

City of San Diego
Parks and Recreation Board Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 15, 2023

“TO PROVIDE HEALTHY, SUSTAINABLE, AND ENRICHING ENVIRONMENTS FOR ALL”

Meeting Held by In Person and Teleconference:

This meeting was held at the Balboa Park Club Ballroom and remotely using the Zoom Webinar platform and was streamed online. The public was invited to join the meeting by phone or computer, as well as invited to submit “Public Comments” in writing via a webform. The form was made available on the Parks and Recreation website at <https://www.sandiego.gov/park-and-recreation/general-info/boards>.

NOTE: Both verbal and written communication were used by Committee Members, City staff, and presenters during the meeting. City staff also used the screen-share function to allow viewers to view content shared by the speaker which included PowerPoint presentations and websites.

Before the meeting was called to order, City staff read instructions to the public regarding technical procedures for making live public comment during the webinar.

Members Present	Members Absent	City Staff Present
Jon Becker Marcella Bothwell (Chair) Shaina Gross Rick Gulley Daniele Laman René Smith	Nick Anastasopoulos Molly Chase Dennis Otsuji (Vice Chair) Evelyn Smith Pita Verdin	Michelle Abella-Shon Cristhian Barajas Ryan Barbrick Sarah Erazo Andy Field Maricris Lomibao Salome Martinez Maureen McGowan Louis Merlin Steve Palle Sameera Rao Anna Sonnenburg Gabriela Verendia

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order by Chair Marcella Bothwell at 2:11 pm.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2023

MOTION/SECONDED:

Mr. Gulley/Mr. Becker

June 15, 2023

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes

Page 2

A motion was made by Mr. Gulley and seconded by Mr. Becker to approve the May 18, 2023, Parks and Recreation Board Meeting Minutes with the noted correction provided by Ms. Laman. The motion was approved 6-0 and passed unanimously with the following vote: Yea: Jon Becker, Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, and René Smith. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Nick Anastasopoulos, Molly Chase, Dennis Otsuji, Evelyn Smith, and Pita Verdin.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT: None

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE: None

COMMITTEE UPDATES:

- Area Committees: Mr. Smith indicated there were no meetings and no updates.
- Balboa Park Committee: Mr. Smith attended and reported that the last meeting was chaired by Assistant Deputy Director Christina Chadwick. Both the water and sewer project and Park Boulevard mobility project were topics of discussion. The Balboa Park Committee of 100 hosted an event on June 14, 2023, which was Flag Day, to raise the flag over San Diego Automotive Museum and to welcome the new bears (“Red” and “Fern” named in honor of the Redfern family) installed on the corners of the building. Finally, the committee received the San Diego High School Connections presentation, which is also on today’s Board agenda.
- Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens Advisory Committee: Mr. Gulley reported there was no meeting and no update.

SAN DIEGO PARKS FOUNDATION UPDATE: Chair Bothwell reported that day camps are getting started, and Parks After Dark will begin in July for the summer with plenty of family-friendly activities.

CHAIR COMMENTS: None

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

1. Ms. Laman stated that the Taft Middle School ribbon cutting on June 5, 2023, was a very nice event in collaboration with the San Diego Unified School District. She announced a Juneteenth celebration coming on Saturday, June 17, 2023, at Gloria’s Mesa at Chollas Lake.
2. Mr. Smith requested the Trust for Public Lands report be included in the meeting minutes; the report is available here:
<https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/prbr20230615a-memo-to-city-council-parks-score-5-31-23.pdf>
3. Ms. Gross appreciated last month’s childcare report and asked if the Board could receive a more prioritized list of childcare needs from the Office of Child and Youth Success (OCYS) to develop that. Last month’s report from OCYS included static data but did not indicate criteria to determine the priority level. OCYS will be working with the Parks and Recreation Department to address concerns with childcare providers

being responsible for tenant improvements at recreation centers and other park buildings. There may be ways to offer financing for smaller childcare providers that can't afford tenant improvements and capital investment. Chair Bothwell asked Ms. Gross if she could provide a letter outlining the Board's requests for information from OCYS. Ms. Gross agreed to do this.

DIRECTORS REPORT: Mr. Field provided the Board with the following updates:

Budget Update: The City Council adopted the Fiscal Year 2024 budget on Monday, June 12, 2023. The Citywide Park Development Impact Fees will be heard by the Community and Neighborhood Services Committee.

Unsafe Camping Ordinance: This was approved by the City Council meeting of June 13, 2023.

Equity Forward Follow-Up: Mr. Field received an update from Planning Assistant Deputy Director Sameera Rao on questions the Board raised several months ago. Here are the responses from Ms. Rao:

1. How does the Budget Equity Guide relate to the Equity Forward initiative?

The budget equity guide and equity forward are two different initiatives. The Budget Equity Guide is intended to guide budget process and decisions. Equity Forward is a separate Planning Department initiative that includes multiple interrelated long-range planning items related to equity and environmental justice.

2. Can the comments received during the Equity Forward presentations be provided back to the Board in granular format?

The Planning Department will present components of Equity Forward related to the scope of the Parks and Recreation Board.

3. When will the Engineering and Capital Projects biannual report (State of the CIP) be released?

The mid-year report for Fiscal Year 2023 has been published and is available at this link: https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/fiscal_year_2023_state_of_the_cip_and_construction_mid-year-01.pdf

4. When will the Equity Forward webpage show all seven planning initiatives fully updated and built out?

Three web pages are up and running:

- a. Environmental Justice: <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/environmental-justice-element>.
- b. Inclusive Public Engagement Guide: <https://www.sandiego.gov/equity-forward/inclusive-public-engagement-guide>.
- c. Partnering for Progress: <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/partnering-for-progress>.

Four other webpages are pending/under development, with more content being added:

- a. The infrastructure Prioritization webpage will go live in June 2023:
<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/work-programs/infrastructure-prioritization-engagement>.
 - b. The Chollas Creek Regional Park Master Plan webpage is anticipated to go live in July 2023: <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/work/chollas-creek-watershed>.
 - c. Planning Department is working on applying for grant funding for the Trails Master Plan. The webpage is available at:
<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/work/citywide-trails-master-plan>.
 - d. Once the draft Park Needs Index report is ready for review, it will be posted on the webpage for review. The Planning Department is aiming for this to be complete in Fall 2023. The webpage is available at:
<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/work/park-needs-index>.
5. **Will Equity Forward address organizational issues in delineating the roles of departments involved in managing and building parks, including Parks and Recreation, Planning, Engineering and Capital Projects, and General Services?**
The following two initiatives of Equity Forward will address existing gaps and propose incremental improvements to facilitate the efficient delivery of public infrastructure in areas with the greatest needs and the greatest growth:

Engagement for Infrastructure Prioritization under Equity Forward will gather public input on infrastructure priorities and share the input received with asset owning department to guide the five-year capital outlook and the budget process for Fiscal Year 2025. And a report detailing community input received and the priorities that were included in the development of the CIP Five-Year Outlook will be published in February 2024.

Partnering for Progress will focus on working with the community to identify case studies of collaboration between the community and the city to build public projects that communities want and propose a streamlined process for communities and community leaders to work with the city on future collaborative public projects.

Balboa Park Update:

- **Mayor's State of Balboa Park** – Thank you to everyone who was able to join Mayor Todd Gloria recently at the Natural History Museum for the first State of Balboa Park address. Mayor Gloria recognized long-term volunteer Betty Peabody with the Key to Balboa Park. It was wonderful opportunity to see so many stakeholders together in one room celebrating some of our recent successes.
- **Balboa Park Projects Prioritization Framework** – As shared by the Mayor in his State of Balboa Park address, we have concluded the competitive search process for a consultant who will create a project prioritization framework for Balboa Park. The

selected vendor is AEA Consulting, who is based in New York. An overall framework will be used to assign scarce resources to the most impactful projects for the park and will include a scoring system for assessing and prioritizing needed work. The Department will start working with the vendor this summer and the Balboa Park Committee and stakeholders will play an important role. More information on how to get involved is coming soon.

- Reference article from *San Diego Union-Tribune*: New effort aims to prioritize Balboa Park's greatest needs:
<https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/business/story/2023-05-24/new-effort-aims-to-prioritize-balboa-parks-greatest-needs>
- **Balboa Park Committee in July and August** – The Balboa Park Committee will meet Thursday, July 27, 2023, at 6:00 p.m. and will be dark in August 2023.
- **Safe Camping Site Preparations** – Our grounds maintenance and ranger divisions are working internally with various other City departments to begin preparations at the 20th and B Maintenance Yard and “O Lot” for their future use as safe camping sites for individuals experiencing homeless. The sites are expected to be ready for operation this summer and fall. Additional information will be provided to the Balboa Park Committee and stakeholders as received.
- **Twilight Concerts in the Park** – Free Balboa Park Twilight Concerts will begin this month and are held every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday from 6:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. until Thursday, August 24, 2023.
- **Mobility and Park Boulevard Redesign Update** – The Mobility Department is giving a presentation to the City's Mobility Board about mobility and circulation in Balboa Park at the last Balboa Park Committee meeting. Stakeholders who wish to provide ongoing feedback about the Park Boulevard redesign effort can submit comments directly to ChadwickC@sandiego.gov.
- **Casa del Prado Restoration** – The Casa del Prado building was closed briefly to perform investigatory work for a feasibility study of the building and its systems. The study will determine what is outdated, major deficiencies, and what is the cost of all the necessary items. The assessment will help to develop a priority list that can be used to develop the final scope.
- **NAT Museum Exterior Gardens Project** – The Parks and Recreation Department continues to work with the NAT Museum on their 90 percent design plan for their exterior garden as well as a corresponding signage and recognition plan. The public input process for this project is slated to begin at the Balboa Park Committee meeting in July 2023.
- **Automotive Museum Exterior Completion** – Thanks to the Balboa Park Committee of 100, the exterior restoration of the Automotive Museum is complete. Mayor Gloria and stakeholders celebrated the grand opening on Flag Day, June 14, 2023, at 10:30 a.m.

