

City of San Diego
Parks and Recreation Board Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 25, 2025

“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 – Santa Fe Room 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
Marcella Bothwell (Chair) Rick Gulley (Vice Chair) Nick Anastasopoulos Jeremy Bloom Dr. Andrea Dooley Daniele Laman Evelyn Smith Allison Soares Agatha Wein	Dr. Judith Munoz	Michelle Abella-Shon Ryan Barbrick Nathan Causman Raul Contreras Andy Field Frank Huntlee Sean McGee Sameera Rao Elvi Ricafort Jon Richards Scott Sandel Coby Tomlins Gabriela Verendia

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chair Bothwell at 2:08 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 26, 2025:

Director Field requested that this item be returned to staff as the draft minutes are not ready for Board review. Ms. Laman asked whether the May 2025 meeting minutes were approved in June, and Ms. Ricafort confirmed that was the case.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE: None.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- Balboa Park Committee – Ms. Soares reported that the proposal for Balboa Park paid parking was discussed at the last meeting. She thanked Deputy Director Jon Richards for his guidance and support through this complicated topic.
- Mission Bay Park Committee – As Dr. Munoz was absent, Chair Bothwell noted that City staff are reconsidering the applicability of the Surplus Land Act for proposed lease agreements in Mission Bay by reapproaching the State of California for possible exemption.
- Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens' Advisory Committee – Mr. Gulley reported that the committee discussed the East County Advanced Water Purification Program. This project will impact operations on Father Junipero Serra Trail due to construction through 2027.
- San Diego Parks Foundation (SDPF) – Chair Bothwell provided a summary of Come Play Outside 2025 with 36,000 people served. Several sports programs including softball and futsal recently wrapped up with their playoffs. Recently completed projects include the Rancho Bernardo Sod Project (former lawn bowling area), Southcrest Outdoor Basketball Court resurfacing, and Colina del Sol Recreation Center indoor court restoration. The most recent class of Park Ambassadors recently started.

CHAIRPERSON COMMENT: Chair Bothwell welcomed the newest member of the Board, Mr. Jeremy Bloom, as today is his first meeting. Director Field joined Chair Bothwell in welcoming Mr. Bloom and noted that there remains one more Board member vacancy to fill.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: Ms. Laman expressed her gratitude and thanks to staff for helping for little league access to fields with recent closure at Mann Middle Joint Use. Staff have also been working to get the Chollas Little League under a special use permit. Ms. Laman invited interested people to attend the Moon Festival on October 4, 2025, at Officer Jeremy Henwood Memorial Park in City Heights. Ms. Laman asked whether the Board would change locations given the soon-to-be-implemented Balboa Park paid parking and whether Board members would receive vouchers to allow for free parking by volunteers. Director Field invited Deputy Director Jon Richards to provide an update on staff and volunteer parking in Balboa Park. Mr. Richards indicated that the paid parking scope remains a work in progress, and it may take time to establish the process for volunteers (such as Board members) to obtain a voucher for free parking. There are no plans to relocate the Board meetings to another location.

DIRECTORS REPORT: Due to the full agenda today, Director Field did not provide a report.

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE: None

CONSENT ITEMS: None

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

101. Approval of Special Meeting of the Parks and Recreation Board Meeting – September 25, 2025

Director Field requested the calendar for the Board be amended to reflect that the September meeting date was moved from the “regular” date of September 18, 2025, to the “special” date of September 25, 2025. He appreciated the Board’s flexibility with the changed date of the meeting.

Motion to amend the Board calendar to reflect no regular meeting on September 18, 2025, and a special meeting on September 25, 2025.

MOTION/SECONDED:

Mr. Gulley/Ms. Soares

A motion was made by Mr. Gulley and seconded by Ms. Soares. The motion was approved 9-0-0 and passed unanimously with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Marcella Bothwell, Jeremy Bloom, Dr. Andrea Dooley, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, Evelyn Smith, Allison Soares, and Agatha Wein. Nay: None. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Dr. Judith Munoz.

Public Comment: None.

Board Comment: None.

102. Naming of “Sessions – Brandegee San Jose Hesper Palm Groves” as an official garden of Balboa Park

Deputy Director Jon Richards and Jackie Higgins from Forever Balboa Park presented the proposed naming of the palm grove garden area in honor of Ms. Kate Sessions, Mr. TS Brandegee, and Mrs. Katharine Brandegee. The presentation was prepared by Nancy Carol Carter, who could not attend the Board meeting on this date.

