsonists, who remain at large.

Link to Crossroads Fire, the largest eco-terrorist act in the US, right here in UC:

<https://www.10news.com/news/fbi-offering-reward-for-capture-of-eco-terrorists-behind-2003-san-diego-fires>

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 30

NAME: Chris Nielsen

EMAIL: cn@adsc-xray.com

ADDRESS: 4225 Caminito Cassis San Diego, California 92122

PHONE NUMBER: (858) 663-0186

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Parks & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE: 2024-05-16

COMMENT TYPE: Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 104

COMMENTS: The University Community Planning Group submits the following comment on Parks recommendations for the University Community. The first page and a half of the comment provides overall context and rationale for the detailed recommendations for university Parks and Rec that follow.

Sincerely,

Chris Nielsen

UCPG Chair

Report and Recommendations of the University Community Planning Group on the Draft University Community Plan – Parks and Recreation.

Submitted to the Parks and Recreation Board as a written comment May 16, 2024, for its meeting Agenda Item #104, May 17, 2024.

VII. UCPG Recommendations: Parks and Recreation

The UCPG is deeply concerned with the very large **recreational value or “parks points” deficit. Based on staff corrections to the D-UCP reported to UCPG, 4-9-2024**, deficit is projected to be ~4,100 points at build out, which represents park facilities for ~41,000 people.

The published (uncorrected) deficit in the Draft UCP is 5,592 points, which represents park facilities for ~56,000 people. (Table 7, p 213).

The UCPG is equally concerned with the **proposed deficit in Recreation Centers and Aquatic Centers**, estimated at a shortage of ~2.2 (**corrected based on staff report to UCPG, 4-9-24**) recreation centers and 0.59 aquatic centers short at build out.

In reality, the deficit in Recreation and Aquatic facilities is larger than reported:

- The new Aquatic Complex at Standley Park is a joint use facility that is not accessible to the public during school hours for most of the year.
- The Recreation and Aquatic Center at the proposed “Torrey Pines Neighborhood Park,” while welcome, is contingent upon non-renewal of a current lease, which is not up for renewal until 2043.
- Thus, the D-UCP offers no potential for improvement in the Recreation and Aquatic Center deficit for at least two decades into the life of the new community plan.

In sum, the D-UCP does not meet the Parks Master Plan guidelines for recreational values, and it does not meet its own stated goal to:

“Increase recreational value by keeping pace with population growth through additional investments in existing parks, acquisition of additional available land for parks, and the additional new parks and public spaces as part of new private development projects.” (D-UCP, p121)

The Revised Draft of the UC Plan must **address and reduce these deficits and prepare plans for providing the Park and Recreation infrastructure** necessary to serve a growing population and required by city policy (*Parks Master Plan*, 2021).

The Revised Draft should show plans for achieving the *Parks Master Plan* standard for University Community.

The **Final University Community** Plan needs a better balance between new growth and supporting Parks and Recreation infrastructure.

The projected **“park points” deficit is a red flag that the Draft-UCP land use scenario is overbuilt.**

The Community **Planning Group Input Land Use Scenario (Discussion Draft, Appendix)** does a better job.

UCPG Recommendations:

A. Account for Recreational Value Fully and Transparently.

Thank you for responding to the recommendations of the UCPG to review and rescore recreational values in the University Community.

The resulting Draft-UCP offers a more reliable basis for evaluating Parks and Recreation planning than the Discussion Draft.

Nonetheless, the D-UCP still includes several instances of potentially missing or miscounted points, including existing city park facilities, and joint use parks. (e.g., Torrey Pines City Park, and Weiss Park – Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center.

Regrettably, the total of new recreational points proposed in the D-UCP is LESS THAN the points planned in the Discussion Draft. The D-UCP projects 5,229 additional points (compared to 6,052 points in the Discussion Draft), a reduction of ~856 points (or parks for 8,500 people).

The D-UCP eliminates a category of Recreational Value points projected for residential and mixed-use developments on sites under 2 acres. In the Discussion Draft ~300 points were expected from such developments (see Disc Draft, Table 5, p 136 and D-UCP, Table 7, p 212).