June 15, 2023

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes

Page 6

- **Movies in the Park** – The Movies in the Park series for Summer 2023 is being held at Morley Field on June 10 (Lightyear), July 14 (DC League of Super Pets) and August 12 (Puss N Boots: The Last Wish).

Future Board Items:

- Appointment of Parks and Recreation Board Chair and Vice Chair for Fiscal Year 2024
- Chollas Creek Regional Park Master Plan Update
- Department of Real Estate and Airports Management Overview including leases
- Restroom Condition Assessment and Maintenance

Questions of the Parks and Recreation Director:

- Mr. Becker asked if the Mission Bay Park Master Plan amendments for Fiesta Island have been approved and asked if the programmatic environmental impact report for multiple Mission Bay Park Improvement Fund programs will include Fiesta Island. Mr. Field responded yes, those amendments have been approved, and the full master plan is available at this web link: <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/work/park-planning/fiesta-island>.
- Ms. Laman asked when the next Community and Neighborhood Services Committee meeting will be held. Mr. Field responded that it is scheduled for 1 p.m. on Thursday, June 29, 2023.

CONSENT AGENDA ACTION ITEMS: None

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

101. Proposed Modifications to Parks and Recreation Board Bylaws

Presenter: Marcella Bothwell, Chair, Parks and Recreation Board

Chair Bothwell presented the proposed changes to the Board bylaws. A motion was made by Mr. Gulley and seconded by Mr. Becker to approve Item 101, Proposed Modifications to Parks and Recreation Board Bylaws. The motion was approved 6-0 and passed unanimously with the following vote: Yea: Jon Becker, Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, and René Smith. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Nick Anastasopoulos, Molly Chase, Dennis Otsuji, Evelyn Smith, and Pita Verdin.

Public Comments:

- Michael Stepner noted that he has been working with Director Field on the Design Review Committee and appreciates that this ad-hoc committee is included in the bylaws.

Board Comments:

1. Ms. Laman appreciated the clarification of the difference between community recreation groups and area committees. She asked whether those groups have bylaws.

Ms. Bothwell responded that they are the own groups that would have their own bylaws.

2. Mr. Smith suggested the Board look at the structure of Mission Trails Citizens Advisory Committee and compare that to open space advisory bodies. In reading the San Diego Municipal Code, he asked if ex-officio members can participate. Mr. Field responded that only Board members could participate as members of the advisory bodies.
3. Ms. Laman asked about the difference between ad hoc and standing committees. Mr. Field responded that the committees cited in the bylaws are standing committees, and any temporary committees for a specific purpose would be ad hoc committees.

102. Proposed Maruta Gardner Memorial Plaque at the Maruta Gardner Playground in Bonita Cove Mission Bay Park

Gayle Cavanaugh, Rosemary Taschi, Nancy Gellar, and Maureen McGowan from Mission Beach Women's Club presented the request to add the plaque at the Maruta Gardner playground. A motion was made by Mr. Becker and seconded by Mr. Gulley to approve Item 102, Proposed Maruta Gardner Memorial Plaque at the Maruta Gardner Playground in Bonita Cove Mission Bay Park. The motion was approved 6-0 and passed unanimously with the following vote: Yea: Jon Becker, Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, and René Smith. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Nick Anastasopoulos, Molly Chase, Dennis Otsuji, Evelyn Smith, and Pita Verdin.

Public Comments: None

Board Comments: None

103. Proposed Renaming of 3Roots Community Park to Bruce Brown Memorial Park

Mark Moss and District Manager Anna Sonnenburg presented the renaming proposal with an overview of the proposed park and highlights of Mr. Brown's life and volunteerism. A motion was made by Mr. Becker and seconded by Mr. Smith to approve Item 103, Proposed Renaming of 3Roots Community Park to Bruce Brown Memorial Park. The motion was approved 6-0 and passed unanimously with the following vote: Yea: Jon Becker, Marcella Bothwell, Shaina Gross, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, and René Smith. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Nick Anastasopoulos, Molly Chase, Dennis Otsuji, Evelyn Smith, and Pita Verdin.

Public Comments: None

Board Comments:

1. Ms. Bothwell noted Mr. Brown used to serve on the Park and Recreation Board several years ago and his efforts continue to make impacts on youth Citywide, especially in Mira Mesa.
2. Ms. Gross asked about how the developer determined the name 3Roots. Mr. Moss did not have a specific answer but did note the park requirements of the development.

Mr. Becker noted that 3Roots is part of the overall development that includes residential and commercial properties as well as the new community park.

201. University Community Plan Update

Associate Planner Ashley Dulaney presented the University Community Plan Update to the Parks and Recreation Board as an informational item.

Public Comments:

1. **Andrew Wiese:** Dr. Wiese from the University Community Planning Group provided the following written document, and he made verbal remarks based on this document. Dr. Wiese had time ceded by Deborah Knight. Here is the written statement from Dr. Wiese:

My name is Andy Wiese. I am a board member of the University Community Planning Group and Chair of the University Community Plan Update Subcommittee, which is a subcommittee of the UCPG. Our subcommittee has been engaged with the UC Plan Update for 4.5 years. We have held over 40 public meetings. Today I will report on Areas of Consensus of the Subcommittee achieved to date with several recommendations, as chair of that group.

This Tuesday, June 13, 2023, I presented to the UCPG a preliminary report of the Subcommittee with 22 pages of recommendations on subjects relevant to this group. Subjects included recommendations for strengthening sections on urban forestry and urban greening, the use of native trees and landscaping, better protections for open space, the MHPA, wildlife corridors, watersheds, riparian areas, and more. The Subcommittee will prepare final recommendations this month and the UCPG will prepare its own recommendations in response in July. Today, I will present bullets focused on just Parks and Recreation. If you are interested in details, I am happy to answer questions.

I. Strengths of the UC Plan Discussion Draft

On the Plan's Positive side, the Subcommittee supports: Three new Linear Parks in dead end street rights of way to be managed by the Parks and Recreation Department (and not Transportation and Stormwater Department).[1] We request that the Parks and Recreation Board ask the City to confirm this expectation about management for University City and as a potential City-wide strategy going forward.

The Subcommittee also supports:

- Plans for the Executive Drive Promenade
- Requirements for on-site Urban Public Spaces - as part of residential and commercial development, and
- Dedication of city-owned open space parcels, which have been a UCPG priority for more than a decade.

II. "Opportunities" for Improvement:

Still there are many "opportunities" for improvement in the Discussion Draft.

1) Recreational Value Deficit

Most obviously, the Discussion Draft proposes a park deficit of 4,900 points. The Draft of the UC Plan is short on park facilities for 49,000 people at build out. The City's presentation says that the Plan would *improve* our current deficit from 56% to 66% of the PMP standard. In my world, as a Professor of History at SDSU, that is progress from an F to D. I believe that no one on this Board should be satisfied with D work on our City parks. Unfortunately, some of the city's suspect point tallies, discussed below, suggest that even this "*progress*" may be an illusion.

2) Recreation and Aquatic Center Deficit

The Draft proposes an equally large Recreation and Aquatic Center deficit. The Plan projects a shortfall of approximately 2.5 Rec Centers and 1 Aquatic Center at build out.^[2] There are no plans to fill this gap.

3) Missing Recreational Value Points

The problem of recreational planning is compounded by a lack of accurate and transparent accounting for recreational values (both current and future). The Discussion Draft lacks clear and transparent data, and without it we lack the basis to plan.

For example:

- In Table 5 (p. 137) the sum of Planned Additional Recreational Value does not match the total of points listed for specific park facilities (p. 130-35). The undercount appears to be more than 400 points (about 10% of projected deficit).
- The Subcommittee list of recommendations prepared for the UCPG includes eight instances of potentially missing or miscounted points, including existing city park facilities, shorelines, and joint use parks. These include facilities at Torrey Pines City Park, University City High School,^[3] Weiss Park – Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center,^[4] and "Montrose Park" at UTC Mall.^[5]

Request/Recommendation: The Parks and Recreation Board can support the UC Plan Update Subcommittee's request that the City immediately share the detailed recreational value scoring sheets used to generate its park point calculations. This will help ensure accuracy and that no potential points have been left on the table. These are public documents.

4) Big Deficits incentivize Bad Planning

Another long-standing concern of Subcommittee members is that large recreational points deficits will incentivize bad planning decisions in an effort to inflate point totals. The Discussion Draft avoids this problem largely, but it includes a few instances of poorly vetted “joint use” parks, where the investment of scarce public funds is not justified by the small harvest of points.^[6] There are other areas that the City should address – and the Parks and Recreation Board can help.

