

Mid-City Communities Plan Update Working Group Meeting Summary

MEETING DETAILS

October 29, 2025 • 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
Park de la Cruz Gymnasium
3911 Landis Street, San Diego, CA 92105

The meeting was conducted in a hybrid format, allowing participation in-person and via Zoom.

PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW

The purpose of this Working Group meeting was to present the [Draft Ideas Report](#) and to solicit feedback from Working Group members and the general public. Because the report covers a wide range of topics, City staff divided its contents into two meetings. For the first meeting, City staff presented on the following chapters: "Introduction," "Sustainability, Equity, and Climate," "Land Use," and "Urban Design,". Whereas this meeting covered the remaining chapters: "History & Place," "Mobility," and "Parks, Public Facilities and Open Space". The Working Group members and community members discussed the aspects of the presentation that stood out to them, suggested ideas, and provided feedback.

BACKGROUND

As a part of an inclusive engagement process, the City has convened a Working Group for the Mid-City Communities Plan Update. The primary role of the Working Group is to inform the Mid-City Communities Plan Update process. Additional details can be found by reviewing the [Mid-City Communities Plan Update Working Group Protocol and Membership](#) (April 16, 2024). In addition, an orientation was held for Working Group members on April 24, 2024, to encourage members to make connections with other members and inform the Working Group on what to expect from their role and the timeline of their involvement.

The City published the [Draft Mid-City Atlas: Existing Conditions Report](#) online on June 14, 2024.

Meeting 1: The first Working Group meeting on June 26, 2024 included a presentation and discussion of the "Introduction," "History and Place," and "Sustainability, Climate, Equity, and Resilience" chapters of the [Draft Mid-City Atlas](#). The City released a *Draft Overview of Key Community Engagement Efforts* on September 4, 2024, which highlighted key engagement efforts such as online surveys, in-person workshops, pop-up events, office hours,

community interviews, emails, and youth engagement. Additionally, it features appendices with detailed information from the workshops, including attendance records, comments from community members, poll results, Zoom chat transcripts, and discussion group notes.

Meeting 2 and 3: The second and third Working Group meetings were held on September 11th and December 11th, 2024, respectively. The September session focused on presentations and discussions of key highlights from the "Land Use & Development," "Mobility," and "Parks, Public Facilities & Open Space" chapters of the [Draft Mid-City Atlas](#). In the December meeting, the City presented the [Draft Existing Conditions Mobility Assessment](#) and an overview of Historic Preservation.

Meeting 4: The fourth Working Group meeting was held on March 19th, 2025. The March session presented the [Public Engagement Summary](#) and focused on the findings from the [Draft Historic Context Statement and Survey](#), which will inform the Historic Preservation component of the Mid-City Communities Plan Update.

Meeting 5: The fifth Working Group meeting was held on August 13th, 2025. The August session presented the first few chapters of the [Draft Ideas Report](#): "Introduction," "Sustainability, Equity, and Climate," "Land Use," and "Urban Design," wherein both working group and public members suggested ideas and provided feedback.

WORKING GROUP MEETING PARTICIPANTS

As shown in Table 1, twelve Working Group members attended the meeting. Eleven attended in person, one attended virtually, and four were absent.

Table 1 - List of Working Group Attendees

Working Group	Attendance	Community
Marcellus Anderson	Absent	Designee - City Heights CPG
Steve Aldana	In-Person	City Heights
Brittany Poggiolo	In-Person	City Heights
Nam Nguyen	In-Person	City Heights
Victor Ponce	In-Person	City Heights
Randy Torres-Van Vleck	In-Person	City Heights
Emilie Colwell	Absent	Designee - Normal Heights CPG
Thomas Aristide	Absent	Normal Heights
Madeleine Baudoin	Absent	Normal Heights
Lynn Edwards	In-Person	Designee - Eastern Area CPG
Eric Kelley	In-Person	Eastern Area

Paul Smith	In-Person	Eastern Area
Zach Young	Virtually/Zoom	Eastern Area
David Moty	In-Person	Designee - Kensington-Talmadge CPG
Die Spittle	In-Person	Kensington-Talmadge
Lisa Stone	In-Person	Kensington-Talmadge

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE

In addition to the Working Group members, 59 members of the public attended the meeting. 26 members of the public attended in person, and 33 attended virtually.

