

**Barrio Logan Community Plan Update
Stakeholder Committee
November 17, 2010**

MEETING SUMMARY

Stakeholder Committee members present:

NAME	SEAT	NAME	SEAT
Georgette Gomez	Community Org.	Antonia Garcia	Res. Tenant
Janet Adamian	Community Org.	Maria Martinez	Res. Tenant
Rachael Ortiz	Community Org.	Ana Nayeli Castañeda	Res. Tenant
Aida Castaneda	Community Org.	Norene Riveroll	Res. Tenant
Chunky Sanchez	Community Org.	Mary Alvarado	Res. Tenant
Gloria Medina	Community Org.	Rudolph Pimentel	Business Owner
Matt Carr	Community Org.	David Duea	Business Owner
John Alvarado	Res. Property Owner	Shaun Halvax	Indus. Owner/Rep.
Albert Duenas	Res. Property Owner	James Gill	Indus. Owner/Rep.
Robert Leif	Non-Res. Property Owner	Lee Wilson	Indus. Owner/Rep.
Eduardo Barrera	Non-Res. Property Owner (MAAC)	Jerry Grey	Non-Res. Property Owner

Ex-Officio members present:

NAME	SEAT	NAME	SEAT
Paul Brown	Port District	Robert Ripley	Navy
Anthony Aguirre	Caltrans		

Alternate members present/excused/not excused:

NAME	SEAT	
Ruben Andrews	Business Owner	Present
Kim Austin	Business Owner	Present
Patricia Bird Chavez	Res. Tenant	Present
Axelia Cordero	Res. Tenant	Present
Patricia Cuevas	Res. Tenant	Present
Ron Beauloye Jr.	Business Owner	Excused
Evelyn Ruth Mitchell	Non-Res. Property Owner	Excused
Ron Halik	Industry Rep.	Not Excused
Isidro Mendoza	Property Owner	Not Excused
Maribel Arellano	Residential Property Owner	Not Excused
Clifford Arellano	Business Owner	Not Excused
Harvey Porter	Industry Rep.	Not Excused

Welcome and Introductions

On November 17, 2010, members of the Stakeholders Committee (Committee) of the Barrio Logan Community Plan Update process convened for their meeting. The purpose of the meeting was: (a.) to give a project update; (b.) to request a preferred land use alternative from the committee; (c.) to introduce the Barrio Logan Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP); (d.) and to discuss next steps in the Community Plan Update process.

Meeting Format

The Committee meeting occurred on November 17, 2010 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at Woodbury University located at 2212 Main Street in San Diego. In addition to the 30 attending Committee members, approximately 45 community members attended the meeting. Upon entering the meeting facility, Committee and community members signed-in and received the agenda, land use maps, zoning maps, and alternative one and two acreage matrix.

The proceedings included simultaneous language translation from English to Spanish using headset equipment. Professional translators provided this service. Additionally, the meeting was

audio recorded. Please contact Lara Gates at 619-236-6006 to set up a time to listen to the recording.

Welcome and Project Status Update

Lara Gates, Project Manager with the City of San Diego welcomed everyone and then addressed the status of the project. The traffic analysis has taken longer than expected because of the assembly and senate bills on green house gas emissions. Traffic consultants and City staff have been working together on the traffic study and it's anticipated that it will be completed and released around January 2011.

Stakeholder meetings will be held about the draft elements and environmental studies. The EIR will be released for public comment around July 2011 and then there will be a 60 day EIR public comment period. Staff anticipates that the final BLSC plan recommendations come before the Committee in October 2011 and then go to City Council with the community plan, zoning, PFFP, amendments to redevelopment plan, and amendments to the local coastal program plan in December 2011.

Draft Land Use Alternatives

Ms. Gates reviewed and explained the land use map alternatives and reminded the audience that at the end of the meeting a vote would be held to determine the preferred land use alternative by the majority of Committee members. Ms. Gates emphasized that both alternatives would be studied equally as part of the environmental process. After the EIR is drafted, City staff will present the EIR findings to the Committee and seek a preferred land use scenario recommendation from the Committee. This could be either of the land use maps or could be a mixture of land uses that are currently in Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

Ms. Gates reviewed the steps leading up to the March 2010 Planning Commission and explained the land use alternatives.

