MEMBERS PRESENT:
Eric Edelman, Carmel Mtn. Rnch (CMRSS)
Barry Schultz, Carmel Valley (CV)
Russ Connelly, City Heights (CH)
Nicholas Reed, Clairemont (CLMT)
Jose Reynoso, College Area (COL)
Bob Link, Downtown (DWNTN)
Kathy Vandenheuvel, Golden Hill (GH)
Deborah Sharpe, Ken/Tal (KT)
Diane Kane, La Jolla (LJ)
Nicholas Reed, Linda Vista, (LV)
Dike Aniywo, Midway, (MW)
Jeff Stevens, Mira Mesa (MM)
Lorayne Burley, Miramar Ranch North (MRN)
Michele Addington, Mission Valley (MV)
Jose Reynoso, Navajo (NAV)
Tim Taylor, North Park (NP)
Andrea Schlageter, Ocean Beach (OB)
Ann Dahlkamp, Old Town (OT)
Jason Legros, Pacific Beach (PB)
Vicki Touchstone, Rancho Bernardo (RB)
Randy Steffler, Rancho Penasquitos (RP)
Marc Lindshield, San Pasqual/Lake Hodges (SP/LH)
Wally Wulfeck, Scripps Ranch (SR)
Bryce Niceswanger, Serra Mesa (SM)
Myron Taylor, Southeastern (SE)
Mike Ogilvie, Tierrasanta (TIRSN)
Brad Remy, Torrey Pines (TP)
Chris Nielsen, University (UN)

VOTING INELIGIBILITY/RECUSALS: Barrio Logan, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Del Mar Mesa, Downtown, Keamy Mesa, Navajo, Normal Heights, Otay Mesa Nestor, Peninsula, San Ysidro, Torrey Hills, Uptown.

Guests: Laura Black, Andy Wiese, David Moty, Maureen Gardiner, Robert Burns, Karin Velazquez, Don Wood, Lorri Block, Eva Yakultis, Brian Curry, Kyle Amdahl1Design, Tom Silva.

City Staff/Representatives: Tony Kempton, Tait Galloway

NOTE: The sign-in sheets provided at the entrance to the meeting are used to list CPC Representatives, guest speakers, and staff present at the meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS:
Chair Wally Wulfeck called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Roll Call: CMRSS, CV, CH, CLMT, COL, DWNTN, GH, KT, LJ, LV, MM, MRN, MV, MW, NAV, NP, OT, OB, PB, RB, RP, SP/LH, SR, SM, SE, TIRSN, TP, UN.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT: 2 minutes per issue.
None

3. MODIFICATIONS AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
Chair Wulfeck swapped order of items 7 and 8.
4. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 25, 2020.**

5. **MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (MMP) 2019 Annual Report (Information Item)** Presenters: Christine Rothman, Development Project Manager III and Antoinette Gibbs, Associate Planner, Transportation & Storm Water Department. Rothman and Gibbs gave a presentation on the annual report and described how the program guided the maintenance of flood control facilities from 2013-2018.

   Board Comment:
   Comment regarding Carroll Creek needing maintenance was voiced. A member requested the survey be sent to Clairemont, as they have some areas in need of maintenance. A member requested maintenance for the San Pasqual/Lake Hodges area leased land owned by the Public Utilities Department, as large agricultural tracts have been lost.

6. **MUNICIPAL WATERWAYS MAINTENANCE PLAN (Action Item)** Presenters: Bethany Bezak, Assistant Deputy Director and Christine Rothman, Development Project Manager III, Transportation & Stormwater. Rothman and Bezak described how the new Municipal Waterways Maintenance Plan will replace the Master Storm Water System Maintenance Program. The main objective of the new program is to maintain channels. Goals include ensuring water quality and reduce flood risk. While the new program allows for ongoing maintenance it also allows the City to be more responsive and transparent. Twelve comment letters were received in response to the 45-day environmental review period. The new plan is scheduled to go to City Council on June 2, 2020.

   Board Comment:
   Runoff from Mt. Soledad was raised as an issue regarding the amount of hardscape allowed in hillside development. Staff responded that Development Services would respond to any issues regarding private development. Cumulative impacts were identified as a big issue but staff responded that development is site specific. Chair suggested that private development is subject to Transportation Storm Water regulations including storm water retention basins, etc. to control certain cumulative impacts from development.

