

Submitted Time	Name:	Meeting Date:	Comment Type	Agenda Item Number	Comments:
4/6/2020 15:25	Nicole Burgess	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	613	<p>BikeSD thanks you for the opportunity to address Item 613: the approval of streets to receive SB1funding for maintenance.</p> <p>As we are all being challenged by the COVID19 crisis, we must take a moment to address this request from a Safety, Economical, and Health perspective. We ask City Council Members to analyze this list of projects, to look at each of the streets in your District and notice that most are small segments or individual blocks of residential streets that have low number of ADT.</p> <p>We understand the need for maintained streets, but we believe the streets that are in most need, are being overlooked or need more dollars as they have become reconstruction projects. These are the major collector roads with high ADT, which are also some of the most dangerous corridors for people biking and walking.</p> <p>BikeSD wants to ensure that SB1 funds are used properly. One provision of SB 1, incorporated into California Streets and Highway Code, requires the City to incorporate "complete streets elements" into any project using these SB 1 funds."</p> <p>The City of SD is missing the opportunity to create safer streets and to address VZ, CAP, SRTS to meet our new reality. Let'sdobetter.</p>

4/6/2020 15:37	Phil Ballew	4/6/2020	City Council Comment	613	<p>BikeSD thanks you for the opportunity to address Item 613: the approval of streets to receive SB1funding for maintenance.</p> <p>As we are all being challenged by the COVID19 crisis, we must take a moment to address this request from a Safety, Economical, and Health perspective. We ask City Council Members to analyze this list of projects, to look at each of the streets in your District and notice that most are small segments or individual blocks of residential streets that have low number of ADT.</p> <p>We understand the need for maintained streets, but we believe the streets that are in most need, are being overlooked or need more dollars as they have become reconstruction projects. These are the major collector roads with high ADT, which are also some of the most dangerous corridors for people biking and walking.</p> <p>BikeSD wants to ensure that SB1 funds are used properly. One provision of SB 1, incorporated into California Streets and Highway Code, requires the City to incorporate "complete streets elements" into any project using these SB 1 funds."</p> <p>The City of SD is missing the opportunity to create safer streets and to address VZ, CAP, SRTS to meet our new reality.</p>
----------------	-------------	----------	-------------------------	-----	--

4/6/2020 15:48	Nevo Magnezi	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	613	<p>As a resident of district 3 in the city of San Diego, I would like to encourage the council to provide oversight over an important provision of Senate Bill 1: The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, adopted into State Highway Code Section 2030 subsection (f) is as follows:</p> <p>"To the extent beneficial, cost effective, and practicable in the context of facility type, right-of-way, project scope, and quality of nearby alternative facilities, and where feasible, the department and cities and counties receiving funds under the program shall incorporate complete street elements into projects funded by the program, including, but not limited to, elements that improve the quality of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and that improve safety for all users of transportation facilities."</p> <p>To my knowledge, the city has not incorporate many, if any, complete streets elements with SB-1 funded projects since they were funded during last year's authorization. Many of the streets scheduled to be repaved have complete streets infrastructure specified in community plans or the bicycle master plan. Some of these streets were the sites of pedestrians or bicyclist fatalities in 2019, such as Texas Street in North Park or West Calle Primera in San Ysidro.</p>
4/6/2020 15:59	Ladene Aardema	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	613	<p>Please use SB1 funding to create safer streets for the health and wellness of our residents as we all become financially burdened by the global COVID crisis. Ask the transportation department to re-evaluate this list of streets and determine which streets would actually help meet VZ and CAP goals and support Safe Routes to Schools, transit, and military bases. All SB1 funds should be used to create complete streets and corridors that are safe for all users and helps create a network of safe pathways for active commuters. As a senior, I enjoy riding my bike to get my essential needs but am terrified by the fast vehicle drivers. Please help support a healthy human approach for using these funds to provide maintained streets as well as safer streets for all.</p>

4/4/2020 12:44	Francine Maxwell	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	We the NAACP San Diego sent a email to all council offices and the city clerk email.
4/5/2020 11:48	Juan Carlos Hernan	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	<p>Thank you for addressing this emergency medical service contract extension in appropriate time to make sure San Diegans are receiving medical care without lapse in service. I am grateful to see this item come before the council given the current COVID-19 health concerns and safety measures. Knowing that there have been delays in awarding and reissuing a new contract for EMS, I worry that there is yet another extension but relieved the discussion is moving forward.</p> <p>As Senior Vice President of California Southern and Immediate Past President of the San Diego County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, I am committed to serving my community by ensuring our businesses can thrive in the public sector. By now we had hoped to be transitioning into a new contract, but we are confident that this next RFP will secure the best provider at the best market price. I strongly encourage you to minimize the extension period so that residents can depend on a newly negotiated contract which should certainly include provisions on how the provider will react to public health crises like the one we are experiencing. Thank you for considering this item.</p>

