

City of San Diego  
Park and Recreation Board  
Minutes  
Thursday, November 16, 2017

*"TO PROVIDE HEALTHY, SUSTAINABLE, AND ENRICHING ENVIRONMENTS FOR ALL"*

**Meeting Held at:**

Balboa Park Club Ballroom  
2150 Pan American Road West  
San Diego, CA 92101

**Mailing Address is:**

City of San Diego  
202 C Street, MS 37C  
San Diego, CA 92101

**Members Present**

David Kinney, Chair  
David Baron  
Jon Becker  
Raymond Bernal  
Marcella Bothwell  
Ron Cho  
Bobby Hughes  
Katherine Johnston  
Noli Zosa

**Members Absent**

Nick Anastasopoulos (excused)  
Dennis Otsuji (excused)

**City Staff Present**

Herman Parker, Director  
Andrew Field, Assistant Director  
John Anderson  
Mike Armenta  
Rumi Doherty  
Sarah Erazo  
Manny Gonzalez  
Tim Graham  
Yovanna Lewis  
Jesse Luke  
Georgette Manela  
Steve Palle  
Kathy Ruiz  
Robin Shifflet  
Clark Taylor  
Jeff Van Deerlin  
Nancy Zamora-Hudson

**CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order by Chair Kinney at 2:07 p.m.

Chair Kinney thanked and welcomed everyone. He announced that there was a new Board Member. He welcomed Noli Zosa and requested that he introduce himself.

Mr. Zosa represents Council District 7. He moved to San Diego in 1990 to attend undergraduate studies and law school at the University of San Diego. He serves as Chairman of the Linda Vista Planning Group. He joined the Park and Recreation Board hoping to help find ways to update some of the recreation centers and make San Diego a more fun place to live.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 19, 2017.**

**MOTION: MOVED/SECONDED      Mr. Hughes/Ms. Johnston**

A motion was made by Mr. Hughes and seconded by Ms. Johnston to approve the October 19, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion was approved (7-0) with Mr. Cho and Mr. Zosa abstaining.

NON-ADOPTION AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT – None

*Chair Kinney asked for clarification regarding two speaker slips that had been submitted as “Non-Agenda Item” regarding DeAnza Item 202. Speakers agreed to have their speaker slip requests moved accordingly since the topic was on the agenda.*

This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on items of interest within the jurisdiction of the Board. (Comments relating to items on today’s Agenda are to be taken at the time the item is heard.) Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes and is not debatable.

REQUEST FOR ITEMS TO BE PLACED ON CONSENT AGENDA – None

The Chair may entertain a motion by any Board member to approve any agenda item as consent when no speaker slips have been submitted in favor or in opposition to the item. Items approved on consent are approved in accordance with staff’s recommendation as reflected on the agenda and described in the Staff Report to the Park and Recreation Board, unless otherwise noted in the motion. At this time the Board may consider adoption of one or more items on the adoption agenda as “Consent” items.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA – None

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE – None

COMMUNICATIONS – None.

(Limited to items not on the agenda. Each one will be limited to three minutes and is not debatable.)

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Community Parks I Area Committee – No report

Community Parks II Area Committee

- Mr. Hughes reported that preparations were underway for the Martin Luther King Celebration, to be held at Martin Luther King, Jr. Park on January 13, 2018, and he invited everyone to attend.

Balboa Park Committee – No report

Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens’ Advisory Committee – No Representative/No Report

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

- Chair Kinney noted that there was no meeting scheduled for December and therefore the next scheduled meeting would take place on January 18, 2018. He wished everyone very happy holidays and New Year.
- Chair Kinney also invited everyone to attend December Nights at Balboa Park the unofficial opening to San Diego’s holiday season.

## DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- Assistant Director Andrew Field welcomed everyone. He announced that Director Herman Parker would be joining the Board Meeting while in progress. He reported back to the Board regarding non-agenda public comment items from the October 19, 2017 Park and Recreation Board Meeting as follows:

- *Board Member request to repair the Mission Bay golf course fence along Grand Avenue/Mission Bay Drive and removal of weeds from the adjacent waterway.*

**Action:** Golf Operations staff were addressing fence repairs even if the insurance payment(s) had not yet been received by the City. The waterway was a Transportation & Storm Water Department asset and Golf staff had requested removal of vegetation from the waterway.