- 1) In January 2009, the Committee picked ten land use scenarios as a part of the charrette. The consultants refined it down to three land uses. In March, April, and May of 2009 a number of community meetings were held to discuss the three alternatives. In May 2009, the International Business and Trade (IBT) land use designation was proposed within the transition zone. In September 2009, the traffic and economics studies that informed the land use scenarios were discussed. It was found that there was not a market for office uses. In January 2010, a community open house was held on the draft goals and policies. In March 2010, City staff went to the planning commission to present our draft goals, policies, and land use alternatives. In June 2010, Alternative three was removed because a Business Park was not feasible and the community village was refined. Furthermore, in June 2010 the IBT land use designation was removed and replaced with Community Commercial in Alternative 1 and Light Industrial in Alternative 2.
- 2) Ms. Gates went into a detailed explanation of the two alternative land use maps and the acreage matrix. The audience had both alternative maps, zoning maps, and acreage matrix handouts and they were also projected on a large screen.

- 3) City staff reviewed the current proposed land uses and zoning parcel by parcel in GIS to ensure that the square footage and acreage numbers were accurate.

Public Questions and Comments- public comments in italics.

What are the units for the matrix measured in? Acreage.

What happens with existing produce distribution sites? They would be grandfathered in under the land development code (LDC) and they would be allowed to expand up to 20% if they meet the conditions set forth in the LDC.

The key thing here is to make this area as productive as possible. The city and county is broke. We should get up every morning and ask how we can serve the military. We have to focus on income property for this area.

Industrial is great but the whole reason we started this process was because of the risk that the residents are in health wise. We need a balancing act. We need industrial here, but we also want to have healthy lives for us and our children. We need a balanced decision and alternative one is the most balanced.

I have lived in Barrio Logan all of my life. Yes, we need business but we live here and we are a community who wants clean air and to be safe.

I am a property owner in Barrio. The land south of 32nd street is identified as prime industrial. Is it subject to this community plan? Yes, only a portion of the area south of 32nd is currently designated as prime industrial. The entire area will be designated prime industrial under the community plan.

Over the years we have heard from residents that industry is causing health problems and somehow industry is responsible. Industry cares about the health of residents. If residents are going to say it is industry causing the health issues, we need to have scientifically based studies that prove that is the case. We need to look at the air quality analysis.

**In Spanish Thank you for listening to me in Spanish. Our health is very important. It is the pollution that is causing our health issues. Barrio Logan is connected to Logan Heights and many other communities. The residents live here. Please be considerate of that.*

There have been a lot of scientific studies. USC did a study of our community and they found that we have three times the amount of asthma cases here. It's not only people saying it, it is science.

People do not take the rights of our residents under consideration. The homeless shelter was placed a half a block from our elementary school with a two day notice. The EPA was at Perkins three weeks ago and have a air pollution monitoring device at the school. No other school around has this device because they do not need it. I want to advocate for more residents.

We have been really affected by the pollution in this area. I brought my x-rays and you can see the effects of the pollution in my lungs. We do not want this for our children and grandchildren.

Industry should work with residents. Trucks should be hybrid. Residents should get HEPA filters and should get rid of carpet. There are things that can be done. Need more technical people involved.

We know we cannot do away with pollution. Children are the most affected. Residents are here everyday breathing pollution. Consider Alternative 1, it offers more benefits. Children are the future. Can't excel with asthma.

Residents have bent over backwards to compromise with Alternative 1. We need to work as a group together. Don't see why industrialists want to encroach. Why do the industrialists not want to compromise when everything is being grandfathered in? The residents have given in so much. Asking to vote for Alternative 1.

My family has been in Barrio Logan since 1926. Could you please explain grandfathered in? Barrio Logan has been more than friendly with industry. I live next to industry and I work for industry. I have never complained. Now we have the community plan update- let's do it right. I support Alt. 1.

Grandfathered in if you are an existing residence or business and the zoning changes you can stay there in perpetuity. You can expand up to 20% if you meet the conditions set forth in the Land Development Code regulations.

Alternative one is already a compromise. We are talking about our families' future. Start changing the way we live and do business. Put new kinds of commercial in place. We have seen the effects of pollution on Mercado residents.