STAFF ATTENDANCE

The Working Group meeting was supported by City staff listed in Table 2.

Table 2 – Staff Attendance

Project Team	Attendance	Affiliation
Alexander Frost	In-Person	City of San Diego
Morgen Ruby	In-Person	City of San Diego
Selena Sanchez Bailon	In-Person	City of San Diego
Mauricio Aguilar	In-Person	City of San Diego
Kelly Stanco	In-Person	City of San Diego
Kelsey Kaline	In-Person	City of San Diego
Emanuel Alforja	In-Person	City of San Diego
Jonathan Avila	In-Person	City of San Diego
Phil Trom	In-Person	City of San Diego
Maureen Gardiner	In-Person	City of San Diego
Aparna Padmakumar	Virtually/Zoom	City of San Diego
Wendy Wang	Virtually/Zoom	City of San Diego
Coby Tomlins	Virtually/Zoom	City of San Diego

MEETING SUMMARY AND ACTIVITIES

At the beginning of the meeting, City staff welcomed the Working Group (WG) members and the public. Given that it was a hybrid meeting, the WG members who attended online were encouraged to have their cameras switched on and to update their nametag to indicate which community they represented. The meeting started with an introduction, meeting logistics and agreements, followed by a presentation on the [Draft Ideas Report](#). City staff provided an update on the [Draft Ideas Report's](#) land use concepts. WG members ranked their top three out of the five land use concepts. Land Use Concept 2: Transit Villages, Corridors, Neighborhoods + Fair Housing received the highest ranking, while Concept 4: Distributed Growth and Concept 5: Transit Centers & Corridors tied for second.

The first [Draft Ideas Report](#) chapter the presentation focused on was “History & Place”. The presentation paused for a 20-minute Working Group discussion regarding this chapter. The questions used to prompt discussion included:

- Any clarifications or questions?
- Any additional recommendations, corrections, concerns, or items to explore further?
- Are there any additional policy ideas you’d like to see explored?

Key takeaways from the discussion included support for establishing historic districts as a meaningful preservation tool and welcomed their consideration in Kensington and Talmadge. There was support for a single, combined Kensington historic district, as well as support for regulations that would require new construction to follow the area’s historic vernacular. Additional housing in Mid-City was supported, especially along El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue, and abandoned lots were mentioned as a good opportunity for housing. The need for more green spaces, especially in Kensington, Talmadge, and the northern part of City Heights, was strongly supported as a complement to increases in density. Anti-displacement strategies are supported as well.

The presentation continued covering the “Mobility” and “Parks, Public Facilities & Open Space” chapters. City staff facilitated another 20-minute discussion amongst Working Group members based on the following questions:

- Any additional recommendations, corrections, concerns, or items to explore further?
- Where to focus pedestrian, bicycle, transit and vehicular improvements?
- Any additional locations for future parks, trails, and public facilities?

Summarized highlights from the discussion included a strong support for safer, more walkable streets—including protected bike lanes, improved pedestrian infrastructure, and better bus and micro-mobility options—especially given the high rates of traffic collisions along major corridors. There was a desire for realistic plans for parks and public spaces, improved lighting and security, and infrastructure that keeps pace with added density. There is broad support for expanding joint-use school facilities with meaningful youth input, opposition to the Lea Street. road extension in favor of a bike/pedestrian path, and interest in reconnecting neighborhoods divided by freeways. There was support for more quality jobs and creative urban design solutions that enhance comfort and access along key streets. The full record of the Working Group discussion is included in Appendix A.

The public comment period opened following the final Working Group discussion to hear from people about topics covered in the presentation. Members of the public were given one minute each to speak, with 10 speakers, 7 in person and 3 on Zoom. Records of the public comment questions and answers are included in Appendix B, and comments from the Zoom chat are compiled in Appendix C.

Members of the public were encouraged to share feedback on the [Draft Ideas Report](#) by submitting comments through the Public Comment Form by November 21, 2025.