- *Public testimony regarding the renaming of Del Mar Mesa Park to Elizabeth Rabbit Park.*

**Action:** A response letter had been prepared by the Department that outlined the events of the renaming of Del Mar Mesa Park, including the action taken by the Ocean Air Recreation Council rather than the community planning board in accordance with Council Policy 900-20. Copies of the letter had been provided to the Board Members. The letter included the steps to be taken in order to rename the park again.

- *Public testimony regarding the San Diego City Auditor Eduardo Luna's hotline investigation as it related to recreation center changes.*

**Action:**

The City Auditor's report had been provided to the Board members. The Department response to the hotline report started on page 8 and advised the Board that the matter had been related to the calculation of fees for use of park space and not the handling of recreation council funds.

- *Public Testimony request that documents pertaining to the Board Meetings be posted on the website in advance as per Brown Act and that color copies be provided to everyone.*

**Action:** All reports would now be printed in color with no more than two slides per page and would be provided to the public at the meetings. Updates to some reports related to informational items, might not be available until the meeting date, in which case the reports would be distributed to everyone including the Board Members at that time and uploaded to the website as soon as possible.

- *Board Member request for increased SDPD enforcement of unsafe and illegal activities in front of Adams Recreation Center, including homelessness, overnight lodging, and drug use.*

**Action:** Deputy Director David Monroe had contacted the Community Relations Officer (CRO) to follow up on this activity. It had been requested that SDPD increase patrols in the area. The Department was also exploring work to sanitize areas of the park as related to the hepatitis outbreak.

- Chair Kinney thanked Assistant Director Field for reporting back the items that had been brought up during non-agenda public comment at the last Board Meeting. He also thanked the public for having brought these items to the Board's attention and expressed appreciation for the Department's efforts to address these concerns.
- Mr. Becker asked for confirmation that the Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board could go back to the Recreation Council so that they would have the opportunity to participate in the renaming effort. Assistant Director Field confirmed that he was correct.

#### ACTION ITEMS

**101. Salk Neighborhood Park GDP Approval**

Presenters: Yovanna Lewis, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department  
Jeremy Franzini, Landscape Architecture Department Manager,  
Michael Baker International  
Patrick Bunning, Architect, Manuel Oncina Architects Inc.

The presentation outlined the following:

- Background
  - Discussion
  - Project Description
  - Requested Action
  - Consultant Presentation
- 
- Mr. Becker complimented presenters on the presentation. He inquired about parking off Parkdale being publicly accessible. Mr. Franzini confirmed that there would be no gate and that it would be open at all times.
  - Mr. Becker asked about the plans for storm water. Mr. Franzini explained that storm water runoff had been planned for in advance and would comply with the City's Storm Water Manual.
  - Mr. Becker asked how the trail linked to the existing system. He recommended additional fencing due to the area having been dubbed rattlesnake canyon.
  - Ms. Bothwell commented that it was a beautiful plan. She asked whether the family bathroom was ADA compliant. Mr. Bunning responded that it was.
  - Ms. Bothwell asked whether there would be outdoor lighting. Ms. Lewis responded that lighting had not been in the scope of work. Assistant Director Field explained that placing night lighting on a field in an established community was controversial. Wide community support would be necessary in order to add

lighting. The plan only included security lighting. There would be no field lighting for nighttime activity.

- Ms. Bothwell asked whether consideration had been given to more permanent shade structure, because sail shades could be easily removed. Mr. Franzini noted that it was something they would consider.
- Ms. Bothwell asked what the two votes in opposition by the Mira Mesa Recreation Council had been. Mr. Zosa had the same inquiry because the vote had been 8-2 with 4 abstentions. Ms. Lewis did not recall what the votes in opposition had been.
- Mr. Zosa asked if there were any plans for reclaimed water use at this park. Mr. Franzini answered that there was no reclaimed water in the area. In order to create a balance, the landscaping would be composed of a lot of native plants and lower water use plant materials in the lower buffer areas. He explained that the water would be mainly used on the fields.
- Chair Kinney welcomed the public speakers and reminded them that they each had three minutes to speak.