In addition, the D-UCP’s cumulative total for “Total Recreation Value Points Community-Wide” does not appear to be accurate. The total reported at the end of Table 7 on p 213 (5,229.375) is not consistent with the sum of “Proposed Recreational Park Values” (5,196.125) reported for planned facilities listed in Table 7, lines 6–36, pp. 206–213. 1

¹ The sum of “Proposed Recreational Park Values” for listed facilities in lines 6 through 36 of Table 7 is 5,196.125, compared to the reported “Total Recreation Value Points Community-Wide” of 5,229.375. The breakdown of park values for new park and recreational facilities

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – DRAFT

Page 32

(lines #6–35) is 1,845.125. Adding 3,351 for CPIOZ urban public spaces in residential/mixed use developments (line #36) = 5,196.125.

Recommendations:

Please incorporate UCPG recommendations:

- **p. 213. Check and Correct “Total Recreational Value Points Community Wide,” (Table 7 on p 213) to ensure that the tally matches the sum of points listed for individual facilities in “Proposed Recreational Park Values” (p. 206–213).**

- **Incorporate UCPG recommendations for Specific Park and Recreation Facilities listed in Section H – discussion of Table 7 – below.**

- **Make recreational value scoring sheets for specific parks publicly available so that community members can check that work and contribute.**

- **Correct population figures on p 133: “Existing and Projected Recreational Value Points.” Ensure consistency btw p 46 and 133.**

“The University Community could attain a projected population estimated at 129,566 people. The community should have access to enjoyable parks, recreational centers, and aquatic complexes as...” (133)

B. Include plans for Recreation and Aquatic Centers to meet PMP standards.

See Table 7, p. 206, and Policies 4.1 F, p 176.

Specific Recommendations:

Add to Table 5, p 129, Table 7, p. 206, Recreation and Aquatic Center at JCC–Mandel Weiss–Eastgate Park.

Modify Policy 4.1 F, p. 180 176. “Preserve, expand, and enhance existing recreation centers and aquatic facilities to increase their life span. *Meet Park Master Plan guidelines for recreation and aquatic facilities to serve the University Community.*”

Add Policy 4.1 F1, p 180 176. *Assure public access to recreation and aquatic center facilities of the Lawrence Family JCC in Weiss Eastgate Park.*

Add Policy 4.1 F2, p 176. *Meet Park Master Plan guidelines for recreation and aquatic facilities to serve the University Community.*

C. Clarify and Strengthen Policies for Urban Public Spaces.

Thank you for responding to the recommendations of the UCPG to consolidate and clarify guidelines for Urban Public Spaces.

Additional revisions will help to clarify and complete this progress.

Outstanding issues:

a) Unfortunately, the new SDR’s eliminate explicit requirements for urban public spaces in Residential and Mixed–Use Developments. This is a change from the Discussion Draft that should be reversed.

- **Please restore a statement about requirements for Public Spaces and Recreational Values in Residential and Mixed-Use Developments.** This statement should be added here in SDRs (or at minimum somewhere else in the plan, with a reference included in this section).

- **The Final Plan should include policy/SDR to implement the statement that “new parks and park amenities will be required of new developments”** (p 129)

b) The order and organization of SDR’s A.1-5 (p 187-93) prioritize secondary information while burying the primary instructions about the required size of public spaces

c) Cost and value of “Amenities” listed in Table 2, “Public Space Amenity Types,” p 188 are not equivalent. This may incentivize the over-provision of low cost and low-value amenities.

Specific Recommendations:

- **The D-UCP should clearly and explicitly state the requirements for Recreational Value in public spaces provided for Residential and Mixed-Use developments.**

- **Please restore SDR 1.K (Discussion Draft, p 191) to new section SDR A.1 clarifying how Residential and Mixed-Use Developments will satisfy the requirement for public spaces and recreational values.**

Add/Restore: SDR A.1.x Recreation Value Points. *All new residential or residential mixed-use development shall satisfy Recreation Value Points as part of the development of the urban public space that meet the standards identified in the Parks Master Plan.* (SDR 1.K, Discussion Draft, p 191)

- **Please revise the order and logic of the content of SDRs A.1, “Required Public Spaces,” and SDR-A.2, “Required Public Spaces Regulations.”**

- **SDR A.1 should first identify the urban public space requirement.**

- **SDR A.2 should follow with guidelines for the amenities that may be required in the spaces provided by developments of different sizes.**

Currently this order and logic is reversed.