   Motion:

7. **COMPLETE COMMUNITIES: HOUSING SOLUTIONS AND MOBILITY CHOICES** (Action Item - originally #8) – Presenters: Heidi Vonblum / Leslie Keaveny/Brian Schoenfisch – Planning Department Description: Complete Communities: Mobility Choices and Housing Solutions proposes amendments to the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) to provide incentives to increase housing production and expand the mobility network around transit hubs and existing development. The initiative removes regulatory barriers to housing at all income levels, especially low, very low, and moderate-income households, while investing in neighborhood and mobility amenities, such as recreational opportunities, street trees, linear parks, bicycle facilities, urban plazas, and promenades. These programs tailor state law to the City’s housing needs, including SB 375 which focuses on land uses that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, SB743 which increases
investment in walking, biking and transit options, and CASA 8763 which focuses on increasing incentives for affordable housing.

Goals for mobility include connecting residents with safe and convenient mobility options that connect them to jobs, shopping, services, parks, and other amenities. SB 743 required cities to move from measuring transportation using a level of service analysis to one using Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Using the VMT metric focuses on activities that reduce vehicle trips like walking, biking and transit instead of accommodating vehicular trips as level of service does. An in-lieu fee for active transportation compliance in portions of the city is also being created. A map shows areas in yellow depicting vmt inefficiency with areas in blue depicting VMT efficiency. The city can get a better reduction in greenhouse gas reductions by investing in active transportation infrastructure within the blue areas where trip length is shorter and there is more opportunity for VMT reductions. The map divides the city into four zones. Zone one is downtown where no additional requirements for development are being planned. Zones two and three include Transit Priority Areas and areas adjacent to them where investment in active transportation is indicated. Area four is the yellow area where return on investment is lowest and where the active transportation in-lieu-fee would apply to fund active transportation projects in the blue areas (zones one, two and three), which include communities of concern (shown in pink).

**Board Comment:**
Comment ranged from whether Golden Hill is a community of concern (it isn’t) to what percentage of fees generated by development in blue areas would be spent in certain other areas. Staff responded that no funds would be generated by development in blue areas but that funds generated by development in yellow areas would be directed for investment in blue areas. Concern was voiced over the proposition of taking funds generated by development in area 4 and using it other zones, in some cases jeopardizing safety for certain groups, i.e. bicyclists. Staff replied that fees are used for the purpose collected, which is to reduce city-wide emissions, not for investment in the areas they were collected but that DIF collected in area 4 could be used to fund transportation improvements in area 4.

Housing Solutions is an opt-in program intended to help the City meet its Regional Housing Assessment Needs (RHNA) goals for affordable housing, CAP goals by providing for affordable housing in multi-family and mixed-use commercial areas served by transit. This is an additional bonus program for providing housing for all income levels while including amenities like linear parks and promenades. Compete Communities Housing Solutions will help the City meet its RHNA goals for affordable housing and comply with state law AB2372, also known as the California Sustainable and Affordable Housing Act (CSAHA). Housing production will need to triple annual production to meet RHNA goals of 108,000 units of housing in San Diego by 2029. The program is only permitted in zones for multi-family in Transit Priority Areas and is intended to incentivize small-scale development while investing in amenities to improve quality of life for new residents. The program would require affordable housing be located in transit supportive areas and meet inclusionary housing requirements to provide an additional 10% rental units be for households earning up to 120% Area Median Income (AMI). The project must also replace existing similar size affordable units. The project must pay $9 per sf of lot area, or $11 per sf lot area if over 95 feet in height into the neighborhood enhancement fund or else construct an onsite promenade. Projects meeting the requirements are allowed incentives including ministerial processing, FAR-based density/height, affordable housing incentives, DIF scaled to square feet of unit size. The program requires 20% affordable housing - the 10% bonus at the inclusionary rate plus 10% at the moderate-income rate. The program is scheduled for City Council summer of 2020.
Board Comment:
A recurring theme and focus of concern was on the incentives for affordable housing that included ministerial review. Members voiced concerns that the switch to FAR-based density would help to allow high rises could be built next to one - and two - story multi-family residential and that nothing would prevent conversion of small-scale units to short-term vacation rentals once built. Staff responded that the assumption is that most infill development will occur on small lots but that doesn’t prevent a developer from consolidating lots. Also, the state has mandated incentives including ministerial review for affordable units and that San Diego needs to drastically increase its housing production to meet state RHNA goals. A concern was expressed over reduced DIF from small scale development that would mean less funds for community improvements. Staff replied that infill development would occur mostly on small lots and that the DIF reduction would encourage smaller unit size and more unit production. Concern over lot consolidation in single-family zones allowing high-rises was expressed but staff replied that the program only applied in multi-family zones within TPA’s