Speakers:                      In Favor (3)

- Mitz Lee spoke in favor of the Salk Neighborhood Park General Development Plan. As a member of the Mira Mesa Recreation Council she explained that she had not voted in support of the GDP because the motion had included a motion to rename the park. She asked the Department and the Board to proceed with renaming according to policy and that the school district be included in the renaming decision as it was a Joint Use facility. She mentioned having a petition against the renaming of Salk Park.
- Sandra Smith spoke in favor of the Salk Neighborhood Park General Development Plan. However, she pointed out that she was against naming any park after a living person. She mentioned three recently renamed parks in Mira Mesa. She felt that parks should not be renamed after sitting members of the Recreation Council. She wanted to make it clear that it was nothing personal against the individuals. In her opinion these actions implied lack of oversight by elected officials.
- Joe Frichtel spoke in favor of the Salk Neighborhood Park General Development Plan. He expressed a desire to get the park approved and completed.
- Chair Kinney complimented staff on the plan and presentation. He liked the combination of active and passive use. He noted that there was a nice combination of activities in a relatively small area. He felt the use of shade was well done. Since Joint Use facilities could be open for special events, he wanted to encourage the Department to create a policy which limited the number of special events so that it would be open to the public the majority of the time.

- Mr. Becker asked for clarification from presenters as to whether they were only seeking approval from the Board for the General Development Plan. Ms. Lewis confirmed that they were only seeking approval for the GDP.
- Mr. Baron asked whether the Joint Use area could be restricted so that dogs would not have access to the school use area. Mr. Franzini explained that the dog park was fenced and that the joint use field was surrounded by a ten foot fence per school district requirements. Assistant Director Field noted that it was not possible to restrict dogs from parks, as that would require a change to the municipal code. Chair Kinney pointed out that it would be difficult to enforce.

**MOTION:      MOVED/SECONDED   Mr. Baron/Mr. Becker**

A motion was made by Mr. Baron and seconded by Mr. Becker to approve Item 101, the Salk Neighborhood Park GDP Approval. The motion was approved (8-0) with Chair Kinney abstaining.

#### INFORMATION ITEMS

**201.    Fiesta Island Amendment to the Mission Bay Park Master Plan**

Presenters:    Clark Taylor, Park Designer, Planning Department  
                      Brooke Peterson, Planning Consultant, PlaceWorks

The presentation outlined the following:

- Background
  - Discussion
  - Project Description
  - Consultant Presentation
- Mr. Zosa recommended the use of more sophisticated diagrams for the master plan and perhaps some overhead views of the areas being referred to.
  - Ms. Bothwell asked for clarification as to the number of volleyball courts and sizes that were being planned in relation to a possible national volleyball center. Ms. Peterson explained that a national facility had not been assumed. She clarified that the capacity for the courts existed, but had not been determined. Mr. Clark noted that the current plan envisioned the volleyball area as being more casual. The current plan did not provide for a national facility. Ms. Peterson mentioned that the exact volleyball design and commitment had not been made. The master plan was currently at a generalized design level.
  - Ms. Bothwell asked how the off leash policy would affect the area. Ms. Peterson responded that the off leash policy would continue in most of the areas. There would be very limited areas where the generalized off-leash policy would not continue. For example, the supervised beach area would require a leash.
  - Ms. Johnson asked if there would be environmental analysis evaluations done on both options during the process. Ms. Peterson responded that both options were being evaluated equally.



- Mr. Baron asked whether diagram B depicted a wider road. Ms. Peterson responded that the crossway as a whole would be widened in order to provide for the bike lane, the travel lane and the multi-purpose lane. Mr. Clark also noted that the entire road around the island would be widened.
- Ms. Johnston asked if bicyclists, triathletes, and triathlon organizers had been reached out to, in order to make sure that the plans met their needs. Ms. Peterson responded that they had received input from the user group via the Mission Bay Planning Group Committee. Ms. Peterson also pointed out that the revised direction of the loop was intended to better accommodate the races that took place.
- Mr. Becker thanked the presenters for the presentation. He liked the graphics and felt they had made efficient use of their budget. He asked when they would be doing the actual phasing plan of how the master plan would be implemented. Ms. Peterson explained that the master plan would only include very generalized phasing. The GDP would include much more detailed plans.
- Mr. Becker asked whether both options would be going to City Council and later memorialized in the plan. Ms. Peterson answered that at the time the plan goes to Council, they would adopt one option or the other.

Chair Kinney informed the Board that Member Ray Bernal would be leaving early to attend a conference.

