

**City of San Diego
Park and Recreation Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 17, 2021**

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

Meeting Held by Teleconference:

This meeting was held remotely using the Zoom Webinar platform and was streamed online.

***** ONLINE MEETING *****

<https://sandiego.zoomgov.com/j/1614916136>

To call into the meeting, dial toll free:

US: +1 669 254 5252 or +1 669 216 1590 or +1 551 285 1373 or +1 646 828 7666 or + 1 833 568 8864

Webinar ID: 161 491 6136

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 Board 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
Katherine Johnston, Chair Dennis Otsuji, Vice-Chair Nick Anastasopoulos David Baron (signed-off at 4:58 p.m.) Jon Becker Marcella Bothwell Ron Cho (signed-off at 3:23 p.m.) Rick Gulley Evelyn Smith (signed-off at 5:04 p.m.) Noli Zosa		Andy Field, Director Karen Dennison, Assistant Director Jonathan Avila Christina Chadwick Gina Dulay Sarah Erazo Martin Flores Ilisa Goldman Mike Hansen Michael Jones Louis Merlin Jon Richards Scott Sandel Shannon Scoggins Jennifer Scott Shelly Stowell Heidi Vonblum Nancy Zamora-Hudson

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order by Chair Johnston at 2:07 pm.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF May 20, 2021

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

A motion was made by Mr. Baron and seconded by Mr. Gulley to approve the **May 20, 2021 Park and Recreation Board Meeting Minutes**. The motion was approved 9-0-1 and passed with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, David Baron, Jon Becker, Marcella Bothwell, Ron Cho, Rick Gulley, Katherine Johnston, Dennis Otsuji and Noli Zosa. Nay: (None). Recused: (None). Abstained: Evelyn Smith. Not Present: (None).

NON-ADOPTION AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT – None

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. The Board did not receive any Non-Agenda Public Comment requests.

REQUEST FOR ITEMS TO BE PLACED ON 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 – Mr. Otsuji reported that no meeting had been held.

Community Parks II Area Committee – Representative to be announced.

Balboa Park Committee

- Ms. Johnston reported that there would be new appointees to the BPC in July. They would likely begin participating in meetings in September.
- Ms. Johnston announced that an item related to strategic framework for long term planning would be coming before the BPC in July.
- Ms. Johnston also noted that the BPC was going to investigate having a later meeting time to accommodate Committee Member travel time as well as provide Staff additional time to prepare crucial reports.

Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens' Advisory Committee – Mr. Zosa reported that no meeting had been held.

San Diego Parks Foundation

- Ms. Bothwell reported that New York City Parks Commissioner Mitchell Silver gave a fabulous presentation via a virtual meeting on June 15, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. The Commissioner shared how they had turned empty lots full of asphalt into beautiful parks and had prioritized the activation of parks and getting rid of crime.
- She noted that the presentation had been “absolutely fabulous” and included good discussion from San Diego Community folks landscape architects who had excellent questions.” The presentation may be accessed on the sandiegoparksfoundation.org website by going to news and events.

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT - None

BOARD MEMBER’S COMMENTS - None

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

- Director Andy Field greeted Board Members and meeting participants. He gave the following update on the Department’s status:
- **Appointment to the P&R Board**

Director Field welcomed **Evelyn Smith** from Council District 4/Emerald Hills (approved by City Council on 6/8/21) and thanked **Bobby Hughes** for his years of service to the Board!

Board Member Evelyn Smith introduced herself and stated “I have lived in Emerald Hills for years and I would say I was involved with the Neighborhood Council at least 38 of those 48. And the last five years, I was Emerald Hills Neighborhood Council Chair. I'm a member of the MLK Park and Rec. I was attending the City Park and Rec meetings up until the pandemic and I am also a member of Groundwork, and a lot of other organizations, which are not associated with parks, and I'm glad to be appointed to the Board, and I hope I can make a difference and accomplish some of the things on the Parks and Rec wish list, and thank you.”

Chair Johnston replied “thank you so much for joining us this afternoon Evelyn and it sounds like you're really engaged in your community so it's wonderful to have someone who's so knowledgeable on park and rec programs and so I just want to thank you so much for your volunteerism and agreeing to serve on this Board, so thank you and welcome, and thank you Andy for making sure I saw that Ms. Smith was present. Thank you all.”

- **Vandalism/Fires**
 - Willie Henderson Sports Complex – Sunday, May 2, 2021
 - Balboa Park Marston Point Storage Shed – Tuesday, June 8, 2021

- **COVID-19 Update**

- The **County Public Health Order** was last updated on 6/15/21 (see https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/hhsa/programs/phs/community_epidemiology/dc/2019-nCoV/health-order.htm)
- **Beyond the Blueprint** (<https://covid19.ca.gov/industry-guidance/>) began two days ago, on 6/15/21:
 - Color-coded tiering system was retired, and capacity restrictions for many industries ended
 - Most industries must follow the COVID-19 Prevention Emergency Temporary Standards (ETS) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/ETS.html>)
 - Large scale events have the following requirements:
 - Required for indoor events with over 5,000 attendees: Verification of fully vaccinated status or negative test results is required of all attendees
 - Recommended for outdoor events with over 10,000 attendees: Verification of fully vaccinated status, negative test results, or face coverings are strongly recommended for all attendees
- **Vaccination:** Goal is to vaccinate 75% of the County population age 12 or older (approx. 2.1 million people). Approx. 93% of this group (approx. 1.9 million people) have at least one vaccination and approx. 73% (approx. 1.5 million people) have received both vaccinations. County vaccination status is available at:
- <https://sdcounty.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opstdashboard/index.html#/cof4b16356b840478dfdd50d1630ff2a>
- We are currently in the process of reopening our recreation centers

- **FY 2022 Budget Development and FY 2021 Budget Monitoring**

IBA's final report on the Fiscal Year 2022 budget development process was released on 6/9/21.

