



**THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
MAYOR JERRY SANDERS**

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 1, 2010

TO: Mission Bay Park Committee

FROM: Paul Jacob, Project Manager, Park and Recreation Department

SUBJECT: Fiesta Island GDP Workshop Item

This memo is intended to serve as a brief update to summarize the activities of the design team for the Fiesta Island General Development Plan (GDP) since the previous meeting on July 6, 2010. The consultant, KTU+A, Inc. and members of the Park and Recreation Department staff have conducted a series of meetings with the major stakeholders to gather feedback and continue to refine the design elements of the plan in anticipation of presenting the plan for approval to this committee in the near future.

Since the last MBPC meeting on July 6, there have been six separate stakeholder meetings with the following groups:

- August 16 – Paddling clubs;
- August 17 – Bicycling groups;
- August 19 – Fiesta Island Dog Owners (FIDO)
- August 20 – Triathlon clubs;
- August 25 – Conservation/Environmental groups;
- August 25 – San Diego Track Club (running)

The meeting minutes for those various meetings are enclosed for your review.

A summary of the various groups' input and of the changes made to the plan as a result of these meetings is as follows:

Paddling Clubs - have better defined their space requirements and made it clear that they do need to trailer boats more frequently than previously understood. We present two variations on the boat storage. We show an open mooring and storage area on the beach under Alternative 5d and we show the near beach fenced storage area on Alternative 5e. In order to offset the acres of

leash free lost, one acre was removed from the regional parkland that does not allow for dog use. We have also added a 1km buoy marking course that would be used as a Dragon Boat training and competition course and can be used by other users such as the swimming portion of a triathlon or by rowing, outrigger and kayaking interests.

Bicycling Clubs - are still concerned about increased traffic, safety and their ability to hold special and regular recurring events. They are not in agreement with intensifying uses on the island, though they acknowledge that the current plan is significantly less intensive than the adopted master plan. They are in agreement on the change in circulation direction, the entry area improvements and the outer and inner loop systems that allow for a managed traffic control on the island. The clubs felt that in order to improve safety and convenience for all users, the multi-use trail system should not have to rely on at-grade roadway crossings. This not only affects the safety of the trail user but also the cyclists and drivers on the roadway. Alternative 5e shows a new configuration of mounding, bridges and trail connections that would allow the central and southern loops to be interconnected without the need for at grade crossings.

Environmental Groups - are concerned about leash free dog use and the potentially negative effects on habitats and restored native plant areas. They would like to see more fencing, interpretive signs and less leash free areas.

FIDO - has been consistently concerned about the obstructions of the beach uses, boats and fencing and how it will affect the perimeter beach walking patterns. They are also concerned about the dominance of the roadway serving the southwest peninsula and how to cross this roadway better. Alternative 5d and the two versions of 5e address these concerns. Alternative 5d is a hybrid of what was Alternative 5b and 5c and it also greatly reduced the width of the roadway / parking / landscaped areas leading to the SW parking lot. The opinion of staff and the design team is that the remote location of the parking lot and fencing requirements for drop-offs is not practical under 5d and the need for the cut-through is minor. The team developed Alt 5e (both variations) to remove beach obstacles, to clarify a better cut-through location at the north end of the parking lot and to keep a berm that would be logical for the cut-through direction. FIDO would also like to remove the pier and floating dock, but a Labrador dog club would like it as a dog dock jumping facility and the paddling clubs would like it to remain.

Running and Triathlon Clubs - are supportive of the idea of new trails and facilities that would accommodate the general public, the clubs for training, and the ability to have some special events on the island including running events and triathlons. They would like to see more asphalt trails versus concrete trails. They also support the idea of more grade separated trail connections using the bridges.

Based on these changes and inputs to the previous version of the plan, some choices remain to be made before a final plan configuration is chosen. These include the following:

1) Should the pier and floating dock remain in the plan?

Advantages: ADA access, chase boats for paddling clubs, general public use, dog jumping competitions;

Disadvantages: expense and obstacle for beach walking parallel to the water (though it could be made to pass under the end of the pier).

2) Should the non-motorized boat storage stay on the beach or be placed in a secure area next to the beach?

Advantages for off beach area: boats would be protected from theft and vandalism, the storage buildings would be more protected and not in the middle of the park, area used is less important to beach users and dog walkers, boats less affected by super high tide;

Disadvantages for off beach area: lose some leash free use (has been replaced by removing 1 acre from the parkland and other modifications), paddling groups have to transport boats an additional 100-200 feet up shore and across the trail, area may be seen as exclusive use and require lease.

3) Should the multi-use trail that comes from off the island, be completely grade separated and other outer loop road crossings be removed?

Advantages: a complete multi looped system tied into the entry parking lot and Mission Bay Multi Use trail that does not cross at grade would be safer and more utilized by recreational / family cyclists and would definitely be useful and safer for walkers, joggers, runners and skaters. These bridges also provide important viewing locations and can accommodate some smaller triathlon and running events;

Disadvantages: cost.

4) Should trail surfaces be asphalt for better running surfaces (note the trails are providing two 2foot DG trail soft surfaces next to the concrete trail)?

Advantages: this would address the knee injury and impacts to runners by utilizing an asphalt trail and would be lower in initial costs;

Disadvantages: higher long term costs including repair and resurfacing, petroleum based runoff occurs from the surface.

5) Should the turf area, paved plazas, hillside seating and dog obstacle course be dropped from the plan?

Advantages: lower costs;

Disadvantages: the turf would allow dogs to shed themselves of dirt and sand, would allow the area to be used a bit more by non-dog users, would provide a venue for competitions and special events used by dog interests as well as some other general public interests.

In addition to these issues, we look forward to your feedback and suggestions for improvement.

Paul Jacob, RCE
Project Manager