5) Supplemental Development Regulations for Urban Public Spaces

SDRs for Urban Public Spaces are a good idea, but the Discussion Draft must state these rules clearly and consistently for them to work. Some issues:

- Guidelines for residential development appear in Table 5 (p 137 lines 38-39) but not in the SDR's (SDR 1, p 191), which is the business end of the plan that developers, and city and community planners will look to when designing and evaluating projects.
- The rules for residential and general (commercial) Urban Public Spaces are different, and it isn't clear which takes priority.

Request/Recommendation: The Parks and Rec Board can help by requesting that the city adopt one clear minimum standard for SDR 1 – projects on 50,000 sf parcels or greater, and that the rules for residential and commercial development appear together in the SDRs (SDR-1 on page 191).

6) Recreational Value of Urban Public Spaces in *Commercial* Developments

The Draft does not clearly address the recreational value of Urban Public Spaces required for *commercial* development. How Will the 5 P's on commercial sites affect recreational value in the UC Plan? We don't know. The Draft should make this clear.

Request/Recommendation: The Parks and Recreation Board can recommend that the City make this policy clear.

7) Neighborhood-Scale Parks

Two further concerns spotlight the problem of land, which remains the most important unresolved and be-deviling issue in the new Parks Master Plan.

First, the UCPU Subcommittee is insistent that our Plan meet Parks Master Plan standards not merely through a trunk-load of discount “mini parks” but through the more challenging effort to ensure that Neighborhood-Scale Park Facilities are in our plan.

We appreciate the 5 P's as a creative approach to future park and recreation needs, but no thoughtful person should expect that "parks" of 3,000-5,000 sf (see pages 192-196 of the Discussion Draft) will meet the future recreation needs of a UC community twice today's size with a daytime workforce population much greater still. The Subcommittee requests planning for parks – as one member put it - large enough to kick a ball, throw a frisbee, or let a three year old run with abandon.

Question/request: Can the Parks and Recreation Board study and report on strategies for *scaling Urban Public Space requirements to the size of development* in order to ensure that Neighborhood-Scale Parks are built *in the places* where growth is occurring?

8) Land Acquisition

Finally, the Draft is silent on the question of land acquisition, which is specified in the Parks Master Plan. The PMP, Appendix D, p. 19 states that *"At least 20% (or 20 points per 1,000 residents) of a community's park standard shall be satisfied through increased land acquisition."* The PMP indicates that this score as part of total recreational value will be "calculated and used during the community plan update process." (PMP, Appendix D, p 19).

However, the PMP is unclear about how this policy will be fulfilled. Based on my own 'back of the envelope' math, the PMP mandates that *336 new acres* of park space will be provided in UC through land acquisition at build out. As the second large plan update to go through under the PMP, the UC Plan should lay out very clearly how (Table 5, p 137) the City will meet this mandate (in UC and city wide).

Question/Request: Can the Parks and Recreation Board please investigate and report on how the Parks Master Plan land acquisition mandate will be applied and how it will be fulfilled for CPAs as part of the community planning update in University City and city wide?

9) General Recommendations

In closing, I have two further General Recommendations for the City and Parks and Recreation Board from my perspective as Chair of the UCPU-Subcommittee:

First, I recommend and request that the City include the Parks and Recreation Board in the Community Plan Updates as a matter of routine and at an earlier point in the process. The City provides informational workshops for the Planning Commission at earlier and later points in the Plan Update process, and it should do the same for the P/R Board.

That routine should include presentations by community groups such as ours which are formally constituted to provide public feedback to the CPU process. As the Discussion Draft of the UC Plan shows, in depth local knowledge and familiarity with a community's complex spaces and histories is essential to good planning. This is especially true for Parks and Recreation.

June 15, 2023

Parks and Recreation Board Minutes

Page 12

Second, I recommend and request that the Parks and Recreation Board take this opportunity to study the potential for a "future opportunities fund" or other means to finance and support Park development in San Diego that can meet PMP standards.

We should all agree that planning for permanent park deficits is bad planning.

We should recognize that even robust and creative efforts such as the SDRs in the UC Plan Discussion Draft, which rely on private development to produce needed new park spaces, still leave us thousands of points short of the Parks Master Plan mandates. I will close with the most obvious first step toward fulfilling the promise of the PMP.

It is unpopular to point out that the emperor has no clothes. However, the projected permanent points deficit in the UC Plan Discussion Draft (like the Mira Mesa Plan before it) is a red flag that proposed land use scenarios are overbuilt. It is a first principle of planning that proposed growth must be supportable by infrastructure. A second is balance.

The City has painstakingly pioneered a new metric for parks and recreation in the Parks Master Plan. What this metric indicates is that the City cannot meet its infrastructure obligations for the growth it proposes. The Subcommittee believes that University City should have a lot more housing and many more new residents, but that goal should be balanced with equally critical goals.

In this case, that balance indicates the need to re-scale proposed land use scenarios so that new growth can be serviced and our growing population supplied with adequate park and recreational facilities.

The UCPU Subcommittee has proposed an alternative land use scenario with approximately 2/3 the residential intensity of the City preferred scenario, which may better meet this goal (Discussion Draft, UC Plan, alternate p. 31).

Thank you for your attention and your support. I look forward to supporting yours.

Sincerely,

Andrew Wiese
Board member, University Community Planning Group
Chair, University Community Plan Update Subcommittee

[1] The goal of management by Parks and Recreation is to assure that these spaces are planned and operated *as parks*, rather than *as streets* and *water conveyance structures*. This is an issue that affects developed communities throughout the city where future park space is in short supply. Since 2021, members of the subcommittee and the UCPG have engaged with our City Council members and the Mayor's office to assure that planning and management of these spaces can be carried out under the responsibility of the Parks and Recreation Department. We have learned that the City Attorney has offered an opinion that this is possible, and we understand that the City

has evaluated these specific spaces to confirm it. However, we have not received this confirmation.

[2] Numerically, UC will be short by .8 Aquatic Centers, however, the new aquatic facility at Standley Park is a joint use facility with the San Diego Unified School District with limited public hours. Also, the Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center Aquatic Center in North University City is operated under a 1981 lease with the City of San Diego on city property designated as Weiss-Eastgate Park. The lease requires that the property “shall be developed, operated, and maintained as a public community center for park, recreational, cultural, and educational activities for the benefit of the citizens of San Diego.”

(Source: https://docs.sandiego.gov/council_reso_ordinance/rao1981/R-254702.pdf). These facilities should be publicly accessible and assessed along with the other Recreational Center facilities as part of the recreational values of the UC Plan Area.

[3] The Draft does not assess Joint Use Facilities at UCHS, however, current facilities at UCHS (e.g., tennis courts) are signed as being managed jointly by SDUSD and the City of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation. The Discussion Draft should confirm the status of joint use at UCHS and consider pursuing additional joint use opportunities at this central community space.

[4] See note 2 above.

[5] Montrose Park should be a privately owned, publicly accessible joint use park today under the terms of the 2008 Master Planned Development Permit for Westfield UTC This MPDP includes “7.3 ac of designated open space,” including 2.10 acres of “park amenities open to the public,” “improved to satisfy population-based park requirements” (Westfield-UTC Master Planned Development Permit, pps. 3:12, 4:81).

[6] These include the proposed Eastgate Drive Pocket Park (p 132: #21) a private parcel in an industrial area under the MCAS Miramar APZ2 currently maintained as a private park space. The proposed Voigt Lane Overlook (p. 134 - #37) is on the UCSD campus, which is not counted in the Plan.

2. Tom Mullaney noted that while the 5 P’s are important, so is additional green space and urban relief for its calming effect. If the plan adds thousands of additional people, perhaps there is not enough room for them to fit. He noted concerns with the recreation value point system. He urged the Board and Planning Department both consider capacity seriously and determine whether the community plan should be scaled back. He agreed with Dr. Wiese’s earlier comments.

Board Comments:

1. Ms. Laman asked about the three parks proposed in the public rights of way and how that impacts the recreation value points (RVPs). Does the calculation for RVPs include dedicated parks and dedicated rights of way? Ms. Dulaney responded yes, parks in the public rights of way would count in the draft recreation element for the community.
2. Mr. Smith asked about the rationale about page 191, SDR-1, Urban Public Spaces, which states: “General Requirements. All new development on a premises equal to or

greater than 50,000 square feet, or with a gross floor area equal to or greater than 75,000 square feet located within the CPIOZ as shown in Figures 32 shall provide urban public spaces that complies with all of the following requirements: a) A minimum of 10 percent of the premises, or 100,000 square feet, whichever is less, shall include urban public spaces.” He wondered what would happen if the square feet number was higher than 100,000 square feet. Ms. Rao agreed to review SDR-1 and provide a written response to the Board. Mr. Smith asked that the Board consider responding to Dr. Wiese’s comments perhaps at next month’s meeting and determining whether the Board wishes to take a position at this time.

