MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
MISSION VALLEY PLANNING GROUP

September 02, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT
Paul Brown
Bob Cummings
Robert Doherty
Randall Dolph
Alan Grant
Derek Hulse
Rob Hutsel
John Laraia
Elizabeth Leventhal
John Nugent
Jim Penner
Keith Pittsford
Marco Sessa
Dottie Surdi
Rick Tarbell
Josh Weiselberg

MEMBERS ABSENT
Steve Abbo
Deborah Bossmeyer
Perry Dealy
Matthew Guilly
Andrew Michajlenko
Alex Plishner

GUESTS
Media Fettinger
Kyra Greene
Cami Hurd
Richard Hurd
Robert McDowell
Vince Meehan
Cindy Moore
David Norvell
Rebecca Sappenfield
Mary Shepperd
Carole Thompson

Dottie Surdi, Chair, called the regular meeting of the Mission Valley Planning Group (MVPG) to order at 12:02 p.m. at the Mission Valley Library Community Room located at 2123 Fenton Parkway, San Diego, CA.

A. CALL TO ORDER
Verify Quorum: 16 members were present, constituting a quorum.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE –
Randall Dolph led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. INTRODUCTIONS / OPENING REMARKS/ AGENDA CHANGE
Dottie Surdi welcomed everyone to the meeting and reminded those present to sign the sign in sheets.
Guests introduced themselves.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Rob Hutsel moved to approve the minutes of the August 05, 2015 regular meeting. Keith Pittsford seconded the motion. Minutes were approved 12 –0 – 4 with Robert Doherty, Randall Dolph, Alan Grant, Rob Hutsel, John Laraia, Elizabeth Leventhal, John Nugent, Jim Penner, Keith Pittsford, Dottie Surdi, Rick Tarbell, Josh Weiselberg voting yes, and Paul Brown, Bob Cummings, Derek Hulse, Marco Sessa abstaining.

E. PUBLIC INPUT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS BUT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF AUTHORITY OF THE PLANNING GROUP.
“The Mission Valley Planning Group has been formed and recognized by the City Council to make recommendations to the City Council, Planning Commission, City staff, and other governmental agencies on land use matters, specifically concerning the preparation of, adoption of, implementation of, or amendment to, the General Plan or a land use plan when a plan relates to the Mission Valley community boundaries. The planning group also advises on other land use matters as requested by the City or other governmental agency.”
Mission Valley Planning Group Bylaws as Amended and approved July 2015

There were no comments

F. MEMBERSHIP BUSINESS
John reported that Jason Broad has submitted his resignation effective September 1st. There are now two openings on the MVPG Board, one for a “property taxpayer” and one for a “Resident”. Both open positions have terms expiring in March 2016.

Jason Broad also resigned as Vice Chair so the position of Vice Chair is open.

John reported that there is an opening for a MVPG Board member on The Community Plan Update Subcommittee.

G. TREASURER’S REPORT
Bob Doherty reported that the balance is $1,357.06.

H. PUBLIC SAFETY REPORTS
1. Police Department – Officer Adam McElroy
   Officer McElroy was not present. No report

2. Fire Department – No report.

I. GOVERNMENTAL STAFF REPORTS
1. Mayor’s Office
   Anthony George was not present, no report.

2. City Attorney’s office
   Julio DeGuzman was not present. No report.
More information on office can be found at:

3. Council Office-District 7- Councilmember Scott Sherman
Liz Saidkhanian welcomed Councilmember Scott Sherman to the meeting and asked if there were any questions that could be addressed by their office. There were none.

3. City Planning Update-Nancy Graham
Nancy Graham was on vacation, no report.

4. State Representatives
   a. Senate Member’s Office – Sen. Marty Block from the 39th Senate District
   Katelyn Hailey was not present. No report
   More information can be found at: http://sd39.senate.ca.gov/

   b. Assembly Member’s Office – Shirley Weber from the 79th Assembly District
   George Gastil was not present. No report.