Motion to approve the naming of the palm grove garden as the “Sessions – Brandegee San Jose Hesper Palm Groves” and designating it as an official garden of Balboa Park.

MOTION/SECONDED:

Ms. Soares/Mr. Gulley

A motion was made by Mr. Gulley and seconded by Ms. Soares. The motion was approved 9-0-0 and passed unanimously with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Marcella Bothwell, Jeremy Bloom, Dr. Andrea Dooley, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, Evelyn Smith, Allison Soares, and Agatha Wein. Nay: None. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Dr. Judith Munoz.

Public Comment: None.

Board Comment:

Ms. Soares expressed enthusiastic support for the proposed naming.

Ms. Laman asked about fire safety in the palm grove area. Mr. Richards responded that yes there have been fires but public safety is a priority for this area.

103. Hollywood Neighborhood Park General Development Plan Amendment

Park Designer Frank Huntlee and Area Manager Raul Contreras presented the proposal to amend the general development plan for Hollywood Park in City Heights to include a disc golf course. The installation of the disc golf course is to be funded with donations in partnership with Price Philanthropies.

Motion to approve the amendment of the general development plan for Hollywood Park to include a disc golf course and the temporary pilot program to operate the disc golf course.

MOTION/SECONDED:

Ms. Laman/Ms. Wein

A motion was made by Ms. Laman and seconded by Ms. Wein. The motion was approved 9-0-0 and passed unanimously with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Marcella Bothwell, Jeremy Bloom, Dr. Andrea Dooley, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, Evelyn Smith, Allison Soares, and Agatha Wein. Nay: None. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Dr. Judith Munoz.

Public Comment:

Robin Kaufman asked how the project will be funded and built. Mr. Huntlee responded that Price Philanthropies will help raise the funding needed to complete the project.

Board Comment:

Ms. Soares expressed thanks and gratitude for the proposal.

Ms. Laman wanted to ensure the motion included both the general development plan approval as well as the pilot program for operating a disc golf course. She asked the Board and local community recreation group receive updates at six and twelve months to confirm how well the disc golf is working and whether any concerns have arisen.

Ms. Wein is an avid disc golfer and appreciates new locations being added to the inventory of disc golf locations in San Diego.

Chair Bothwell is concerned with safety precautions. Mr. Huntlee responded that disc golf will not be played when other sports are being played in areas where disc golf overlaps sports fields.

Ms. Laman asked whether the Hollywood Park restroom will be repaired, repurposed, or demolished. Director Field responded that the Department is working with Councilmember Sean Elo-Rivera to determine next steps. Portable restrooms can be added for sports activities and special events while the permanent restroom is closed.

104. The Clairemont Community Plan Update

Landscape Designer Scott Sandel and Principal Planner Sean McGee from the City Planning Department presented the draft community plan update for Clairemont.

The Parks and Recreation Board declined to make a motion related to this item.

Public Comment:

Tom Mullaney does not support the draft plan for Clairemont. He expressed concern with the planned population growth and the inability to meet the park requirement to meet this growth. He recommends the plan be returned to staff.

Robert Montana noted the stark difference between the Clairemont and College Area draft plans, as they vary widely in their parks.

Board Comment:

Chair Bothwell asked whether the Clairemont Community Planning Group had approved the draft community plan update. Program Manager Coby Tomlins from City Planning indicated that had not occurred yet. A draft letter in support is being prepared by the planning group, but the Board has not received a copy of the letter since it is not yet finalized.

Ms. Laman asked about questions she had submitted via email: (1) did this plan go to the community recreation groups, (2) how the recreation value points (RVPs) changed between drafts, and (3) whether there is capacity to house the additional population anticipated in the community. Ms. Rao responded that engaging with community planning groups is part of the primary community input process. The planning process engages with recreation groups via the community planning groups. Ms. Rao noted that RVPs are going to be updated again when the next draft of the plan is released around October 10, 2025. This change is based on recent work with the community. Finally, Ms. Rao outlined how the housing will fit into the community.

105. College Area Community Plan Update

Park Designer Scott Sandel and Senior Planner Nathan Causman from the City Planning Department presented the draft community plan update for the College Area.

Motion to disapprove the draft College Area Community Plan Update and to write a letter to the Planning Commission outlining the Board's concerns with lack of parks in the draft plan.