4/5/2020 11:56	Francine Maxwell	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	<p>NAACP San Diego celebrating 101 years in San diego sentry for a century has been monitoring the progress of the EMS contract and noticed there has not been a public bid for over 2 decades. Many members of NAACP San Diego are looking forward to receiving quality ems care in the community through a open and transparent rfp process. Our life members are disappointed the city will be restarting the time intensive rfp process again providing a short term solution through an extension of the current provider. As the president of NAACP San Diego branch I am calling on the city council to be bolder leaders and not business as usual.</p>
4/5/2020 16:01	Nancy Maldonado	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	<p>Chicano Federation is a 51-year old nonprofit whose mission is to invested in undeserved communities through a variety of programs aimed at building resiliency and promoting self-sufficiency. During this pandemic we have witnessed the importance of continuing our mission and providing consistent and comprehensive, neighborhood-based services. We know the City shares that goal. Therefore, we respectfully encourage you to continue to move towards bringing the long-discussed EMS contract to a final resolution.</p> <p>The current crisis has placed more demands on our medical system leaving thousands of San Diegans uncertain if they can get the care they need in the coming months. We believe the current EMS extension does assuage some of these doubts. However, what is best for residents is for the RFP to be released and awarded as soon as possible. This will provide the City with greater flexibility and oversight to address quality of service and competitive rates. With a stable provider, this council moves forward in ensuring that your constituents have confidence in their EMS system. We implore that with the next provider, you can give us assurances that when our community members call for help, there will be an ambulance ready.</p>

4/6/2020 12:17	Iris S Garcia	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	<p>For two decades the San Diego Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (SDCHCC) has served as one of the leading Hispanic organization in the City, advocating for the Hispanic businessperson and the Latino community. We have a diverse membership of over 500 members who strives to create and promote a favorable business climate that provides equitable access to the market. To create that climate, it's important that government be part of those efforts. The recent news regarding the award and recent cancelation of the EMS RFP raises concerns about that climate and the ability for a fair process.</p> <p>That is why we would encourage the Council to help mitigate those concerns by approving an extension to the existing EMS contract that provides flexibility. We believe that this will provide the City of San Diego with greater oversight and ensure all providers, incumbent or new, continue to operate in the best interest of the City and its residents.</p> <p>Given our reality of the coronavirus pandemic, its budget implications, community members and businesses cannot afford to have doubts about the equity of service. Although another extension is needed, we need to ensure that a new contract is enacted as soon as possible.</p>
4/6/2020 12:31	Mike Murphy on beh	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	<p>Thank you for your time today, AMR supports the Fifth Amendment and greatly appreciates the San Diego Fire Rescue Department, the Purchasing and Contracting Department and the City Attorney's office for working with us during these unprecedented times to draft this agreement for your consideration today. It is our honor to work on behalf of the City of San Diego to provide EMS services.</p>

4/6/2020 12:33	John Borja	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	<p>Greetings City Councilmembers,</p> <p>My name is John Borja and I am a resident of the North Park neighborhood in District 3. Having heard about the recent RFP cancellation and now the contract extension for emergency services, I would like to contribute to the discussion regarding our collective options. I support a limited extension which will provide City staff (and residents like me) the oversight needed over the incumbent provider while we once again proceed with a new RFP process after nearly two decades of not going to bid.</p> <p>Once the City makes their final selection, we can all feel secure that our tax dollars are being spent responsibly and fairly with a competitive vendor. Now more than ever, I want to know that my family and neighbors have a reliable service provider we can count on. The sooner we manage to get through this process, the sooner we know City Council has reviewed what is in the best interest for San Diego's emergency medical calls. Thank you for your time and attention during this difficult time</p> <p>-John Borja</p>
4/6/2020 13:00	Iris Garcia	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	<p>For two decades the San Diego Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (SDCHCC) has served as one of the leading Hispanic organization in the City, advocating for the Hispanic businessperson and the Latino community. We have a diverse membership of over 500 members who strives to create and promote a favorable business climate that provides equitable access to the market. To create that climate, it's important that government be part of those efforts. The recent news regarding the award and recent cancelation of the EMS RFP raises concerns about that climate and the ability for a fair process.</p> <p>That is why we would encourage the Council to help mitigate those concerns by approving an extension to the existing EMS contract that provides flexibility. We believe that this will provide the City of San Diego with greater oversight and ensure all providers, incumbent or new, continue to operate in the best interest of the City and its residents.</p> <p>Given our reality of the coronavirus pandemic, its budget implications, community members and businesses cannot afford to have doubts about the equity of service. Although another extension is needed, we need to ensure that a new contract is enacted as soon as possible.</p>

4/6/2020 14:42	Rodolfo Lopez	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	<p>Good afternoon Council President and Member of the City Council.</p> <p>My name is Rudy Lopez. I come from a family of long-time San Ysidro residents and am currently a San Ysidro School District Trustee. I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in this meeting virtually while we all do our part to keep the city safe. With our wellbeing at the top of everyone's thoughts, I urge the council to move towards a swift resolution to our EMS contract which should be released as quickly as possible. We are grateful this extension is being considered to ensure residents will continue to receive timely care. However, a long-term solution should not be delayed to avoid any decrease in quality of care if a new provider is awarded the contract.</p> <p>In this new RFP, we urge you to make certain that ambulances reach every corner of the City, especially in District 8. Our residents seek equity in the next provider and look for the shortest possible extension period to counter any ineffectual service that may come from the transition. It is imperative our residents maintain confidence in medical service providers, especially during these trying times.</p> <p>Thank you and stay safe.</p>
----------------	---------------	----------	-------------------------	-----	--