The meeting concluded with City staff outlining upcoming events and engagement opportunities.

NEXT STEPS

- The next Working Group meeting is tentatively scheduled for late Jan. or Feb. 2026.
- Additional engagement activities will occur in 2026.
- The Public comment period was open for the [Draft Ideas Report](#) until Nov. 21, 2025.
- A Draft Community Plan is anticipated to be released in Spring 2026.

APPENDIX A – WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION NOTES

Feedback provided from Working Group members in response to [Draft Mid-City Ideas Report](#) include the following:

PART 1 – “HISTORY AND PLACE”

- Support for historic districts as meaningful historic preservation rather than individual designations. Pleased to see that historic districts are being seriously considered in Kensington- Talmadge.
- Improve planning for park development considering anticipated population growth in Kensington and Talmadge, which is currently the second most park-deprived planning area in the city. Without a park development plan, the commenter would support most development to be concentrated along El Cajon Boulevard, which is closest to areas within walking distance for Talmadge and other park spaces.
- Question related to how historic preservation will work for the more intensive development concepts and why Kensington Manor and District Heights, and Kensington Park District are separated. Concerns relate to this being a bureaucratic exercise to separate these districts when they share commonalities.
 - Staff's answer: Clarified that the reason for their separation is due to the period of significance of the subdivisions, and that a more intensive level survey to evaluate them will be conducted in the future.
- Question asked about the land use concepts and what regulations are available to require new construction to follow historical vernacular.
 - Staff's answer: The city's Preservation and Progress initiative aims to create objective design standards for historic districts, helping to incorporate new development while protecting the district's significance.
- Increase investment in green space in Talmadge and northern City Heights to support the larger future population. Access to nature improves mental and physical health and builds community.
- Support utilizing abandoned lots as opportunities for additional housing development.
- Advance efforts to add more green space and specifically to expand Teralta Park.
- Improve the clarity of land-use concept densities, which are currently difficult to interpret.
 - Staff's answer: Clarified that the next step will be to provide a more detailed land use map with density ranges included, based on the guidance of the working group's ranking.

- Question asked about what anti-displacement strategies are being considered as density increases along El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue.
 - Staff's answer: There are existing tenant protections and dwelling unit replacement ordinances that provide sufficient anti-displacement protections; however, the team can explore additional policies through this initiative. Additionally, SB 79 also has anti-displacement measures, and the city will assess if they are more aggressive than the city's existing inclusionary requirements. The team will also investigate updating citywide inclusionary requirements to further fair housing.

PART 2 – "MOBILITY" & "PARKS, PUBLIC FACILITIES & OPEN SPACE"

- Question asked about any pedestrian amenities planned for major corridors in the eastern area given nothing is shown on the map.
 - Staff's answer: Eastern area was not an area that was studied in the Pedestrian Master Plan so that is why they are not identified but that the team will be looking into them as a part of the plan update.
- Appreciate that one of the mobility priorities/policies is to prioritize the vulnerable users through implementation of a complete streets network, which addresses gaps in pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, including sidewalks, enhanced crossings, roundabouts, traffic signals, protective bikeways, etc.
- Address high levels of traffic violence in City Heights. A City Heights CDC study found that in the span of 4 years, 114 kids were hit by a car while walking/biking in a quarter mile of a school. That's only the reported crashes, a fraction of all crashes is not reported.
- Accelerate implementation of safety projects on Vision Zero corridors such as University Avenue, El Cajon Boulevard, and Euclid Avenue.
- Elevated a recent youth fatal accident on University Avenue and 54th Street. Luckily, the University Avenue Bikeway is going to be under construction soon. We need to continue to prioritize these. There is a good inventory of these planned projects.
- Question asked if there are any new projects being proposed in the mobility concept other than the policies, the green corridor projects and green spaces.
 - Staff's answer: The Mobility team are just beginning the mobility planning process, so the improvements shown are planned and serve as the baseline; recommendations will come that will build on the existing planned recommendations. City is working with a consultant to come up with corridor maps for ten corridors throughout Mid-City that will include proposed concepts on aerial maps that will be publicly shared.

