



Planning + Landscape Architecture
3916 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103

CITY OF SAN DIEGO - FIESTA ISLAND GDP, COASTAL COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES Meeting Date: April 27, 2009

DISTRIBUTION:

City Staff

			<u>Attendance</u>
Paul Jacob	City of S.D. – Park & Rec. Dept.	pjacob@saniego.gov	yes
Stacey Lomedico	City of S.D. – Park & Rec. Dept	SLomedico@saniego.gov	yes

Consultants

Michael Singleton	KTU+A L.A. & Planning	mike@ktua.com	yes
Cheri Blatner	KTU+A L.A. & Planning	cheri@ktua.com	yes

Resource Agencies

Ellen Lirley	California Coastal Commission	elirley@coastal.ca.gov	yes
Deborah Lee	California Coastal Commission	dlee@coastal.ca.gov	yes
Sherilyn Sarb	California Coastal Commission		yes

Fiesta Island Dog Owners Representative – “FIDO”

Carolyn Chase	FIDO	cdchase@sdearthtimes.net	yes
---------------	------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

ITEM DISCUSSION:

1. Mike Singleton gave an update of the General Development Plan Process history and current status for Fiesta Island.
2. The group reviewed Carolyn Chase’s “FIDO” alternative plan (FIDO Plans 1-3), which suggests alternative sites in Mission Bay for other organizations and their activities (in particular, move the paddlers to South Shores and relocate the parking lot proposed @ southwest beach further north on Fiesta Island). By doing this, it would eliminate a good portion of the proposed road to the “Southwest Beach” that currently separates the off leash dog areas.
3. Mike asked would the current plans shown on Alternative 4h be in conformance with the adopted Master Plan, LCP and SeaWorld Expansion requirements? **Staff Response:** *Probably, but no real assurances until it would be reviewed at the full commission level. Would the same be true for a new Alternative 4i (similar to 4h but with the roadway shortened, parking lot pulled back and possible increase in leash free acreage and access policies)? Probably but with the same caveats listed above.*
4. Mike asked CC staff if the southwest corner becomes completely used for off-leash dog use with no parking, beach access, roadway access, launch ramp or picnic areas, would this be considered in substantial conformance with the master plan, the LCP and the conditions of the SeaWorld Expansion? **Staff Response:** *Deborah Lee stated there needs to be reasonable accommodations made for all public uses including dog use. If access is improved for the general population, then it helps to address public demand. If there are ways to address all uses, then pursue them. The more multiple uses the better. The more parking, trail and visual access the better. Coastal Commission suggested moving the remote parking lot (shown on the FIDO plan) closer to the beach so it is not so far away. Carolyn will support this to move as long as it allows for more contiguous walking areas than the previous plan.*
5. Mike asked CC staff if they thought the plans from FIDO (FIDO 1-3) would be in conformance with the approved Mission Bay Park Master Plan, Mission Bay Park LCP and the conditions of the permit and Master

Plan amendment related to the SeaWorld Expansion? **Staff Response:** Staff reiterated that the intent of the Mission Bay Park Master Plan needs to be reached, not specific locations and sizes. However, if a particular use is dropped completely, then the plans may not be in conformance with the adopted plans and policies. Staff indicated that it would be up to the Coastal Commission staff to determine if the new Fiesta Island GDP or some alternative that FIDO suggests, was in conformance or not. If not, then a Mission Bay Park Master Plan amendment and LCP amendment would be likely. No permits would be issued by the Coastal Commission (coastal development permits) until this determination were made. The City of San Diego has indicated that they would like to see the entire GDP obtain one Site Development Permit, and if a Coastal Development Permit was also obtained, and the Environmental review was certified, then just individual permits for construction and building would be required at the local level (except for some federal and state agency permits).

6. It was pointed out that the road location in Alternative 4h (& most previous versions) was generally held 300' from the water's edge to reserve these areas for beach and aquatic uses. In the southwest corner, keeping this 300' may not be either feasible or warranted in the area where the jet skiing operations. Based on the permit requirements for this use, no water use by the general public is allowed. Mike suggested possibly expanding the beach area further to the east making it more accessible. Carolyn feels that a parking lot does not need to be located right at the beach. The word "accessible" doesn't mean people can't walk a ways to their destination.
7. Mike asked what priority should be given to aquatic based uses along the shoreline of Fiesta Island, compared with other non-aquatic and special uses (such as leash free dog use) along this same shoreline? Does the coastal act provide direction on this situation? **Staff Response:** Yes there is some language associated within the coastal act that gives priorities to aquatic uses. Deborah stated "if paddlers want to stay", then that's a right that needs to be accommodated. If they are willing to relocate, then that's a compromise that should be considered. But this only addresses one use out of many uses for the beach and launch area. She also said to keep working on a better compromise. Address more public uses that add more than just "dog use" only.
8. Would the Coastal Commission staff preliminarily support an adjusted plan that reduces the size of the public park, the beach and parking areas and relocate the roadway towards the east to allow for a more connected dog leash free area, along with the ability to have the entire area leash free during weekdays up until approx. 3:00 p.m. and on weekends during the winter, late fall and early spring up until noon? **Staff Response:** Coastal Commission stated there might be some problems with restricting public access in combination with leash free dog use in the summer months. However, if the general public is not restricted at all and that this arrangement allows for the greatest diversity of use and quantity of users, then it would be consistent with public access policies. Carolyn indicated a concern for the actual hours suggested and would like to work with the team to identify the most critical hours for dog users and compare those with peak park use times.
9. Would the Coastal Commission staff preliminarily support a revised plan that keeps the public beach and swimming area but removes the launch ramp and non motorized water craft use area (assuming another location in the bay can be found that is mutually agreed upon by the user groups)? **Staff Response:** Coastal Commission said they would.
10. Would the Coastal Commission staff preliminarily support a revised plan that removes the public beach and swimming areas, the launch ramp, the non motorized water craft, the parking lot and roadway and leaves the dog leash free area currently the way it is? **Staff Response:** Coastal Commission emphasized again that there needs to be a compromise. They also requested a multi-purpose road for emergency vehicles may be needed in order to assure public safety.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Consultant team requested written documentation from the Coastal Commission in response to the questions they submitted.

Prepared by: Cheri Blatner / Mike Singleton

ALL PARTIES ARE REQUESTED TO REVIEW THESE MEETING MINUTES AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE AUTHOR PRIOR TO THE NEXT MBPC MEETING.