

City of San Diego

De Anza Revitalization Plan – An
Amendment to the Mission Bay Park
Master Plan and Local Coastal Program

FINAL Ad-hoc Committee Meeting No. 6
Summary

June 29, 2017

Prepared by:
PlaceWorks and Katz & Associates, Inc.

I. Introduction

The City of San Diego conducted the sixth meeting of the De Anza Revitalization Plan Ad-hoc Committee on Thursday, June 29, 2017 at Mission Bay High School on Grand Avenue. The Ad-hoc Committee met from 6 to 7 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the input received on the three Draft Concept Alternatives, present the two Refined Draft Concept Alternatives and solicit feedback regarding the Refined Draft Concept during a focused Ad-hoc Committee member discussion. In addition to the project team and Ad-hoc Committee members present (Addendum A), approximately 230 community members also attended the meeting.

Click the links below for the meeting agenda and presentation.

[Agenda](#)
[Presentation](#)

II. Format

The meeting was called to order by the Ad-hoc Committee Chair, Paul Robinson, at approximately 6:00 p.m and was facilitated by Robin Shifflet, City of San Diego-Planning Department, Project Manager.

After presenting the agenda, Robin Shifflet provided an overview of the meeting purpose and goals, a review of the Mission Bay Park Master Plan Goals and Guiding Principles, and a general project overview and update. Following Robin's comments, a summary of the public input received from Community Workshop #3 and online activities on the three Draft Concept Alternatives was presented by Brooke Peterson (PlaceWorks). Alyssa Muto, City of San Diego Planning Deputy Director then presented the approach used to guide developed of the Refined Draft Concept Alternatives. A detailed overview of the Refined Draft Concept Alternatives followed, provided by Glen Schmidt (Schmidt Design Group).

At the conclusion of the presentation, Robin Shifflet guided the Committee through a focused discussion on the Refined Draft Concept Alternatives regarding consistency with the Mission Bay Park Master Plan and Guiding Principles and other feedback. Ad-hoc Committee comments were captured on a flip chart by a note taker. After all members provided their comments, Committee Chair Paul Robinson recommended the Ad-hoc Committee make a motion to select one Alternative to submit to the Mission Bay Park Committee. City staff reminded the Ad-hoc Committee that a motion was not required. Ad-hoc Committee member Cindy Hedgecock made a motion to vote to submit Alternative 2 with the Ad-hoc Committee's comments as shared during the focused discussion to the Mission Bay Park Committee. The motion passed 10 – 0 with one abstention. Paul Robinson adjourned the meeting at approximately 7 p.m.

A Community Open House was hosted directly after the Ad-hoc Committee Meeting in the High School's cafeteria. Attendees had the opportunity to review the Refined Draft Concept Alternatives at information stations and ask questions directly to project team members as well as provide written comments. The Community open House took place from 7 – 8 p.m.

III. Discussion and Input

Following the project team's presentation, Ad-hoc Committee members participated in a focused group discussion. Each Ad-hoc Committee member took a turn providing their input and answering the questions, "How do the Refined Draft Alternatives best meet the goals of the Mission Bay Park Master Plan and align with the project's Guiding Principles and feedback received from the public?" Below is a summary of the Ad-hoc Committee's comments and questions during the discussion.

"Which draft alternative most closely aligns with the Guiding Principles and goals of the Mission Bay Master Plan?"