- Elevate letter created by the Chollas Creek Coalition, led by Groundwork San Diego, that includes a good, detailed list of recommendations, including protected bikeways and street trees for 54th Street, and additional connections to improve the City Heights connection to Downtown San Diego and North Park with a bike pedestrian bridge over the 15 and a lot of other mobility improvements.
- Recognize that one of the issues with Azalea Park is that it is island locked.
- Concerns over lack of pedestrian safety on Fairmount Avenue due to high-speed traffic. Improve Fairmount Avenue as a complete street with widened sidewalks and a traffic safety conversion.
- Consider making 43rd Street a two-way street, as Fairmount Avenue is a high-speed expressway for northbound traffic, and 43rd Street serves as a high-speed expressway for southbound traffic. So, for a two-way option, 43rd Street with traffic safety improvements on both sides could help with the north-south connectivity.
- Incorporate mobility improvements identified in Groundwork San Diego letter.
- Correct item number five identified on the greenways, it is the Madison Avenue greenway, not Monroe Avenue.
- Question asked about how a joint-use agreement on the high school will be attained. High schools are so heavy with use that they never do joint use; it's only elementary schools that do joint use.
 - Staff's answer: They are difficult to acquire, but we have examples in the city to follow, ex. University.
- Support for achievable parks not hypothetical parks. Freeway lids will never be funded. Question was asked how it would be funded.
 - Staff's answer: There are potential grant funds.
- Question asked about where the idea for on joint use at Hoover High School came from.
 - Staff's answer: The idea was discussed internally in the park planning concept development process. A survey of high school students was suggested to have students be involved in how the school space is used.
- Focus on achievable ideas for mobility and parks.
- Consider the city's financial realities, including rising utility fees and strained budgets, when planning future improvements.
- Acknowledge low U.S. transit and bicycle mode share cited in comparative studies of global cities. There was an article in the Atlantic saying that when we look at 800 cities worldwide, less than 5% of the trips in the United States cities are by mass transit. The number of bicycles ridership is even less.
- Support traffic-slowing measures and safe streets.
- Supports making the main corridor safe for bikes and pedestrians, noting low costs.

- Concerns over the Purple Line being a pipe dream, given low transit ridership and past investment in the Blue Line.
- Criticize Planning Commission's decision to approve the Clairemont Community Plan Update, specifically to keep the Bay Park neighborhood as a low-density area, despite its proximity to the light rail station. Billions of taxpayer dollars went to that station, and the city is letting that neighborhood stay as low-density.
- Incorporate current and projected city finances into park planning because parks are needed now.
- Support for playgrounds and dog parks within walking distance.
- Support for working with San Diego Unified to open as many properties as possible for joint use. Agreement that input from the students is needed. Other neighborhoods allow fields to be used for dogs.
- Change the classification of open space. The canyons are often full of fire traps, overgrown vegetation, at the best/worst case, it is loaded with homeless and trash, and it's an eyesore. Change them into landscape parks that people can use with features.
- Support for joint use parks at schools and getting input from the youth and the community groups that have youth who are involved in their communities.
- Address mobility challenges (fatalities, injuries and collisions) before increasing densities so significantly. As an example, El Cajon Boulevard has two lanes in each direction and adding density there may not be the best idea. If it's a dedicated bike and bus lane with a single auto lane, accompanied by traffic calming and increased density, there won't really be a viable east-west corridor. Traffic would turn to the neighborhoods and the collector roads that are already a nightmare (in the Ken-Tal area). These projects need to focus on the main corridors and ensure they're adequate.
- Ensure infrastructure, like green spaces and transit, are in place to support added density; note lack of parks in the College Area
- Attract quality jobs and careers to Mid-City, not just transactional jobs, to move the needle forward for advancement.
- Explore adding density along El Cajon Boulevard with redesigned setbacks to allow buildings to overhang/create arcades and shaded walkways to expand the pedestrian right-of-way, but also not limit the ability for developments to build on top and reduce the footprint too much.
- Improve bus stops.
- Support for micro mobility to address first and last mile needs to access neighborhood hubs like major grocery stores, community centers, and parks.
- Create reliable transit options to reach small green spaces.