4/6/2020 15:35	Troy Hagen	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	621	<p>Falck California is fortunate to safely deliver our remarks virtually to this council, and we look forward to a future competitive RFP process to deliver emergency medical services to the City of San Diego. Our team stands ready to continue the forward momentum once the new RFP is released. Meanwhile, we consider the current contract extension a necessary action to ensure the health and safety of this city's residents.</p> <p>More than ever, it is critical that the City proceeds expeditiously towards the release of a new RFP to inaugurate a competitive process leading to the establishment of the emergency medical services that every San Diegan deserves. Ultimately, Falck is confident that the City of San Diego will select the right company to provide accountable, affordable and clinically competent care for the community.</p> <p>Additionally, during this unprecedented time, Falck pledges our help and support to San Diego as an additional source of relief to the existing medical infrastructure. With more than 113 years of bringing rapid help to people in urgent situations, we stand at the ready with our resources, expertise and commitment to assist.</p>
----------------	------------	----------	-------------------------	-----	---

4/6/2020 15:37	Keith Maddox	4/7/2020	City Council Comment	626	<p>Current language includes the sentence: "This measure required a two-thirds vote for approval. Measure C did not receive the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the qualified voters voting on the measure and is hereby declared to have been defeated." We respectfully ask the City Council to amend the Resolution by removing this language.</p> <p>Our legal counsel advised us that declaring Measure C is defeated is problematic given recent lower court rulings suggesting that special tax citizens initiatives require a simple majority of voters to pass. Pending litigation brought by the City of San Francisco is pursuing higher court rulings confirming these lower court decisions. While litigation proceeds, legal clarification is required before the final result of Measure C can be determined.</p> <p>The draft resolution should be amended to include the final vote count, ensuring that the election is certified as required by law, and acknowledging the need for clarification by the courts to determine the ultimate result. This meets all of the standards required in the City Charter and Municipal Code. Upholding the will of the voters is imperative, and this language acknowledges that to do so, court clarification is required before a final determination can be made.</p>
----------------	--------------	----------	-------------------------	-----	--

4/6/2020 20:34	Jaymie Bradford	4/7/2020	City Council	626	<p>RE: ITEM 626: Results of March 3, 2020 Municipal Primary Election and Municipal Special Election in the City of San Diego Subitem III, Measure C</p> <p>Dear Honorable City Council,</p> <p>On behalf of the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, I respectfully request the City Council to remove the following language currently included in the resolution:</p> <p>“This measure required a two-thirds vote for approval. Measure C did not receive the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the qualified voters voting on the measure and is hereby declared to have been defeated.”</p> <p>It is critical to ensure the City of San Diego is in the most advantageous legal position as the courts consider the fate of ballot measures brought forth by citizens. Over 65% of the voters in San Diego supported Measure C. It would be a shame should a legal outcome be favorable to the measure, yet the voters’ will could not be upheld because of the current language in the resolution.</p> <p>Your attention to this matter is very much appreciated, as is the work you continue to do on behalf of your constituents during this time. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jaymie Bradford San Diego Regional Chamber</p>
----------------	-----------------	----------	--------------	-----	--

4/7/2020 8:34	Joe Terzi	4/7/2020	City Council	626	<p>my comments address certification of the election results for Measure C. While the City has the responsibility to certify the results, it is not required to render a conclusion about the legal significance of the results. The vast majority of San Diegans,</p> <p>voted in support of this critical measure.</p> <p>It is even more critical today to find resources to address the three issues included in Measure C. There are unprecedented times and our Country, State and City are all dealing with devastating impact of Covid-19. Vital Citywide Conventions have been force to cancel, and the Tourism industry, the third largest source of income San Diego is literally shut down! Our Convention Center has now been converted to a shelter to assist homeless and to provide needed support for essential City services.</p> <p>There is uncertainty whether Proposition 218's supermajority requirements for local taxes applies to those proposed by initiative given the Supreme Court's ruling in the City of Upland case. Additionally there are 3 cases on this issue pending before the First District Court of Appeals.</p> <p>I urge you, certify the results but to NOT comment on the legal significance until the courts tell us what the law is.</p>
---------------	-----------	----------	--------------	-----	--

4/7/2020 8:37	Donna Frye	4/7/2020	City Council	626	<p>I encourage you to make no changes to the proposed resolution (R-2020-442) that declares Measure C defeated.</p> <p>The ballot materials informed the voters that passage of Measure C required a two-thirds vote. Those materials were available for public inspection, and the vote threshold specified in the materials was never challenged in court.</p> <p>It is improper to deem an initiative to have passed when it received more than a simple-majority vote but fell short of a super-majority vote when the ballot materials stated that the latter was required, even if it turned out after the election that a simple-majority vote would have been sufficient. Courts view such conduct as amounting to "fraud on the voters." Hass v. City Council of City of Palm Springs, 139 Cal. App. 2d 73 (1956).</p> <p>It could not be more clear. The voters are legally entitled to rely on the ballot materials prepared by the City. I therefore urge you to declare Measure C defeated for failure to achieve the two-thirds threshold represented to the voters. That is what happened; please do not try to pretend otherwise.</p>
---------------	------------	----------	--------------	-----	---