Habitat / Wetlands

- The habitat areas in both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are well designed to provide public interaction and educational opportunities (location, circulation-elevated boardwalk, etc.). The habitat area in Alternative 2 provides more interesting circulation between the island and the site. The island also provides better tidewater circulation and unique features, along with its quality natural area. Also, it is completely separated from the more active portion of the site. In Alternative 1, additional habitat could be added where the tennis courts are currently planned. The tennis courts could be relocated east of the ball fields. Additional habitat could be applied to Alternative 2 by increasing the habitat area along the golf course adjacent to Rose Creek. [D.O.]
- I like Alternative 2 better, it is more natural. [V.G.]
- There should be an educational component of the habitat area other than the overlook, people should know why it's there and have the opportunity to learn about Mission Bay. There were also good improvements addressing tidal flow. [D.W.]
- I like Alternative 2 for the tidal flow. Although I do have concerns, like what is the cost to maintain and develop the plans? What is the outlook going to look like? Will it obstruct views? [J.G.]
- I applaud the City for defining the Campland site as restored wetlands so Rose Creek connects with the Kendall Frost Marsh. Currently, wetlands only account for 2% of Mission Bay, and both alternatives will only increase wetland area to 3%. The expanded natural habitat is an improvement, but

- the City has always prioritized recreation over species and habitat preservation. But, we implore the City to reconsider its land use priorities and shortsighted view of Mission Bay, and to shift its view to habitat protection. It would be better for water quality, sea level rise and public education. We need to restore 200 acres of natural habitat today in order to provide restoration need over a meaningful planning horizon of 75 years. We understand that it is a difficult decision, as it means moving the golf course. The Mission Bay Park Master Plan was drafted in 1994 and didn't take into account sea level rise, but did include language that would make future planning flexible to new needs. We live in a new era and we need to change. We disagree with the land use decisions and can't support either alternative. Alternative 2, although, is the better faith effort to take natural habitat into account and we do support parts of Alternative 1, like the addition of the barranca. What you have tried to do here is to satisfy the most amount of people. But this is not a popularity contest. We really need to keep the highest interest of the natural habitat and the entire region a priority. [R.S-L.]
- Alternative 2 is better in terms in habitat and water quality. I would like a comparison between the data of the two alternatives to demonstrate which one is more beneficial to habitat and water quality. [C.O.]

Guest Housing

- Guest housing in both alternatives are in good locations and do not conflict with other site uses. The interior of the guest housing area will be important, especially the perimeter where it will be interacting with the habitat area. That transition will be important in the next phase of the design. [D.O.]
- The guest housing seems to have followed the public opinion and what the Ad-hoc Committee had asked for. [C.O.]
- The Kendall Frost Marsh expansion cuts into Campland, so the alternatives need to demonstrate what low-cost guest housing does to balance out the loss of Campland. [C.H.]

Golf Course / Practice Green / Driving Range

- The golf course and its amenities fit well in both alternatives. There are slight differences, but there is enough flexibility that they would work with the final location of the ball fields and tennis courts. This brings into the discussion of joint use – Mission Bay High School is adjacent to this location and they have both ball fields and tennis courts. [D.O.]
- There should be a few more picnic areas for day use. [D.W.]
- A lot of the groups I reached out to want to eliminate the golf course, but some were in favor of maintaining it. In the data you showed there was more opposition to the golf course than support. [C.O.]

Barranca

- The barranca and water quality basins are well integrated into the site and look like natural amenities – not engineered. [D.O./V.G./D.W.]

Parking and Circulation (Bike / Pedestrian Path & Boardwalks)

- Both plans have located activities that are not in conflict with each other most of the time. The circulation in both alternatives works well. However, in Alternative 1, pedestrian, bicycle, automobile circulation and parking goes deeper into the site and does come into some conflict, but that is due to the location of the restaurant. That is probably the ideal location for that restaurant, but there is a tradeoff. In Alternative 2, the location of the restaurant is not that bad and there is less intrusion in the automobile circulation. The parking area is sufficient and it doesn't seem to be taking up too much space, the ingress and egress works okay. I suggest to look into a shuttle or driverless system. [D.O.]
- But, what I like best is that parking is kept out of the primary area, in the outer boot, where there are pedestrians. However, I am concerned there is not enough handicap parking, especially for peak days. As we get older, there will be a need for increased handicap parking. Some type of reservation system or shuttle service needs to be set up for parking. Parking will not be sufficient as it is proposed, people will be driving around and around during peak times. From my experience with Balboa Park, internal parking does not work. Electric shuttles can be implemented and mitigate concerns regarding carbon emissions. [V.G.]
- Also, Alternative 2 may need more parking to accommodate the needs of small children and those with ADA issues. The possibility to use shuttles to make up for the lack of parking might raise concerns about increasing the carbon footprint. [N.M.]
- The pedestrian and bike paths in Alternative 2 provide a peaceful and natural way to enjoy the area. It also has habitat and nature recreational opportunities. I like the pedestrian underpass in Alternative 1 as it segments Campland from beach opportunities. [M.R.]
- The circulation is good. [C.O.]

