



**Stakeholders Committee
Meeting #10**

March 11, 2009

SUMMARY

ATTENDEES

Stakeholder Committee members present:

NAME	SEAT	NAME	SEAT
Georgette Gomez	Community Org.	Antonia Garcia	Res. Tenant
Jennette Lawrence	Community Org.	Maria Martinez	Res. Tenant
Jose Rodriguez	Community Org.	Clifford Arellano	Business Owner
John Alvarado	Res. Property Owner	David Duesa	Business Owner
Maribel Arellano	Res. Property Owner	Rudolph Pimentel	Business Owner
Albert Duenas	Res. Property Owner	Michael Poutre	Business Owner
Alexander Alemany	Non-Res. Property Owner	Ron Halik	Industry
Bob Leif	Non Res. Property Owner	Shaun Halvax	Indus. Owner/Rep.
Evelyn Ruth Mitchell	Non-Res. Property Owner	Karl Johnson	Industry

Ex-Officio members present:

NAME	SEAT	NAME	SEAT
Paul Brown	Port District	Reynaldo Pisano	SESDPG
Connery Cepeda	Caltrans		

Stakeholder Committee members absent and excused:

NAME	SEAT	NAME	SEAT
Diego Aguilera	Non-Res. Property Owner	Gloria Medina	Community Org.

Isabel Betty Aguilera	Non-Res. Property Owner	Lee Wilson	Industry
Ana Nayeli Castañeda	Res. Tenant	Rachael Ortiz	Community Org.

Stakeholder Committee members absent and not excused:

NAME	SEAT	NAME	SEAT
Carlos Castaneda	Community Org.	Hilda Valenzuela	Res. Tenant
Norene Riveroll	Res. Tenant		

Alternate members present/excused/not excused:

NAME	SEAT	
Ruben Andrews	Business Owner	Not Excused
Kim Austin	Business Owner	Present
Ron Beauloye Jr.	Business Owner	Present
Matt Carr	Industry Rep.	Excused
Patricia Cuevas	Res. Tenant	Present
Jerry Gray	Industry Rep.	Present

INTRODUCTION

On March 11, 2009, members of the Stakeholders Committee (Committee) of the Barrio Logan Community Plan Update process convened for their 10th meeting. The purpose of the meeting was: (a.) to review the summary of Meeting #9; (b.) to provide clarification regarding the International Business and Trade (IBT) designation and other information items requested at the February 11 meeting; (c.) to continue the discussion regarding the draft Land Use Alternatives; (d.) and to discuss next steps in the Community Plan Update process.

MEETING FORMAT

The 10th Committee meeting occurred on March 11, 2009, from 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Barrio Logan Plan Update Meeting Room located at 1625 Newton Avenue in San Diego. In addition to the 26 attending Committee members, approximately 55 community members attended the meeting. Upon entering the meeting facility, Committee and community members signed-in and received the following documents.

- Agenda
- Meeting #9 Summary Report
- Market Analysis
- Relationship between General Plan and BLCPU Process
- EIR and BLCPU Outreach Process diagram
- Alternatives Comparison Matrix
- Land Use Alternatives A, B, C and Common Elements Map
- EIR Fact Sheet

All meeting handouts, presentation materials and displays included English and Spanish languages. The proceedings included simultaneous language translation from English to Spanish using headset equipment. Professional translators provided this service.

Committee and community members provided comments and questions during the facilitated discussion. Andy Pendoley of MIG and Daisy Gonzalez of the City of San Diego recorded attendees' comments and questions in English and Spanish languages on a large wallgraphic paper at the front of the room, which is attached as a photo-reduced copy at the end of this summary report.

Welcome and Introductions

Lara Gates, Project Manager with the City of San Diego welcomed everyone then introduced Esmeralda García of MIG, Inc., Project Manager for the consultant team. Ms. García then provided an overview of the agenda and led a round of self-introductions with the Committee members. Afterwards, Ms. Gates read aloud the names of recently appointed Alternates to the Stakeholder Committee.

Review of Meeting #9 Summary Report

Ms. García led the audience through a review of the previous meeting's summary, and individuals, both on the committee and the public, were able to provide comments or changes to the document by marking their own agenda and handing them in to the city staff. There were no comments from the committee or general public.

Information Items – Items Requested at February 11 Meeting

Ms. García reminded the group that there were several questions raised at the last meeting, and that the team is now following up on these. She introduced Bill Anderson, Director of City Planning & Community Investment, who reviewed the relationship of the General Plan to the Community Plan Update while referencing one of the hand-outs. Mr. Anderson next provided clarification and further information on the International Business and Trade (IBT) Designation, a recent introduction to the land use categories used in the Alternatives maps. Mr. Anderson talked about and showed images of what types of uses could potentially be allowed under the IBT designation. Next, Bill Lee of ERA presented on the results of the initial market analysis. Committee members and community members provided the following comments and questions on each topic. Planning Team responses follow questions in *italics*.