- Zone every parcel to allow community gardens to create opportunities for community gardens and community urban farms.
- Increase Park security because City Heights has the most sex offenders who live around the school and park areas. Working Group member claimed that the top three schools within San Diego Unified School District are Rosa Parks Elementary at number 1, followed by Central Elementary in second place, and Sherman Heights Elementary comes in at third place. Parents fear letting their children be alone in parks.
- Concern over the disproportionate number of freeways in City Heights and Mid-City; ex, I-805, I-15 and SR-94. The I-15 goes right through the middle of Mid-City. Take a special look at it in the mobility plan on how we can improve this connectivity.
- Support for the expansion of Teralta Park.
- Revive the planned Caltrans bike path behind Home Depot along SR-94 to connect southwest Mid-City and Southeast San Diego.
- Community support to reconnect communities that have been divided by freeway infrastructure, therefore, against the planned expansions of the I-805 and SR-94.
- Oppose the Lea Street extension and propose converting it into a bike/pedestrian pathway with safety amenities. They understand the goal of breaking up big blocks and super blocks but prefer that it's done with pedestrian and bike infrastructure, hawk signals and other amenities that can achieve pedestrian safety.
- Support for a trail from Mount Hope along Home Avenue to 39th Street.
- Clarify bike lane categories and distinctions between existing and proposed facilities.
- Develop a safe and separated bike lane on Aldine Drive due to severe safety issues. Safe access points will motivate people to use alternative modes of transportation.
- Improve biking conditions on Fairmount Avenue Expressway, which currently lacks adequate facilities.
- Address safety issues where the Montezuma protected bike lane merges with high-speed traffic.
- Improve access from the I-15 freeway trail to destinations in Mission Valley, which is currently limited by lack of river crossings.
- Create more north-south bicycle paths that are protected.
- Add protected intersections, it is concerning to go from protected bike lanes to nothing in some streets and intersections and fill the transportation gaps where protected lanes suddenly end.
- Concern regarding park safety. There is a challenge with Colina Del Sol Park. Green space isn't being activated as intended because it is difficult to police for both the police and rangers. Allowing the golf course to expand would take away public

access, but it would decrease issues because there would be less space that isn't policed. Park doesn't have set hours. City Council would need to approve this still, so he hopes this group can influence the creation of more safety.

- Create more protected north-south bicycle routes.
- Request for Aldine Drive to have a focused discussion because it is so bad.
 - Staff's answer: Confirmed we will discuss this street segment at a future meeting.
- Acknowledge positive feedback on new tree plantings on University Avenue.
- Support for public spaces to be included in developer requirements. Particularly with Concept 5, which has a maximum density. Would like to see additional public spaces created for people to gather, rather than waiting for a park to be built.
 - Staff's answer: The College Area Community Plan Update's Community Enhancement Overlay Zone, which requires public spaces, is an example of something that could be considered for Mid-City.
- Oppose the Lea Street proposal, especially because it would be next to a park with children. Bad for pedestrian safety. It will be like Chollas Parkway, which has fast-moving vehicles.
- Extend micro-transit operating hours.
- Add lighting to public spaces for night use.
- Support angled parking to increase parking supply.

APPENDIX B – PUBLIC COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, AND ANSWERS FROM THE CITY

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following are comments, feedback, and concerns shared by the public attendees during the meeting's public comment period.