- **In addition, new SDR A.1 should begin with the public space requirements for developments of different sizes. Currently this info is buried in SDR A.2, section 3:**

3 Size. A minimum of 5 percent of the premises or 5 percent of the gross floor area of the development, whichever is greater, shall be provided as public space. The maximum amount of public space required shall not exceed more than 15 percent of the premises.” (p.192)

Steps to resolve:

- **Please renumber SDR A.2 as SDR A.1 and move it to the beginning of the SDR’s**

- **Please renumber current SDR A.2, section 3, as SDR A.1, section 1.**

- **Please renumber current SDR A.1 as SDR A.2 and move it to second position in the list of SDRs.**

- **Please ensure that “Amenities” listed in Table 2, p 188 are roughly equivalent in cost and value.**

- Delete “free library stands” from list of “Placemaking” elements in Table 2, Public Space Amenity Types.

“Placemaking Elements 3, 4 A minimum of two (2) placemaking elements such as decorative lighting, interactive art, interactive playscape, climbing walls, elements of historical or cultural relevance, community activation elements/games, gathering areas, multifunctional “centerpiece” furniture, or similar.”

- Justification: Selected amenities should be relatively equal in cost and impact to assure the greatest value and variation in future urban public spaces. The public space requirement should not incentivize and over-supply of very inexpensive “amenities” such as “free library stands” in exchange for more expensive and more substantial features offered in Table 2.

Alternative Views on the UCPU Subcommittee: The CPIOZ and SDR requirements for urban public spaces are too detailed and rigid and don’t belong in a planning document. E.g., for one specific large life sciences campus, these could require as much as 8.5 acres of public space at private expense in the middle of an R&D campus.

Clarification: SDR-1 limits urban public space requirements to 10 percent of square footage or 100,000 sf, whichever is smaller. Many firms try to accommodate public access, but this is not feasible everywhere. Some restrictions are necessary – e.g., after hours and to meet tenant requirements for privacy and security. Recommend better balance between reasonable public access with needs of life science and R&D tenants.

Thank you for incorporating the concerns of property owners and balancing them with the needs of public access.

Point of clarification: the Discussion Draft provided for a maximum of 100,000 sf (2.3 acres) of urban public spaces for all new developments. It did not specify where in a project those requirements must be met.

D. Neighborhood Scale Parks

Thank you for incorporating the recommendation of the UCPG for new Neighborhood and “Neighborhood-Scale” Parks.

The UCPG recommends that the Revised Plan include plans for new **“Neighborhood-Scale” Parks** to serve the needs of new and existing residents – not just mini parks and “5Ps”.

Thank you for the creative proposal for a Torrey Pines Neighborhood Park (pps 125, 208).

The site has potential, including for co-existence of park and hospital uses as well as incorporation of adjoining space in Torrey Pines City Park.

Unfortunately, the proposal is contingent on non-renewal of a lease that runs until 2043 for a valuable community amenity (hospital). This proposal cannot address the dearth of Recreational Values or Neighborhood and Neighborhood Scale Parks until at least two decades into the life of the plan.

More effort is needed in this category.

SDR A.1-5 supporting Urban Public Spaces for commercial developments is a creative approach, which the UCPG supports; however, “parks” of 1,250-3,000 sf (see pages 189-191 of the **Draft-UCP**) will not meet the future recreation needs of a UC community twice its

current size. The **Final** UC Plan must undertake the more challenging effort to ensure that **Neighborhood-Scale Park Facilities** are in our plan.