Ball/Sports Fields

- Good use of community uses on the north. [D.W.]
- The tennis and ball fields are less than what was requested, and there are no soccer fields even though it was asked for. [C.O.]

Tennis Courts

- As the area is right next to natural habitat, the lighting for the tennis courts should face the inside of the road to minimize impact. [D.W.]

Water Quality

- Water quality should be much improved with baranca and channel in Alt. 2 [D.O.]
- Waterflow, runoff filtration, and sediment control are being addressed. [D.O./J.G./M.W.]

Restaurants

- Preference for the island how it is now, with no restaurant. [V.G.]
- Restaurants should be a good revenue generator [D.O]

Open Green

- The open green space, natural recreational area, expanded beach area, snack shack/restroom, adventure paly are and boat rentals and dock area in both alternatives work well along with the iconic boardwalk, iconic overlook and interpretive nature overlook. Additional open green spaces need to be considered in both alternatives – there’s an opportunity next to the guest housing, on the east side. In Alternative 1, the sand volleyball courts do not seem to fit where they are located, that area should be restudied. [D.O.]

Sand Volleyball

- Sand volleyball needs better representation. It needs 2-3 acres for 20 courts. [C.O.]

Revenue Generation

- Both alternatives have revenue sources to support activities: the golf course with its amenities, guest housing, boat rental, the restaurant and the snack shack. The iconic overlook could also be turned into an income source. Also, we should consider using the habitat area as an income source by leasing a portion of the area to an educational institution or research entity. Adding an amphitheater would generate income and provide a great entertainment venue. [D.O.]
- I like the non-motorized boat rentals, as that area gets “smaller” during the summer. [D.W.]
- I like how much income will come in for Alternative 1, as it might cost less than Alternative 2 due the tidal flow improvements in Alternative 2. [J.G.]
- I have concerns about the costs of Alternative 2. [N.M.]

- Alternative 2 is preferred as it does a good job addressing the comments received at the previous workshop. It has balanced uses and fiscal opportunities. [M.R.]
- The Mission Bay Park Committee is the overseer of the revenue balance of the park as a whole. So, I'm concerned about revenue generation as there will be an increase in the maintenance costs because the pedestrian walkways will generate more trash and the need for bathroom facilities. The restaurant might be able to mitigate the increase in maintenance costs. The golf course is a negative revenue source for the City as it loses money. [C.H.]
- The Mission Bay Fund Committee is concerned with revenue generating opportunities. We want to make sure that the area will be revenue neutral or generate revenue and not be a drain. [P.R.]

Other

- I like the idea of an amphitheater. [D.O./VG]
- The alternative is also missing a community garden, skate park and aquatic park. [C.H.]
- The alternatives are missing the iconic waterpark and public art. I think the area could be so beautiful, but I don't see the designs demonstrating more beautiful attractions. [C.O.]
- Should include a community garden [C.O.]