5. Federal Representatives
   a. Congresswoman Susan Davis’ Office
   Mark Zambon was present and distributed The Davis Dispatch.
   Mark reported on the Congresswoman’s activities during the summer recess.
   More information is available at: http://www.house.gov/susandavis/

   b. Congressman Scott Peters’ Office –
   Sarah Czarrecki was not present. No report.
   More information is available at: http://scottpeters.house.gov/

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Mission Valley Stadium Draft EIR

   **Draft Motion:** Recommend a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Site Development Permit (SDP) to construct, at 9449 Friars Road San Diego, California 92108, a new multi-purpose sports stadium with a permanent seating capacity of up to 68,000 seats, expanding to approximately 72,000 seats for special events, and capable of hosting National Football League (NFL) football games, other professional and amateur sports, entertainment, cultural and commercial events. The new stadium would have a maximum height of 250 feet and would cover an area of approximately 750,000 square feet (approximately 17 acres) with an approximate floor area of 1,750,000 square feet in the north east corner of the site. The existing Qualcomm stadium will be demolished subsequent to construction of the new stadium.

   More information can be found at:
3. The City’s presentation to the NFL Los Angeles Relocation Committee:  

Kris Shackelford, Senior Civil Engineer, Public Works department, The City of San Diego presented an overview of the stadium EIR.

Randy Dolph, the MVPG Design Advisory Board (DAB) Standing Committee Chair reviewed the minutes from the August 31st DAB meeting. The entire minutes for the meeting can be found at the end of these minutes, however the relevant points from the DAB minutes in relation to this agenda item are:

1. Placement of the stadium on the site:

   a. The DAB acknowledged that any new stadium will likely need to be constructed prior to demolition of the existing stadium. That said, the proximity of the new stadium to the existing stadium is problematic if implosion is used to demolish the existing stadium. Alternative demolition options need to be explored in more depth.

   b. The new stadium site plan (Figure 3-2) does not indicate any hook ramps from I-8 and/or I-15 into the site, nor the Milly Way access bridge. As part of the site design, these alternatives should be explored in more depth, and subject to their feasibility, included in the base scope.

      - The DAB recalls the potential for direct freeway access from the stadium project, back when it was originally constructed in 1969, and was not chosen. The board feels the City should reopen the discussions with Caltrans as part of the proposed development process, in consideration of the traffic impacts.

      - Board members have recognized the Milly Way southwestern site access bridge was promised to the community with the development of the Ikea, Lowes Costco center, back in 2000. The board further understands the developers DIFF fees paid for a significant portion of this bridge design and construction, have been transferred to the city general fund. The board strongly urges the city to consider the inclusion of this new site exit, as part of the overall masterplan of this new stadium project, in consideration of improving the current site exiting design.

   c. The proximity of a fully-populated stadium to the existing bulk petroleum terminal presents a higher risk of incident versus locating the stadium elsewhere on the site.

   d. Table 3-1 indicates that the footprint of the new stadium is 17 acres versus 15 acres for the existing stadium. This is not consistent with the graphic representation of the new stadium in Figure 3-1 which shows a smaller new stadium. This is also not consistent with the impact analysis on page 4.15-46 which states that the new stadium has a 2 acre smaller footprint.

   e. The new stadium site plans (Figure 3.1 and Figure 3-2) do not acknowledge the presence of the new fire station along Friars Road. Although the EIR discusses the temporary fire station on Qualcomm Stadium’s site, the EIR does not provide a thorough analysis of the operation of the new fire station at its new...
location. This study is required for both emergency vehicular access into the Valley and into the stadium.

2. Surface parking:

a. The new stadium site plan (Figure 3-2) exclusively indicates a surface parking lot, with a small greenbelt leading from the trolley and parking area into the stadium. The parking area narrative on page 4.15-21 suggests that a minimum of ten percent of the parking lot area be landscaped. The DAB recommends that the project follow the City’s Land Development Code requirement for locating trees within parking areas to provide shade.

b. In an effort to reduce the environmental impact to large areas of surface paving, alternatives such as parking structures should be explored.

3. Stadium characteristics.

a. Height/Massing: The DAB did not take exception to the increased height of the new stadium, provided that the overall massing/bulk was in keeping with the stadium design and overall appearance.

b. Lighting: The cross section diagram (Figure 3-3) indicated a large roof overhang. To prevent light pollution, the DAB recommends that the high-intensity lighting remain below the plane of the roof overhang.

c. Iconic Image: There is a significant discrepancy between the renderings of the project that the City presented to the NFL and the renderings of the project presented in EIR Section 4.15 “Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character.” The renderings in the EIR are much more subdued and scaled back in size. This discrepancy needs to be addressed before any conclusions can be made.

d. On page 3-2, the EIR project design indicates that the exterior materials would be of steel, concrete, stucco and other durable finishes. Given the City’s past history with deferred maintenance, the DAB recommends that consideration be given to materials that have a long service life with low maintenance requirements. Exposed ferrous steel is not recommended due to increased maintenance versus exposed concrete.