**202. DeAnza Revitalization Plan/Mission Bay Park Master Plan Amendment**

Presenter: Robin Shifflet, Development Project Manager III, Planning Department

The presentation outlined the following:

- Background
  - Discussion
  - Project Description
  - Presentation
- Ms. Bothwell presented a letter from the Pacific Beach Planning Group as partners of the Pacific Beach EcoDistrict in support of the DeAnza Revitalization Plan from the perspective of the Pacific Beach EcoDistrict Framework. (Letter attached). Ms. Bothwell stated that the percentage of comments in opposition did not seem to support the City's decision in support of the 18 hole golf course. She cited information on Page 6 of the report. She also noted the concerns raised in the letter signed by Beautiful PB, the Pacific Beach Town Council, the San Diego Audubon as well as on line comments. Ms. Shifflet stated that the golf course was a key element of the City's golf plan. She explained that she had met with the Golf Association and that they had expressed that the course was very important to the golf plan and provided a place for all levels of players. Furthermore, she noted that the course was unique because it provided lighting at night. And thus, the City had decided to keep the golf course unchanged. Ms. Bothwell asked who had made that decision. Ms. Shifflet explained that it had been a variety of managers and departments. She further explained that the City had weighed and balanced

all the input they had received and had made the decision to keep the golf course as it was.

- Ms. Johnston requested to reserve her comments until after having listened to the speakers.
- Chair Kinney welcomed the public speakers and reminded them that they each had three minutes to speak.

Speakers:      Neutral (2)  
                     In Favor (2)  
                     In Opposition (2)  
                     Unspecified (1)

- Ann Dynes spoke in opposition to the DeAnza Revitalization Plan/Mission Bay Park Master Plan Amendment. Ms. Dynes introduced herself as the Chairman of the Municipal Golf Course Committee. She was happy to hear for the first time, that the golf course would remain unchanged. However, she had continued concerns as to how the plan would move forward since the golf course had been added after the sub-committee had started. She would like to see better consultation with representatives from the golf community. She noted that she had e-mailed the Director and Assistant Director a copy of a letter authored by the golf committee to Paul Robinson, Chair of the Mission Bay Planning Committee. She kindly requested that her letter be circulated accordingly. (Letter attached)
- Megan Flaherty spoke regarding the DeAnza Revitalization Plan/Mission Bay Park Master Plan Amendment. Ms. Flaherty introduced herself as the Restoration Program Manager of the San Diego Audubon Society. She explained that the society has been very involved in the process to restore 48 acres of wetlands which had once been 4000 acres in Mission Bay. She thanked staff for their effort. In 2014 the Society began a feasibility study which had found that in order to have 120 acres of wetland, the plan would have to restore 200 acres. She felt that the sea level rise finding had not been taken into account.
- George Heatherington spoke as neutral regarding the DeAnza Revitalization Plan/Mission Bay Park Master Plan Amendment. Mr. Heatherington felt that there were many misrepresentations of fact in the plan. He stated that there had been no Coastal Commission involvement and that the plan was not a representation of what the community wanted. He further expressed that the sub-committee had not heard the public as they were not in favor of RV parking as it was no different than having residential living in the that area.
- Ben Haddad spoke as neutral regarding the DeAnza Revitalization Plan/Mission Bay Park Master Plan Amendment. He represented Top Golf and explained that Top Golf was a food and beverage operation with a focus on golf. He noted that they did not intend to displace the golf course, but rather work in conjunction with the golf course by driving business to them. He offered to have Top Golf come to the Board as an information item.