Recommendation:

- **Include plans to create new Neighborhood Parks** (PMP >3 ac). Parks “large enough to kick a ball, throw a frisbee, and let a three-year-old run to her heart’s content.”
- **Include plans to create new “Neighborhood-Scale” Parks (1-3 ac)**. Parks large enough for unstructured play, picnics, games, etc.
- Consider and include a strategy for *scaling Urban Public Space requirements to the size of development* to ensure that **Neighborhood Parks and Neighborhood-Scale Parks** are built *in the places* where growth is occurring.
- **Consider new SDR A.2 F (p.192)** to include guidelines for residential/mixed use development of greater than X acres to provide **Neighborhood-Scale Park facilities (1-3 ac)** scaled to the size of the parcel.

E. Land Acquisition

The UC Plan should explain clearly how it will **meet the Parks Master Plan for land acquisition and land area**.

Note: The *PMP*, Appendix D, p. 19 states that “At least 20% (or 20 points per 1,000 residents) of a community’s park standard shall be satisfied through increased land acquisition.” The *PMP* indicates that this score as part of total recreational value will be “calculated and used during the community plan update process.” (*PMP*, Appendix D, p 19).

The operative word is “**shall**.”

However, the *PMP* is unclear about how this policy will be fulfilled. The Discussion Draft includes no discussion of how this mandate will be achieved.

As the **largest** plan update to approach completion since approval of the *PMP*, the **Final** UC Plan should lay out very clearly how the city will meet this mandate. This is an answer the city must have, and the UC Plan is the place to apply it.

Specific Recommendations:

- **p. 137 206-13, Table 7 Existing and Planned Parks and Recreation Facilities**

Inventory – Include Land Area for future parks

The UC Plan should explain clearly how this standard will be applied to UC (and to community plan updates in general).

- **p. 212-13, Table 7 Existing and Planned Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory** Should clearly state how many acres of land acquisition will be required to meet the city’s points standard (and where these are planned).

- Note: fast math suggests as much as **296 additional new acres** of park space will be required to meet the *PMP* mandate (**based on corrected population announced 4-9-24**):

The PMP would require ~ 370 total acres of park land in the UC Plan Area at build out (that is, 12,956 points needed x 20% of rec value points at ~7 points per acre). Subtracting the

current 74.6 acres of community park (UC Community Atlas, 58) equals approximately 296 additional acres to meet the PMP standard.

– The **Final UC Plan** should include this information and show clearly how the Plan and its proposed policies/SDR's will meet (or not meet) this standard. (Table 7, pp. 206–213)

F. Funding and Implementation Mechanism for Parks

The UCPG appreciates the creative effort to design SDR_{A1-5} (p 187–93) for Urban Public Spaces; however, as noted, even with this effort, the Draft does not come close to meeting the required recreational values mandated by the *Parks Master Plan*. It cannot meet the land acquisition mandate. It cannot meet the requirement for Recreation Centers *or Aquatic Facilities*.

The UCPG recommends that the city develop additional strategies to build and finance future park and recreation infrastructure.

Specific Recommendations:

- Consider a **supplemental funding mechanism** such as Supplemental Development Impact fees (“Future Opportunities Fund”) for Parks in UC (see section X below).
- Consider a **revised or expanded SDR-1 A.F and G** to scale park facilities to the size of development with the goal of providing **Neighborhood (>3 ac)** and **Neighborhood-Scale Park (1–3ac)** facilities in developments of sufficient size (see above).
- Consider **other means to finance and support park development** to meet *PMP* standards.

G. Prioritize preserving unstructured, open green areas in current and future parks.

The UCPG recognizes many comments and concerns over the need for unstructured open green areas and play fields in our local parks.

– The UCPG recommends that the Plan **prioritize unstructured, open green areas and play fields** in current and future parks.

H. Specific Park Recommendations: RE Table 5: Park Inventory

– pp. 206–210: **Community Parks, Pocket Parks, Trailheads and Plazas**

Column 4: Rows 6–24:

– **Replace “Recommendations”** for proposed parks in lines 6–32. Clarify that future park design will coordinate with the community. Note, many items have been on the unfunded list for years.

Substitute the following process statement for current lists of amenities:

“Work with the community to In coordination with UC Parks and Recreation Council, determine items needed and desired to be added to the park. Include on that list for consideration items on the city’s Parks Unfunded Improvements list.”