4. Applicability of “San Diego River Park Master Plan” to the project.

a. Throughout the EIR, a portion of the site adjacent to the river has been designated without any direct construction improvements. On page 4.15-19, the EIR addresses the design protection areas and the San Diego River and states:
“Since the Project would not be constructed within nor affect the San Diego River Corridor of Influence Area of the San Diego River Park Master Plan, the Design Protection Area Design Guidelines, related to the San Diego River Park Master Plan, would not be applicable to the project.”

The DAB disagrees with this EIR finding and recommends that the project be designed in accordance with the San Diego River Park Master Plan.

Discussion/Question/Comments:

- Length of Conditional Use Permit/life of stadium is estimated at 30 years
- Timing of asking for a recommendation of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Site Development Permit (SDP) is problematic as there is not sufficient documentation for a proper due diligence in preparation for a vote of recommendation on project.
- EIR is without an appropriate design or renderings/EIR is based on conceptual parameters and not a specific design.
- Recommending a CUP or SDP for this project based on incomplete reports and documents could prove problematic in the review and recommendations for other projects in the future.
- Timing of EIR review set by external forces/not ideal/recommendation of CUP/SDP will send an important message to NFL/need to show progress on new stadium to NFL, including community support.
- EIR does not include or provides reference to the current Mission Valley Community Plan in relation to a park that is to be located “on City-owned land in Mission Valley. One site will be located in the vicinity of San Diego Jack Murphy Stadium.”, and does not include or provides reference to the Mission Valley Community Plan which locates a second park in the vicinity of the existing YMCA with a pedestrian connection being available between the two facilities through an open space linkage system to be established along the river corridor.
- The current Mission Valley Community Plan includes a provision for the financing of a City Park as a condition of approval of any San Diego Jack Murphy Stadium reuse program. The EIR and/or plans for redevelopment of the site does not address the financing, design or location of the City Park or the financing, design, location and completion of the pedestrian pathway, on the stadium grounds, directed towards the City Park on the west end of Mission Valley.
- EIR is incorrect on page 4.15-19 when it addresses the design protection areas and the San Diego River, stating: “Since the Project would not be constructed within nor affect the San Diego River Corridor of Influence Area of the San Diego River Park Master Plan, the Design Protection Area Design Guidelines, related to the San Diego River Park Master Plan, would not be applicable to the project.” Proper surveys and studies have not been completed to validate that statement, especially in relation to a wetlands buffer area. The San Diego River Park Master Plan states “if any part of the River Corridor area is mapped MHPA, or determined to be within a wetland buffer area, the San Diego River Pathway should be moved just outside these areas. In these situations, the outer edge of the San Diego River Pathway will be the new boundary for the River Corridor.” A determination as to whether the Design Protection Area Design Guidelines, related to the San Diego River Park Master Plan, would be applicable to the project can only be made based on further studies be completed.
• The Serra Mesa Planning Group believes that their planning area of the City will be impacted by the project but the EIR does not mention them as a boundary/boarder entity or any impacts that the project may have on their planning area.
• Proposed conceptual stadium is in 100 year flood yet normal rainfall floods part of site already/problem is with cleaning out of existing concrete channels and storm drains controlled by various governmental agencies
• Height of proposed conceptual stadium
• EIR indicates a potential for more noise from site/proposed conceptual stadium design would have some noise mitigations included
• It appears this project may need an amendment to the current Mission Valley Community Plan

Marco Sessa moved that the minutes from the August 31, 2015 Design Advisory Board meeting on the Stadium Reconstruction Project EIR, be formally submitted to the City of San Diego along with comments on this project related to The San Diego River Park Master Plan, the locating and financing of a City Park and partial pedestrian path on the site per the Mission Valley Community Plan. Josh Weiselberg seconded the motion. The motion was approved 15-1-0 with Paul Brown, Bob Cummings, Robert Doherty, Randall Dolph, Alan Grant, Derek Hulse, John Laraia, Elizabeth Leventhal, John Nugent, Jim Penner, Keith Pittsford, Marco Sessa, Dottie Surdi, Rick Tarbell, Josh Weiselberg voting yes and Rob Hutsel voting no.