- City Council considered and approved the Fiscal Year 2022 budget, Fiscal Year 2021 Third Quarter Budget Monitoring Report, and Year-End Capital Budget Monitoring Report on 6/14/21
- Active Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will consider the Commercial Paper program and capital project allocations at a special meeting on 6/24/21
- City Council will consider the Fiscal Year 2022 Appropriation Ordinance on 6/29/21

- **Come Play Outside**
 - Funding sources, obtained in partnership with San Diego Parks Foundation:
 - County of San Diego Health and Human Services Grant: \$750k
 - City of San Diego Fiscal Year 2022 Budget: \$400k
 - Price Philanthropies
 - Focus on 16 recreation centers and parks within Communities of Concern (defined by the **Climate Equity Index**, which is available at: https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2019_climate_equity_index_report.pdf)
 - Planned Programs:
 - Aquatics
 - Learn to Swim
 - Pool Guard Training
 - Fern Street Circus
 - Flexible youth activity and camp programming
 - Arts and Crafts
 - Gymnastics
 - Martial Arts
 - Music Lessons
 - Photography Camp
 - Science Camp
 - Sports Clinics
 - Water-Based Activities (kayaking, surfing, etc.)
 - Outdoor Adventure Camp
 - Movies in the Park
 - Teen Nite
- **Summer Youth Environmental and Recreation Corps Program**
 - Permanent Job Opportunities
 - Grounds Maintenance Worker
 - Recreation Aide/Leader
 - Swimming Pool Guard/Manager
 - Internships and Mentorships

- LEADER Academy
 - Mentor Program
 - Natural Resource/Park Ecology Program
 - Park Ranger Interpretation and Education
- Partnership with local nonprofits to help reach youth ages 16 to 24
- **Ongoing Recruitments** – we in the process to hire all levels of staff, and Personnel Department will issue notices seeking interested applicants. Employment Opportunities are available at <https://www.sandiego.gov/empopp/current> and <https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/sandiego>.
- **Balboa Park Update:**
 - Botanical Building RFP Results
 - Framework for the Future
 - Project Prioritization
 - Mobility
 - Benchmarking
 - Friends of Balboa Park/Balboa Park Conservancy Merger
- **City Council Items:**
 - **Proposed curfew at 3 Pacific Beach-area parks (PB Library Grounds, Fanuel Street Park, and Bob McEvoy Fields)** approved by City Council on 6/8/21; Coastal Commission approval also needed
 - Proposed modifications to **on-leash dog approved hours for Mission Bay Park** are slated for a future Environment Committee meeting
 - **Annual park equity report and proposed budgets for recreation center funds** approved by PS&LN Committee on 5/19/21 and City Council on 6/15/21
 - **Fiesta Island General Development Plan** – California Coastal Commission approved Option B of the General Development Plan at its meeting on 6/10/21
 - **Parks Master Plan** to be considered by P&R Board today and will move to PS&LN Committee and City Council later this year
- Letter to **Community Recreation Groups** regarding status of updates to Council Policy 700-42 – no update since our letter dated 1/5/21
- **Golf**
 - U.S. Open starts today and lasts through Sunday (6/17/21-6/20/21)
 - On 6/8/21, City Council approved **U.S. Open Week** (6/14/21-6/20/21) and **Mark Marney Day** (6/20/21)
- **Requests for future Park and Recreation Board Agenda Items:**

- Pure Water project and reclaimed water program
- Federal funds for improving park maintenance
- Climate Equity Index
- Park Social
- **Pickleball** – Expansion of pickleball opportunities in the park system remains a priority for the Department.

ACTION ITEM:

101. Parks for All of Us – City of San Diego Parks Master Plan, General Plan Recreation Element Amendment, Citywide Park Development Impact Fee, and Designation of Chollas Creek Watershed as a Regional Park

Presenters: Heidi Vonblum, Deputy Director, Planning Department
Jonathan Avila, Park Designer, Planning Department

The presentation outlined the following:

- Background of the Parks Master Plan (PMP)
- Discussion
- Requested Action

NOTE: The Board received 36 public comments for Action Item 101: nine (9) written and 27 verbal.

Written Public Comment #1 – Laurie Broedling

<p>Laurie Broedling City: San Diego</p>	<p>The San Diego Green Infrastructure Consortium (GIC) exists to promote increased use of integrated green infrastructure to improve environmental sustainability, enhance community resilience, and address climate justice.</p> <p>Because green infrastructure is nature-compatible, it is often as effective as alternative gray infrastructure solutions and almost always less expensive. The GIC is very pleased with the additions to the Parks Master Plan that promote use of integrated green infrastructure and with the items related to modernizing park infrastructure. We support our parks system adopting state-of-the-art methods and technologies to the extent possible. We believe implementation of these recommendations will result in major improvements to city parks while reducing operating costs and providing many co-benefits to environmental sustainability. We congratulate the city on these progressive steps and look forward to supporting their implementation in any way deemed useful.</p> <p>Laurie Broedling Co-Founder San Diego Green Infrastructure Consortium</p>
--	--

Written Public Comment #2 – **Karin Zirk**

<p>Karin Zirk City: San Diego</p>	<p>Ms. Zirk thanked staff for incorporating changes requested by the Biodiversity Working Group into the current draft PMP and clarifying the functions and restrictions around our MSCP/MHPA and other open space lands. Protecting San Diego’s rich biodiversity is critical.</p> <p>Ms. Zirk is thrilled about the new park typology of the Urban Watershed Park. Ms. Zirk appreciates the park planners willingness to tackle the multijurisdictional issues to create Chollas Creek Regional Park and look forward to taking lessons learned from this effort to create lower Rose Creek Park connecting Marian Bear Natural Park and Rose Canyon Open Space Park with restored wetlands at the mouth of Rose Creek in Mission Bay to open up wildlife corridors and create important linkages to facilitate climate adaptation for plants and animals alike.</p> <p>Ms. Zirk feels very strongly that without a dependable funding source to address maintenance backlogs and future park acquisition to support a grown and increasingly dense population, this plan will not be able to achieve all its goals. Ms. Zirk supports all the recommendations made by PARC as well as the Biodiversity Working Group</p>
---	---

Written Public Comment #3 – **Anne Fege (Community Forest Advisory Board)**

<p>Anne Fege, Chair, Community Forest Advisory Board City: San Diego</p>	<p>Ms. Fege noted that a formal public comment period is still needed, and this Board can demand it. Lacking that, six changes are essential.</p> <p>(1) We need more trees and parkland—not less--as extreme heat events increase, development adds buildings and pavement, and public health depends on parks and other cooling places.</p> <p>(2) Trees are the most dominant and defining natural element in parks. Stronger management objectives are needed to actively manage trees to keep them healthy, long living and safe elements.</p> <p>(3) The mix of trees and “hardscape” infrastructure is skewed too far to “hard” nonliving infrastructure. Only trees can provide all the shade-cooling, habitat, and recreation benefits.</p> <p>(4) Land acquisition must be required in communities lacking parks. Trees need space, and if there is no parkland, there is no space for trees.</p> <p>(5) The proposed point system is untested and unsupported by urban park planning experiences in other cities or park planning research. The "recreation value park scoring matrix" (Appendix D) is truly difficult to understand and lacks evidence or experts behind the individual recreation “opportunities point.</p> <p>(6) Some individual guiding principles for tree cover and landscaping need revision. These and other recommendations are provided in a separate</p>
--	---