Addendum A

Project Team Members in Attendance

PlaceWorks – Lead Consultant

Brooke Peterson
Scott Ashlock
Alex Reyes
Trevor Kennedy
Matt Gelbman

Katz & Associates

Natalia Hentschel
Marissa Twite
Emily Wolfsohn

Schmidt Design Group

Glen Schmidt
Todd Schechinger
Lindsay DeCeault

City Staff

Robin Shifflet
Alyssa Muto
Herman Parker
Craig Hooker
Clark Taylor

Committee Members in Attendance

Chris Olson	Pacific Beach Planning Group
Cindy Hedgecock	Mission Bay Park Committee
Darlene Walter	Mission Bay Park Committee
Dennis Otsuji	Parks and Recreation
Jim Greene	Mission Bay Park Committee
Madison Roberts	American Planning Association, San Diego Section
Namara Mercer	Mission Bay Lessees Association
Paul Robinson	Mission Bay Park Committee
Rebecca Schwartz Lesberg	San Diego Audubon
Vicki Granowitz	At-Large

Addendum B
Member Comments Submitted in Hard Copy at the
Meeting

(Dennis Otsuji / Darlene Walter)

DRAFT CONCEPT COMMENTS

1. BOTH ALT 1 & 2 ARE BOTH WELL DESIGNED AND LAYED OUT. THEY BOTH HAVE LOCATED ACTIVITIES THAT ARE NOT IN CONFLICT WITH EACH OTHER MOST OF TIME.
2. THE CIRCULATION IN BOTH ALT 1 & 2 WORKS WELL – PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AUTO. ON ALT 1 THE AUTO AND PARKING GOES DEEPER INTO THE SITE WITH SOME CONFLICT BUT THAT IS DUE TO THE LOCATION OF THE RESTAURANT. THAT IS PROBABLY THE IDEAL LOCATION FOR THAT RESTAURANT BUT THERE IS A TRADE-OFF. ON ALT 2 THE LOCATION OF THE RESTAURANT IS NOT THAT BAD AND YOU HAVE LESS INTRUSION OF THE AUTO. THE PARKING AREA ARE SUFFICIENT AND THEY DON'T SEEM TO BE TAKING UP TOO MUCH SPACE. INGRESS EGRESS WORKS O.K. NEED MORE MASSAGING . LOOK INTO SHUTTLE SYSTEM-DRIVER & DRIVERLESS.
3. THE HABIT AREA IN BOTH ALT 1 & 2 ARE WELL DESIGNED TO BE ABLE TO INTERACT WITH THE PUBLIC ON ITS EDUCATIONAL VALUES (LOCATION , CIRCULATION-ELEVATED BOARDWALK, ETC). THE HABITAT AREA IN ALT 2 PROVIDES A MORE INTERESTING CIRCULATION BETWEEN THE ISLAND AND THE SITE. THE ISLAND ALSO PROVIDES A BETTER TIDEWATER CIRCULATION AND UNIQUE FEATURES ALONG WITH A QUALITY NATURAL AREA. ALSO IT IS COMPLETELY SEPARATED FROM THE MORE ACTIVE PORTION OF THE SITE. ADDITIONAL HABITAT AREA COULD BE ADDED IN ALT 1 WHERE THE TENNIS COURTS ARE LOCATED. THE TENNIS COURTS

COULD BE RELOCATED EAST OF THE BALL FIELDS. THE SAME COULD APPLIED TO ALT 2 BY INCREASING THE HABITAT AREA ALONG THE GOLF COURSE ADJACENT TO ROSE CREEK.

