

From: jnugent50@aol.com
Sent: Friday, September 04, 2015 6:50 AM
To: DSD EAS
Cc: dottie.surdi@svn.com; jnugent50@aol.com
Subject: Project Name: Stadium Reconstruction Project Project No. 437916 / SCH No. 2015061061

Project Name: Stadium Reconstruction Project
Project No. 437916 / SCH No. 2015061061

Comments from the Mission Valley Planning Group:

1. Placement of the stadium on the site:

- a. The Mission Valley Planning Group Design Advisory Board (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.

Additional comments based on the San Diego River Master Plan and the Mission Valley Community Plan

- 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.

- It appears this project may need an amendment to the current Mission Valley Community Plan
- 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.

Submitted by Mission Valley Planning Group Secretary
John W. Nugent
5765 Friars Rd #150
San Diego, CA 92110
(619) 772-8855