	<p>letter to the Board, which is available here: https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/obc-public-comments/citysd_parkbd_pmp_trees_ltr_fr_anne_fege_2021-06-16.pdf?sandread=d581d977e877a75f</p>
--	---

Written Public Comment #4 – Tom Mullaney

<p>Tom Mullaney City: San Diego</p>	<p>The proposed Parks Master Plan has a fundamental problem: It attempts to steer the city primarily into using existing parks to meet the needs of current residents and new residents. There’s no provision requiring that parks keep pace with the increasing number of residents. With this plan, the focus would be on getting points: The City could add a swing set, a concession building, or a bus stop. They could close a street and add some tables. On paper, that would add points.</p> <p>Yet SANDAG has forecast that our city will add 325,000 people over a 30-year period. That’s about 11,000 per year.</p> <p>Without a standard for park land, without a policy to acquire a specific amount of park land, existing parks will become more overburdened each year. That’s why the City needs a land standard.</p> <p>The land standard should be separate from the points system. But if they are combined, an adequate split would be to require that 20% of the total points consist of park land. That’s a reasonable requirement: 20% of the points for park land.</p> <p>Mr. Mullaney stated that the City cannot have a park system without a land standard. More people need more parks!</p>
---	---

Written Public Comment #5 – Amie Hayes, Save Our Heritage Organization

<p>Amie Hayes, Save Our Heritage Organization (SOHO) City: San Diego</p>	<p>Ms. Hayes, representing SOHO, appreciates the addition of its previous recommendations, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying and highlighting San Diego’s National Historic Landmarks • Prioritizing master plans for historic landmarks • Ensuring City staff receive training in administering the Secretary of the Interior Standards • Supporting regional park designation for the Chollas Creek Watershed <p>SOHO requests the following additional elements to the PMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a 45-year review/CEQA process for existing and newly acquired parks/open space parcels to identify historic and/or cultural resources • Develop a goal to minimize environmental impacts to create and expand urban parks • Eliminate parking fees as a revenue opportunity (policy F5) to
--	---

	<p>achieve equitable access - A parking fee impacts equitable community access to the iconic landmarks of our city and, since many regional and historic parks serve their local community, which are otherwise deficient in parkland, a parking fee further makes access more difficult for those also within the direct community the park serves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a Design Review Board • Prioritize park acquisition • Support the enhanced open space conservation commitment • Develop parks opportunities in under-served communities in a manner that does not threaten other area resources such as where specific opportunities have been identified in adopted community plans • Identify and prioritize routes to parks and for multi modal users; the ideal mode (especially for neighborhood parks) should be non-motorized transport, consistent with the CAP goals; however, both public transit (which in many areas is not planned or ever built) and vehicles should be included. • Maintain thoroughfares within parks that give park access to many (such as Morley Field) should not be removed. <p>https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/obc-public-comments/parks_revised_master_plan_-_soho_comments.pdf?sandread=618037f12602a0af</p>
--	---

Written Public Comment #6 – Shelah Ott

<p>Shelah Ott City: San Diego</p>	<p>Communities such as San Ysidro that have experienced historic disinvestment should not wait for new parks to be built. We must focus on investments in greenery, amenities, and recreational equipment for existing parks before we aim to build new parks. Ms. Ott strongly supports the new parks plan as it will sufficiently address the equity gaps that exist in San Ysidro parks and the lack thereof.</p> <p>The prioritization of Citywide development impact fees over the next five years to park-poor communities and Communities of Concern is critically needed to account for historic lack of investment in those communities. Ms. Ott strongly supports committing at least 50% of the Development Impact Fee (DIF) budget for improvements specifically in Communities of Concern within the first five years as well as updating the metric for calculating the value of community parks to include a more equitable and environmental justice approach to determining the value of parks to community-based on health, socioeconomic information, and amount of green spaces available due to amenities, proximity, acreage and other factors.</p>
---	---

Written Public Comment #7 – **René Smith (Fairness for Balboa Park)**

<p>René Smith City: San Diego</p>	<p>Mr. Smith presented a letter signed by Wilbur Smith, Mike Stepner, Howard Blackson, Roger Showley, and himself. Mr. Smith requested that the current version of the Parks Master Plan be returned to staff for further community engagement (it comes to this committee prior to being presented to the CPC), corrections, and improvements. Funding, neighborhood scaling, assessment, and “Good Design” improvements are needed.</p> <p>Just one illustration is the condition assessments. Earlier versions of the PMP included the use of the Park Amenity Assessments already completed. There was a derived Park Condition Index. All that useful analytical information was removed and replaced by a novel implementation plan. More time is needed to assess sweeping changes such as this and their implications.</p> <p>The tireless work of city staff is to be recognized and appreciated. Let's build on that by making this a Plan that elicits broad public support, provides the groundwork for addressing the continual parks funding shortfalls, and, importantly, creates iconic parks, worthy of San Diego, for generations to come.</p> <p>On behalf of Wilbur, Mike, Howard, and Roger, Mr. Smith asked that the Board not approve the plan as written. It can and must be improved.</p>
---	--

Written Public Comment #8 – **Alejandro Amador (Casa Familiar)**

<p>Alejandro Amador City: San Diego</p>	<p>Mr. Amador is the Environmental Programs Supervisor at Casa Familiar and a San Ysidro resident. He expressed support for the latest draft of the Parks Master Plan because it aims to address equity for San Diego's most underserved communities.</p> <p>The prioritization of Citywide development impact fees over at least the next five years to park-deficient communities and communities of concern is very needed to account for historic lack of investment in those communities.</p> <p>The biggest pushback that Mr. Amador heard against this plan is the lack of prioritization of new parks. However, for our lower income communities of concerns, the City should first have to address the deficiency of greenery, amenities, and recreational value of the existing parks. Additionally, this latest draft addresses this concern by setting a goal to acquire 100 acres for new parks.</p> <p>In conclusion, to start addressing the large inequities across resources in communities in San Diego, the City needs to support this new parks master plan.</p>
---	--

Written Public Comment #9 – Sarina Vega (Casa Familiar)

<p>Sarina Vega City: San Diego</p>	<p>Ms. Vega is the Environmental Programs Associate at Casa Familiar and a City of San Diego resident. She is in full support of the Parks for All of Us Master Plan. This latest draft truly aims for an equity-centered approach to our existing public parks – green spaces that are extremely valuable to communities like San Ysidro. The draft update – with its prioritization of city-wide development impact fees over the next five years for park-deficient communities and Communities of Concern is a staunch commitment.</p> <p>Considering access to and quality of parks is imperative. This draft update begins to address what counts as a park for a community – is it just a patch of grass or is it something more?</p> <p>Ms. Vega feels that the updated 100-point system to calculate value and equity will serve communities like San Ysidro well. The update based on park value and respective amenities provides a better approach than the current acres per park standard, particularly for communities like San Ysidro that have smaller, older parks and less land parcels up for grabs and zoned for park space. Due to historic disinvestment, San Ysidro should not wait for new parks to be built.</p>
---	--

Public Speaker Comment #1 – Susan Baldwin

Ms. Baldwin is the co-chair of the Parks and Recreation Coalition (PARC) and is a retired planner who worked for the City of San Diego for five years and for SANDAG for 27 years.