3. Mr. Becker is concerned about the points deficit at Mira Mesa and University City and asked if there has been any discussion of adjacency to help add more RVPs, such as the University of California at San Diego (UCSD). Ms. Rao stated that open space is included but UCSD was not counted.
4. Ms. Bothwell asked whether open space trails were considered as part of the recreation value point calculation for University City? Ms. Rao stated that trails are included.
5. Mr. Smith asked whether joint use areas are included in the recreation value point calculation? Ms. Rao stated that joint use areas are included.

202. Inclusive Public Engagement Guide

Senior Planner Cristhian Barajas presented the Inclusive Public Engagement Guide to the Parks and Recreation Board as an informational item.

Public Comments:

1. Sally Smull, who serves on the Encanto Community Recreation Group, Chollas Creek Community Planning Group, and Chollas Creek Coalition, expressed her concerns with the inability to obtain translation services. She noted that media resources are not readily available for the smaller groups, and those resources don’t seem to exist at the recreation centers. She appreciates it when Director Field comes to the community for meetings and events, as this builds trust and relationships between community and the City bureaucracy. She noted that the Council Policy 600-33 notification distance of 300 feet should increase to 1,000 feet along with additional input opportunities.
2. Andrew Wiese reinforced what Mr. Smith stated in his Board comments and noted that even in an empowered community, the City does not want to hear input. The community does not just want to be heard but also to receive a response. Dr. Wiese noted that his group did not know that the Parks and Recreation Board item on the University City Planning Group was forthcoming, and he feels his group should have been invited to present and participate.

Board Comments:

1. Chair Bothwell mentioned Parks After Dark, which is posted on the San Diego Parks Foundation with four languages. She asked whether the surveys can be expanded into other languages and whether the infrastructure exists to gain input from communities that do not speak English as their primary language? Mr. Barajas agreed and stated that the guide needs best practices for translation and language. Chair Bothwell noted that communication skills are needed to build trust.
2. Ms. Gross asked if the guide is for the entire City and not just for the Planning Department and whether there would be standards for public meetings and workshops that require interpretation and language services. Mr. Barajas said that yes, language services are available. Ms. Gross noted community meetings can be intimidating, especially when barriers exist to participation. She would like to see training or additional pre-meetings to help reduce those barriers.
3. Mr. Smith thanked Mr. Barajas for his enlightening and enlightened presentation, during which Mr. Barajas highlighted the important differences between awareness and engagement. Mr. Barajas had asked several important questions of this Board, and in the spirit of reciprocal engagement, Mr. Smith offered process suggestions that might help achieve some early successes. Council Policy 600-33 holds immense significance for communities expecting future infrastructure development. Currently, the public notification process used by the Planning Department follows the minimum requirements outlined in the policy – notification of homeowners within 1,000 feet of a future general development plan (GDP). It will be a true sign of the City’s commitment to public engagement when the involved departments change their processes and reach out to a broader community, not just within 1,000 feet and not just property owners. This change could be such an early, positive win. Mr. Smith suggested this could help with future community plan updates as well.

203. San Diego High School (SDHS) – Balboa Park Connections Working Group Spring 2023 Status Report

Michael Stepner provided an overview to the Parks and Recreation Board as an informational item regarding the San Diego High School working group activities, which was formed to address connections between downtown and Balboa Park after City Council approved the high school lease agreement with San Diego Unified School District.

Public Comments: None

Board Comments: None

301. Pickleball and Tennis

Director Field introduced the item and indicated that two groups, representing pickleball and tennis, would each provide 15-minute presentations to the Board. The pickleball presentation was led by Juliana Humphrey along with Stefan Boyland, David Coppa, and

Mike Shinzaki. The tennis presentation was led by Todd Sprague along with John Broderick, Carole Farr, Steve Leffler, Randie Lettington, and Ryan Redondo.

Public Comments:

1. Noli Zosa noted that the City of San Diego has not been able to add pickleball courts or repurpose tennis courts into pickleball courts, while other nearby cities (Oceanside, La Mesa, and others) converted numerous courts. He encouraged board members to see the high usage currently seen at various regional pickleball locations. Fairness, justice, and equity should include more resources for pickleball. Nick Garza, Conrad Larsen, and Shane Buysse ceded their time to Mr. Zosa.
2. Steve Miller stated he has numerous friends who play pickleball and spoke about the community with older adults. He asked Mr. Redondo whether the proposed new pickleball courts are oriented north-south or east-west.
3. Joanna Hirst with the Pacific Beach Tennis Club has bonded with tennis and pickleball over the years. She noted Mr. Redondo's announcement of 19 new pickleball courts at Barnes Tennis Center is significant and expressed gratitude for their efforts.
4. Thelma Sepulveda plays tennis at Point Loma Nazarene University and supports Peninsula Tennis Club and its tennis programs.
5. James Irwin from Pacific Beach Tennis Court requested a correction regarding pickleball courts, as that function was brought in house and is now offered by the club staff rather than an independent contractor. He supports Peninsula Tennis Club.
6. Lesley Guajardo provided a handout that notes the loss of 21 tennis facilities and 110 tennis courts that are now gone. This handout is attached to the minutes. She supports Peninsula Tennis Club and notes the difficulty of obtaining tennis court reservations.
7. Noel Allen from the Point Loma High School tennis team noted the lack of tennis courts at the high school campus. She uses the Peninsula Tennis Club courts instead.
8. Au-Co Mai shared a letter from the athletic director at Point Loma High School. The athletic director noted that the school's tennis teams would be impacted by the loss of facilities at Peninsula Tennis Club. The partnership between Point Loma High School and the PTC has lasted over 30 years. While it is possible to share space at Barnes with High Tech High School, there would be difficulties in realizing that shared usage. Bob Simmons yielded his time to Au-Co Mai.
9. Carole Lynn is a pickleball player who noted the expense of playing pickleball. Inclusion is important, and pickleball should be available to all San Diegans, not just an exclusive group.

10. Konrad Gerwinski is a pickleball player who wants to use courts that are not being fully utilized.
11. Kevin Bacon stated that when he played at Barnes, it was difficult for pickleball to get respect. He expressed surprise that Barnes is adding 19 pickleball courts.
12. Judy Sweet is a retired athletic director for the University of San Diego at California and sees the need for physical activity. She expressed the need for inclusion and expressed concerns that pickleball does not have access that is needed for this underserved sports. If dedicated pickleball courts cannot be provided, they should be shared with tennis courts.
13. Jeff Greenwald is an executive board member for San Diego District Tennis Association. He noted that there has been extensive attention provided by local tennis to the needs of pickleball.
14. Tim Schubert was ceded time by John Douma. Mr. Schubert is the Point Loma High School tennis coach. A loss of courts at Peninsula Tennis Club would reduce the high school's ability to provide tennis programs and offer a competitive program. He noted that Barnes Tennis Center, which is home to High Tech High School, cannot accommodate Point Loma High School simultaneously. Mr. Schubert noted that Roosevelt High School could provide pickleball courts as they see less use than those at Peninsula Tennis Club.
15. Mike Shinzaki noted that the City of San Diego needs more pickleball courts. The City of Coronado recently converted two tennis courts into eight pickleball courts. The Pickleball SD proposal will help gain more needed courts in San Diego.
16. David Coppa noted membership restrictions at Pacific Beach Tennis Club that prevent pickleball players from joining the club. The fees result in money coming from pickleball players to the tennis club operators, who are mostly tennis players, not pickleball players. He noted concerns with the usage levels at Peninsula Tennis Club when Point Loma High School is practicing at the tennis courts. James Barmwell ceded his time to Mr. Coppa.
17. Katrina Peterson was surprised at the announcement of 19 new courts at Barnes Tennis Center and asked whether club membership is offered to pickleball players as well as tennis players, and she asked how much it would cost to play pickleball on the new courts. She looks forward to seeing compromise and sharing between the two sports.
18. Judith Fisher noted the numbers of people who come from all over the world to play at Peninsula Tennis Club. This has created a friendly place to play tennis. Mary Lee Brendsel ceded her time to Ms. Fisher.
19. Stefan Boyland hopes decisions on court usage is made on facts and data including utilization.

20. Jay Simon noted there are not enough pickleball courts and suggested the fees are too high for routine pickleball playing.
21. Steve Weisenberg spoke about Point Loma High School tennis team and their early hours of practicing and playing, mostly in the early morning hours. He noted Peninsula Tennis Club is heavily utilized. He believes Pickleball SD is trying to take over the entire tennis club, not just the six courts temporarily. He would like to see a dedicated pickleball facility built. Tracy Wilkinson and Whitney Wilkinson ceded their time to Mr. Weisenberg.
22. Paul Marvin left the meeting and did not speak. His speaker slip stated that he would like to see the Peninsula Tennis Club courts converted into pickleball courts to provide public space for all people to enjoy.
23. Barbara Greievt was involved in a prior pickleball court conversion and noted a wait list to access that club. She expressed concern that the pickleball courts at Barnes Tennis Club should be managed by pickleball players, not tennis players.
24. Josh Jorgensen stated that equity consideration suggests more tennis courts are needed and more pickleball courts are needed without taking courts from each other. He stated that new public tennis court construction has not kept pace with the expansion of the sport, especially with post-pandemic growth phase.
25. Megan Allen, Kim Latham, Nate Martin, Paul Marvin, Bridget O'Brien, Simone O'Connell, Christy Smiley, Vadim Yufa, and Joy Zarubin submitted speaker slips but had left the meeting by the time their names were called.