After further discussion regarding the appropriateness of recommending a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Site Development Permit (SDP) based on current studies and reports the request was made for the City staff to return at a later meeting to further discuss the EIR, especially addressing comments made during the meeting and in the DAB minutes.

However, in order to show support for the concept of a replacement stadium and to indicate progress and community support for the concept of a replacement stadium the following motion was made:

Marco Sessa moved to support the concept, consistent with the Mission Valley Community Plan and San Diego River Park Master Plan, of replacing, at 9449 Friars Road San Diego, California 92108, a new multi-purpose sports stadium. Rob Hutsel seconded the motion. Motion was approved 16 –0 –0. with Paul Brown, Bob Cummings, Robert Doherty, Randall Dolph, Alan Grant, Derek Hulse, Rob Hutsel, John Laraia, Elizabeth Leventhal, John Nugent, Jim Penner, Keith Pittsford, Marco Sessa, Dottie Surdi, Rick Tarbell, Josh Weiselberg voting yes.

K. OLD BUSINESS

1. Subcommittee Reports:
A. Standing Committees:
   1) Design Advisory Board – Randy Dolph
The committee met on August 31st with the primary agenda to review and comment on items in the draft Mission Valley Stadium EIR subject to the purview of the Mission
Mission Valley Design Advisory Board. The minutes of the meeting follow these MVPG minutes (see below).

The next meeting is set for Monday October 5, 2015 at 3:00pm at the Mission Valley Library.

2) Mission Valley Community Plan Update-John Nugent
The Community Plan Update Subcommittee (CPUS) is a standing subcommittee of the Mission Valley Planning Group,

A meeting was held on August 14, 2015. The minutes of the meeting follow these MVPG minutes (see below).

The CPUS committee meets the second Friday of each month from 3:00-4:30 at the Mission Valley Library.

For more information please visit the CPUS website at: http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpu/missionvalley/

B. Ad Hoc Committees
1) Parks – Jason Broad
With Jason Broad’s resignation Rob Hutsel was appointed as the committee Chair. The committee did not meet so there was no report

2) Public Health, Safety and Welfare – Elizabeth Leventhal
Elizabeth Leventhal reported that a number of California cities and counties are adopting “deemed approved” ordinances. These ordinances target existing grocery stores, liquor stores, and specialty stores, which sell alcoholic beverages to take home (or elsewhere).

In municipal codes, these businesses are often referred to as “off-sale” businesses, “alcoholic beverage outlets” or “package stores.” In particular, deemed approved ordinances target businesses which are “grandfathered,” i.e., subject only to restrictions applied to their licenses when the businesses came into existence. In other words, “grandfathered” businesses often benefit from fewer restrictions than newly licensed businesses. As long as the location, size, and scope of the business remains unchanged, there is no significant interruption in the operation of the business, and there is no significant disciplinary action against the business license, the business continues to benefit from the lesser restrictions. In municipal codes, terms like “legal non-conforming” or “previously conforming” are used to denote “grandfathered” businesses.

“Deemed approved” literally refers to the businesses which are already legally operating at the time a new ordinance regulating local alcohol sales is adopted. In particular, deemed approved ordinances are intended to give cities more enforcement tools against grandfathered businesses, including the ability to “revoke” a business’s right to exist.

The California constitution generally prohibits cities from retroactively applying restrictions on existing businesses with alcohol licenses. Cities adopting “deemed approved” ordinances attempt to offset this constitutional protection by coupling nuisance oriented performance standards, targeted enforcement, and zoning laws. Because
nuisance can be a rather subjective and hard to define concept, the nuisance standards in
deemed approved ordinances are typically made to be complaint-driven, resulting in a
hearing in which testimony is given and a hearing officer, panel, commission, or city
council decides whether the business is a “nuisance.” Nuisance evidence will typically
consist of things like law enforcement “calls for service” to the businesses address, crime
rate near the business, evidence linking inebriate crimes (e.g., public drunkenness, DWIs,
etc.) to the business, and complaints from nearby residents or other businesses about the
business.

Cities with deemed approved ordinances include  Alameda County, San Francisco,
Oakland, Ontario, Oxnard, Pasadena, Petaluma, Richmond, Rohnert Park, San
Bernardino, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, Vallejo, Ventura, and Walnut Creek.

3) Riverwalk-John Nugent
The committee did not meet: No report.