Some improvements have been made that we applaud, yet more changes are needed. Ms. Baldwin noted three points: (1) all standards should be retained, (2) the errors in the point scoring sheets used to set the Citywide park fee should be corrected, and (3) a stronger commitment to equity is needed.

1. The proposed elimination of the land standard is very troubling as such a guideline or goal is used by most local jurisdictions throughout the country and, as a clear objective metric. The untested point system is complicated and pits land acquisition against amenities, we agree that amenities need more attention, however, without revisions to the point system will result in less parkland as the city grows and it has argued that the land standard cannot be met. However, our affordable housing goals and climate goals also remain unmet, but we do not eliminate them we use them to measure progress number two. The complex objective point system is error prone. The recreational value scoring sheets that assessed points contain errors that translate into errors in the Citywide park fee.
2. The Citywide park fee, which we fully support, should not be tested on this complicated subjective system. If it is, the errors must be corrected.
3. The equity focus of the PMP is needed to rectify decades of nonattention to the park needs of communities of concern and park deficient communities. However, the proposal to prioritize funding for these areas for only five years is not enough. The commitment should

be longer to rectify. That remedy needs time to address the problems that have evolved over many, many years and decades.

The plan needs to clearly define and provide a list and map of communities of concern and park deficient communities, since 80% of the city wide part fees are proposed to be spent in these areas, we need to see where these areas are and have a list. PARC cares deeply about the values of park value of parks to the residents of San Diego and we hope the issues we have raised will be addressed before the plan is presented to the City Council.

Public Speaker Comment #2 - Howard Greenstein

Mr. Greenstein is a landscape architect and retired City of San Diego Park Planner I was responsible for the current general plan, recreation element, and direct elements of numerous community plans.

As a member of PARC, Mr. Greenstein noted a key recommendation is to retain the 2.8 acre per 1,000 population park standard. This should be separate from the point system and should use the point system only for amenities. However, if park size is retained in the point system, a minimum of 20% of the points should be allocated to park acreage. This would be a very reasonable compromise that would still allow the flexibility for a full 80% of the points to be used for facilities and amenities.

To propose point system is a closed system which assigns value arbitrarily and pits parkland against amenities by requiring them to compete against each other for the same pool of points. A basketball court, a volleyball court, and a bocce ball court each have a value worth seven points, which is the same as a one-acre park. Due to the zero-sum game methodology on the extraordinary differences of costs amenities will be provided, instead of land to achieve the required points, the plan systematically discourages land acquisition.

The premise that the current system is failing, based on the lack of progress, and providing parks and recreation facilities confuses the system with the land standard. While there is nothing wrong with the land standard, the problem is the lack of funding and the need to distribute funds to communities that need them most. Both acreage and amenities contribute to the system and helps to achieve Citywide equity. Mr. Greenstein recommends not demonizing or weaponizing either of them and that the City should embrace both as the City deserves a PMP that can deliver both.

Public Speaker Comment #3 - Carolyn Chase

Ms. Chase is a former Planning Commissioner and is the co-chair of PARC.

Ms. Chase asked staff to work with PARC since the goals of staff and PARC are similar. The best possible park master plan is one that will empower us to address current park deficiencies and future growth. A sound plan is also required to attain grants and win with voters on the ballot significant additional funding is necessary, above and beyond the citywide park impact feed to address either the deficiencies or the growth.

But the current PMP draft is missing critical elements to support the identification of needs, a project list and an asset assessment. For example, why was the park amenities condition

assessment for parks not included in the plan? other areas of concern in the current draft of the PMP include funding, commercialization, climate change, urban forestry, and recreation.

The PMP needs to have sufficient and timely oversight, an understandable land standard, and annual reporting of parkland separate from amenities. The point system is confusing, it is not simple and instead is complicated. Staff promotes this innovative idea, but innovation is only useful when the new system is better.

The Citywide park fee is better, but we don't think that a system where the City and developers can value one acre of parkland with the same point value as a 10 square foot sign will produce better results for parks. The details matter, and the Board should ask staff to staff correct the errors and work with PARC on improvements to create the best possible park master plan with a focus toward equity.

Public Speaker Comment #4 - Matt Wahlstrom

Mr. Wahlstrom, a resident of Hillcrest, noted that his neighborhood is the only one in Uptown Community Planning Area that has no parkland. He noted that the current draft parks master plan is not guaranteed to bring equity to the park system, but the recommendations that PARC submitted would bring equity. Uptown Planners, along with the vast majority of community planning groups have voted to endorse PARC's proposal. Mr. Wahlstrom asked the Board to incorporate PARC's recommendations instead of continuing to push for a flawed master plan.

Public Speaker Comment #5 - Sarina Vega

Ms. Vega presented written comments earlier, and during her verbal comments noted that the latest PMP draft aims for an equity-centered approach for existing public parks. The value of parks really became noticeable during the COVID-19 crisis, specifically for communities like San Ysidro. Ms. Vega noted that a PMP focused on equity is necessary considering financial, social, economic, and spatial barriers have access to parks and quality of parks.

This draft update begins to address what a valuable part is for community, for example, and it takes cues from New York City Parks Commissioner Mitchell Silver's presentation on Tuesday. NYC Parks had a concrete patch of land with a fence around it that did not function as a true "park." Ms. Vega noted that land acquisition is not necessarily possible in all communities. San Ysidro, for example, doesn't have much land for new parks. That should be considered in the new PMP.