4/7/2020 8:39	Joe Terzi	4/7/2020	City Council	626	<p>my comments address certification of the election results for Measure C. While the City has the responsibility to certify the results, it is not required to render a conclusion about the legal significance of the results. The vast majority of San Diegans,</p> <p>voted in support of this critical measure.</p> <p>It is even more critical today to find resources to address the three issues included in Measure C. There are unprecedented times and our Country, State and City are all dealing with devastating impact of Covid-19. Vital Citywide Conventions have been force to cancel, and the Tourism industry, the third largest source of income San Diego is literally shut down! Our Convention Center has now been converted to a shelter to assist homeless and to provide needed support for essential City services.</p> <p>There is uncertainty whether Proposition 218's supermajority requirements for local taxes applies to those proposed by initiative given the Supreme Court's ruling in the City of Upland case. Additionally there are 3 cases on this issue pending before the First District Court of Appeals.</p>
---------------	-----------	----------	--------------	-----	--

4/7/2020 8:53	Michael Colantuono	4/7/2020	City Council	626	<p>On the result of Measure C: I encourage the Council to delete the sentence of the resolution which declares the measure was defeated. The truth is, we do not know. Although the Council has a legal duty to declare the results of the elections, this means the facts — how many votes for and against. It need not — ought not to — make a determination as to legal significance of nearly, but not quite, 2/3 approval. Courts will decide that in pending appeals involving San Francisco, Oakland and Fresno. Out of respect for the large majority of voters who approved Measure C, I encourage the Council to state the facts, make no effort to collect the tax, and await clarification of the law, which is presently uncertain.</p>
4/7/2020 9:23	Marshall Anderson	4/7/2020	City Council	626	<p>Marshall Anderson, on behalf of the Downtown San Diego Partnership. We respectfully request that the language accompanying the 65.24% vote in the affirmative for Measure C be amended to strike: "This measure required a two-thirds vote for approval. Measure C did not receive the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the qualified voters voting on the measure and is hereby declared to have been defeated." We believe additional legal analysis is needed to ultimately determine the result of Measure C and urge Council to amend the Resolution. Thank you.</p>

4/7/2020 10:21	Stephen Russell	4/7/2020	City Council	627	<p>As Executive Director, I'd like to express San Diego Housing Federation's enthusiastic support for establishing emergency shelter and service operations at the Convention Center. We applaud the swift, decisive action from the City, County, San Diego Housing Commission, and Regional Task Force on the Homeless to address the immediate needs of our unsheltered neighbors. At a time when social distancing is needed to end the health emergency, it is imperative that all residents have access to a safe, sanitary place to shelter.</p> <p>This is an essential step toward addressing the immediate needs of our homeless population, but we should also be planning now for when the health emergency ends. That means finding and creating permanent housing opportunities for all who temporarily sheltered in the Convention Center. As unfortunate as the circumstances are, the temporary sheltering of most, if not all unsheltered residents is a laudable achievement and presents unprecedented opportunity to permanently end chronic homelessness in San Diego. The San Diego Housing Federation again thanks you for your effort and stands ready to work with each of the involved organizations to find and create the safe, permanent, and affordable homes our city needs.</p>
----------------	-----------------	----------	--------------	-----	--

4/4/2020 15:09	Lorayne Burley	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Comments for Item 1: HAR20-014</p> <p>Deny the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments (SMA).</p> <p>The SMA is not located in a Transit Priority Area (TPA) and should not qualify for a bonus density and two incentives. The closest bus stop to this project is 2 miles away. SR wants transit and has made requests to both SSTAC and MTS to get some type of transit options. Can we please have transit before density?</p> <p>San Diego Unified (SDU) states that the SMA affordable housing units would be offered to SDU staff and teachers for housing, not very low-income SD families. The HA should not approve bond funds for SDU employee housing.</p> <p>Staff report omits the fact that five Scripps Ranch advisory groups ALL voted to oppose this project. The developer never offered to discuss any project modifications. Community told that SMA was "done-deal" with a ministerial city review. Does this satisfy the HA community engagement requirement?</p> <p>Please help us work toward a reasonable SMA development: deny the current funding authorization.</p>
4/4/2020 15:33	Lisa Croner	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014.</p> <p>Please DENY AUTHORIZATION of bonds funding the Scripps Mesa Apartments. There are housing projects that deserve bonds. This is not one of them.</p> <p>The project has met with almost universal opposition in Scripps Ranch. It violates legally binding Community Plan requirements for building height, bulk, and function. Density bonus incentives do not justify the combination of legal violations. The project is the subject of an active lawsuit raising valid objections that will be addressed in court.</p>

4/4/2020 16:23	Barbara and Don W	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	We are strongly opposed to issuing the bond for the Scripps Mesa apartment complex. The project is totally incompatible with the Scripps Ranch long range plan and is a misuse of money and of the property. Every planning group in SR opposes this and so do the residents. The problems this project will cause are many including traffic problems, density, and misuse of the property which should be used for a school or other community structure. Please do not vote for this.
4/4/2020 16:28	Keshav Gopinath	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project. The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. The Scripps Ranch (SR) community opposes the plan. The business deal includes unethical use of bond funds. The dramatic increase in local density will cause dangerous traffic problems on an evacuation route that is essential for the fire dangers that exist in our community. Additionally Scripps Poway Parkway is a congested road even without these apartments and commuters face long waits during rush hour trying to get on and off I-15. The SDUSD and developer, along with City organizations, have treated the community badly and stonewalled attempts at compromise. SR is not against affordable housing; we have affordable housing and we have apartments. SR is against the way this particular project has been designed and forced onto the community. The HA should not support this approach to development. The HA may think that prior approvals (now being legally challenged) justify this project, but this is wrong: the HA is bound to respect the lawful interests of the community, and the SR community has major valid objections to this project. This is a gross waste of funds.

