





NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE

Draft Minutes: August 15, 2017 – 6:30 PM

www.northparkplanning.org

info@northparkplanning.org

Like us:  [NorthParkPlanning](https://www.facebook.com/NorthParkPlanning) Follow us:  [@NPPlanning](https://twitter.com/NPPlanning)

To receive NPPC Agendas & Announcements sign up at (no Facebook account required):

https://www.facebook.com/NorthParkPlanning/app_100265896690345

I. Call to order: 6:33 pm

1. Attendance Report:

Member	Kate Callen	Dennis Campbell	Dionné Carlson	Kathleen Ferrier	Daniel Gebreselassie	Robert Gettinger	Peter Hill	Brandon Hilpert	Megan Kucharski	Sarah McAlear	Dang Nguyen	Melissa Stayner	Tim Taylor	Eduardo Velasquez	René Vidales
Attendance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Late					6:55						(6:45)				
Absences	2	1		2		1				2		1			

2. Modifications to/Adoption of the August 15 Agenda.

- a. No modification, no Adoption motion
- b. **Approval of Previous Minutes. MOTION:** Approve July 18, 2017 minutes. Hill/Stayner 12-0-1 (Ferrier)
- c. **Treasurer’s Report. Brandon Hilpert.** Current balance \$818.88.

II. Non-Agenda Public Comment:

- a. **William Perno, with SAY San Diego.** Refutes assertions made by CUP applicant for Idaho Market liquor license that “the owners have 20 years experience without negative experience.” Records indicate owners had a 20-day suspension in 1998, and in 2015 there was a 2nd violation involving sales to a minor. Requests that in the future NPPC pull up the license info via ABC website prior to hearing. SAY has a continuing concern with restaurants turning into nightclubs, and he’d like to come back and give a presentation.
- b. **Ted Coakley, resident on Illinois St.** Complaint about a neighbor building a backyard structure they originally claimed would be guest quarters/artist studio, then turned it into a kindergarten (featured in Reader article). He reports that the use is unwelcome by nearby neighbors. Requesting relief/recourse, and if not possible, want to determine how to keep it from happening to other areas. Chair suggested contact with Code Enforcement and City Councilmember Chris Ward’s office.
- c. **Dionné Carlson.** Spalding Place is now a Historic District and the first in North Park since the Community Plan was updated. Spalding Place joins Burlingame, Shirley Ann, and Dreyden Historic Districts.
- d. **Sarah McAlear/Rene Vidales.** Congratulations to former Chair Vicki Granowitz for being recognized by the American Planning Association (APA), California Chapter for winning the Planning Advocate Award of Excellence. The award ceremony will be on September 24 in Sacramento. Vicki previously received the Planning Advocate Award from the local chapter of the APA last May.

III. Announcements & Event Notices:

- a. **The Boulevard Market.** Monthly nighttime market on Utah St. between El Cajon Blvd. and Howard Ave. Taking place August 18, September 15 and October 20 from 6-10 p.m. More information at: <http://theboulevard.org>
- b. **Public Meetings on Potential of an Alternate Water Rate Structure for Water Customers of the City of San Diego Public Utilities Department.** Monday, August 14 at 10 a.m. at 525 B Street 1st Floor Conference Room; Tuesday, August 15 at 5:30 p.m. at 9192 Topaz Way, 1st Floor Auditorium; Wednesday, August 16 at 5:30 p.m. at 7900 Paradise Valley Road (Skyline Library)