MOTION/SECONDED:

Ms. Laman/Ms. Wein

A motion was made by Ms. Laman and seconded by Ms. Wein. The motion was approved 8-1-0 and passed with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Marcella Bothwell, Dr. Andrea Dooley, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, Evelyn Smith, Allison Soares, and Agatha Wein. Nay: Jeremy Bloom. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Dr. Judith Munoz.

Public Comment:

Tom Mullaney does not support the draft plan. He expressed concern with the planned population growth and the inability to meet the park requirement to meet this growth.

Susan Richardson from the Colina del Sol Community Recreation Group and College Area Community Planning Group noted the draft plan does not provide the necessary park space for the proposed population growth within the community. She noted some possible

locations that could be considered for future park expansions. The College Area Community Planning Group does not support the draft plan.

Robert Montana recommends against approving the draft plan especially given the limited park space identified in the draft plan.

David Moty from Kensington-Talmadge Community Planning Group noted College Area is one of the most park-deprived communities in San Diego. There is insufficient park space given the proposed population increase. He recommends against approval of the draft plan.

Julie Hamilton from the College Area Community Council expressed similar concerns about increasing population without adding more open space and parkland. She urged rejection of the draft plan.

Sandee Bass expressed concerns that the neighborhood is being neglected and that housing will be prioritized over public infrastructure.

Additional public comment was received in writing and is attached to the minutes.

Board Comment:

Ms. Laman expressed concerns with the draft plan and recommended against approval. Most open space in the College Area community is privately owned. She suggested the Board prepare a letter outlining concerns with the lack of parks in the draft plan.

Ms. Wein described living in similar communities elsewhere in Southern California that lack park space and agrees that park space is needed. Dense housing requires parks to be nearby.

Mr. Bloom asked about leveraging public-private partnerships. Assistant Deputy Director Sameera Rao from City Planning Department described efforts to work with various developers to provide on-site parkland, including several in the Otay Mesa community.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:47 p.m.

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: October 16, 2025, at 2:00 p.m.

Submitted by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Andy Field", is written over a light blue circular stamp.

Andy Field
Deputy Director
Parks and Recreation Department

ATTACHMENTS: Written Correspondence for Item
105, College Area Community Plan Update

ATTACHMENTS – PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEM #105:

From: [City of San Diego Official Website](#)
To: [Commissions Public Comment](#); [Ricafort, Elvira](#); [Barbrick, Ryan](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Webform submission from: Meeting Agenda Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 9:22:19 AM
Attachments: [2nd-draft-cacpu-du-pop-vs-other-cpus.docx](#)
[comments-on-the-2nd-draft-college-area-community-plan-update-9-25-25.docx](#)

Submitted on Wed, 09/24/2025 - 08:48

NAME:
Danna Givot

EMAIL:
dannagivot@gmail.com

ADDRESS:
4669 59th Street
San Diego, California 92115

PHONE NUMBER:
(760) 443-7379

BOARD OR COMMISSION:
Park & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE:
2025-09-25

COMMENT TYPE:
Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:
105

COMMENTS:

For the reasons below, I ask the Park and Recreation Board to reject the Recreation Section of the College Area Community Plan Update 2nd draft and request it be revised in a manner to better serve the needs of present and future residents of the College Area. The City must invest in the College Area as outlined in Park policies 6.1 – 6.7.

The plan proposes 34,150 total dwelling units, a 322% capacity increase, triple the growth rate other communities have been asked to bear. This draft allows for a 277% increase in College Area population, over three times the average population increase that other community plan updates have planned for and far more than is supported by SANDAG's projections.

Currently, the College Area has 9% of the park points for its current population of 27,900 people. It has one community park of approximately 1.5 acres, part of which is a drainage swale. It has some picnic tables. There is zero funding for additional parks. Most other parks proposed in the plan are contingent upon funding from developers, which is unlikely to happen. Even if it did, these are pocket parks, etc., without fields or play areas for College Area youth. We have no recreation center, though we are eligible for one having exceeded 25,000 people in our community.

The College Area is recognized per 2025 CTCAC as primarily a low resource area. Our only park currently has no playground and no funding to provide one. The recreation section of this plan does not meet the overall goals of the City to provide equitable parks and recreational facilities that meet the needs of users of all ages and abilities with access to multiple types of park and recreation opportunities. The plan offers no meaningful prospect of improving the availability of these services for either existing residents or for prospective new residents.

The plan identifies less than 945 existing and potential future park points for the future population of 74,170 (this number does not even serve the existing population of 27,900, where 2,790 points are needed). When including on campus SDSU students, 2050 population will be at least 87,170.