4/4/2020 16:32	Anita Gopinath	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project. The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. The business deal includes unethical use of bond funds with very low financial gain for SDUSD. It is shocking that SDUSD shuts down a school, moves it to a business park spending millions for pennies on the dollar. SDUSD and developer, along with City organizations, have treated the community badly and stonewalled attempts at compromise. SR is not against affordable housing; we have it and we have apartments. SR is against the way this particular project has been designed and forced onto the community. The HA should not support this approach to development. The HA may think that prior approvals (now being legally challenged) justify this project, but this is wrong: the HA is bound to respect the lawful interests of the community, and the SR community has major valid objections to this project.
4/4/2020 16:35	Magesh Hariharan	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014 I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apts. SDUSD has treated scripps ranch like a cash cow for \$ and has not respected the community opinion.
4/4/2020 17:11	Valerie Lake	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. The Scripps Ranch community opposes the plan for so many reasons from safety to unethical business dealing, but fundamentally it completely violates common sense from both a community character and business deal perspective. Its a lose lose lose proposition. There are ideas that are smarter and more community appropriate with better financials for this property. Please take a step back and re-think holistically a best use for this site. Why ruin one of the best neighborhoods in the city.

4/4/2020 17:36	SALLY SMITH	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Comments for Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014.</p> <p>Deny the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments (SMA). This is a poor use of tax money. This developer is already getting sweetheart deal on taxpayers backs from San Diego Unified School District. The SMA is not located in a Transit Priority Area (TPA) and should not qualify for a bonus density and two incentives. I oppose this plan.</p> <p>Staff report omits the fact that five Scripps Ranch advisory groups ALL voted to oppose this project. The developer never offered to discuss any project modifications. Community told that SMA was "done-deal" with a ministerial city review. Does this satisfy the HA community engagement requirement?</p>
4/4/2020 22:16	Chris Jones	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project. The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. SR is not against affordable housing; we have it and we have apartments. SR is against the way this particular project has been designed and forced onto the community.</p>

4/4/2020 22:42	William Zhang	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014</p> <p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments, because children are our hope and our future. Children's interests should be in higher priorities. We don't like that our lovely school is being replaced by an apartment complex, even though the school will be relocated.</p> <p>Since this area is a high fire-hazard region, we pay more premium to insurance companies every year, (some insurance companies even do not quote because of higher fire risks). The apartment project will dramatically increase local density and fire risks.</p> <p>Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>
4/5/2020 2:19	Emily Dresslar	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments ("SMA"). The SMA is not located in a Transit Priority Area (TPA) and does not qualify for a bonus density and two incentives. The closest bus stop to this project is 2 miles away. Any future plans of providing a transit stop near the project must be effectuated prior to authorization of bond funds.</p>
4/5/2020 9:04	Soumitra Ghosh	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. Building these apartments will result in a dramatic increase in local density that will cause dangerous traffic problems on an evacuation route. In addition, the proposed construction is in an area that is a fire hazard region.</p>
4/5/2020 10:21	Sam	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. Tax payers already struggled to pay new bond. Please do not waste money on these non sense! Our kids need Innovation Academy to stay in the community!</p>

4/5/2020 11:00	William Walsh	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	I am opposed the construction of the Scripps Mesa Apartments. PLEASE follow the law!!! Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project. The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. The Scripps Ranch (SR) community opposes the plan. The business deal includes unethical use of bond funds. The area is a high fire-hazard region, and the dramatic increase in local density will cause dangerous traffic problems on an evacuation route. The SDUSD and developer, along with City organizations, have treated the community badly and stonewalled attempts at compromise. SR is not against affordable housing; we have it and we have apartments. SR is against the way this particular project has been designed and forced onto the community. The HA should NOT support this approach to development. The HA may think that prior approvals (NOW BEING LEGALLY CHALLENGED and will be taken to litigation) justify this project, but this is wrong: the HA is bound to RESPECT THE LAWFUL INTERESTS of the community, and the SR community has major valid objections to this project.
----------------	---------------	----------	---------------------------------	------	---