4. THE WATER QUALITY & BARRANCA BASINS ARE WELL INTERGRATED INTO THE SITE AND LOOK LIKE NATURAL AMENITY TO THE SITE-ITS NOT ENGINEERED.
5. THE OPEN GREEN SPACE, NATURAL RECREATIONAL AREA, EXPANDED BEACH AREA, SNACK SHACK/RESTROOM, ADVENTURE PLAY AND BOAT RENTAL & DOCK ON BOTH ALT 1 & 2 WORK WELL ALONG WITH THERE ICONIC BOARDWALK, ICONIC OVERLOOK AND INTERPRETIVE NATURE OVERLOOK. THE ONE THING THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IS ADDITIONAL OPEN GREEN SPACE. THE AREA THAT IT WOULD FIT EASILY IS THE EASTERN EDGES OF THE GUEST HOUSING AREA. ON ALT 1 YOU SHOW SAND VOLLEYBALL COURTS AND IT SEEMS TO NOT FIT WHERE IT IS LOCATED. RESTUDY. SHOULD STILL CONSIDER AMPHITHEATER-ENTERTEINMENT VENUE.
6. THE GUEST HOUSING ON BOTH CONCEPT ARE LOCATED WHERE IT DOES NOT DIVIDE ANY OF THE SITE USES. THE INTERIOR DESIGN OF THE GUEST HOUSING WILL BE IMPORTANT ESPECIALLY THE PERIMETER WHERE IT WILL BE INTERACTING WITH THE HABITAT AREA. THAT TRANSITION WILL BE IMPORTANT IN THE NEXT PHASE OF THE DESIGN.

7. THE GOLF COURSE AND ITS AMENITIES(CLUB HOUSE, RESTAURANT, PRACTICE GREEN & DRIVING RANGE) FIT WELL IN BOTH ALT 1 & 2. THERE ARE SLIGHT DIFFERENCES BUT THERE IS ENOUGH FLEXI- ABILITY THAT THEY WOULD WORK WITH THE FINAL LOCATION OF THE BALL FIELDS AND TENNIS COURTS. ALSO IS THERE THAT MUCH DEMAND FOR TENNIS COURTS. AND THIS BRINGS INTO THE DISCUSSION OF JOINT USE. MISSION BAY HIGH IS ADJACENT TO THIS LOCATION AND THEY HAVE BOTH BALL FIELDS AND TENNIS COURTS. IS THAT SOMETHING THAT WE COULD STUDY?
8. LOOKING AT BOTH ALTERNATIVES FROM A REVENUE SOURCE TO SUPPORT ACTIVITIES THEY BOTH HAVE THE GOLF COURSE WITH ITS AMENITIES(RESTAURANT, DRIVING RANGE, CLUBHOUSE), GUEST HOUSING, BOAT RENTAL, SNACK SHACK AND A RESTAURANT. THE ICONIC OVERLOOK COULD ALSO TURN INTO A INCOME SOURCE . ALSO WE SHOULD CONSIDER IF THEY WOULD BE A INCOME SOURCE IN THE HABITAT AREA IN LEASING PORTION OF THE HABITAT TO A EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION OR RESEARCH ENTITY. AND IF YOU ADD THE AMPHITHEATER BACK IN THAT WOULD GENERATE INCOME AND GREAT ENTERTAINMENT VENUE
9. THE BIGGEST DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ALT 1 & 2 IS THAT 2 IS MORE NATURAL IN IT SETTING WHICH INTERGRATES NATURALLY INTO THE HABITAT AREA.

	Alt 1	Alt 2 - Preferred	General
Provision of public recreation	good	good	public parking provisions ratio? Is this motor boat, or human power in this cove? Small area for swimming and these activities don't blend well Lighting of an area near ESHA habitat will need to be thought through;
Sustainable mgmt of resources			Educational component of habitat area other than overlook? People should know why it's there and know about Mission Bay
Operation of economically successful commercial leisure enterprises	Fountains are high energy use and expense; tunnel and elevated road - are they necessary?		Good use of community serving uses on the north
	Good use of 2 restaurant locations	Better use of restaurant locations	Has the City evaluated a proforma of revenue vs expense? Could another restaurant be sustainable?

Advance the MP concept			Feels like a destination; but still trying to be everything to everyone
Prioritize public access and connectivity	yes	yes	
Enhance public use and diversify recreational uses			Should have more picnic areas for day use.
Transit			
WQ	less	yes	
stewardship of environment	less	yes	lighted tennis courts near habitat are in conflict
Technology? / Climate change	yes	yes	What is the technology? Just loss of shoreline?
New business			Don't see very much NEW opportunity for leasing?

What puts this on the map?
What makes this iconic?
Does this serve a wide demographic?