- Recognize and understand Somali Town culture in City Heights and the Eastern Area, as highlighted in the Somali Community's letter.
- Remove the Lea Street extension from the plan to prevent increased traffic and danger for children, especially following a recent child fatality on University Avenue; provide safer options such as sidewalks and bike lanes to allow children to play, walk, and bike safely.
- Improve pedestrian safety on Adams Avenue, where cars frequently do not stop.
- Acknowledge gratitude for the planning initiative, given that this is a large area that is very diverse both in terms of income and ethnicity.
- Concern over claim that students contributed 85% of the total engagement hours while the adults represented about 15% for public input, student engagement should have been listed as community education. Adults were asked to rank specific categories like safety, parks and affordability, which was qualitative data.
- Appreciate the revisions to the Talmage Park Estate Historic District and for clarifying language that, in the future, there could be a combination of Kensington Park Manor.
- Advocate for dedicated bus lanes on El Cajon Boulevard east of Fairmount Avenue. SB79 would potentially apply there, and we need housing not just along El Cajon Boulevard but around it.
- Increase housing opportunities in Kensington to ensure a fair distribution throughout our neighborhoods.
- Support for investing in housing around rapid transit.
- Appreciate maintaining Talmadge Park Estates Historic District listed on the National Register together and not separate, as the survey had indicated.
- Implement Land Use Concept 5 with businesses on the bottom story, especially on empty lots on El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue. Would like professional services and offices provide above business, and affordable housing on top (3 stories) so that people can walk or bike to work and access services.
- Appreciate the historic team for engaging with the Talmadge Historical Society. Support for a local district. Shared importance of preserving architectural heritage as a tangible connection to our history.

- Support for a separated bike path on Aldine Drive. Bikers are close to getting clipped along there. It's necessary to take bikes off the road to ensure safety.
- Expand pedestrian access, bike access and traffic calming measures, particularly off University Avenue. No additional streets. More access to recreational places.
- Oppose the Lea Street extension and support pedestrian and bicycle access to the park instead.
- Visualize street-greening concepts through mockups.
- Assess sidewalk feasibility, noting that sidewalk placement may require moving into the street or building setback; provide physical mockups to show real-world implementation.
- Oppose the Lea Street extension to reduce vehicle traffic, increase safety, and support environmental and climate goals.
- Provide Talmage with a park, noting long-standing neglect.
- Consider podiums over Fairmont Avenue instead of freeway lids to connect Kensington and Talmage.
- Acknowledge Chollas cannot have a pool unless you move the operations yard because you need native soil instead of on top of the landfill.
- Provide more details on where the Sunshine Bernardini pool could be accommodated.
- Oppose the Lea Street extension based on safety concerns documented in a letter signed by dozens of community organizations; prevent creation of another auto-centric collector and promote a pedestrian and bicycle extension instead.
- Oppose the Lea Street extension as inequitable, noting negative impacts on the Global Village site's development potential; remove the proposal from the plan.
- Clarify the tan color on historic map.
 - Staff's answer: Clarified that the speaker is referring to the map that shows potential historic districts and areas that need to be surveyed to confirm the districts and areas that are proposed to be exempt from 45-year review. Clarified that the beige areas are areas that do not have the same shared history that post-WW2 areas have, so they could not be evaluated. They have a pre-WW2 pattern where blocks were developed at different times. Those areas would need to go through the 45-year process and would be evaluated on a site-by-site basis, but they do not qualify for a district.
- Support for better pedestrian safety measures. Two recent tragedies of children getting killed by cars.
- Request fire-safe landscaping in high fire zones.

APPENDIX C - RECORD OF COMMENTS PROVIDED THROUGH ZOOM CHAT

Jess Ramirez: Good evening - Jesse with City Heights CDC. Happy to be here and thankful to the city of San Diego for putting this together.

John Domenichelli: JD Domenichelli - Talmadge Neighborhood. Good evening everyone. Look forward to furthering this conversation.

City Staff: Please note that we'll be taking public comment at the end of this presentation. Thanks!


Lindsay Rodriguez: The areas in the rest of the Mid-City plan in the light tan color, what is the plan for historical preservation in those areas? I don't see anything in the key. Thank you

Judy Harrington: The Mid-City Fire Safe Councils would like to see a goal to make our parks examples of excellent fire-safe landscaping based on the latest science, especially in high fire zones.

City Staff: Thank you, everyone, for your valuable input. Have a great evening!

APPENDIX D – COMMENT CARDS RECEIVED

Comment Card
Please share your comments about the Mid-City Communities Plan Update below.

 **PLAN MID-CITY**
Communities Plan Update


I'm not fully convinced that historic districts have great value to those outside the district. Some of the benefits seemed a little dubious. Social cohesion involves many different factors, neighborhood stability can occur in non-historic districts. How does declaring a historic district restrict new building? In general, I feel the designation of historic districts has gone too far & is being used by single-family neighborhoods that are affluent to "save our neighborhoods."