4/5/2020 12:08	Stephen D Rosen	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Comments for Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014.</p> <p>I respectfully request denying authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments (SMA).</p> <p>Developer omits the FACT that EVERY community organization REJECTED/DENIED the project for legitimate and legal reasons. Community was told to pound sand by SDUSD and the developer repeatedly advised the community this project was ministerial and community had no input. Profit land grab at community expense.</p> <p>The claim of low-cost housing for teachers ignores that starting SDUSD salaries are ABOVE the qualification threshold. In addition, the State requirements for Joint Occupancy requires a minimum of 2% for SDUSD - this project allocates less than that.</p> <p>SDUSD used restricted property tax bond money of \$54 million (taxpayer liability of over \$100 million payback over generations) to relocate the Charter School and direct the lease payments from the project into the unrestricted General Fund. A VERY BAD PRECEDENT.</p> <p>The SMA is not located in a TPA and should not qualify for a bonus density and two incentives. Closest bus stop is 2 miles away. SR wants transit and has made requests to both SSTAC and MTS to get transit options.</p>
----------------	-----------------	----------	---------------------------	------	---

4/5/2020 12:12	Srikanth M	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments.”
4/5/2020 12:30	Christine Farnsworth	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014</p> <p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. he SDUSD and developer, along with City organizations, have treated the community badly and stonewalled attempts at compromise.</p> <p>Thank you very much, Christine Farnsworth</p>
4/5/2020 13:06	Carol Beissel	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>I appose authorization of bond for Scripps Mesa Apartments. iv.</p> <p>Agenda item 1 HAR20-014 iii.</p>

4/5/2020 13:17	Tim Farnsworth	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. The project design clearly violates the legally binding Community Plan. The Scripps Ranch (SR) community opposes the plan. The business deal includes unethical use of bond funds. The SDUSD and developer, along with City organizations, have treated the community poorly and stonewalled attempts at compromise. Don't force this onto the community. The HA may think that prior approvals (now being legally challenged) justify this project, but this is wrong: the HA is bound to respect the lawful interests of the community, and the SR community has major valid objections to this project.
4/5/2020 16:48	Jodi Beissel	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project. The Scripps Ranch community strongly opposes this plan. The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. Our community has had to evacuate for fires twice since I've lived here and dramatic increase in local density will cause dangerous traffic problems on an evacuation route. The SDUSD is unwilling to work with the community and stonewalled attempts at compromise. SR is not against affordable housing; we have it and we have apartments. SR is against the way this particular project has been designed and forced onto the community. The HA should not support this approach to development. The HA may think that prior approvals (now being legally challenged) justify this project, but this is wrong: the HA is bound to respect the lawful interests of the community, and the SR community has major valid objections to this project.

4/5/2020 17:48	Joan Gass	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	I strongly oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. This project, on public land, profits only the developer. The SDUSD loses both the use of the property and money in a deal that goes against the interests of the community, without adding significantly to the below market housing inventory . Housing authority money, public money , should not pay for a private project. Public funds should go to projects such as the one in Chula Vista that provides 100% of the housing units for teachers and other school employees. As a Housing Authority, I believe you have an obligation to use your funds in the best interest of the taxpayers who provide the money, not in the interest of a for-profit developer. With your admonition that inexpensive money is not available for this project, the developer might finally be willing to meet seriously with community members to develop this parcel of public land to benefit not only himself but also the residents of the community. Such a project could be a win-win for both groups. The history of Scripps Ranch is the history of a partnership between all developers and the community.
4/5/2020 21:46	Michael Malone	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014 - I strongly oppose the authorization of bond funds for Scripps Mesa Apartments. The SDUSD and developer, along with City organizations, have formed an unethical deal that violates the community plan and is an unethical use of bond funds. This project seems to be less about affordable housing and more about the developer and SDUSD profiting from the land at the expense of the community and taxpayers.

4/6/2020 9:46	Peter Bonavich	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>For affordable housing bonds to issue, state policy requires: "The project to be financed or applicant requesting financing must promote economic development and demonstrate tangible public benefits to the community in which it resides." (From https://www.calpfa.org/policies-and-fees/general-policies/).</p> <p>Applicant has not demonstrated tangible public benefits to the community in which it resides. It has not honored its obligation to demonstrate benefits but instead has stiff-armed the community. Applicant misrepresented and impugned the motives of residents and community representatives, condoning false charges that Scripps Ranch residents have an "I've Got Mine" attitude toward affordable housing. Members of SDHA have responsibilities and duties different from and independent of their duties as Councilmembers. Bonds should not be approved for this project. The project has only 20% of its units designated as affordable. The other 80% are appropriately designated as luxury, not affordable, units. It would be a misuse of bond authority to approve bond issuance.</p> <p>Monarch has stonewalled and refused to consider community input; the project blatantly disregards the Community Plan; it disregards legitimate zoning, planning, and land use concerns.</p> <p>Applicant misuses the density bonus and related provisions for the cynical purpose of avoiding community plan and zoning provisions and maximizing its revenue and profit.</p>
4/6/2020 10:17	Louise Merrithew	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014</p> <p>The Scripps Mesa Project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. Please deny authorization of the bond funds for this project. I have lived through two major fires in San Diego County that included Scripps Ranch both times and found the access out of Scripps Ranch is very limited. Allowing so many new dwelling is a hazard for any evacuation plan or route. Adding so many more cars to the already heavily traveled Scripps Poway Parkway is unconscionable. I am against how the San Diego Unified School District and the developer have designed and pushed this project onto the community.</p>