Of the counted future/current park amenities: not accessible to the public (Alvarado Estates); three joint use fields that have limited access during the day; a church without any signed use agreement (62nd St.); storm water channels/right-of-way scraps; and a trail head on private property (Adams to Baja) now entitled for construction of an ADU. None of these potential suggestions offer quality amenities such as playgrounds. These 945 identified points need to be reduced to reflect actual and realistic park projects.

The plan's future population of 87,170 should be matched with future facilities and Park Recreational Value Points of 8,717, to include the Parks Master Plan standard of 1.5 aquatic complexes and 3 recreation centers with a minimum size of 17,000 square feet each. The proposed College Avenue recreation center (4,000 sf) is insufficient to be used as a required 17,000' community center.

ATTACHMENTS:

-

https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_1030632/113916/2nd-draft-cacpu-du-pop-vs-other-cpus.docx

-

https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_1030632/113916/comments-on-the-2nd-draft-college-area-community-plan-update-9-25-25.docx

From: [City of San Diego Official Website](#)
To: [Commissions Public Comment](#); [Ricafort, Elvira](#); [Barbrick, Ryan](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Webform submission from: Meeting Agenda Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 2:50:20 PM

Submitted on Wed, 09/24/2025 - 14:50

NAME:
Yvonne

EMAIL:

ADDRESS:

San Diego, California 92115

PHONE NUMBER:

BOARD OR COMMISSION:
Park & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE:
2025-09-25

COMMENT TYPE:
Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:
105

COMMENTS:

For the reasons below, I ask the Park and Recreation Board to reject the Recreation Section of the College Area Community Plan Update 2nd draft and request it be revised to better serve the needs of present and future residents of the College Area. The City MUST invest in the College Area as outlined in Park policies 6.1 – 6.7.

The plan proposes 34,150 total dwelling units, a 322% capacity increase, triple the growth rate other communities have been asked to bear. This draft allows a 277% College Area population increase, over three times the average population increases of other community plan updates, and far more than is supported by SANDAG's projections.

The College Area is recognized as a poorly resourced and underserved community (2025 CTCAC maps). It is woefully deficient in parks, recreation centers and other recreational opportunities (more than 90% deficient in park points for current population). We have one park 1.3 acres (partly a drainage swale). Currently, there is not a single playground at a City park in the College Area. The recreation section doesn't meet the City's goals to provide equitable parks and recreational facilities that meet the needs of users of all ages and abilities with access to multiple types of park and recreation

opportunities. The plan offers no meaningful prospect of improving the availability of these services for either existing or new residents.

The PLAN identifies less than 945 existing and potential future park points for the build-out population of 74,170 (this number does not even serve the existing population of 27,900, where 2,790 points are needed). The actual build-out population is 87,170 including SDSU students living on campus.

Of the counted future/current park amenities (945 points): not accessible to the public (Alvarado Estates); three joint use fields that have limited access during the day; a church without any signed use agreement (62nd St.); storm water channels/right-of-way scraps; and a trail head on private property (Adams to Baja) now entitled for ADU construction. None of these potential suggestions offer quality amenities like playgrounds. These 945 identified points need to be reduced to reflect realistic park projects.

The plan's 87,170 horizon population should be matched with future facilities and 8,710 Park Recreational Value Points to include the Parks Master Plan standard of 1.5 aquatic complexes and 3 recreation centers with a minimum size of 17,000 square feet each. (The proposed College Avenue Recreation Center on a tiny lot with a 4,000 sf building is insufficient versus 17,000 sf standard.)

Our community should not be expected to rely on SDSU facilities (not open to the public) or recreation facilities in neighboring areas (pg. 76) that are not sufficient for their own populations. The City reduced the park acreage standard to park points and is now failing to fulfill even the dramatically lower park points requirements while low resource communities like ours suffer the consequences.

Communities that experience excessive density without infrastructure become slums. Please reject this so-called Park and Recreation "plan." It's not a plan!

ATTACHMENTS:

[webform_submission:values:attachments_multiple_file]

From: [City of San Diego Official Website](#)
To: [Commissions Public Comment](#); [Ricafort, Elvira](#); [Barbrick, Ryan](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Webform submission from: Meeting Agenda Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 11:29:57 AM

Submitted on Wed, 09/24/2025 - 11:29

NAME:
Rene Kaprielian

EMAIL:

ADDRESS:

San Diego, California 92115

PHONE NUMBER:

BOARD OR COMMISSION:
Park & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE:
2025-09-25

COMMENT TYPE:
Non-Agenda Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:

COMMENTS:
I urge the Board to reject the College Area Plan Update due to insufficient parks for the proposed population increase. We currently do not have enough parks today and adding nearly 300% more people without significantly more parks is a non-starter.