- Scott Chipman spoke in opposition to the DeAnza Revitalization Plan/Mission Bay Park Master Plan Amendment. Mr. Chipman advocated for the Mission Bay Gateway Plan, a grass roots effort. He felt that the City plans were inadequate and ignored multiple opportunities. He felt that the plans should reflect a balance of recreation, education and all environmental needs. Furthermore the project should include facilities currently absent in Mission Bay Park. He noted that facility features that could be included would be eliminated by creating wet lands.
- Doris Cronkhite spoke in favor of keeping Mission Bay Golf Course intact. She introduced herself as a member of Mission Bay Women's Golf. She noted that the last ad-hoc meetings had been cancelled and that she had not been given an answer as to why the golf community had not been given a chance to participate in the ad-hoc process. She commented that today was the first time that she had heard that the golf course would remain.
- Phil Monroe spoke in favor of the DeAnza Revitalization Plan/Mission Bay Park Master Plan Amendment. He thanked the Board for their service. He reminded the Audubon Society that a National Wildlife Refuge existed in the bay. He explained that the three golf courses worked together as a system providing a course for all levels of play. It would be inefficient to take one out of the system.
- Ms. Johnston complimented staff on their work on this project. She asked for clarity regarding the access off Grand Avenue. Ms. Shifflet answered that they have been working with transportation planners. The City's Planning Department was already working on a plan north of DeAnza to increase density to the housing area. There is a need for existing and new to find a way into Mission Bay. The City was looking at other traffic controls which would include pedestrian and bicycle access. Ms. Johnston commented that would create a lot of intersections in a heavy traffic area.
- Ms. Johnston expressed concern for the economic feasibility of the project to actually build out the improvements. She asked whether any of the improvements contemplated, had been included in the Mission Bay Park Ten-Year Expenditure Program. She was concerned with the revenue impact on the fund. She emphasized that a lot of consideration needed to be put into what commercial leases provided as a source of revenue to both funds to benefit the park.
- Ms. Johnston noted that she fully supported keeping the golf course at its present location. She also recommended that staff continue to work with stake holders who are vested in the area. Ms. Shifflet noted that the master plan stated at the beginning that the plan was a balance between habitat, environment, recreation and commerce because they all needed to work together.
- Chair Kinney thanked Ms. Shifflet for the presentation and wished her well with the process.

**203. Proposed Changes to Recreation Councils**

Presenters: Herman D. Parker, Director, Park and Recreation Department  
Andrew Field, Assistant Director, Park and Recreation  
Department

The presentation outlined the following:

- Background
  - Discussion
  - Questions/Answers
- Chair Kinney welcomed the public speakers and reminded them that they each had three minutes to speak.

Speakers: Neutral (3)  
In Opposition (2)

- Gail Forbes spoke as neutral regarding the Proposed Changes to Recreation Councils. She introduced herself as a member of the La Jolla Town Council. She urged that recreation council 501(c)(3) funds not be co-mingled with City funds. She recommended that more time be given to the issue.
- Bill Robbins spoke as neutral regarding the Proposed Changes to Recreation Councils. Mr. Robbins identified himself as being a member from La Jolla. He noted that volunteers did a lot of things for free that staff were paid to do. He was not sure what would continue to happen if the local people were disenfranchised. He urged the City to postpone the decision. He doubted that recreation councils would not be charged an administrative fee for keeping track of the money. Lastly he noted that recreation councils wanted to fix the problem but wanted to be part of fixing it.
- David Rodger spoke in opposition to the Proposed Changes to Recreation Councils. Mr. Rodger reiterated what the City Attorney had said at the October City Council Meeting regarding having notified Park and Recreation staff regarding the issue ten days after having taken office. He stated that there already were two working models in place such as BID councils and business associations that receive funds from the City into private accounts and spend it on City properties. He stated that he did not understand why almost an entire year had been wasted when there were existing systems that the City Attorney accepted.
- Norman A. Ryan spoke in opposition to the Proposed Changes to Recreation Councils. Mr. Ryan identified himself as Chair of the Tierrasanta Recreation Council. He noted that he was opposed to Director Parker's Memorandum. Mr. Ryan made reference to City Attorney Aguirre's requirement that recreation councils become 501(c)(3)'s, eight years ago. He noted that not one community member had been involved in this decision. He suggested that there would not be accountability of funds. And that surcharges had not been paid. He recommended that attention be paid to where the money was going.

- Robin Kaufman spoke as neutral regarding the Proposed Changes to Recreation Councils. Ms. Kaufman identified herself as Chair of the Rancho Bernardo Recreation Council and requested a question and answer session as follows;
  - o How can Council Policy indemnify members if there's no recreation councils? Without recreation councils there can be no members. Director Parker reiterated that the indemnity stayed in place and that there would be more clarification as the working groups came together.
  - o Are we supposed to still hand over our funds come December 31<sup>st</sup>? Director Parker noted that the question was a bit premature and that as the issue moved to Council there would be more clarification as to how the money would flow. Notification would be disseminated to recreation councils as soon as it became available.
  - o Why wasn't the task force process extended to community volunteers to help resolve the situation instead of starting a working group now? Director Parker explained that the entire process had been an evolving process. From a staff perspective, ramifications to the Department and how they could continue to work with recreation councils had to be researched under attorney/client privileges with the City Attorney's Office.
  - o Now that the working groups are going to be formed will a representative from the City Attorney's Office be included? Director Parker responded that he was not an attorney so he could not answer. He noted that they were still looking at what the working group would look like.
  - o Was this memo reviewed by the City Attorney? Director Parker responded that no, the memo had been drafted by staff.
- Mr. Zosa requested further clarification about the City Attorney's response at the October 31<sup>st</sup> City Council meeting. Director Parker reiterated that the Department had been working with the City Attorney ever since a right of entry permit had not been approved under confidential client/attorney privileges.
- Mr. Cho stated that he had been assured that the recreation funds would not be comingled with City funds. He asked himself whether recreation councils could form a citizen's initiative to overturn the decision.
- Chair Kinney acknowledged that this was a difficult subject. He was glad that it was taking a little longer to resolve. Furthermore, he hoped that it would work out in a manner that served all sides so that recreation councils could continue to serve the very important role that they had served for so long.