Public Speaker Comment #6 - Matt Fuller

Mr. Fuller noted that parks are necessary to escape the clutter and noise pollution of our urban areas to reflect and recharge and get physical activity. He asked that the City protect passive parklands from encroachments not all parkland needs to be activated we need parklands for solace in escape, please do not allow too many retail commercial operations. Please require more trees and let communities have both more parkland and more part goodies and be able to understand what we're getting. Also, what about more benches and seating at parks, there are no requirements in the plan for seeding except for small plazas. Parks need places to sit and it should be a typical component listed in the charts for parked apologies and light trees, there should be some requirements thanks."

Public Speaker Comment #7 – Kathy Parrish

Ms. Parrish advocated for park trees with concerns that the proposed point system devalues trees. Even though the City's policy and the climate action plan are to increase the urban tree canopy. Trees play an important part in sequestering carbon and reducing urban heat island effects. An area of concern is that the draft PMP shows that the removal of mature healthy trees and its replacement with manmade shade gets more points. The point system gives more points for removing trees. And even though younger trees may be planted, they can't replace the benefits of our existing mature trees, not for many years. So stronger requirements for and protections of trees and annual reporting requirements for both tourism moved and trees planted must be included in the PMP to be consistent with the City's Climate Action Plan and to support healthy, mature trees.

Public Speaker Comment #8 – Wally Wulfeck

Mr. Wulfeck is the chairperson of the Community Planners Committee. He noted that the PMP is coming to the Community Planners Committee on June 22, 2021. Mr. Wulfeck noted the the lack of serious public involvement in this process. He received the latest revision that was announced two weeks ago, but there isn't sufficient time for involvement of the Community Planning Groups (CPG) and the Community Recreation Groups (CRG).

Mr. Wulfeck requested about two months to allow CPG and CRG review since their meetings are spread out over the whole month, and they need time to analyze. and determine their recommendations for City consideration. CPC is opposed the previous draft of this plan, but Mr. Wulfeck noted the current draft PMP has improved.

CPC voted in January to endorse the PARC recommendations, and CPC will consider the new draft PMP and PARC recommendations at its meeting on June 22. CPC is in support of improving the equity features of the plan. CPC supports the Citywide development impact fee, but Mr. Wulfeck noted that the fee is insufficient to correct most deficiencies of the park system. Other sources of funding need to be found, but there's just not enough money in the depths to do a serious job of undoing park inequities that have accumulated over the past 50 years.

Public Speaker Comment #9 – Goyo Ortiz

Mr. Ortiz is a San Ysidro teacher and resident, and he is also the Community Development Coordinator at Casa Familiar. He commended the latest draft for the parks master plan for a clear vision towards advancing equity in our communities as a father of two small children, after a year of isolation due to the COVID-19 pandemic. During that time, Mr. Ortiz noticed the lack of adequate open green spaces in his community, and he noted that the draft PMP begins to prioritize those deficiencies of greenery and amenities of value for existing parks and communities. He expressed support for the concept of 50% development impact fees for the next five years is a great start. To address historic inequities, standards must address more than just adding more land, since available open space is limited and adequate recreation areas are highly valued.

Public Speaker Comment #10 – Deborah Sharpe

Ms. Sharpe is a retired landscape architect and was supervisor of the Park Planning section for the City of San Diego until her retirement in 2012. Ms. Sharpe wants to see a park master plan approved, as it would benefit all existing and future residents and visitors.

Although many positive revisions have been made to the proposed master plan, it's still deficient in some areas, which was pointed out by previous speakers from PARC. For example, of the one major issues is the proposed untested point system which is complicated, and we feel that it pits the recreation amenities against parkland.

The elimination of a parkland standard at a time when the City's population is growing, and housing is identifying makes retention of a park land standard more important than ever. Ms. Sharpe noted that recreational amenities and parkland should be separately calculated and measured, and only then can you determine objectively which areas are which communities are truly park deficient.

The proposed point system actually puts existing open passive parkland at risk due to incentives that are encouraging the addition of recreational amenities in existing parks, without any guidance or guidelines or baseline metrics to prevent excessive encroachments and displacement of existing uses. The City must protect our open, multi-use parklands from point stuffing, which is an obvious possibility and would benefit residential developers who would be looking to reduce their parks and recreation obligations.

Ms. Sharpe would prefer to see the land standard of a point system be modified to separate the land from the recreation amenities. However, if the point system is to be retained, as proposed, then it should require the allocation of 20% of the 100 points per 1,000 residents to parkland for parkland acquisition. She asked the Board to only conditionally accept this proposed draft by requiring a 20% allocation for acquisition of usable parkland as defined in the current general plan glossary. She also requested the Board require creation of a baseline for recreational amenities for each park type so as to protect passive open parkland.

Public Speaker Comment #11 – Jeff Harkness

Mr. Harkness is a retired Park Planner for the City of San Diego and a member of PARC. He noted that the Citywide park development impact fee would not provide the necessary funding to create an equitable park system. Significant additional funding will be required to ensure park deficits are eliminated and new parks are added for new growth. He recommends not deleting the policy from the City's General Plan Recreation Element that directs the City to study fees for non-residential uses. The Parks Master Plan is the instrument to inform and prioritize future funding and, most importantly, to support increased funding on any future ballot measure. Yet the current PMP draft is missing critical elements to support that, which would include the project list identification of needs and asset assessment. The amenities assessment for parks wasn't included in the plan or us to identify park needs, and Mr. Harkness asked that these important elements to be addressed in the parks master plan. Also, as previous PARC members have stated in their testimonies, PARC is requesting the 20% of the points being used for land acquisition. Mr. Harkness looks forward to the fourth draft of the PMP for review.

Public Speaker Comment #12 – Andy Wiese

Mr. Wiese is a resident of University City and a professor of Urban and Environmental History at SDSU. He applauded the overall equity goals and the orientation of the plan. Mr. Wiese registered support for a Citywide development impact fee to help to begin to pay for the meeting those equity goals, and he noted the commitments to open space conservation that have been added to the to the draft PMP revision. He urged the City to redouble its commitment to acquiring and developing more land for parks because the City is parkland

deficient. Equity in the future requires a commitment to contributing more resources to our park system and land, it is a foundational resource in any park system. The current PMP doesn't go far enough in providing sufficient commitment or guidance by the City to meet that goal. Mr. Wiese urged the Board to recommend that the parks master planning needs a much more aspirational goal than the current 100 acres of land, as this is a City of 240,000 acres and a park system of 40,000 acres. He recommended following the PARC recommendations to incorporate land more fully in the criteria for measuring park adequacy. That could include retaining land as a separate category for evaluation alongside a proposed recreational point value or to set aside 20% of the proposed recreational value points for land acquisition at a rate of seven points per acre. This is not just the view of PARC, it is the view of the University Community Planning Group as voted last year on June 9, 2020, and reinforced on January 12, 2021. The City needs to continue to secure permanent park space for all of our communities and all of our children for the future.