2. Community Reports
   1. San Diego River Coalition
   Alan Grant reported that there was not a meeting in August.

   There will be no meeting in September due to the 2015 Anniversary Party on September
   17th at the Carlton Oaks Golf Course in Santee.

   The committee meets the third Friday of each month from 3:00-4:30 at the Mission
   Valley Library.

   More info at: http://www.sandiegoriver.org

   3. Community Planning Chairs Meeting –
   Dottie Surdi reported that the community planning chairs did not meet in August.

   4. Miscellaneous Mail
   There were no items

   5. Miscellaneous Items
   There were no items

L. ADJOURNMENT – There being no further business to be brought before the
Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 1: 35 P.M.

The next regular meeting will be on Wednesday October 07, 2015 at 12:00 p.m. at the
Mission Valley Library, Community Room.

__________________________
John Nugent, Secretary
September 2, 2015

TO: Dottie Surdi, MVPG Chair
FROM: Randy Dolph, DAB Chair
SUBJECT: Report of August 31, 2015 DAB Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 P.M. in the Mission Valley Library. Members present were: Paul Brown, Randy Dolph, Paul Dugas, Steve Kiss, Jerry Shonkwiler, and Dottie Surdi. Guests included John Nugent.

Stadium Reconstruction Project: Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Action Item

The focus of this DAB meeting, in the absence of an applicant presentation, is to provide formal comments to the Stadium Reconstruction Draft EIR for those items that are under the purview of the Mission Valley Design Advisory Board (DAB). Discussion and comment items included:

5. Placement of the stadium on the site:

a. The DAB acknowledged that any new stadium will likely need to be constructed prior to demolition of the existing stadium. That said, the proximity of the new stadium to the existing stadium is problematic if implosion is used to demolish the existing stadium. Alternative demolition options need to be explored in more depth.

b. The new stadium site plan (Figure 3-2) does not indicate any hook ramps from I-8 and/or I-15 into the site, nor the Milly Way access bridge. As part of the site design, these alternatives should be explored in more depth, and subject to their feasibility, included in the base scope.

- The DAB recalls the potential for direct freeway access from the stadium project, back when it was originally constructed in 1969, and was not chosen. The board feels the City should reopen the discussions with Caltrans as part of the proposed development process, in consideration of the traffic impacts.

- Board members have recognized the Milly Way southwestern site access bridge was promised to the community with the development of the Ikea, Lowes Costco center, back in 2000. The board further understands the developers DIFF fees paid for a significant portion of this bridge design and construction, have been transferred to the city general fund. The board strongly urges the city to consider the inclusion of this new site exit,
as part of the overall masterplan of this new stadium project, in consideration of improving the current site exiting design.

c. The proximity of a fully-populated stadium to the existing bulk petroleum terminal presents a higher risk of incident versus locating the stadium elsewhere on the site.

d. Table 3-1 indicates that the footprint of the new stadium is 17 acres versus 15 acres for the existing stadium. This is not consistent with the graphic representation of the new stadium in Figure 3-1 which shows a smaller new stadium. This is also not consistent with the impact analysis on page 4.15-46 which states that the new stadium has a 2 acre smaller footprint.

e. The new stadium site plans (Figure 3.1 and Figure 3-2) do not acknowledge the presence of the new fire station along Friars Road. Although the EIR discusses the temporary fire station on Qualcomm Stadium’s site, the EIR does not provide a thorough analysis of the operation of the new fire station at its new location. This study is required for both emergency vehicular access into the Valley and into the stadium.

6. Surface parking:

a. The new stadium site plan (Figure 3-2) exclusively indicates a surface parking lot, with a small greenbelt leading from the trolley and parking area into the stadium. The parking area narrative on page 4.15-21 suggests that a minimum of ten percent of the parking lot area be landscaped. The DAB recommends that the project follow the City’s Land Development Code requirement for locating trees within parking areas to provide shade.

b. In an effort to reduce the environmental impact to large areas of surface paving, alternatives such as parking structures should be explored.