This Board represents the people of San Diego, not the mayor or City Council, and should not support bad policy. The City needs to do better and provide more parks and scale back its population targets.

ATTACHMENTS:
[webform_submission:values:attachments_multiple_file]

From: [City of San Diego Official Website](#)
To: [Commissions Public Comment](#); [Ricafort, Elvira](#); [Barbrick, Ryan](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Webform submission from: Meeting Agenda Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 4:18:31 PM

Submitted on Wed, 09/24/2025 - 16:18

NAME:

Susan Richardson

EMAIL:

dprsmr@gmail.com

ADDRESS:

5433 Hewlett Dr
San Diego, California 92115

PHONE NUMBER:

(619) 865-8669

BOARD OR COMMISSION:

Park & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE:

0025-09-25

COMMENT TYPE:

Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:

105

COMMENTS:

This PLAN proposes a 277% increase in the College Area population, three times that of other CPU's, on average. We are an underserved community, deficient in parks, recreation centers and recreational opportunities. Over 90% deficient in park points for our population. Currently, there is not a single playground or recreation center at a City park in the College Area.

This PLAN does not provide equitable parks or recreation facilities to meet the needs of users of all ages and abilities with access to multiple types of park and recreation opportunities nor does it offer meaningful prospects of improving the availability of services for existing or new residents. The PLAN identifies only 917 existing and potential park points for a future population of 74,170 (which does not serve the existing population where 1,969 points are needed.) No potential suggestions offer quality amenities such as playgrounds or reflect actual and realistic projects. The PLAN's recommended future facilities need to identify the Parks Master Plan standard of 1.5 aquatic complexes and 3 recreation centers with a minimum size of 17,000 SF each.

The size and scope of the proposed recreation center on College Avenue (currently 4,000 SF, too small for the old library) is not sufficient to be used as a required 17,000SF community center. Additional/alternate sites need to be identified to serve the current and proposed future population.

Development Impact Fees need to be allocated for the immediate purchase of land and Capital Improvement Projects be identified to serve the existing population for parks, an aquatics center and community center(s).

SDSU is not an option for the College Area community to use for recreation purposes, due to eligibility/capacity.

Figure 6-12 does not correctly identify a 10-minute Walk to a Park, the distances shown are much more than 10-minutes and the parks identified do not offer the required “40-minutes of activity for a safe and enjoyable park or recreation facility” any time of day that is not a joint use field.

The PLAN suggests that College Area residents rely on parks/recreation centers in adjacent communities. Figure 6.10 demonstrates that the service area of the centers adjacent to our community are not even sufficient for their own community needs, with no overlap available into the College Area. Directing travel by trolley/car/bus to other communities which are also deficient in park points or to SDSU Riverpark which has limited access and metered parking, is not a solution for failing to provide recreation facilities/parks in the College Area.

For these reasons, the College Area Planning Board recommends that the Park and Recreation Board reject the Recreation Section of the College Area Community Plan Update 2nd draft and request that it be revised in a manner that better serves the needs of present and future residents of the College Area. The City MUST invest in the College Area as outlined in Park policies 6.1 – 6.7.

Susan Richardson
College Area Community Planning Board, Secretary/Park and Recreation
Representative
Colina Del Sol CRG, Chair
Retired Park & Recreation Director

ATTACHMENTS:

[webform_submission:values:attachments_multiple_file]

From: [City of San Diego Official Website](#)
To: [Commissions Public Comment](#); [Ricafort, Elvira](#); [Barbrick, Ryan](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Webform submission from: Meeting Agenda Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 4:24:23 PM
Attachments: [comments-on-the-2nd-draft-college-area-community-plan-update-9-25-25.docx](#)
[2nd-draft-cacpu-du-pop-vs-other-cpus.docx](#)
[screen-shot-2025-09-24-at-9.55.08-am.png](#)

Submitted on Wed, 09/24/2025 - 16:21

NAME:
Joel Davis

EMAIL:
jd1050@gmail.com

ADDRESS:
4669 59th Street
San Diego, California 92115

PHONE NUMBER:
(760) 443-7379

BOARD OR COMMISSION:
Park & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE:
2025-09-25

COMMENT TYPE:
Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:
105

COMMENTS:

For the reasons below, I ask the Park and Recreation Board to reject the Recreation Section of the College Area Community Plan Update 2nd draft and request it be revised to better serve the needs of present and future residents of the College Area. The City MUST invest in the College Area as outlined in Park policies 6.1 – 6.7.