Public Speaker Comment #13 – Suzanne Baracchini (Preserve Windansea Beach Association)

Ms. Baracchini spoke on behalf of the Preserve Windansea Beach Association. Windansea Beach suffers from chronic neglect, disrepair, and erosion, which creates significant public safety hazards for the millions that visit. Ms. Baracchini requested a master plan for shoreline beach parks and suggested that they shoreline beach parks should rank high on the need for equity scale since they are used by most residents and visitors. Inland suburban community parks are not as frequently visited by tourists. To be truly equitable, the City should place shoreline beach parks into a special category, since they serve not just the immediate community but all San Diegans. Beach parks in La Jolla are advertised around the world on travel blogs, TV shows, YouTube videos, and all of social media, as well as the San Diego International Airport.

Windansea Beach in particular needs attention, including the road, sidewalks, shoreline, and bluffs. All of these are in severe dire straits. It's only a matter of time before someone is severely injured due to this neglect, and Ms. Baracchini urged the Board to consider putting shoreline beach park into a special category and asked the Board to visit the Preserve Windansea webpage at preservewindansea.org.

Public Comment Speaker #14 – David Moty

Mr. Moty is the chair of the Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group. Mr. Moty generally supports the draft PMP, the point system concept, and the Citywide development impact fee. He noted that the recreation value point system is a good way to compare two dissimilar aspects of park development (land acquisition and park amenities), mix them together into one number, and then that one number can be compared between communities across the city. And that would provide an objective determination of where the park deficits are worst, and that is very important. Mr. Moty suggested that Council Policy 800-14 on capital project prioritization should be made consistent with the draft PMP to complete the picture of how this would work..

While the draft plan addresses concerns about double counting points in a few places page D-20 addresses double counting between local and regional parks and page D-24 precludes double counting event space and amphitheaters. However, the draft plan doesn't include a broad based prohibition against double counting. Mr. Moty suggested that staff should including such a prohibition. Since the draft plan is a dramatic change in parks planning, he

recommended constant monitoring of how this plays out over the coming years, and he hopes staff time for that will be a top priority for the department.

Public Speaker Comment #15 – Vicki Estrada

Ms. Estrada is a landscape architect and president of Estrada Land Planning. Her firm designed over three dozen parks within the City over the last 36 years. Ms. Estrada is past chair of the Community Forest Advisory Board. She supports the comments made about prioritizing trees within parks, and she is representing the Chollas Creek Coalition in her comments. The Coalition supports the focus on equity within the Parks Master Plan. The majority of Chollas Creek Coalition board members live in the historically underserved communities of the Chollas Creek watershed. She endorsed the creation of a Chollas Creek watershed regional park as a critical step that will help make the watershed all that it could be.

While the draft PMP contains an equity focus and the pooled DIF, Ms. Estrada noted the following concerns:

- Pooled DIF should be defined with weighted allocation of those funds toward the Communities of Concern.
- Chollas Creek Coalition understands that the points of value system enables this city-wide default, which in turn enables a weighted spending policy.
- The point system should not impact the actual design process for a city design part, as it typical for any abstract value system, whether based on acreage or park amenities.
- Standardized systems cannot measure the multiple nuanced and qualitative nature of park equity within all the different communities within San Diego.
- No value system, including the proposed points value system is sufficient for measuring equity. It is sufficient for measuring parity of expenditure on identified projects, not the equity value of those amenities between communities.
- The recreation value point system should be based to reflect the age of the park facility rather than transit access, which should not be included in a point system given equity value to transit connections. Ms. Estrada believes that in practice, this is problematic and not supported by evidence.
- The only way to ensure equity in parks planning is to let the underserved communities speak for their own needs and draw from an equitable public input process a priority project list, which can then be included in the budget.
- Revising the walking bike shed analysis is important. Those elements are not the same in communities with higher crime rates and poor infrastructure areas as compared to more affluent communities, so the distances traveled are not equal.
- Within six months of PMP adoption, the City should prepare a report that includes:
 - Community by community project list for implementation
 - Community facilities deficiencies cost matrix that clearly defines how parks and facilities are prioritized
 - Implementation matrix of existing development impact fees expenditures that clearly defines the budget gap performed
 - Analysis of progress made toward meeting equity goals within specific communities of concern

- This implementation framework plan should be presented to the City Council on an annual basis annually every year in the fall, so that new project funding can be prioritized by the City Council for the upcoming budget cycle
- The City should create a website for each community that includes GIS base maps that indicate existing park resources, future park projects, timeline for project completion, and funding source for the improvements. This would enable the community to know when new parks and amenities will be completed and available for use.
- The Chollas Creek Coalition would like an explanation of how the hundred acres was determined to be sufficient for the City over the next 10 years. She agreed with Mr. Weise that 100 acres in 10 years is not enough. Ms. Estrada noted that based on Commissioner Silver's presentation on New York City Parks, there is quite a bit the City can do to help create more parks.
- The draft PMP should ensure adequate sizing information for recreation and aquatic centers to ensure upgraded and new facilities in communities of concern.
- Mount Hope Cemetery should be considered a resource based park in the City's General Plan and draft PMP.
- Chollas Creek Coalition is interested in meeting with City staff to help improve the draft PMP.

Public Speaker Comment #16 -Daniele Laman

Ms. Laman, a member of the Chollas Lake Recreation Group, requested that Chollas Lake and the seasonal creek in the Chollas Creek watershed be designated as part of the Chollas Creek Watershed Regional Park. She expressed concern that the general development plan from the 1990s Chollas Lake was not included in the proposed regional park. The lake and creek are located midway between the two North forks and the two South forks of the highlighted tributaries of Chollas Creek. She noted that the community recreation group will meet at the end of the month to review the proposed regional park designation. Ms. Laman also asked when will the regional park will be dedicated?.