– p. 212 – #34– **Torrey Pines City Park**

– **Update Project Description** – Many current facilities appear to be missing – include existing facilities – overlooks, trails, beach, picnic tables, cafe, deck, etc.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 37

- **Fully score existing park facilities** to ensure that recreational value tallies are accurate for current and existing points

Thank you for incorporating UCPG recommendation to include direction to implement the Torrey Pines City Park GDP.

Thank you for responding to UCPG recommendation to review and confirm status of community Shorelines:

- **Please Add and Score – Old Route 101 Trail**

3,800 LF of paved, publicly accessible walking/cycling path on City of San Diego land. The pathway runs from Torrey Pines Lodge/Callan Rd to South Fork Trailhead, Torrey Pines State Reserve on the west side of North Torrey Pines Road

- **p. 208 – #13 Mandell Weiss Eastgate Neighborhood Park:**

Thank you for responding to recommendations of the UCPG to confirm and clarify the status of public park facilities at Weiss/Eastgate Park and Lawrence Family JCC:

Unfortunately, the finding is that these recreational facilities on city land designated as Weiss-Eastgate Park do not meet PMP standards for public access.

- **Clarify the intention that Weiss Park/JCC facilities are public⁴**

⁴ The 1981 lease between the city and JCC includes the expectation that the property “*shall be developed, operated, and maintained as a public community center for park, recreational, cultural, and educational activities for the benefit of the citizens of San Diego.*” (Source: https://docs.sandiego.gov/council_reso_ordinance/rao1981/R-254702.pdf). The 1987 UC Plan includes Eastgate Park among population-based parks, “*as a privately operated park and community recreation center open to the general public*” 229.

Like the lease related to the proposed Torrey Pines Neighborhood Park, this lease will expire before the term of the Community Plan.

The Final UC Plan should include plans that include public access to these recreational facilities in a city park.

Specific Recommendations:

Please Incorporate recommendations listed in Part B (above) – Recreation and Aquatic Centers:

Add to Table 5, p 129, Table 7, p. 206, Recreation and Aquatic Center at JCC–Mandel Weiss–Eastgate Park.

Modify Policy 4.1 F, p. 180 176. “Preserve, expand and enhance existing recreation centers and aquatic facilities to increase their life span. *Meet Park Master Plan guidelines for recreation and aquatic facilities to serve the University Community.*”

Add Policy 4.1 F1, p 180 176. *Assure public access to recreation and aquatic center facilities of the Lawrence Family JCC in Weiss Eastgate Park.*

Add Policy 4.1 F2, p 176. *Meet Park Master Plan guidelines for recreation and aquatic facilities to serve the University Community.*

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 38

– p.208, line 13

Confirm and Re-Score Mandell Weiss Park

(“Existing Park Value”) *including JCC facilities.*

Facilities listed in website include recreation center, fitness gym, tennis center and courts, theater, and aquatic center.

Table 7, line 13, column 4, includes outdoor amphitheater. JCC website lists: “an outdoor amphitheater”

Thank you for incorporating UCPG recommendation to modify Project Description, to read “The park includes the facilities of the Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center”:

– p 208, **Change the acreage to 10.49 acres** in column “Existing Size”

– **Limit hardscape and development in open areas of Weiss Park.** The open outdoor area of Weiss Park is very well used. It is crowded with limited

Space for play fields.

– **Universal change - Replace column 4 recommendation:**

“Work with the JCC and the Community to determine needs and priorities.”

– **Add policy 4.1 F1**

“Assure public access to recreation and aquatic center facilities

of the Lawrence Family JCC in Weiss Eastgate Park.”

– Consider adding the **recommendation to explore potential for expanding Weiss Park in the future** through purchase or agreement with adjoining property owners. Note: utility property at NE corner of Regents Rd/Executive Dr. may not be needed for present purposes in the future. It would represent an opportunity for the city to expand park space in a critical location.

– **p. 130 208 – Future Neighborhood Park Opportunities**

– Town Park Villas Golf Course:

Consider potential for future **Neighborhood Park** at former golf course through acquisition or joint use agreement. Vet with community.