Please provide your contact information below. (OPTIONAL)

Name: Karen Kinney
E-Mail: kkinney@com.net Telephone: _____
Address: 4921 Lerkins Dr. City: SD
Are you affiliated with any community organizations? Zip Code: 92115
Please list: _____
How did you hear about the Mid-City Communities plan Update?
 Email from City Other Email Social Media Saw a flier Friend/Colleague
Other: _____

from Daniele Laman
CD9 Rep on Parks + Rec Board

Comment Card
Please share your comments about the Mid-City Communities Plan Update below.

 **PLAN MID-CITY**
Communities Plan Update

#1 Talmadge needs a Park
#2 podiums over Fairmont Ave. not freeway kids
#3 South Chollas cannot have pool unless the Ops. yard is moved

#4 Where exactly could a pool go near Sunshine Berardini GDP in

Please provide your contact information below. (OPTIONAL)


Name: _____ Telephone: _____
E-Mail: _____ City: _____
Address: _____ Zip Code: _____
Are you affiliated with any community organizations? _____
Please list: _____
How did you hear about the Mid-City Communities plan Update?
 Email from City Other Email Social Media Saw a flier Friend/Colleague
Other: _____

the works


APPENDIX E - IN-PERSON SIGN-IN SHEETS AND ZOOM ATTENDANCE

IN-PERSON SIGN-IN SHEETS


PUBLIC SIGN-IN SHEET



Name	Affiliation/Organization	Email Address	Mailing Address
Diana Anderson		diana@midcity.net	
Leticia Switzer		lswitzer@midcity.net	
Malyn Gonzalez		malyn@midcity.net	
Tina Blazynski	TechnoEdge	tina@technoedge.com	
Kevin Gunn		kgunn@cox.net	
Traci LaBerge	Keosauqua Township	traci@keosauqua.net	
Rachel Koenig	PANA	rachel@pana.org	
Ahmed Maimun	MIUSD	amaimun@miusd.com	
Laura Henson	JHS	lhenson@jhs.net	
Geoff Hester	Tea Lane Cafe	geoff@tealane.net	
Paul Sams	KCS	psams@kcs.net	
Ahmed Mahmud	PANA	ahmed@pana.org	
Danielle Haman		dhaman@cox.net	
Manan Upadhyay	PANA	manan@pana.org	
Clarene Hill	City of Hesperia	clarene@cityofhesperia.com	
Deen Sinton	PANA	Deen@panashoot.com	



Name	Affiliation/Organization	Email Address	Mailing Address
Rae Anderson	Self	rae@midcity.net	4582 Highland Ave
Jana Kirk	Teledge Resident	janakirk@teledge.com	4520 Green Ave T2US
Doranne Wills	Resident	doranne@midcity.net	
Caroleen Linneman	Resident	caroleen@midcity.net	
RALPH TEYSSEIE	SELF	ralph@teysseie.com	1592 Euclid Ave
IZAMIA ABEL	PANA	izamia@pana.org	4767 Marlboro Ave 5024 T2US
Lequita Grand		lequita@midcity.net	
MARCIA SAUER		marcia@midcity.net	



Name	Affiliation/Organization	Email Address	Mailing Address
Rachael Linneman	PANA	rlinneman@pana.org	5577 University Ave
Richard Graham	Corp owner	kgraham@midcity.net	3518 Miller Road 2105

ZOOM LIST OF PUBLIC ATTENDEES

Evihn Vaszily
Alex Zukas
Justin Carey
Lindsay Rodriguez
Mike Moser
Sam Orndorff
Jonathan Garrett
Dana Long
John Domenichelli
Renee Mezo
Elaine May
Gerald Chacon
Danna Givot
Jesss Ramirez
Denise Armijo
Karen Austin
Judy Harrington
Scott
Jim
Mike
Paul
Roland
Marianne
Ellen
Rahmo
Edwin
Laura
Ellen
Misha
Peter
Mikail
Ahmed
Jennifer