7. Stadium characteristics.

a. Height/Massing: The DAB did not take exception to the increased height of the new stadium, provided that the overall massing/bulk was in keeping with the stadium design and overall appearance.

b. Lighting: The cross section diagram (Figure 3-3) indicated a large roof overhang. To prevent light pollution, the DAB recommends that the high-intensity lighting remain below the plane of the roof overhang.

c. Iconic Image: There is a significant discrepancy between the renderings of the project that the City presented to the NFL and the renderings of the project presented in EIR Section 4.15 “Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character.” The renderings in the EIR are much more subdued and scaled back in size. This discrepancy needs to be addressed before any conclusions can be made.

d. On page 3-2, the EIR project design indicates that the exterior materials would be of steel, concrete, stucco and other durable finishes. Given the City’s past history with deferred maintenance, the DAB recommends that consideration be
given to materials that have a long service life with low maintenance
requirements. Exposed ferrous steel is not recommended due to increased
maintenance versus exposed concrete.

8. Applicability of “San Diego River Park Master Plan” to the project.

   a. Throughout the EIR, a portion of the site adjacent to the river has been
designated without any direct construction improvements. On page 4.15-19, the
EIR addresses the design protection areas and the San Diego River and states:

   “Since the Project would not be constructed within nor affect the San Diego
River Corridor of Influence Area of the San Diego River Park Master Plan,
the Design Protection Area Design Guidelines, related to the San Diego
River Park Master Plan, would not be applicable to the project.”

   The DAB disagrees with this EIR finding and recommends that the project be
designed in accordance with the San Diego River Park Master Plan.

Jerry Shonkwiler initiated a motion that the minutes from today’s DAB meeting, addressing the
DAB’s comments to the Stadium Reconstruction Project EIR, be formally submitted to the City
via the Mission Valley Planning Group. Dottie Surdi seconded the motion. The motion was
approved 6-0-0.

Dolph thanked the DAB members and guests for their participation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 P.M., with the next regularly meeting tentatively scheduled
for Monday, October 5, 2015.

The Community Plan Update Subcommittee (CPUS)

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
MISSION VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

August 14, 2015

Members Present:
Paul Brown, Perry Dealy, Terrance Fox, Alan Grant, Rob Hutsel, Richard Ledford,
Elizabeth Leventhal, Andrew Michajlenko, David Norvell, John Nugent, Patrick Pierce,
Michael Richter, Phillip Saenkov, Rebecca Sappenfield, John Schneidmiller, Marco
Sessa, Karen Tournaire

Members Absent:
Deborah Bossmeyer, Stephen Fluhr, Ryan Holborn Derek Hulse, Dottie Surdi

Governmental Staff and Consultants present:
Nancy Graham, Tara Lieberman, Liz Saidkhanian, Diego Velasco
Others in attendance:
Karen Ruggels, Mary Sleepe, Carole Thompson, Ken Williams

A. CALL TO ORDER
John Nugent, Chair, called the regular meeting of the Mission Valley Community Plan Update Subcommittee (CPUS) to order at 3:03 p.m. at the Mission Valley Library Community Room located at 2123 Fenton Parkway, San Diego, CA.

B. INTRODUCTIONS / OPENING REMARKS/ AGENDA CHANGE
John Nugent welcomed everyone to the meeting and reminded those present to sign the sign in sheets.

All present introduced themselves.

C. OPENING REMARKS/QUESTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS
John Nugent announced that there was a position opening on the Mission Valley Planning Group in the category of “Resident” with the term expiring in March 2016

D. KEY SUBCOMMITTEE PROVISIONS IN MVPG BYLAWS
John Nugent reviewed two components regarding the Mission Valley Community Plan Update Subcommittee (CPUS) from Exhibit B-Description of Standing Committees of the MVPG By-laws.
1. (C) Committee members may be replaced after three consecutive, unexcused absences from the committee meetings.
2. (E) Minutes of the meetings shall be kept and either incorporated into the minutes of the Mission Valley Planning Group minutes or posted separately on the City website.

E. PLANNING CONTEXT FOR THE MISSION VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
John turned the meeting over to Nancy Graham, Senior Planner, Planning Department City of San Diego.

Nancy gave an overview of the planning context for the Mission Valley Community Plan Update. The power point presentation can be found at the CPUS website is: http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpu/missionvalley/

E. PROJECT INITIATION ACTIVITY
Diego Velasco, project consultant, reviewed the project initiation activity “Map A Path of Discovery Through Mission Valley”. Additional activity forms can be found at: http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpu/missionvalley/
Completed forms can be returned at the September 11th meeting or submitted to Tara Lieberman at: TLieberman@sandiego.gov.

F. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
The Next Regular Meeting Date – Friday, September 11, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. at the Mission Valley Library, Community Room.