Details of the reports and PowerPoint presentations can be found on the Park and Recreation Department website at: <http://www.sandiego.gov/parkandrecboard/reports>

WORKSHOP – None

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Next Meeting: **Thursday, January 18, 2018**  
**Balboa Park Club Ballroom**  
**2150 Pan American Road West**  
**San Diego, CA 92101**

Submitted by,

Herman D. Parker,  
Director  
Park and Recreation Department

Ann Parode Dynes  
c/o Torrey Pines Golf Course  
Attention: John Howard  
La Jolla, California 92037

October 20, 2017

Mr. Paul Robinson  
Chair, Mission Bay Planning Committee  
600 W. Broadway, Suite 800  
San Diego, California 92101

Dear Paul:

Thank you for the telephone conversation this week and for Robin Shifflet's further input about the impact of current plans on the Mission Bay Golf Course (MBGC). I write on behalf of the City of San Diego Municipal Golf Committee (MGC), on which I currently serve as Chair. Our Committee was appointed by the Mayor and City Council to serve as a citizens' advisory group to the City of San Diego's Golf Division with respect to the public golf courses directly operated by the City--Torrey Pines, Balboa and MBGC. MBGC is a 62-year-old public, 18-hole, 2700-yard golf course operated by the Golf Division using the resources of the Golf Enterprise Fund (which is not a part of the City's General Fund).

On behalf of the MGC (not the Golf Division which cannot take a position) and the thousands of users of MBGC, we write to first question the basis on which MBGC was included in the De Anza Revitalization Plan (Plan). As we understand it, along with other recreational facilities in De Anza Cove 46-acre MBGC was added to your Plan in late 2015 or early 2016 taking the Plan area from initially 76 acres to 166 acres. Since MBGC is a regional park, not local to Mission Bay or even Pacific Beach, and because it is located on former tidelands which we understand were dedicated to park and recreational use by the State, we question whether your Committee is on legal ground to include the course, and perhaps the other recreational uses at De Anza, in the Plan at all. Can you arrange to provide us with confirmation that MBGC is appropriately included in the Plan process at all? It seems very possible that the Revitalization Plan should be restricted to areas in De Anza which are not already dedicated recreational acreage.

Secondly, if MBGC is properly included in the Plan, we believe that the omission of representation by the golfing community in the Plan process is a serious oversight requiring correction. Once the golf course was belatedly included in the Plan area, the omission of any representative of, nor even consultation from either the MGC or the golfing community at any level of the process, has compromised the opportunity for a complete, fair and thoughtful review of the options for golf at De Anza. We believe that there are thoughtful options for maximizing the role of MBGC, while leaving its functionality intact, which deserve consideration.

The Golf Division, and accordingly the MGC, was first informed that MBGC had been included in the footprint of the Plan only in spring 2016 at which point the Plan Subcommittee had been formed and public workshops were already underway. We did not then understand the manner in which MBGC constituencies had been omitted from the decision-making process while environmental and commercial interests seem to have been favored. Representatives of the MGC and the golfing community attended all public workshops convened by the Subcommittee and consistently



communicated the case for retaining MBGC substantially unimpaired to the City's Planning staff. We think that it is inappropriate that ReWild Mission Bay is prominently featured on the web site for the Plan while MBGC, a current operator in the Plan area, is not. While there were numerous consultants on the Subcommittee with various (we think but do not know, mostly environmental and Pacific Beach commercial) competencies, none of them appear to have had an adequate appreciation for public golf nor were they skilled in the complexities and cost of "shrinking" a golf course. While one of the options currently pending seems to retain the substance of MBGC, the Subcommittee's current recommendations pertaining to the course require direct input from the golfing community, parallel in kind to that apparently obtained from other interested groups. We feel strongly that there is an appearance, if not a fact, of unfairness to San Diego golfers.