International Business and Trade (IBT)

- Light industrial seems to be more clearly defined, but we don't want industrial uses
- Light Industrial designation must be clearly defined
- How do we choose desirable IBT uses? – *Various options will be discussed with the community and with other communities because this land use will be a city-wide designation*
- IBT designation may work as a tool to provide more flexibility to adapt to the economy
- If using IBT, limit non-environmental friendly uses in Light Industrial
- IBT sounds like it would encourage new mid-sized businesses. It would be beneficial for the community to have businesses such as those working on new energy sources

- IBT must take into account resident's comments. The community wants light industry out and more affordable housing.
- If the goal is to promote jobs and businesses, they have to be non-polluting businesses and healthy employment opportunities for the residents.
- Allow light manufacturing to create jobs for local residents that do not harm the community or the environment and to create new energy sources.
- Affordable housing is needed more than industry
- Create alternative zoning options for Barrio Logan and facilitate debate! – *All options will be reviewed.*

Economic Analysis

- The study does not show how existing housing and the Barrio will be affected? – *That is part of the process. You can decide to accommodate downtown expansion or not.*
- How can we measure demand with the economic fluctuations? – *A 20-year horizon will be used.*
- Include environmental impacts as part of costs
- Assess local income impacts from changing economy
- Clarify infrastructure needs and costs and how it will be paid for
- Provide residual land value analysis to clarify what infrastructure costs will be covered
- Provide industrial analysis
- Offices should be for local residents
- Study the needs of low-income residents, not businesses
- Economic development should serve local residents
- Assess new housing costs and if residents can afford to live here
 - Housing balance is important
- Create a theme that will draw in visitors by creating a link between the neighborhood and its Mexican history and heritage
- Avoid downtown expansion
- Individuals continue speaking about business concerns but the resident's needs for affordable housing and parks are not being met.

Information Items – Land Use Alternatives Discussion

Ms. García went on to resume a discussion that had begun at the last Stakeholder Committee meeting regarding the three draft Land Use Alternatives and community response to each. Large print-outs of Alternatives A, B and C were displayed, and participants were asked to reference a hand-out that provided a quick summary of major differences between the three Alternatives. Committee members and community members provided the following comments and questions on each Alternative, and in general. Planning Team responses follow questions in *italics*.

Alternative A

- Supports quality-of-life for community
- Provides density at trolley stations
- Higher density near the Harbor trolley stop does not provide a buffer to the Port
- Higher residential near the Bay blocks views of the Bay. Residential development should step down to provide a view of the Bay for all.
- Park supports school

- Residential should not be allowed near the freeway

Alternative B

- Mixed-use will support arts district live/work communities
- Provide buffer around transit, or higher-density?
- Would retail generate traffic on Logan Avenue and the bridge ramps? – *More detailed data to follow in the environmental impact study.*
- Good employment emphasis
- Area North of Cesar Chavez should contain the highest density the plan will allow

Alternative C

- Mixed-use will support arts district live/work communities
- Consider allowing housing closer to freeways
 - Health impacts must first be assessed

General

- Zoning should support current health services throughout the community
- How do we know truck volumes will be lower in this alternative? Is it from the impact study? – *This is a high-level analysis; more detail will be provided in the environmental impact study*
- Evaluate using SANDAG's data
- Need to balance quality-of-life needs
- Analyze environmental impacts assuming the use of hybrid/electric cars
- Need more initial health impact data evaluated in each alternative
- Uses may change over time
- Expand environmental study beyond one Alternative so that there is more flexibility for community
- Show bus stops on maps
- Need acreage comparative analysis
- Need property-owner input
- Identify and focus on "hot zones", or areas of great disagreement
- Discuss rights and conforming uses
- The Economics report does not include a study on industrial demand
- Main Street between 28th and 32nd should not be residential

Next Steps

Ms. Gates thanked everyone for their participation and Ms. García reminded everyone of the date for the next Stakeholder Committee meeting, scheduled April 8, 2009. Agenda topics will include:

- Preferred Land Use Alternative supporting data

Non-Agenda Public Comment

There were two members of the public who made comments.

- Support a park next to Perkins
- Community gardens should be included somewhere in the plan

CLOSE

Ms. García closed the meeting by thanking Committee and community members for attending.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments submitted via comment cards. Comment cards submitted at past meetings are on file at the City of San Diego and are available for viewing during normal office hours. Please contact Lara Gates at 619-236-6006 to set up a time to view the actual cards.