Written comments:

26. Jodi Varner: Pickleball participation has been proven to offer so much more than just fun and sport. Mothers feel safer to have young children at parks when there is a large gathering at a pickleball players (Collier, Big Rock, and La Mesita). Parks become safer as greater numbers participate. Major health institutions (See Sharp articles) are touting the benefits of pickleball for their members as it addresses both physical and social dimensions. Let's face it, eight pickleball courts regularly bring 40 or more people in morning (7:00 a.m. to noon) and evening hours (4:00 to 10:00 p.m.) - see statistics for Mackenzie Creek, Big Rock, and Carlsbad as examples. More schools are adopting pickleball programs for students because of the cost effectiveness and popularity. More and more kids are coming to the sport, creating a phenomenal effect of young, senior and mid-life players all participating together. It is the pinnacle of a healthy vibrant community! More pickleball results in greater safety, health, diversity, and community.
27. Judy and Al Janc: Not everyone knows the history of public tennis courts in San Diego. The city was struggling to maintain courts so the players formed clubs open to all for nominal fees. The participants handled replacement and maintenance and this became the model all over the city. After more than 50 years and much neighborhood usage, a new sport emerged. They propose to take over tennis

facilities for their own profits. They don't need expensive infrastructure that tennis requires. Their ball damages the court surface for one thing. The other is they need only a slab of concrete (parking lot or fresh pour). Some low fencing and nets much like people are already doing at various sites like recreation centers. Do the right thing and prepare their special sites for their exclusive use.

28. Bruce Murray: Peninsula Tennis Club is already very busy with a wide variety of ages of tennis players. There's no spare room for pickleball, which should not be trying to take over six of these courts. Tennis requires special nets and can't be played anywhere else. Pickleball should be looking at building new courts elsewhere or using outdoor basketball or multi-purpose concrete courts.
29. Rita Murphy: Pickleball and Tennis should live in different worlds. Both sports provide opportunities for family and community fun but the manner in which the Pickleball organizers have sought to take over tennis courts is unacceptable. Peninsula Tennis has been supported by a tennis community that put their money, time and effort into creating the facility. Why should they be directed to just give away their well-used facility with no cost to a group that can spend their time, money and effort to accomplish the same. What the City should be thinking about is where to designate the land in the park for the Pickleball Organizers to build. Please do not think that just changing lines on the court makes it okay. The demands of pickleball players is for many courts that allow for large groups to gather, play their music, and try out the new fad. Tennis is a quiet sport that has been unfairly impacted by this new demand. Both Peninsula Tennis Club and USTA provide access to all income groups and ages; tennis participation is at an all-time high. Long wait lists at city clubs are common due to a lack of courts. Please give pickleball land.
30. John Chisholm: Please pass a motion to cease this ongoing attack on our tennis community. Peninsula Tennis Club (PTC) is an established historic community that has been here for decades with excellent relationships with the City; why destroy this by adding Pickleball? It is extremely noisy and incompatible with serious tennis. Tennis players would be forced to find other courts (expensive private clubs if the city has a new mission to destroy tennis opportunities, especially for low-income people and children). Repainting lines destroys the quality of tennis. There have been many Lawsuits on the noise issue; please do your research, do not expose our city to lawsuits. All lawsuits on the noise issue have been won by plaintiffs protecting themselves from noise, e.g., Santa Barbara City converted courts to Pickleball, which generates noise above 85 decibels, which damages hearing and health. It's unethical to steal courts for a new sport from a vibrant community - we nurtured this facility, donated our own citizens' funds for improvements. It's criminal to continue this attack; any new sport must invest in its own facility. We support pickleball; their large numbers must pay for their own new facility, stop trying to steal. Convert any paved surface and/or unused parking lots.

31. Paul Son: Pickleball changed my life for the better. I was very depressed and unhealthy back in 2020, and it is a huge catalyst in bringing a community and opportunity to exercise unlike any experience I've ever had before. I have encountered other people with similar stories every day. I want other people to share in the life-giving experience that Pickleball has given me. The City needs more places to play as the demand is astronomically growing. The demand is there but the City just needs to execute.
32. Prudence Horne: Tennis should not be punished. Pickleball and tennis are two separate sports and both are thriving. Please do not do a "take-away" from tennis. Would Torrey Pines give up any greens for frisbee golf? Absolutely not – two different sports. Pickleball deserves their own courts. Please help them to stop being bullies and to redirect their efforts to finding and creating their own space. Tennis deserves and has earned the respect and status it has in San Diego.
33. Ed Collins: I would like to make several points for City officials to consider as they make decisions about converting public tennis facilities into use for pickle ball (or any other activity that might follow). One, local tennis enthusiasts need places to play; two, San Diego must preserve its reputation as one of the nation's great tennis cities; and three, tennis is a great teacher of youth ... and adults. Due to ever-increasing local property values, many private clubs have turned into places to live. Fortunately, public tennis facilities have provided an alternative for a grateful tennis community.
34. Monica Sweet: Peninsula Tennis Club is a public community center for the residents of San Diego supported by the members of the club. I have lived in Point Loma for over 30 years and my family has enjoyed the benefits of having this center in our neighborhood. My kids and I play tennis here. Clinics, individual lessons, social play, high school teams, adult leagues, and children leagues all utilize these courts. Peninsula Tennis Club is not underutilized during the normal use times which are mornings and early evenings. As a club, we have coordinated and participated in fundraising events for the benefit of the club and fundraising events for other groups such as Susan Komen and StandUp for Kids. I am not sure why there is even any more discussion occurring now that Barnes is going to have 19 pickleball courts which is less than a mile away. I spoke to a representative at Barnes and the 15 additional courts are going to be available within the year.
35. Sunny Kim: I have lived in San Diego County for 30 years and played badminton at Balboa Park's Federal Building and Activity Center. I teach padel on private courts in North County. As an active Tennis and Pickleball player, I urge the Board to find a way to partner with private sector entities in order to add both pickleball and tennis courts. Both sports have increased participation numbers in the past three years and the need for more access to municipal facilities is growing for both pickleball and tennis. San Diego especially needs programming in addition to courts to support

and NEW and returning participants retain their outdoor activity. Thank you for your consideration.

36. John Saunders: If I wanted more pickleball courts at Robb Field, I'd be asking the two guys that call themselves PASD if they turned down open space there with room for about a dozen dedicated pickleball courts 2 years ago, and if so, why they have spent the last 2 years insisting they need to be given (or "share," with the sharing all going one way) a fully developed facility that other people have built and maintained for a different sport, when those dozen pickleball courts would have been up and running by now. I would be wondering if that's why the magic number of dedicated pickleball courts they say they need is just over a dozen. Also, if I was a city administrator who didn't provide financial support to that facility, and I felt I had to force a "compromise" that damaged a first class tennis facility, supporting events and tourism, funded by donors, I'd feel like a first class jerk if the City didn't go back about 10 years and reimburse those cash donors, individuals and organizations who donated for capital improvements specifically for that purpose.
37. Swaminathan Sureshchandran: Pickleball players should try to get their own dedicated courts and not take over existing tennis courts, which are essential for developing new junior talent and holding sanctioned tournaments. San Diego area has renowned players like Fritz, Vandeweghe, and Laver and junior development for the future is more critical than older Pickleball players. Other than that, even adults who play tennis don't want their courts taken or be next to noisy Pickleball play.
38. Saralyn Miller: My son played junior competitive tennis from ages 10-17. He is now 19 and is a freshman at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). His time spent playing team tennis through the United States Tennis Association (USTA) (at Rancho Peñasquitos Tennis Club [RPTC] at times) and tournaments at RPTC were critical to his success as a tennis player (he and his partner were the California Interscholastic Federation [CIF] Boys Doubles Second Place Team – in all of San Diego) and now as a college student at the #1 public school in the U.S. Tennis was pivotal in his life and the junior programs are equally important. Please, consider the impact pickleball will have on the youth of the RPTC community. These children rely on these programs.
39. Judith Sweet: The Parks and Recreation stated mission is "To Provide healthy, sustainable, and enriching environments for all." Goal #2 states: Access to enjoyable fulfilling recreational opportunities to all. Connect all San Diegans with their local park by understanding and offering desired community recreation activities, programs, and events. Unfortunately, this mission and goal is not being realized as thousands of San Diegans have limited access to pickleball courts due to a shortage of courts in the city. Please create more access for players of all ages in this growing and underserved sport. If dedicated pickleball courts can't be made available, sharing of tennis courts would be a solution until dedicated pickleball courts are provided. The City needs to honor its goal to offer desired community

recreation activities “for all.” Please address this desired activity and growing need. And lastly, the master plan states: Relevant parks and recreational programs should meet the changing needs and priorities of residents, both now and in the future. Now is the time to meet the changing needs.