Had there been appropriate representation on the Subcommittee of the golfing community like it did with Audubon, Pacific Beach merchants, Campland and other voices, the Subcommittee would have had access to significant information which is essential to a fair and thorough review of the options for MBGC (assuming that it is appropriately in the footprint of the Plan at all). Such information includes an understanding of the unique role which MBGC plays in San Diego youth golf and in affordable and accessible public golf generally. Because it is the only night lit course in the City, because it also offers disc and foot golf, and because it is the principal practice facility for at least 12 high school golf teams, MBGC is a one-of-a-kind training ground for future golfers and outdoor sports generally. MBGC clearly offers a healthy alternative all year, and especially winter, long to our youth instead of video games, television and other modern distractions. San Diego prides itself as a golf destination for the world and MBGC is a huge part of the pipeline for entry level golfers; there can't be players at Balboa let alone Torrey Pines without learners at a full-service course like MBGC. According to a recent study, golf has become a growth sport among young people; they must play on a full golf course, including par 4 holes (MBGC has four of them), with associated practice facilities, to become proficient at the sport. There simply is no other course of this character and affordability for our youth.

In addition, senior golfers and working people need and value a local, affordable and accessible course to play. MBGC is flat and walkable for seniors unlike most other public courses. And hundreds of working men and women use the course on weekends and after work; it is playable in a couple of hours but still permits the use of every club in a player's bag. Sixty thousand rounds of golf are played there annually, plus another 40,000 users of the driving range. MBGC is a unique and irreplaceable resource to a very broad range of golfers, young, old and in between. I urge you to chat with Robin about the outpouring of youth, seniors and working people who spoke out at our last MGC meeting in September, each pleading to leave MBGC intact. As stated, MBGC is a regional resource with a draw far wider than visitors to Mission Bay itself. Unlike the assumption of some opponents of golf, MBGC is anything but elite.

We also submit that your Committee needs a better understanding of what would be involved in modifying MBGC as currently proposed. In its present form, MBGC is already an environmentally friendly location for migrating and other birdlife with old shrubbery and fresh water. MBGC does not have a mosquito problem as we understand the tidelands there previously did. Also, your Committee should be aware that \$7 million in Golf Enterprise funds are going to be invested in MBGC to replace the irrigation system, the club house and other facilities in 2019. The Golf Division does not plan to wait for the De Anza project to get finalized and funded to implement these repairs, planned years ago and now coming up for prioritization.



The point is that MBGC is not just another piece of De Anza Cove to be carved up to meet the demands of constituencies which became a part of the Plan before the golf community was even aware of the threat to diminish the course. MBGC is one of a kind because its current footprint which enables San Diegans and visitors to learn and practice every aspect of the game. We respect the fact that the Revitalization process might involve some compromise by historic users of De Anza like MBGC but supporters of MBGC simply have not been given a full seat at the table where that discussion has been taking place.

There also has been significant misinformation in the public dialogue about the impact of MBGC on public finances and its role in the Mission Bay Master Plan which, we understand, calls for a percentage of the Plan area to have commercial value to the City. MBGC is operated within the Golf Enterprise Fund which is paying \$450,000 to the general fund in 2017 for essentially rental and reimbursement of City overhead. Every acre taken away from the course will reduce that revenue stream and, in fact, increase City costs if land is reallocated to the Parks & Recreation Department (which spends \$14,180 per acre to operate other recreational facilities in the City). Yes, MBGC is operated by the Golf Division at a loss to the Fund, but this is a public recreational service. No one seems to expect that City basketball courts, softball fields or other public recreational facilities should be profitable but, in fact, MBGC is a profit center to the City's general budget thanks to the Golf Enterprise system.

In conclusion, the project's City staff have been politely receptive to public golf input, and Subcommittee workshops have given lip service to listening to the MBGC story, but the Subcommittee process became flawed once MBGC was included in the Plan area and direct participation by the public's educated golfing community was not incorporated into the decision-making process. Other interests have been favored from the outset and we have only just awakened to this injustice. We were going to request that your Committee take a step back and postpone the November 7<sup>th</sup> meeting until corrective action can be taken. However, you have assured me that November 7 is another information-gathering session at which neither of the pending proposals will be adopted. Our representatives will attend with that expectation and the hope that better involvement by the golfing community occurs going forward, unless of course it develops that MBGC was inappropriately included in the Plan in the first instance.