– La Jolla Village Square/Nobel Campus Area in general:

Consider recommendation for a Neighborhood Scale Park at/in vicinity of La Jolla Village Square.

– **p. 208, #15-16 – Linear Parks at Regents Road North/South**

– The UCPG, UCPU Subcommittee and community strongly support these Linear Parks.

The UCPG has the following recommendations to meet its expectations for these important community spaces.

Unfortunately, support for these Parks appears to have eroded in the D-UCP. Expanding use of the term “greenways” to describe Linear Parks suggests a retreat of city support for this community goal.

Recommendations:

Please incorporate the recommendations of the UCPG:

- **Add policy language** that they will be developed *as Parks* and **managed** as such by the Park and Recreation Department.

- **Confirm transfer and management by Parks and Recreation Department** (not Transportation and Storm Water).

Thank you for incorporating UCPG recommendation to:

- Correct Photos** on p. 122–24

Please incorporate UCPG recommendation to identify these facilities as Linear Parks.

- **Modify language, p. 126:**

Please use “Linear Parks” (versus “greenway”) to clarify the city’s intention that these will be *PARKS*, planned, managed and maintained by Parks and Recreation Dept, and *not STREETS* managed and maintained by TSW.

“These three green-way *Linear Park* projects could provide fitness circuit nature exploration playgrounds, educational signage, pedestrian and bike paths for families and children as well as providing scenic overlooks into the canyon while maintaining and improving existing trails, *habitat conservation* and maintenance access. They also provide an excellent opportunity to educate the public on the native plants and animals that need the canyon to thrive and survive.” (p 126)

Note: If there is anything the community or UCPG need to do to ensure that the Linear Parks will be managed *as parks* by Parks and Recreation Dept, please let us know now.

Thank you for maintaining the incorporating UCPG recommendation to utilize unused rights of way for linear parks and other public spaces.

- **Modify Policy 3.1 H (p 173) for clarity:** “Pursue opportunities for the conversion of underutilized right-of-way (e.g., areas adjacent to roadways, and paper streets) into exclusive pedestrian ways, multi-use paths, linear parks, or other public spaces that encourage outdoor activity and expand urban greening space. Areas of particular interest within the University Community include Governor Drive terminus west of Stresemann Street, Regents Road terminus south of Porte de Merano, and the *unused right of way of* Regents Road between Governor Drive and the Rose Canyon Trailhead.”

- **Modify Policy 4.1 G (p 176) to include street as well as alley ROWs.**

“Increase recreational opportunities by acquiring and developing land through road/parking “diets” and **street and alley** rights-of-way vacations, where appropriate, to provide for park and recreation uses.” (p 176)

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – DRAFT

Page 40

Thank you for incorporating UCPG recommendation to delete erroneous reference to linear park on Campus Point Drive.

- **p. 132 210, #19 Eastgate Mini-Park 2,**
- **Include potential to expand Eastgate Mini Park 2** on Towne Center Drive. Please implement concept presented to Subcommittee, May 17, 2022, including potential vernal pool restoration, elevated walkway, public access, and outdoor education space at Mini-Park 2.
- **Explore potential joint use agreement** with adjoining owner of this former building pad, which contains a natural vernal pool and tremendous potential for restoration, education, and stewardship.
- **Correct Project Description for accuracy, Table 7, p 210**

There are no picnic tables. The “multi-use pathways” are disconnected sidewalk. Concrete edging serves as “seating.”

(Source: Planning Department Presentation, CPUS Meeting, May 17, 2022)

- **p. 210: # 20: Governor Drive Linear Park**
- Revise language -
- Identify as a “Linear Park”
- Delete “Greenway”
- Clarify, location
- Confirm transfer and management by Parks and Recreation Dept.
- Update description: *Governor Drive Linear Park*

“Existing rights-of-way *at the west end of Governor Drive* south of the Rose Canyon is planned to be converted into a **linear park under management by Parks and Recreation Department between Stresemann Street and** at the entrance to the Coastal Sage Habitat Interpretive trail.