Motion:
LV moves for Planning Department not to docket Complete Communities for City Council consideration but work to re-write the plan based on CPG and CPC input and request an extension of the state deadline for submission. SP/LH second. Ayes: CV, CHE, CH, CLMT, COL, GH, KT, LJ, LV, MM, MRN, MV, OT, RB, RP, SP/LH, SR, SM, SE, TIRSN, TP, UN. Nays: DWNTN, MW, NAV, NP, OB. Abstain: CMRSS.

Vonblum explained that the current General Plan contains a provision to prepare a Parks Master Plan. Planning is currently involved in that process and will be providing information on identifying park opportunities in conjunction with plan updates. Plans will be prepared for approval by the Director of Parks and Recreation then drawn for actual development. The Parks Master Plan is intended to guide community planning as well as site-specific planning into the future. The plan is also intended to implement the Climate Action Plan to increase walking, biking and transit use and increasing the city’s urban tree canopy. Community outreach included a survey, thirteen city-wide workshop and other efforts. The results of the outreach indicated that city residents are generally satisfied with the city’s parks but that they also identified needed amenities including small neighborhood parks, open spaces and trails, and beaches. Residents favor upgrades to existing facilities and opportunities to add recreational value to existing public spaces. The General Plan currently calls for an acreage-based plan for providing community parks. The standard metric used is 2.8 acres per 1,000 residents. But this results in a disconnected park system limiting comprehensive planning. Lack of land for new park space is also an issue for planning. The new Parks Master Plan has four goals including: equity goals, 10, 20 ,30, 40-minute, mode related access goal, new park standard and a new impact fee. The new standard is a point system, awarding twelve points per 1,000 population. Parks were scored to arrive at a twelve-point total. to
comprise the new recreational value standard. Parks with fewer recreational amenities score lower than those with more. A restructuring of DIF for public facilities is also proposed.

**Board Comment:**
Main board concern centered on the replacement of the acreage-based metric to a point system based on recreational amenities. Some felt the new system was too abstract and would not result in recreational value and that acreage was what was needed, not recreational amenities like tot lots or benches. Other concern was that the planning groups didn’t have enough time to consider the Parks Master Plan, due to the COVID19 emergency and recommended delaying a vote and forming a CPC subcommittee to discuss and make recommendations.

**Public Comment:**
A concern was expressed that the proposed point system was open to abuse. For example, a tot lot could be added to a 1-acre park resulting in the same recreational value as for a 3-acre park.

**Motion:**
CH moved to request an extension of time and for CPC to form a subcommittee to consider the program prior to a vote. LV seconded. Ayes: CV, CHE, CH, CLMT, COL, DWNTN, GH, KT, LJ, LV, MM, MRN, MV, MW, NAV, NP, OB, OT, RB, RP, SP/LH, SR, SM, SE, TIRSN, TP, UN. Nays: 0. Abstain: CMRSS.

9. **ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2020-2021**
Wally Wulfeck - Chair, Andrea Schlageter - Vice Chair, Vicki Touchstone - Secretary

**REPORTS TO CPC**
- Staff Report - None.
- Chair Report – Electronic meetings are working well. Wally urges members to contact their Council office regarding the issues discussed tonight. Wally expressed concern over the state usurping local land use authority.
- CPC Member Comments – None.
- Subcommittee Reports - None.

**ADJOURNMENT TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING: JUNE 23, 2020:** The meeting was adjourned by Chair Wally Wulfeck at 9:12 PM.