40. Lynn Owens: I am a pickleball player in Scripps Ranch. I am fortunate to have eight dedicated pickleball courts available within a nearby private club, the Scripps Ranch Swim and Racquet Club. However, nearby residents who want to join the club are facing a two- to three-year wait, even if they can afford to join. Pickleball can easily be a very egalitarian sport, requiring relatively little space, low start-up equipment costs, and a quick learning curve. It is suitable for all ages from at least 6 to 86 (I'm 76 myself). It's good exercise and a great way to build community across ages, cultures, income levels, and identities. It is a clear, low-cost contributor to much-needed physical and mental health for all community members. No wonder that cities across America are converting under-used space into pickleball courts. I trust that San Diego will do the same, at the fastest possible pace. Thank you.
41. Kim Latham: It's time to stop the endless meetings, presentations, and commentary. The Peninsula Tennis Club (PTC) was told by Parks and Recreation Department to participate in this process and get support for from the park advisory boards for its existing tennis club despite our 40 years of operation. We've succeeded as none of the parks advisory boards have endorsed Pickleball Association of San Diego's (PASD) proposal to take over PTC. PASD's only proposal for the last year has been to take all or part of PTC. They have presented no other alternative. They want an “easy” button that repurposes PTC tennis courts and displaces over 1,500 tennis players - all without regard to how this impacts the tennis community. To PASD, PTC is just hardscape. To the PTC community that has invested its own money in the maintenance and upkeep of PTC, the courts are an essential part of a larger tennis ecosystem. Every tennis court is important. Facilities under special use permits (SUP) operate at no cost to the City. No new tennis courts have been built at SUP clubs without funds raised by the tennis community which is why we have continued to fight for PTC. It's time to reject the PASD proposal to take over PTC once and for all.
42. Daniel Gant: Regarding the workshop item 301 on Pickleball and Tennis, I support both pickleball and tennis as valuable activities for the residents and visitors of San Diego. However, Peninsula Tennis Club is a valuable resource for the tennis community. Just as there are not enough pickleball courts to meet demand, there are not enough tennis courts, either. I personally waited two years and three months to join the tennis club closest to my residence: Rancho Peñasquitos Tennis Center. We shouldn't take away from one community resource to provide for another. Barnes Tennis Center is actively adding pickleball courts and they are in the same geographic area as Peninsula. Please keep tennis courts as tennis courts, since they are in high demand and continue to work on alternative solutions for

pickleball, including new construction and indoor options, as the Parks and Recreation Department has progressively done already in other parts of the city.

43. Juliana Humphrey: Pickleball Association of San Diego (PASD) respectfully accepts the opportunity to submit additional comments regarding our request to temporarily repurpose six courts at Peninsula Tennis Club to pickleball until the City of San Diego completes a pickleball facility. In addition, we will respond to questions raised by Board members, comments made by the Tennis presenter (including the tennis-planned surprise announcement of a plan for 19 courts at Barnes), and comments by Parks staff about the state of pickleball in San Diego.

PASD's presentation was in three parts. The first part explained the data behind why PTC courts were chosen for the temporary repurposing for pickleball. The data show that PTC uses less than half of their court hours. Full stop. Tennis presented no information counter to PASD's, even though they own all the data. Tennis also did not dispute the fact that their most recent reservation system often exaggerated the use of their courts and used courts for non-tennis purposes.

The second part of PASD's presentation explained its philosophy about public pickleball courts. PASD believes that pickleball is an inexpensive sport and should be free or inexpensive to play at a public facility. PASD would bear the costs of court conversion. Again, tennis had no response.

The third point by PASD was that pickleball courts and programs should be run by pickleball players or pros, rather than by tennis clubs. Players desire a "pickleball experience" at a facility with ladders, leagues, and curated play for various levels. This does not happen when pickleball courts are an addendum to tennis.

In contrast with the positive potential for a pickleball center run by pickleball, PASD offered three recent, stark examples of local tennis clubs' mistreatment of pickleball play in favor of tennis. The point was echoed by several speakers who play at tennis clubs where pickleball plays second fiddle. No dispute by tennis.

After the presentation, a board member seemed incredulous that PASD would request pickleball courts be run by pickleball. He said the suggestion "made his head explode." It is regrettable that the member did not absorb the seriousness of the examples of tennis mismanagement presented, including the loss to a vibrant group of seniors who were shut out of their one tennis court by the greed of University City Racquet Club, or the example of Barnes, at its then-four pickleball courts, costing players more than twice the going rate to play. At a public club.

The same board member criticized PASD for not working on other solutions for its members. Given the limited time constraints, PASD chose not to speak at length about its historical attempts to create a public pickleball facility in San Diego. In fact, PASD worked toward several ideas within the last two plus years. This criticism may have been encouraged by the tennis presenter's claim that PASD did not seek approval from local park and recreation advisory committees for its

pending request. This claim was false. At our meeting in January, *with the tennis presenter in attendance*, PASD specifically asked the Park Director whether PASD needed to shop its request for temporary courts to the various committees as it had been doing with its plans for several previous months. The director said no; Parks and the Mayor would make the decision themselves. The tennis presenter was not corrected during the “fact” presentation.

The truth is that the founders of PASD went in good faith to all boards/committees suggested to them, often several times, and presented all their pickleball plans and ideas as transparently and thoroughly as they were allowed. The plans always included the component that PASD would pay to build or convert courts. Each board/committee said they deferred to the Parks Board. The founders were also in direct correspondence with multiple city staff about finding a city park space where PASD could build. They received a flat “no” about building courts from scratch at Nobel Park in 2021. By January 2023, PASD had demonstrated enough rationale and community support to present at Parks Board. This invitation came from the Parks Director and made sense: he and the mayor would be making the decision on the PASD plan.

Tennis had no data-driven elements to its presentation. What it had was a surprise announcement that Barnes Tennis Center – in cooperation with PTC and District Tennis – was building 19 pickleball courts at its club. (Ironically, the founders of PASD made their first proposals, to Barnes in 2020, to pay to build 20+ courts in the approximate space shown by Barnes now. The proposal was abandoned when management informed them that Barnes was reserving the space for other purposes.) Clearly, tennis believed that Barnes’ action would make PASD’s proposal moot. However, given the announced purpose of the 19 courts for Barnes, PASD contends its proposal should still be considered.

Per the Barnes manager’s own words, the proceeds from pickleball players at Barnes will be used to subsidize the club’s many tennis programs. Whatever the merit of such programs, pickleball dollars should not be paying for them, and would not be if pickleball had control over its own club. Further, there was no mention of pickleball players being able to join Barnes as members and thus able to reserve a court at a reduced cost as tennis players do.

The use of inflated pickleball rates to support tennis programs is not a “win” for pickleball. Rather, it highlights the currently unbridgeable divide between PASD and tennis. Tennis wants to profit from pickleball and PASD wants pickleball play to be free or low cost – truly non-profit.

Here is the math regarding tennis play versus pickleball on an annual basis at Barnes. Presume the tennis player and pickleball player each play three times per week:

Tennis player: Join Barnes – all play is included. (\$350; \$250 seniors) *

**Other perks: Discounted clinics/lessons/leagues, discount in pro shop*

Pickleball player: No membership opportunity.

A. 3 times/week two hours open play (\$5 each time = \$780)

B. 3 times/week two hours reserved play (\$14 each time = \$2148)

This is the same story at all public tennis clubs where pickleball is available. They accept the money of pickleball players but do not treat them as equals of the tennis players. This is the inequity and unfairness that PASD seeks to end on the public pickleball courts in our city.

Last, PASD must comment on the information provided by Parks regarding “what pickleball players want.” The Parks representative reported that players preferred indoor play. This is in opposition with the experience of PASD’s thousands of players. The beauty of living and playing in San Diego is being outside. What may be being expressed to Parks is a preference for more *free* places to play, which describes the indoor courts, and few outdoor courts provided by the city. PASD would be pleased to assist Parks in reaching out to our thousands of members to gauge their preferences for a public pickleball facility.

PASD looks forward to the decision of Parks and Recreation and the Mayor on its proposal.

44. Ron Bell: I have been fortunate to live in other beautiful cities like Rio de Janeiro, Santa Barbara, and Santa Monica. However, I was raised along Sunset Cliffs and now live in the home I was born and raised in. I am 65 and have played tennis since I was about 10 years old (learned from Ben Press...a SD Tennis icon) and played at Peninsula all along the way including when in high school at Point Loma High.
- a. PTC members, community members, and fees from guests have funded and taken good care of the tennis courts for many years. PTC is in good standing, well-used (especially during prime times), and has a great community of over 500 members. PTC is also free to Juniors and provides a low-cost place to play for resident guests and visitors to San Diego. It also provides courts for community groups to hold events (e.g., Wounded Warriors and others).
 - b. PTC has the support of Robb Field and the broader community. PTC is one of the most accessible and least expensive places to play and learn tennis in San Diego.
 - c. PTC is the “home” of the Point Loma High girls and boys tennis teams and they would be displaced if any of the existing courts are used for PB.
 - d. PTC hosts tournaments, clinics, lessons, and league play and provides overflow support to the many tournaments at Barnes. These activities would be displaced with the loss of any courts and the net result would negatively impact the club and the sport.