This neighborhood has had a long struggle. Freeway, bridge, junkyards. A long history of dis-concern for the residents who live here and this is a continuation of the struggle. People are concerned about maintaining their homes. Not trying to get rid of industry- just strike a compromise.

I recommend that we go ahead and vote for the preferred alternative. There are a couple of members who have not been heard, let's go ahead and let them speak.

Alternative one is a compromise.

Placing the homeless shelter at Perkins Elementary is a disgrace. We need to find a solution to this, we really do. I want to compliment the principal of the school. The vast majority of the pollution will not change whether we go with alternative one or two because the old companies will be grandfathered in. I don't want the residents to be disillusioned. We need to take into consideration that Barrio Logan does need business. So this is a balancing act. My hope is that in the future we have a good neighbor policy that the businesses want to make their industry greener.

Does the industrial use include the Navy? No. The military has its own use designation.

People live here but I live (work) here 12 hours per day. Without an economic base how can we vote? I am in favor of delaying the vote tonight. Alternative two protects the community economically and provides a better buffer.

I am in favor of alternative one. The residents need to be heard.

Can we move the vote along? This is why we are here today.

Has anyone not spoken that wants to speak?

I'd like to make a recommendation that we vote. I also would like to voice my support for alternative one.

Thank you. This has been a long process and at times a painful process. When I was a kid there were farms in San Diego. These farms no longer exist due to zoning changes and that industry went away. As soon as the industrial zoning changes –in 20 to 30 years we will lose industrial lands and jobs which cannot come back. Alternative 2 allows for businesses and residents to coexist. When we met with Planning Commission, they acknowledged that Barrio Logan has always been a mixed use neighborhood. Both alternatives provide for commercial. But changing to residential in Alternative 1 doesn't make sense and doesn't follow the direction Planning Commission gave to the Planning Department.

I'd like to talk about the whole grandfather clause idea. The problem with the grandfather clause is that if we want to attract cleaner, greener industry, the grandfather clause only allows 20 % expansion. The naval base is going to be able to locate clean businesses. If I am a business owner looking to service the navy, this is the place to be. There needs to be environmentally safe business practices. If I am a business owner I can't locate in Barrio, I have issues with both alternatives.

The land use calculations are different than what came out shortly before. I do not trust all of the data that is being given to us. Now we are being asked to vote. We need to have more time to study this. The City is not coming forth with a plan responsive to the Planning Commission direction.

I've been here for over thirty years. I speak for the Barrio Logan Smart Growth Coalition. The BLSC should not act on the land use tonight. We are trying to work through information and numbers. We need additional time to review the information. Last time the information that the city gave us was not accurate. When we started this update the economy was much different. I strongly recommend that we postpone the vote so we can go over the data to make an informed decision.

If we vote tonight do we get to vote again later? Yes.

The EIR report will address both so why vote? We need to determine if the 2 land use maps that we have prepared are acceptable to the community so we can evaluate both alternatives in the environmental document.

Let's show with a show of hands if you support postponing the vote. 7

Let's show who would like to vote. 14

Who is in favor of Alternative 1? 16

Who is in favor of Alternative 2? 6

--- 5 minute break-----

Introduction to preparing the Barrio Logan Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP)

Vickie Burgess, Planning Department, Public Facilities Financing Plan

The last time we updated the Barrio Logan Plan was in June of 2007. We would like to update this plan with the new information. Staff knows which projects should be done first based on the impact fee monies.

What kinds of projects are you considering could be done? It could be any project in the current financing plan. Fire station, parks, streets, and roads.

Every project that is built in the community comes through the public facilities financing office. The development impact fees are collected when people build projects in the community and the money goes into the Barrio Logan Facilities Financing account and will be used for projects in Barrio Logan.

Let's call for volunteer for the subcommittee for the PFFP. Ms. Gates identified eight members who volunteered to be involved. These eight BLSC members who volunteered to serve on the PFFP subcommittee will report back to the full committee. The members include: Matt Carr, Georgette Gomez; Lee Wilson; Aida Castaneda and Albert Duenas Rudolph Pimentel; John Alvarado; and Anna Castaneda.

Public Comment

I appreciate all the work that the committee and staff are doing.

I want to say thank you to all on behalf of Barrio Logan. We will achieve justice.

Next Steps

We will get the traffic study out to the committee as soon as it has been finalized by City staff.