The plan proposes 34,150 total dwelling units, a 322% capacity increase, triple the growth rate other communities have been asked to bear. This draft allows a 277% College Area population increase, over three times the average population increases of other community plan updates, and far more than is supported by SANDAG's projections.

The College Area is recognized as a poorly resourced and underserved community (2025 CTCAC maps). It is woefully deficient in parks, recreation centers and other recreational opportunities (more than 90% deficient in park points for current population). We have one park 1.3 acres (partly a drainage swale). Currently, there is not a single playground at a City park in the College Area. The recreation section doesn't meet the City's goals to provide equitable parks and recreational facilities that meet the needs of users of all ages and abilities with access to multiple types of park and

recreation opportunities. The plan offers no meaningful prospect of improving the availability of these services for either existing or new residents.

The PLAN identifies less than 945 existing and potential future park points for the build-out population of 74,170 (this number does not even serve the existing population of 27,900, where 2,790 points are needed). The actual build-out population is 87,170 including SDSU students living on campus.

Of the counted future/current park amenities (945 points): not accessible to the public (Alvarado Estates); three joint use fields that have limited access during the day; a church without any signed use agreement (62nd St.); storm water channels/right-of-way scraps; and a trail head on private property (Adams to Baja) now entitled for ADU construction. None of these potential suggestions offer quality amenities like playgrounds. These 945 identified points need to be reduced to reflect realistic park projects.

The plan's 87,170 horizon population should be matched with future facilities and 8,710 Park Recreational Value Points to include the Parks Master Plan standard of 1.5 aquatic complexes and 3 recreation centers with a minimum size of 17,000 square feet each. (The proposed College Avenue Recreation Center on a tiny lot with a 4,000 sf building is insufficient versus 17,000 sf standard.)

Our community should not be expected to rely on SDSU facilities (not open to the public) or recreation facilities in neighboring areas (pg. 76) that are not sufficient for their own populations. The City reduced the park acreage standard to park points and is now failing to fulfill even the dramatically lower park points requirements while low resource communities like ours suffer the consequences.

Communities that experience excessive density without infrastructure become slums. Please reject this so-called Park and Recreation "plan." It's not a plan!

ATTACHMENTS:

-

https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_1030632/114062/comments-on-the-2nd-draft-college-area-community-plan-update-9-25-25.docx

-

https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_1030632/114062/2nd-draft-cacpu-du-pop-vs-other-cpus.docx

-

https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_1030632/114062/screen-shot-2025-09-24-at-9.55.08-am.png

From: [City of San Diego Official Website](#)
To: [Commissions Public Comment](#); [Ricafort, Elvira](#); [Barbrick, Ryan](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Webform submission from: Meeting Agenda Public Comment
Date: Thursday, September 25, 2025 12:04:56 AM

Submitted on Thu, 09/25/2025 - 00:04

NAME:
TROY MURPHREE

EMAIL:
troy.sandiego@gmail.com

ADDRESS:
6758 Saranac Street
San Diego, California 92115

PHONE NUMBER:
(619) 339-5834

BOARD OR COMMISSION:
Park & Recreation Board

MEETING DATE:
2025-09-25

COMMENT TYPE:
Agenda Comment / Closed Session Comment

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:
105

COMMENTS:
The College Area is recognized as a poorly resourced and underserved community. It is severely deficient in recreational opportunities and the proposed Recreation Element of the second draft of College Area Community Plan Update (CACPU) does not improve the future of this unacceptable situation. The facilities proposed (Figure 6-1) are meager and unrealistic. SDSU facilities are not open to the public in a meaningful way. Community members have very limited use of joint use parks due to school priorities and, in the case of the artificial-turfed Language Academy, the dominance of soccer leagues when school is not in session. Harriet Tubman Village Charter School site and the Language Academy site were the only proposed park facilities in the 1989 CACP and were completed only after ~30 years of ongoing community advocacy. There is nothing even as promising as those in this Plan. I request that your Board NOT support the Recreation Element in its current form. Please return it to the community and the city for revisions that provide more adequate future recreational opportunities.

Thank you for your understanding of the College Area's continued dismal recreational future under this Plan.

ATTACHMENTS:

[webform_submission:values:attachments_multiple_file]