- e. Barnes has, and is adding more, pickleball courts (19) and the greater San Diego area is also adding other pickleball facilities (e.g., The HUB and others). No new tennis facilities have been added (yet). Point Loma and Mission Bay residents also have other pickleball locations to play (Cabrillo, Ocean Beach Rec Center, Mission Bay Resort, and others). We/they may need more, and Robb Field can also build more within the Robb Field and Parks and Recreation Department process (no annexation!).
- f. Parks and Recreation Department can still double line public tennis courts where there are smaller groupings of two and four court facilities that do not host tournaments, leagues, clinics, or high school play.
- g. Please allow PTC to move forward as a tennis only facility and let's all spend our time constructively to enhance all park facilities including the addition of pickleball courts at Robb as appropriate.
- h. Less time spent on PTC will also allow everyone to spend more time on other park issues like homelessness, parking, rebuilding, and enhancing existing facilities that deserve our time.

Thank you again for listening and for your ongoing efforts to maintain and enhance our parks. I look forward to working together to improve Robb Field and other park venues.

45. Carole Farr: Ms. Farr is the Peninsula Tennis Club Secretary. She wrote that Peninsula Tennis Club (PTC) is home to over 500 members, an additional 1,000 nonmember users from all over San Diego County, the PLHS boys and girls tennis teams, and 16 league teams. We hold summer youth tennis camps, 12 instructional clinics per week, Drop-In tennis on Wednesday nights, private tennis instruction, and an annual tournament (which had a 58% increase in entries compared to 2022). We will also be hosting weekly Wounded Warrior clinics this summer. With all of these activities, PTC is not underutilized. Tennis clubs like PTC are managed and maintained by the permittees at no cost to the City. While permittees do not pay rent, they are required by the Parks and Recreation Department to be nonprofit organizations and are required to staff, maintain, and resurface the courts periodically under the permit. The City pays for none of the cost to operate and maintain the courts. With regard to the utilization "data" that has been presented -- PASDs analysis ignores that most park facilities are not used during hours that people work or children are in school. The assumption that facilities with low utilization in the middle of the day are underutilized ignores the normal patterns of people's lives. It's reasonable to assume these patterns would apply to pickleball as well. Finally, Barnes Tennis Center will soon have 19 dedicated, lighted, and publicly available pickleball courts. The opening of these courts just 800 feet from Robb Field addresses PASD's request for a "temporary" pickleball solution until a dedicated pickleball center can be built at Robb Field. This is a WIN-WIN for PTC,

which can continue to thrive as a tennis club, and addresses the need for pickleball courts.

46. Steve Leffler, with the San Diego District Tennis Association, is a member of the San Diego tennis community and attends clinics at 40-year old Peninsula Tennis Club (PTC) in Robb Field (Ocean Beach). PTC and the greater San Diego tennis community recognizes the need for more pickleball courts in Ocean Beach. However, PTC has been under unwarranted and unrelenting attack and harassment for over a year from what began as for-profit activity and then morphed into a so-called non-profit (PASD) whose sole mission according to their bylaws, is not, as you would think, to grow their sport but is “to repurpose lightly-used tennis courts.” PASD’s website, supporter emails, and advisory group presentations continually feature the “temporary” conversion of half of PTC to pickleball without realistic consideration of the dire consequences to the 500+ members and ~1,000 occasional users of the club who would be extremely hard-pressed to find affordable club options comparable to PTC to play and take lessons. Barnes Tennis Center and other clubs cannot take up the outflow. Many of the local clubs have long waitlists. Note that the PASD group often refers to “for-profit” instructors at PTC (these are widely recognized tennis professionals who provide high quality clinics and lessons at among the lowest rates in town), while claiming that they will offer instruction at their purported post-PTC pickleball center. Aside from the violation of the approved Robb Field conceptual plan (GDP) by the establishment of a separate pickleball facility, it is clear that temporary occupancy of PTC gives little incentive to the pickleball group to pursue the cost and time involved in fundraising for and developing a dedicated facility of their own under the GDP amendment process currently underway. In other words, to do what the tennis community has done. Fortunately, any rationale for the PASD request to convert half of PTC to pickleball has now been eliminated as Barnes Tennis Center (800 feet away from PTC) has announced the public availability of 19 new, lighted, dedicated pickleball courts in July (with 7 open now). Furthermore, neither Robb Field Community Recreation Group (CRG) or Mission Bay Park Committee (MBPC), the relevant recreation advisory groups for Robb Field, has recommended adoption of any specific PASD proposal so their proposal to takeover half or more of PTC should not have come before the Parks and Recreation Board until approved by both recreation advisory boards. MBPC did support pickleball somewhere in Mission Bay and we certainly have that situation now with the 19 courts at Barnes, just 800 feet away from PTC. Finally, the PASD bylaws have an interesting and potentially profitable feature compared to local tennis non-profit organizations. While PTC with a six-person board, the San Diego District Tennis Association (SDDTA) with more than 30 board members, and local clubs such as Balboa Tennis Club and La Jolla Tennis Club have purely voluntary and non-compensated boards of directors, the PASD bylaws (as currently found on their website) indicate that “not more than forty-nine percent (49%) of the persons serving on the Board may be interested persons. An

interested person is (i) any person being compensated by the corporation for services...” Do the math.

47. Randie Lettington, from the Southern California section of the United States Tennis Association (USTA SoCal) wrote that San Diego has run Adult Tennis League Programming for the USTA SoCal in the San Diego Area for six years and has firsthand experienced the local growth in tennis activities. League and Tournaments are the tip of the recreational player experience for those who want to experience scheduled matches against competitive level opponents. Growth in league participation generally represents more players overall. As they gain experience, they desire to compete more. I have visibility to what is happening throughout the county as I coordinate play at over 40 private and public facilities in San Diego County to develop programs for their players. I’m aware of capacity issues and scheduling challenges to accommodate the teams and players. As has been shared by Todd Sprague previously, tennis growth nationally has been roughly 20% since 2019. San Diego exceeds that level of growth with participation numbers in the 20–30% range over multiple years. USTA has recognized San Diego as a top area for growth nationally out of 300+ geographic areas for at least the past 5 years. Tennis is thriving but there are 3 concerns for tennis players:
 - a. Fewer tennis courts. Past years have shown a loss of clubs to redevelopment as well as conversion to pickleball, including Singing Hills, Astiz, Del Cerro, Fit Athletic, Stoneridge, Bobby Riggs, and Rancho Arbolitos. Existing tennis courts are needed for tennis – our community cannot continue to lose capacity while our sport continues to grow.
 - b. Many public-school courts exist but they are not affordable and accessible as the Pickleball Association of San Diego continues to imply.
 - i. Utilizing high school courts is cost prohibitive. Most public high schools and community colleges (i.e., San Diego Unified School District, Poway Unified School District) utilize the Facilitron booking system for all facility reservations. The cost for a two-hour court reservation for three courts with restroom access (required for league play) can range from \$400 to over \$900.
 - ii. We have examples of Facilitron fees from Mission Bay High School, which is now a joint use facility, as well as Patrick Henry High School. It’s not sustainable as an outlet for tennis players. Schools have not been responsive to negotiate fees, although we are starting a pilot program with MiraCosta College in Oceanside which has been receptive to working together. Hopefully, we can work with the City on the Joint Use program to reserve outside of the Facilitron system. Many school courts are locked or are occasionally available for community drop-in access but not available for scheduled tennis.

- c. Demand is very high to play tennis and teams are full. The waitlist for players who want to join USTA teams currently is roughly 200 at this time. The majority of teams form at tennis clubs, and many have waitlists to join of six months to one year plus. Players who are not members of clubs can only form teams where rental courts are available (very limited). Our programs have maxed out at local facilities, and we need additional courts to accommodate building new teams. Tournament play also competes for the same court space at clubs.

Why is Peninsula Tennis Center (PTC) so critical to our tennis eco-system?

- Open to the public – New players to the area can join clinics and open play. It is affordable and inclusive. Many new players relocating to San Diego want to continue playing here and we have few options for them. I refer people to clubs that best suit their level, age and where programs are strong. PTC checks many of those boxes.
- Peninsula encourages and promotes team play and provides opportunities for its members and non-members alike.
- Serves the community for Point Loma High School and middle school physical education programs
- Supports greater tennis community with courts for National events/ Sectionals events. (As an example, USTA Adult League Sectionals utilized courts on June 2, 2023, for an event and there are National tournaments that utilize PTC to supplement Barnes Tennis Center.)

As feedback to the comment made by Ms. Humphrey, the May 19th court block marked as 'Other' at Peninsula was actually a reservation by USTA SoCal for a league Sectionals event. The hold was put on the courts 4/13 but was released on 5/15 due to schedule changes. PBSO implied this was falsifying usage. Pickleball growth is great for racquet sports overall but it should not be at the expense of growing tennis just because it's easier to convert tennis courts than build new. SD tennis players have developed and maintained these public park clubs over many years and deserve to use them for their designated use. As tennis continues to grow, clubs such as Rancho Peñasquitos and Mountain View (Martin Luther King, Jr. Park) are making strides toward adding tennis courts to our inventory by following City processes and fundraising. Thank you for your consideration and support of continued tennis growth.