Public Speaker Comment #17 – Andrew Sturm

Mr. Sturm, a resident of Council District 8 and the Director of Public Vitality for Casa Familiar, is an avid park user. He asked whether the speakers had analyzed existing conditions in parks with the same level of detail as they had reviewed the draft PMP. Mr. Sturm shared his strong support for the new San Diego parks for all for all of us plan. The new plan addresses the lack of equity in our current park system. He noted that there is room for improvement. This plan shows how to build equity into policy in the funding and into action, so we can work toward equity together now and for the coming years. The point system will be evaluated and modified over time, but the old system that got us here is not working, so to keep repeating that and expecting a different outcome is not a good path forward. The prioritization to Citywide development impact fees over the next five years goes a long way towards addressing the historic disinvestment and imbalance that is clearly visible between neighborhoods in the city. Mr. Sturm noted his appreciation for the presentation by Mitchell Silver, the Parks Commissioner in New York City. Mr. Silver stated that a primary function of parks is to help us heal. Mr. Sturm noted that it's very hard to use a park to heal when you show up to a park and the first thing you feel is sad because you can tell your park hasn't been a priority for a very long time.

Public Speaker Comment #18 – Ed Gallagher

Mr. Gallagher from Pacific Beach is pleased with the discussion thus far and sees improvements to the plan he reviewed earlier draft PMP and noted the need for more time to review it. Mr. Gallagher noted Commissioner Silver's presentation about scarcity of land. In Pacific Beach, for example, underutilized streets, which are available free to the City, along with empty lots that could be acquired or are already owned by the City. The Mission Boulevard redesign plan identifies several undeveloped paper streets that are City-owned, such as a portion of Oliver Street right off Mission Boulevard. That land is a sand pit that could be acquired for free. The same is true for watersheds such as Chollas Creek and Rose Creek that could make nice green landscapes for the community.

Public Speaker Comment #19 –Chris Nielsen

Mr. Nielson is the chair of the University Community Planning Group. UCPG has voted multiple times to support a land standard for parks and absent, a population-based park acreage standard a change to the proposed Parks Master Plan that makes sense. It would be to allocate 20% of the points to park like this would ensure that objectives, specifically equity that the city has identified which are served by the point system also have a parkland component.

Public Speaker Comment #20 – Sally Smull

Ms. Smull is with the Emerald Hills Neighborhood Council, the Chollas Valley Community Planning Group, and the Chollas Creek Coalition. She congratulated Board Member Ms. Smith for her appointment to the Board. Ms. Smull noted earlier speakers mentioned many of the major items she wished to discuss, including the equity issue, which is definitely still in need of some work. She noted it will take more than five years, maybe 10 years knowing how long it's taken us to get some minimal things done in Emerald Hills and Encanto alone. Ms. Smull appreciated the concept of a Citywide development impact fee coming to communities of concern and agreed that the age of a park facility is really important when allocating funds. Lights in southeastern San Diego is a different situation when compared to Scripps-Miramar Ranch, as it is a safety issue. Ms. Smull recommended updates to Council Policy 600-33 for community input for park projects, because the City is lagging in that area.

Public Speaker Comment #21 – Diane Kane

Ms. Kane is the president of the La Jolla Community Planning Association and a member of the Park and Recreation Coalition. She echoed the comments made by Mr. Wulfeck to reflect that the community planning groups have not had insufficient time to look at any draft of this plan. She was pleased to hear that there's a fourth draft coming out, and she urged the Board and staff to provide sufficient time for this to go to the community recreation groups and community planning groups for review and comment. Ms. Kane stated she is pleased with the latest iteration of the draft PMP, noting it is a much-improved draft over the earlier ones, but it still needs work. Some of the major improvements include the Chollas Creek Watershed Plan and the Citywide development impact fee, but that fee will be insufficient to address the needs of the park system. Ms. Kane suggested the PMP should evaluate additional sources of steady income to keep our parks upgraded. She noted that land to be considered as a reasonable and important element of this parks plan going forward. Along with PARC, Ms. Kane supported at least 20% of the total point system that's used for valuing parks to be assigned as the land acquisition.

Public Speaker Comment #22 - Brenda Garcia Millan

Ms. Garcia Millan is on the climate action campaign. Parks provide unique environmental and health benefits to communities, including green spaces to filter rainwater reduce the heat island effect and promote the physical activity. To maximize those effects, it is crucial to invest in greenery amenities and reiteration only with men for existing parks, particularly those currently located in communities of concern. She supports the Parks Master Plan, particularly the prioritization of the Citywide development impact fees over the next five years or longer, and she encourages equitable investments in parks located in areas with the greatest need.

Public Speaker Comment #23 – Elida Chavez

Ms. Chavez is a resident of District 4 and part of the Old Park Community Council and the Chollas Creek Coalition. She expressed her appreciation of Mr. Field and Ms. Dennison for being so responsive to the Oak Park Community Council when we addressed or have addressed many concerns regarding Chollas Lake and today we have an open door to where we can communicate whenever we have a problem. Ms. Chavez appreciated the testimony of Ms. Estrada, and she is concerned with the point system. She has been waiting for many years for the watershed creek park to be developed and is pleased that the plan can help parks in the fourth district and the communities of concern with lower income populations. Ms. Chavez asked the Board to consider carefully the requests from the Chollas Creek Coalition and to take into consideration that the City is located on sacred land, as the parks are on Kumeyaay land that deserves the respect residents to the first peoples of this region.

Public Speaker Comment #24 - Raquel Juarez

Ms. Juarez noted that park improvement is among the most important undertaking before the City, and it should have the cordial cooperation of all. This was published in the San Diego Union editorial in 1910 it is, in fact, even more important today when a vote at the ballot is required to increase the kind of funding needed to sustain maintain operate and add to our already great park system. She asked where the new parks needed by the next 300,000 people are going to be located and how more parks will be integrated into the draft PMP. Ms. Juarez would like to see an analysis of how many acres are in each community now and how many additional acres are needed in each community in the future. She also asked for clarification of what the process would be to decide on the proposed new parks.

Public Speaker Comment #25 – Deborah Knight

Ms. Knight is the Executive Director of Friends of Rose Canyon. She looks forward to seeing the fourth draft of the plan. She noted the testimony of Ms. Estrada and other speakers and urged the Board to ask staff to continue to accept input from stakeholder groups.. Ms. Knight believes the plan is moving in the right direction and it should not be rushed at this point. She appreciated the added protections for the MHPA, which are critically important. She would like the Board to consider increasing the draft PMP's current goal of acquiring 100 acres of develop parkland for parks over the next 10 years. As the Chollas Creek Coalition and PARC noted, the goal of 100 acres is insufficient. Many communities are deficient in park acreage, and the City's population is projected to grow a lot. The goal for developed parkland acquisition over the next 10 years should be significantly increased, perhaps to at least 200 acres remember, we have to catch up and keep up at the same time over the next 10 years to provide enough parks for everybody.