- **p 132 210: #21: – Delete Eastgate Drive Pocket Park.**
- UCPG recommends deleting this proposal for a joint use park. The area is maintained privately as a small park. City should not take on maintenance and costs of this space.
- **The location is inside the Airport Noise Exposure 65 decibel zone. Passive recreation is NOT a permitted use in the 65+ decibel zone.**
- **p 132 210, #22**

- **Please restore potential Gullstrand St. Trailhead Pocket Park.**

- There is strong community support for acquiring this 14-acre parcel **as open space park**. Multiple community group votes have supported this position. The UCPG voted 16–0 in July 2020, to recommend protection of this parcel *as open space*. (see UCPG Minutes, July 2020).

Clarify that the 14 acres would remain an **open space park** with a new trailhead, pocket park at Gullstrand Street.

-Specify potential for acquisition through purchase or land swap – which Public Utilities Department may have greater interest in and the city may be better able to afford.

Modify Include project description: restored row #22, column 4.

“Recommend acquiring 14 acres of vacant open space north of University Gardens Neighborhood Park from the Public Utilities Department (*through purchase, land exchange or other means*) for use as *open space* park. Design, and construct a **pocket park** consisting of a trailhead, *trail*, public art, educational/cultural elements, and seating.”

- p 210, #22 Torreyana Pocket Park. Please locate this proposed pocket park in Figure 26, p 125.

- p 210, #23 Campus Point Drive Pocket Park. Please locate this proposed pocket park in Figure 26, p 125.

- Update Project Description. Note that this proposed park is on private property, like #21-22

- Update Recommendations:

“Design and construct a park with facilities consisting of public art, educational/cultural elements, seating, a scenic view overlook area, *native plant restoration*, and shade trees.

- p 210, #24 Nobel Drive Pocket Park. Please locate this proposed pocket park in Figure 26, p 125.

- Update description. Note that this proposed park is on private property, like #21-22

- p. 210 #28 Montrose Park – UTC (aka “Torrey Trail”)

Thank you for incorporating the recommendation of the UCPG to review and clarify the status of this existing joint use facility. [Westfield UTC is required to maintain this as a public park as a condition of the city’s 2008 approval of the UTC mall expansion. See 2008 MPDP for Westfield UTC, MPDP, p 3:12, 4:36, 4:81](#)

- p. 210, #29. Joint Use – SDUSD – Mission Bay Montessori.

- Delete recommendation for sports field lighting as this property adjoins the MHPA and a steep, unlighted canyon visible from I-5, etc. Avoid light pollution and habitat impacts.

- Revise recommendation:

“Work with the community to determine items needed and desired to be added to the park. Include on that list for consideration items on the city’s Parks Unfunded Improvements list.”

- p. 134 210 Joint Use Opportunities – University City High School

Thank you for incorporating the recommendations of the UCPG to review and clarify the joint use status of facilities at UCHS.

The UCPG recommends that the City continue to:

- Consider future Joint Use opportunities at UCHS.

May 16, 2024

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes – **DRAFT**

Page 42

These facilities are routinely used. Informal use should be formalized to secure public access to facilities that have been in public use for many years.

p. 210 Consider Joint Use Opportunities – North UC: La Jolla Country Day

School/Places of Worship?

– **Consider possible joint use opportunities** in North UC where the majority of residential development is planned and the greatest need is/will be.

– **Explore potential for private/public partnerships** for joint use with LJ Country Day School and NUC religious institutions.

– **p. 212 #32 Rose Canyon Open Space Park**

– Update Recommendation to meet MSCP/MHPA Natural Resources **Management Planning** should precede recreational planning in MSCP/MHPA areas such as RCOSP. The city is 25 years behind in this legal obligation:

– Revise recommendation:

See San Diego Municipal Code, chapter 13, Table 132-15D, Noise Compatibility Criteria for MCAS Miramar, Brown Field Municipal Airport, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport, and NOLF Imperial Beach Airport Influence Area.

“Complete a Natural Resources Management Plan to inform future uses.”

– **Please Correct Typo:**

Design and construct trails that *comply* with the MSCP consistency findings, Environmentally Sensitive Land regulations, and Natural Resource Management Plans.

Thank you for incorporating UCPG recommendation to delete proposed Voight Lane Overlook, which is on the UCSD campus.