48. John Broderick: I would like to share an interview with you which discusses the announcement of the 19 pickleball courts at Barnes Tennis Center and the reaction by the PASD organization (KUSI Good Morning San Diego Interview from Junen 19, 2023): https://www.kusi.com/barnes-tennis-center-announces-addition-of-19-pickleball-courts/?fbclid=IwAR2rwxJ4e6nraxK8hS_Y7jhEAw12tRWD0LQcwbKOnnFD7uJCghMy

[PLSOQF8](#). I will also be doing a follow-up interview with Allie Wagner this coming Sunday morning between 7:00-7:30 a.m. which should further clarify the situation and help educate the public. I'm hopeful these interviews will contribute in some way by helping to alleviate further pressure placed on the city by PASD.

In case you were not aware, Barnes Tennis Center announced new pricing yesterday which will make it among the most affordable pickleball facilities in San Diego. There are no membership fees to play pickleball at Barnes and the courts are available to the general public. It should also be noted, these courts are dedicated for pickleball. Each court is self-contained and of the highest quality. In addition, the energy efficient LED lighting is state of the art and 17 of the 19 courts will face north-south which was a concern mentioned by one of the PASD supporters in last Thursday's workshop at Balboa Park.

It's important to note the Pickleball-SD now PASD organization during the Mission Bay Parks CRG meeting at Santa Clara Rec Center in April 2022 used the Bobby Riggs facility located in Encinitas as a model for what was needed for San Diego proper.

Barnes Tennis Center

19 dedicated PB courts

\$5 for 3 hours of open play

\$15 per court per hour

Bobby Riggs

21 dedicated PB courts

\$7 for 2-3 hours of open play

\$14 per court per hour

**Barnes additional 12 courts are scheduled to be operational by the end of July 2023.
**

Bobby Riggs is owned and operated by Steve and Jennifer Dawson whose background up until 2012 was completely tennis oriented. They now run a premiere pickleball facility: <https://www.barnestenniscenter.com/pickleball>

The question of Barnes' legitimacy of operating pickleball courts is misguided. Barnes also successfully operates 7 padel courts and already is successfully operating the 7 existing pickleball courts.

Our wish is the subject of the proposal to take over 50% of Peninsula Tennis Club by PASD as far as the City of San Diego Parks and Rec is concerned will no longer be a consideration. The burden for the San Diego tennis community and specifically Peninsula Tennis Club and the San Diego District Tennis Association (SDDTA) has been more than considerable. We would like to see any further discussion of pickleball courts at Robb Field go through the GDP amendment process which has already begun: <https://www.barnestenniscenter.com/pickleball>

We know you've been working hard to provide pickleball players locations to play. I'm hopeful you realize the SDDTA and our tennis advocacy committee has continued to help find solutions and make compromises wherever practicable. We also endorse the

proposal to convert one tennis court to four pickleball courts at a San Diego SUP tennis club which is currently under consideration. With the conversion of tennis courts to pickleball at most private tennis clubs, the need for public tennis courts is all the more crucial. It's also clear the private sector is rapidly meeting the demand for more pickleball courts. The conversion of Astiz tennis center in Spring Valley to the Hub pickleball facility (26 courts) became operational in January 2023. There have also been well publicized plans for Bed Bath and Beyond locations to be converted to pickleball facilities further alleviating public pressure. Historically, 70% of all tennis is played on public tennis courts which makes the need for their preservation all the more crucial. As was mentioned in public comment, tennis has collectively lost over 120 tennis courts over the past 20 years in the San Diego area due largely in part to real estate values. These numbers precede the conversion of tennis courts to pickleball.

I would like to thank all of you for your time and efforts during this past year and a half to deal with this sensitive and complex issue. I ask your consideration to include this letter as part of public comment.

Board Comments:

1. Ms. Gross thanked everyone for their passion for their sports. She noted the data shows underuse at the tennis courts. She noted that the Barnes Tennis Center did not collaborate in constructing the additional pickleball courts, which is disappointing. She would like to see better efforts of collaboration and communication.
2. Ms. Laman would like to understand the process and would like to see City data on pickleball and tennis. Director Field invited Program Manager Salome Martinez to provide an update on pickleball efforts in the City.

Ms. Martinez provided the following report:

Prior to 2020, demand for pickleball courts was mostly localized to indoor spaces and gymnasiums. Over 12 years ago, the Parks and Recreation Department was able to stripe many indoor facilities at recreation centers in communities that requested it. These courts remained available for free public use during open play times for a decade. When the Covid-19 pandemic occurred starting in March 2020, and the recreation center facilities closed to the public for a year and a half, the demand for outdoor pickleball courts grew substantially. Since then, the Department has been trying to find ways to accommodate the needs of this growing community as quickly as possible. With time and funding being extremely limited during the pandemic, the Department focused on identifying and co-striping existing facilities to meet the immediate needs of pickleball enthusiasts. As the City comes out of the pandemic, the Department has been working to identify locations that could accommodate space for dedicated pickleball courts to meet public demand while minimizing impacts to other sports or recreation uses within our parks.

Currently, there is one (1) dedicated pickleball court in the newly constructed (2022) Fairbrook Park in Scripps Ranch. The court was incorporated into the final design of the park as a result of the Department soliciting community feedback regarding the types of amenities desired for the park. The Department will continue to reach out to the community for feedback when new parks are being constructed. In addition, the Department is taking steps to add more dedicated and co-striped pickleball courts to existing facilities where space and feasibility allow.

The Department has added 16 co-striped Pickleball courts in 2022 and 6 more in 2023 so far. In total, the Department offers 33 locations with 109 indoor and outdoor co-striped courts in various communities. When broken down, there are 78 indoor and 32 outdoor courts available for use throughout the City. In this second half of 2023, the Department is working on establishing 10 dedicated pickleball courts as follows:

- Golden Hill Community Park – 2
- Kearny Mesa Community Park – 4
- Colina del Sol Park – 4

The City has received feedback from the communities and appreciates the passion for their preferred sport and their desire to see it grow and flourish throughout San Diego. As it relates to pickleball, the demand has increased precipitously during and immediately after the COVID-19 pandemic. Residents of all ages and abilities began playing pickleball as a way to socialize and get some fresh air and exercise while maintaining social distancing guidelines during the pandemic.

The City's goal is to help foster and grow an appreciation of pickleball without hindering interest in other sports. Identifying appropriate locations, obtaining funding and constructing the facilities to meet the demand is always challenging. The City continues to work with the community to offer pickleball facilities as quickly as possible while engaging with the affected communities to solicit input and feedback from them on proposed changes to their parks. The City appreciates the community's patience and collaboration as we strive to meet the needs of each community throughout this process.

Locations added since 2020:

- 2020: Jerabek Neighborhood Park – 2 outdoor co-striped tennis courts
- 2021: Gershwin Neighborhood Park – 4 outdoor co-striped pickleball courts on 1 tennis court
- 2022: La Jolla Recreation Center – 2 outdoor co-striped on basketball courts

- 2022: Ellen Browning Scripps Joint Use Park – 2 outdoor co-stripped on basketball courts
- 2022: Pacific Highlands Ranch Park – 2 outdoor co-stripped on basketball courts
- 2022: Fairbrook Ranch Park – 1 dedicated Outdoor Pickleball court (CIP)
- 2022: Standley Recreation Center – 2 outdoor co-stripped on basketball courts and 2 indoor courts
- 2022: Western Hills – 2 outdoor co-stripped on basketball courts
- 2022: Mira Mesa Recreation Center – 2 indoor co-stripped on basketball courts
- 2023: Nobel Recreation Center – 2 outdoor co-stripped on basketball courts
- 2023: Pacific Beach Recreation Center – 2 outdoor co-stripped on basketball courts
- 2023: Park de la Cruz Community Park – 2 outdoor co-stripped courts

Pending/Future projects:

- Fiscal Year 2023
 - Colina del Sol – 4 dedicated outdoor pickleball courts by June – July 2023 (scheduled)
 - Kearny Mesa Recreation Center, 2 co-stripped courts by June 2023 (scheduled)
- Fiscal Year 2024
 - Golden Hill Recreation Center – 2 dedicated outdoor courts by December 2023
 - Kearny Mesa Recreation Center, 4 dedicated outdoor courts, expected later in 2023-2024
- Future
 - Grove (formerly Southwest) Neighborhood Park – 1362 27th St. 92154 – 2 potential courts
 - Hidden Trails Neighborhood Park at 1049 Parsons Landing 92154 – 2 potential courts
 - Robb Field – 6 to 12 dedicated pickleball court facility (general development plan workshop currently is in progress)
 - Standley Community Park – 3 to 4 outdoor pickleball courts (under discussion)


- Partnership:
 - San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) is interested in partnering with the City to add pickleball courts or co-stripped courts at various joint use sites as funding permits.
- 3. Mr. Smith watched collaboration between multiple sports at the DeAnza Natural workshop meeting this past Tuesday and wondered if that collaboration can exist between pickleball and tennis.
- 4. Ms. Laman asked about next steps. Mr. Field responded that the board can consider future action items as appropriate related to this topic.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Copies of the reports, attachments, PowerPoint presentations, and audio-video recordings can be found on the Parks and Recreation Department website at <http://www.sandiego.gov/parkandrecboard/reports>.

Next Calendared Meeting: July 20, 2023, at 2:00 p.m.

Submitted by,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Andy Field". The signature is cursive and fluid, with the first name "Andy" and last name "Field" clearly distinguishable.

Andy Field
Director
Parks and Recreation Department