Public Speaker Comment #26 – Tom Mullaney

Mr. Mullaney began working on parks, with the City staff about 16 years ago during the creation of the General Plan Recreation Element. Mr. Mullaney noted several shortcomings with the current draft PMP, which does not require the needed park space, especially passive park space to have a picnic or read a book. The draft PMP could perpetuate inequities and not eliminate inequities since San Diego is forecast to add 325,000 people over the next 30 years. That's 11,000 a year, so as Ms. Knight said, the City first needs to catch up on some of the past inequities and keep up with the new growth. Without a standard for parkland acquisition, existing parks will become more crowded each year. Portions of streets can be closed and used for parks might be useful in some neighborhoods, but use of streets for parks will not accommodate the extra 325,000. This is why a land standard in addition to facility standards is needed. He recommended that 20% of the points be used for parkland acquisition.

Public Speaker Comment #27 – Vicki Granowitz

Ms. Granowitz was inaudible due to technical difficulties.

- Chair Johnston concluded public testimony and moved to Board member questions and comments.
- Ms. Bothwell asked how will the points system will be used. She wants to identify where parks are needed and place them onto a map. She noted that the concept of 20% for land is new.
- Mr. Baron noted the input in this meeting, probably the most he's seen in his time as a board member. He noted that the City simultaneously needs more housing and also need more parks. He presented a motion to table this matter and have action at a future date with issues mentioned by Ms. Baldwin and Mr. Greenstein addressed, but he pulled the motion back when Chair Johnston suggested an alternative motion to accept the draft PMP and make specific recommendations from the Board.
- Chair Johnston has been engaged in this process for five years. She commended City staff to try to incorporate as much feedback as possible. The point system with recreational value is more dynamic than the usual standards such as acreage standards and 10-minute walk. The existing development impact fee is inefficient and should be Citywide. Ms. Vonblum noted that Citywide fee is important based on the standards-based approach as noted in the fee nexus study. Chair Johnston suggested that the standard could be reconsidered with the 20% points system for acreage. She mentioned that the Design Review Committee should be examined for possible reinstatement. She commended that language to strengthen link to nonprofit service providers. She asked about the status of the Trails Master Plan, which is identified as a priority in the PMP draft. Chair Johnston concluded by confirming that the PMP has goals to add to the urban tree canopy.
- Mr. Becker is appreciated seeing equity and trees focused in the PMP. The Design Review Committee is an important factor and should be reconsidered. He recommended that staff test some of park evaluations with some of the points scoring including the 20% idea, and he agreed with the mapping process.

- Mr. Otsuji asked whether the creation of the Chollas Creek Master Plan could be sent out on a request for proposals. He noted the history of the neighborhood of Southcrest. Chollas Creek should be recognized as a regional park and have prioritized funding. Mr. Otsuji noted that he has been in practice for 51 years and has designed 400 parks. The design process is the most important element and needs to be prioritized. He felt the point system needs to be overlaid onto the design process. The PMP is a living document and will not necessarily be perfect. He noted his support of the PMP and indicated that what was presented is better than what the City had 62 years ago. He was very appreciative of the public comments received for this item, as they were very respectful and informative.
- Chair Johnston noted for the record that the motion was to recommend that staff move forward with **Action Item 101, Parks for All of Us – City of San Diego Parks Master Plan, General Plan Recreation Element Amendment, Citywide Park Development Impact Fee, and Designation of Chollas Creek Watershed as a Regional Park** with the following recommendations: 1. request to further analyze the 20% allocation request; 2. Create a proposal for revisions to PMP Live document; 3. Take steps to allocate funding to move forward on the Chollas Creek Watershed as a Regional Park.

MOTION:

MOVED/SECONDED

Ms. Johnston/Mr. Otsuji

A motion was made by Ms. Johnston and seconded by Mr. Otsuji to recommend approval of **Action Item 101, Parks for All of Us – City of San Diego Parks Master Plan, General Plan Recreation Element Amendment, Citywide Park Development Impact Fee, and Designation of Chollas Creek Watershed as a Regional Park**. The motion was recommended for approval

9-0-0 with the following Board recommendations and vote:

Approve staff recommendation for Item 101 (four items) and make additional recommendations as identified by Chair Johnston: (1) evaluate 20% allocation request proposal for park land acquisition (see PARC proposal), (2) create an ongoing monitoring program to keep the PMP continuously updated, (3) recommend to the City Council that P&R and Planning provide an implementation plan for Chollas Creek Watershed Regional Park to the next level by requesting an RFP for a master plan, and (4) offer a better definition of communities of concern and low/moderate income areas (Climate Equity Index).

Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, David Baron, Jon Becker, Marcella Bothwell, Rick Gulley, Katherine Johnston, Dennis Otsuji, Evelyn Smith, and Noli Zosa. Nay: (None). Recused: (None). Abstained: (None). Not Present: Ron Cho .

102. John Baca Park General Development Plan

Presenters: Jennifer Scott, Senior Civil Engineer, Engineering & Capital Projects
Department
Leigh Kyle, Principal, Spurlock Landscape Architects

The presentation outlined the following:

- Background
- Discussion
- Requested Action

No public testimony was received for this item.

Mr. Otsuji confirmed that the proposed monument sign would face Linda Vista Road and noted that it should be respectful of Mr. Baca being a medal of honor winner. Given the number of mature trees on the site, a few trees are proposed to be added, along with a shade structure. There are existing mature trees. A flagpole could be added to the park conceptual design, although there may be maintenance considerations.

Mr. Becker noted that the draft general development plan is a very nice way to break up the park given its linear nature. He noted that there is no reclaimed water near this site. Since the lawn is regularly used, it should not be reduced. The community wanted shade, but there's not much room to add many new trees (just a few near picnic area) plus the shade structure. The tot lot fencing is proposed to be a woven wire product that we're seeing used at Children's Park that will not create visibility problems since it is transparent.

MOTION: MOVED/SECONDED Mr. Otsuji /Mr. Becker

A motion was made by Mr. Otsuji and seconded by Mr. Becker to recommend approval of **Action Item 102, John Baca General Development Plan**. The motion was approved 7-0-0 with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Jon Becker, Marcella Bothwell, Rick Gulley, Katherine Johnston, Dennis Otsuji, and Noli Zosa. Nay: (None). Recused: (None). Abstained: (None). Not Present: David Baron, Ron Cho, and Evelyn Smith.

INFORMATION ITEMS - None

WORKSHOP - None

ADJOURNMENT - The meeting was adjourned at 5:32 pm.

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

Next Calendared Meeting:

Thursday, July 15, 2021

Submitted by,



Andy Field
Director
Parks and Recreation Department