

**City of San Diego  
Torrey Pines City Park Advisory Board  
February 18, 2010**

**MINUTES**

**Meeting Held at:**

Forum Hall – 2<sup>nd</sup> Fl. Wells Fargo  
4545 La Jolla Village Drive  
San Diego, CA 92122

**Mailing Address is:**

City of San Diego  
202 C Street, MS 5A  
San Diego, CA 92101

**Members Present**

Ginny Barnes, Chair  
Douglas Williamson, University Community Planning Group  
Edward Slater, Associated Glider Clubs of Southern California  
Ken Baier, Hang Gliding/Torrey Hawks Hang Gliding Club  
Michael Stepner, Park & Recreation Board Member  
Chris Schmidt, Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter  
Ken King, Council District 1 Representative  
Brian Thompson, Torrey Pines Association

**Members Absent**

David Metzgar, Paragliding/San Diego Hang Gliding & Paragliding Association  
Ronald Brown, Torrey Pines Gulls-Radio-Controlled Soaring Society  
Mary Coakley, Park & Recreation Board's Community Parks 1 Area

**City of San Diego Staff**

Michelle Abella-Shon, Project Manager  
Deborah Sharpe, Project Officer II  
Bennur Koksuz, Deputy Director for Urban Form  
Jesse Mays, Council District 1 Representative  
Jeff Harkness, Project Manager

**Other Agencies**

**Consultant**

Laura Burnett, Wallace Roberts & Todd  
Kathleen Garcia, Wallace Roberts & Todd

**CALL TO ORDER** - Chair, Ginny Barnes, called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

A motion was made by Edward Slater and seconded by Ken Baier to approve the November 19, 2009. The vote, of those present at the November meeting, was unanimous.

**COMMUNICATION**

- a. Ernie Kasco expressed concern about the need to address the management of the flight operations.
- b. Bob Kuczewski said that he has attended everyone of the Torrey Pines City Park Advisory Board (Board). And strongly recommends that the Board stay intact beyond the General Development Plan (GDP) following the direction of the

Settlement Agreement to address management issues. He is concerned that to initiate a different Board would take too long.

### **REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES**

None

### **CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

1. Council Resolution 303-300 established this Board to advise and provide direction on January 18, 2008. The volunteer representatives have been serving since September 2008. Board members present were asked to provide comments on the process:
  - a. It has been a fascinating and enjoyable process;
  - b. First board I have participated in and I have enjoyed the process and want to get to the next step of management issues;
  - c. Having served on many such boards I know we need to complete this step;
  - d. Also served on other such processes and appreciate the opportunity;
  - e. This is such a unique resource that needs to be valued and kept open, the chairperson has done an excellent job;
  - f. Has served on many boards and appreciates this process
  - g. Proud to have been involved. This plan creates a city park not only for the primary users but for the entire community and natural environment.

### **CITY STAFF REPORT**

Public input is very important to the City of San Diego, thank you for your participation through this process.

The city's web site is being actively updated to publicize the agenda, information and links.  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/parkplanning/tpcitypark.shtml>

### **BOARD MEMBER'S REPORT**

None

### **OTHER AGENCY'S REPORT**

None

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

#### **301. Review and Approve**

1. The Draft General Development Plan was presented.
2. The Board members expressed positive support Draft General Development Plan. Questions were addressed by WRT. The Chairperson reminded the group that the GDP only considers the park property, not UCSD, Blackgold Road or the management of the facilities.
3. Public Comments in Opposition:
  - a. This has been a great process but there is potential for too much development in terms of footprint and sizes. Erosion on the trails is problematic. A hydrologist needs to look at the 'lithwick'
  - b. Design of physical property is good, but it doesn't address the management which is an ongoing problem, and asks for non-approval.
  - c. Scale back the areas for picnic tables, decks are too big.

4. Public Comments in Favor:
  - a. Impressed with the Board's understanding of the site. Sorry UCSD cannot dedicate the runway.
  - b. The plan is elegant, light touch, gives honor to the place. It guides incremental steps to preserve the park into the future. The site is currently dangerous with erosion and garbage.
  - c. This is a good step in the process. Doing nothing is not the right step.
  - d. This will be a great place to inspire children.
  - e. Tres Magnifique
  - f. We appreciate appropriate improvements to the trails to the beach. Be careful about wood because people will tear it up for beach bonfires. We don't want to pay for parking.
  - g. Erosion begins at the UCSD property.
  - h. The public process has been excellent and responsive.
5. The Chairperson read a portion of the UCSD statement regarding Gliderport Use and Operations (see attached).
6. Ken King moved for the approval of the General Development Plan, Seconded by Michael Stepner. The vote was unanimous in favor.

It was decided that there should be an additional Advisory Board meeting to discuss implementation phases and priorities.

Deborah Sharpe provided information on the City's next steps for the GDP, the pursuit of a variety of funding sources and implementation.

ADJOURNMENT - The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: **to be announced**

Respectfully submitted,  
Michelle Abella-Shon/Jeff Harkness, Project Manager

While UCSD has not had an opportunity to meet with City and consultant staff to review and comment on the Draft Torrey Pines City Park General Development Plan, a preliminary review produces the following comments. A meeting with UCSD staff is being scheduled.

**Hydrology** UCSD appreciates the work that has been done to assess the hydrology and storm water related issues on the common UCSD and City properties. Storm water does not respect property lines and there must be an effective and cooperative approach to any solution. The basically minimal approach that has been proposed is encouraging. UCSD is prepared to find a common solution and assist in its implementation for the benefit of both properties.

**Beach Access** The existing beach access road at Blackgold Road was never intended to be a major public access route to the beach. It presently provides access for emergency services, pedestrians, and a very limited number of vehicles. The road is not suitable for any significant increase in vehicular traffic. Repair and maintenance of the road to maintain it in a safe and suitable condition is challenging. Any expansion of the road would be both costly and environmentally problematic.

UCSD is interested in assuring that the access road can continue to be used for public beach access in spite of the challenges that are present. There may be some ability to provide ADA access to the beach using the road, but such a program would likely be very limited in scope. Certainly there are no plans or desires for the provision of general public vehicular access or the construction of significantly greater improvements that presently exist.

Discussions regarding ADA access may be initiated.

**Gliderport Land Use and Operations** The use of the UCSD-owned portion of the Gliderport for fixed-wing glider operations is a recognized historic use and one that UCSD has accommodated for many years. There is, of course, no guarantee that such activity will continue in perpetuity. UCSD intends to continue to work with the glider users and regulatory agencies to see that fixed-wing glider use is able to continue at the site for as many years as possible. However, UCSD needs for use of the property for the University-related uses for which it was deeded by the City or the inability to properly license the necessary temporary airport activity could result in future restrictions or the cessation of aircraft activity. Any UCSD plans and projects will be discussed and coordinated with the users and any other interested parties as far in advance as possible.

Minor revisions to the draft plan graphics will be needed to reflect runway alignments, etc. that have been modified as the result of California Coastal Commission and Caltrans review.

*Comments Prepared by Milton J. Phegley, AICP  
Director — UCSD Community Planning  
February 18, 2010*