4/6/2020 10:48	Jean L. Feinstein	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Request from Monarch/Essex for \$100,000,000 item 1:HAR2014</p> <p>Deny the Authorizaton of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments</p> <p>The Housing Authority has been asked by Monarch/Essex for \$100,000,000 to construct 264 luxury apartments, Scripps Mesa Apartments. Of those, 53(20%) are low income/affordable. Thus, \$80,000,000 will go to the construction of luxury apartments solely for the benefit of a for-profit developer. The parcel is owned by San Diego Unified School District which has used to date \$54,000,000 S,Z and YY GObond funds to relocate a charter school in exchange for a lease agreement from Monarch for \$40,000,000 parceled out over 66 years. There is an additional apartment complex under construction and 2 large developments projected for the future. There is little existing land. Where will the children from those 4 sites be educated?</p> <p>Monarch has not worked with any community group to modify its plans to meet portions of the community plan. The community has a 50 year history of working collaboratively with developers including low-income/affordable apartments and section 8 housing.</p> <p>Deny the funding authorization.</p>
----------------	-------------------	----------	---------------------------	------	---

4/6/2020 13:07	Summer Spencer	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014. I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan, and the business deal includes unethical use of bond funds to remove a school (community benefit) and replace it with luxury apartments (and less than 10 affordable) that will overwhelm the community's vehicular infrastructure.
4/6/2020 13:28	Melissa Ward	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014. I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project. The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. The Scripps Ranch (SR) community opposes the plan. The business deal includes unethical use of bond funds. The area is a high fire-hazard region, and the dramatic increase in local density will cause dangerous traffic problems on an evacuation route. The SDUSD and developer, along with City organizations, have treated the community badly and stonewalled attempts at compromise. SR is not against affordable housing; we have it and we have apartments. SR is against the way this particular project has been designed and forced onto the community. The HA should not support this approach to development. The HA may think that prior approvals (now being legally challenged) justify this project, but this is wrong: the HA is bound to respect the lawful interests of the community, and the SR community has major valid objections to this project.

4/6/2020 13:34	Marco Gonzalez	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Coast Law Group LLP represents the Applicant, Monarch Group. We'd like to provide a brief clarification of some information in the staff report:</p> <p>At page 8 , the section entitled "Environmental Review" is technically incorrect. The project is a "by-right" development requiring only building permits from the City. CEQA compliance was long ago completed by San Diego Unified School District, and no further action under CEQA is required. This is accurately reflected in the resolution you are considering today.</p> <p>So, where the staff report notes: "Future actions to consider and approve development entitlement approvals related to the future development of the site will require additional review under the provisions of CEQA by the lead agency," it should instead note that because an EIR for development of the project was previously adopted, no additional CEQA review will be required, and the action being taken at this time involves only consideration of the approval of the issuance of the Bonds, and so is not a "project" and is therefore not subject to CEQA pursuant to Guidelines Section 15060(c)(3).</p>
----------------	----------------	----------	---------------------------	------	---

4/6/2020 14:02	Eric Johnson	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014. I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. The Scripps Ranch (SR) community opposes the plan. The area is a high fire-hazard region as seen by the Cedar and Witch fires, and the dramatic increase in local density will cause dangerous traffic problems on an already crowded evacuation route, jeopardizing the safety of all the current residents of Scripps Ranch and Poway. In addition to this, the developer and Housing Authority has not worked with the community to find a reasonable compromise as the majority or residents oppose this development. Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project.</p>
----------------	--------------	----------	---------------------------	------	--

4/6/2020 14:18	Diane Pipkin	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014</p> <p>Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project. The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. The business deal includes the unethical use of bond funds. The area is a high fire-hazard region, and the dramatic increase in local density will cause dangerous traffic problems on an evacuation route. The SDUSD and developer, along with City organizations, have treated the community badly and stonewalled attempts at compromise. SR is not against affordable housing; we have it and we have apartments. SR is against the way this particular project has been designed and forced onto the community. The HA should not support this approach to development. The HA may think that prior approvals (now being legally challenged) justify this project, but this is wrong: the HA is bound to respect the lawful interests of the community, and the SR community has major valid objections to this project.</p>
4/6/2020 14:23	susan flanagan	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>I oppose authorization of bond funds for Scripps-Mesa Apartments. It would worsen our traffic problems immensely.</p>

4/6/2020 14:27	Cheryl Kilpatrick	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	Housing Authority Agenda 1: HAR20-014. I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan. This business deal includes unethical use of bond funds. This area is a high fire hazard region and the increase in local density will cause even greater traffic problems on evacuation routes. The HA should not support this approach to development and should respect the lawful interests of the community which strongly objects this project.
----------------	-------------------	----------	---------------------------------	------	--

4/6/2020 14:38	glenn peterson	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	I am writing to voice opposition to your use of housing bonds to fund Monarch apartment capital projects. To achieve a gain of 55 low income units is such a small piece of this overall project and revenue stream. I believe if more taxpayers understood this use they would begin voting no on these misleading propositions and initiatives
4/6/2020 14:50	Edgardo Dimagiba J	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments.