I understand that there may be aspects of our beliefs which might be misinformed because we have been in the dark until recently. I welcome the opportunity to clear the air if so and come to a mutually satisfactory understanding of the situation. Thank you for your consideration of our requests.

Very truly yours,



Ann Parode Dyne  
Chair, Municipal Golf Committee  
[anndynes@ucsd.edu](mailto:anndynes@ucsd.edu)

cc: Mayor Kevin Faulkner  
Herman Parker, Park & Recreation Department  
Lori Zapf, City Councilwoman  
Barbara Bry, City Councilwoman  
Scott Sherman, City Councilman  
Robin Shifflet, Planning Department  
Mark Marney, Golf Division

January 3, 2017

TO: San Diego Mayor Kevin Falconer  
San Diego City Council  
De Anza Revitalization Plan Ad Hoc Subcommittee  
Mission Bay Park Committee  
San Diego Park and Recreation Board

As partners of the Pacific Beach EcoDistrict we support the De Anza Revitalization Plan from the perspective of the Pacific Beach EcoDistrict Framework. Representatives from our organizations have attended all public meetings related to the De Anza Revitalization Plan and read all relevant documents. We support the eleven page "Response to the De Anza Revitalization Plan Alternatives" adopted by the Pacific Beach Planning Group (PBPG) on November 30, 2016 with particular emphasis on the following points:

- 1) Prevent "planning in a silo" by cooperating closely with adjacent concurrent planning efforts, land uses, and future transit oriented development along and around Mission Bay Drive
  - a) Make a serious effort to pursue joint use agreements with Mission Bay High School, and Barnard Elementary in terms of tennis courts, athletic fields, adventure/creative play areas, and a resource/nature/visitor center. These do not all have to be located within the De Anza Revitalization Plan area. (Also consider moving some proposed uses to Fiesta Island, the dirt lot on the north end of Crown Point Park, or other underutilized areas of Mission Bay Park to reduce the number of competing interests in the De Anza Revitalization study area.)
  - b) Consider areas of the De Anza Revitalization Plan which front Grand Avenue and Mission Bay Drive as entryways to Pacific Beach and Mission Bay Park as a whole and design accordingly.
  - c) Require key planners of the De Anza Revitalization Plan to meet regularly and coordinate with the key planners of the concurrent projects of the Balboa Avenue Station Specific Plan, ReWild Mission Bay, and the SANDAG Rose Creek Bikeway projects.
- 2) Embrace the Ecotourism concept as described on page 7 of the PBPG document.
- 3) Meet regularly with key planners of the ReWild Mission Bay project and use their input, including the technical reports and input from their public meetings to inform plans for expanded and improved habitat restoration in the De Anza Revitalization Plan. Recognize that competing uses of the De Anza Revitalization Plan do not have to be balanced within the planning area. The De Anza Revitalization Plan should attempt to move towards creating a balance within the entire park.
- 4) The community garden is an important element that supports the EcoDistrict Principles and will serve as an example for visitors to this area.
- 5) We purposefully re-include a statement removed from section 4.1 of the PBPG response regarding the future of Mission Bay Golf Course (MBGC). Eliminate MBGC from the planned area for the following reasons:
  - a) There is a national and regional trend toward golf course closures and declining golf play retention and especially amongst lower cost facilities like MBGC. Reducing to a 9-hole is not an option. Daily fee, lower-priced, and 9-hole courses continue to be the segments that are disproportionately represented among course closures.
  - b) There are many other golf courses and driving ranges in the region, both public and private, that offer a similar or superior golf experience at similar or higher value and in a preferred setting.
  - c) The economic viability of a golf course within the constraints of this site are not feasible. MBGC loses \$600,000 to \$800,000 per year.
  - d) Too many acres will be used for too few members of the public to enjoy.
  - e) A golf course or driving range are not compatible with adjacent proposed land uses.
  - f) A golf course will require much more water consumption than other types of active recreation or passive land use being proposed and therefore challenges the goals of the Pacific Beach EcoDistrict.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matthew Winter, President  
beautifulPB



Catherine Jolley, President  
Pacific Beach Town Council



James Paugh, Conservation Chair  
San Diego Audubon