4/6/2020 15:05	Craig Lammers	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments. Monarch's Scripps Mesa project has been opposed by most all Scripps Ranch residents, and all community planning groups. Scripps Ranch is not opposed to affordable or high-density housing projects, as there are several apartment complexes in our community approved without resistance.</p> <p>Supporting Monarch would misuse funds. Monarch presents the Scripps Mesa project as an affordable housing project. In reality, Scripps Mesa is a LUXURY apartment project with only 20% of the units designated as affordable housing. Scripps Mesa is NOT an affordable housing project!</p> <p>Monarch has made no effort to engage, communicate, or work with the community. Monarch's project is precedent setting in that it bulldozes and displaces a successful charter school, misuses school bond funds, and results in a significant financial loss to a financially struggling school district. \$54M in bond funds was misused to unnecessarily move a successful charter school from an idyllic park setting to an industrial zone in close proximity of a strip club. In return, SDUSD would earn \$40M over 66 years from Monarch (equivalent to <\$10M w/ inflation). A total loss. This is NOT the model for housing that should be supported.</p>
4/6/2020 15:20	Shannon Ward	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014</p> <p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments.</p> <p>SR is not against affordable housing; we have it and we have apartments. SR is against the way this particular project has been designed and forced onto the community. The HA should not support this approach to development. The HA may think that prior approvals (now being legally challenged) justify this project, but this is wrong: the HA is bound to respect the lawful interests of the community, and the SR community has major valid objections to this project.</p>
4/6/2020 15:37	Paul Argraves	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa apartments. Please deny authorization of the bond funds for the scripps mesa project. The scripps ranch community opposes the plan. The business deal includes unethical use of bond funds. The SDUSD and developer, along with the city organizations, have treated the community badly and stonewalled attempts at compromise.</p>

4/6/2020 15:41	Linda Schoeneberg	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>HAR20-14</p> <p>I very strongly oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments as it is an unethical use of bond funds. In addition, the community's interest has been completely disregarded in the process because the community plan has been totally ignored. This is not right. The decision makers from the school board or the developer will not live here and suffer the consequences. Apart from either of these concerns, I have a personal safety reason in that I travel through that intersection almost daily and it is already highly congested with traffic. The addition of hundreds of cars will only increase the difficulties and dangers on this fire evacuation route. Please - let the Scripps Ranch community determine what will best serve it's area.</p>
4/6/2020 17:20	Daniel Schumann	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014.</p> <p>I oppose the authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa Apartments.</p> <p>The project design violates the legally binding Community Plan.</p> <p>The area is a high fire-hazard region, and the dramatic increase in local density will cause dangerous traffic problems on an evacuation route.</p> <p>Scripps Ranch is not against affordable housing; we have it, and we have apartments. Scripps Ranch is against using public school resources for commercial development that violates the Community Plan.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>

4/6/2020 18:57	Shay Schweinfurter	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>Housing Authority, Agenda Item 1: HAR20-014</p> <p>Please deny authorization of bond funds for the Scripps Mesa project: 1) per pending lawsuit (Case No. 37-2020-00005321-CU-WM-CTL) as Petition pertains to permitting of the construction of all 264 units, including 53 very low income units; 2) Key Stake Holders and Projected Impact: This project does not have positive impact on community (all community groups oppose project, removal of neighborhood school, removal of beloved Farmer's Market, and dangerous traffic issues in high fire-hazard region.)</p>
4/6/2020 20:34	Craig A. Sherman	4/7/2020	Housing Authority Comment	HA-1	<p>The law office of Craig Sherman has prepared and delivered a written comment letter that was submitted on behalf of the community group, Voice for Scripps Ranch. The letter and its 3 attachment should have been received and distributed to each of you in advance of today's meeting. This matter involves a pressing legal issue in which the Housing Authority may not authorize bonds for a project that, number 1, is inconsistent with the local Miramar Ranch North Community Plan, and number 2, has not yet been properly reviewed and approved, nor can it be without an appropriate development application and development permit for the underlying Project. The Housing Authority should not grant the requested approval – which includes an almost immediate funding and issuance of bonds – for an unapproved housing development project that violates numerous objective community plan standards. This is true despite the important housing benefits offered by the proposed 264-unit Project. On behalf of the many local community members that Voice of Scripps Ranch represents, my client requests a "No" vote on Item - 1.</p>
4/4/2020 9:56	Louis Rodolico	4/7/2020	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>Our street is scheduled to receive additional fire hydrants; the entire street will need to be ditched. We are also a street that has overhead; power & data lines. Can council review adding electrical & data conduit while the street is opened up for hydrant ditching? It would be a reasonable cost saving measure.</p> <p>Our street is a North-South finger mesa which is susceptible to high Santa Ana and Ocean winds. I once witnessed flying debris catch fire when it hit electrical power lines. SDG&E should prioritize undergrounding wiring to those locations where power lines post the greatest risk, like high wind exposure finger mesas. Thank You, Louis Rodolico</p>

4/7/2020 10:26	Hillary Melcolm	4/7/2020	Non-Agenda Comment		Beware of excessive measures that will ruin residents lives such as Misdemeanors and jail time for covid response and enforcement. This will impact employment possibilities in a future where opportunities will be scarce as hundreds of employers have shuttered. Furthermore, injecting the jail system with new inmates can contribute to the spread of covid in the incarcerated population. Treat covid ticketing as parking violations - financial fine, not record damage! Reflect on not becoming a totalitarian state, hold composure in trying times.
----------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------	--	---