IV. Elected Official Reports & contact Info:

- a. **Jessica Poole, Hon. Susan Davis, US Congress Dist. 53,** 619-208-5353, Jessica.Poole@mail.house.gov
National Defense Authorization Act passed the house, and Davis had several provisions included. Signed onto Scientific Integrity Act (to prevent Executive Branch from silencing scientific findings). Locally, she has continued to work on US Postal Service continuing door delivery and Saturday service.
- b. **Nick Serrano, Hon. Todd Gloria, State Assembly Dist. 78,** 619-645-3090, Nick.Serrano@asm.ca.gov
Goes into session again next Monday. Legislature taking aim on housing; 3 bills considered that are considered a more comprehensive approach: SB2 (Atkins), SB3 and SB35. AB1637 is the Missing Middle bill.
- c. **Toni Duran, Hon. Toni Atkins, State Senate Dist. 39,** 619-645-3133, Toni.Duran@sen.ca.gov
Also on recess, have been attending community events. 30th Annual Stand Down happened recently, community helped Atkins gather 2200 pair of socks and 200 pair of underwear. She sponsored SB2, which passed the Senate and is being heard by the State Assembly, and will create permanent funding for affordable housing. SB2 is estimated to generate \$ 1.2 billion (raising a total of \$5.8 billion including federal, local and private matching funds. Sales of residential or commercial property are not subject to the fees that build this funding.
- d. **Chloe Madison, Hon. Chris Ward, City Council Dist. 3,** 619-236-6374, CMadison@sandiego.gov
- e. **Planner's Report:** Nancy Graham 619-236-6891; NHGraham@sandiego.gov (filling in for Elizabeth Ocampo Vivero, who is on maternity leave)

V. NPPC Reports

a. Chair's Report/CPC

1. **North Park Observatory Community Forum** held July 13.
The meeting was covered at length in the July 28 edition of the Uptown News. The July 13 meeting about the June 7 incident at the Observatory Theater was headed by Councilmember Chris Ward, the Police Department and management from the Observatory.
-The spokesperson from the Observatory acknowledged they need to a better job in directing the crowds out of the theater and vicinity when an incident happens; the performer brought their own security team to the performance and that may have complicated things.
-The police department stated that the criminal investigation about the two persons who were attacked (including the performer) was closed because both victims were from outside of the County and were non-cooperative during the investigation.
-Councilmember Chris Ward stated that we all need to work together to come up with a solution that works for everyone.
2. **Spalding Place Historic District.** Historic Resources Board meeting held July 27 and the 10-day appeal period has already passed. North Park has its 4th historic district following Burlingame, Shirley Ann, and Dreyden historic districts.
3. **Proposed Valle Vista Terrace Historic District.** Historic Resources Board (HRB) August 24 1st reading; September 28th 2nd reading. More on this proposed historic district later in the agenda.
4. **Balboa Park Community Meeting** held August 1, discussed projects in Balboa Park.
5. **Bylaws.** Now that July meeting minutes are approved, Chair Vidales will be sending out the board approved edits to the City for the City attorney to review and finalize.
6. **Community Planners Committee (CPC).** Tuesday, August 22, 2017, 7-9 pm. 202 C St Civic Concourse. Terrace Level Silver Room. For more info: <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpc/agendas/index.shtml>

- b. **Social Media Report. Brandon Hilpert.** No update.

c. **Subcommittee Reports:**

- i. **Urban Design/Project Review (UD/PR)**, Peter Hill (chair), Melissa Stayner (vice chair) – North Park Rec Center, 6:00pm 1st Mondays. Did not meet in August. Next meeting WEDNESDAY, September 6, 2017 (unusual day due to Labor Day holiday weekend).
- ii. **Public Facilities & Transportation**, Eduardo Velasquez (chair) – North Park Rec Center, 6:00 pm, 2nd Wednesdays. Next meeting September 13, 2017.

d. **Liaisons Reports**

- i. **Balboa Park Committee, Rob Steppke:** Did not meet this month.
- ii. **Maintenance Assessment District, Peter Hill:** Did not meet this month. Next meeting is on September 11th. City staff will present on planting plans.
- iii. **North Park Main Street, Robert Gettinger:** PBID passed with 70% support. NPMS still waiting to put press release out. Wanted to come tonight and update NPPC, but couldn't make it.
- iv. **Adams Ave BIA, Dionné Carlson:** Working on Street Fair on Sept 30 and October 1st.
- v. **El Cajon Boulevard BA, Dang Nguyen:** Did not attend, no meeting in August.
- vi. **Community Review Board (CRB) for Police Practices, Brandon Hilpert:** Trying to work with City to get Measure G (codified practices) implemented. City determining implementation plan, should be happening in the next 2-3 months. CRB also looking to secure independent legal counsel.

VI. **Action Items:**

- a. **County of San Diego Probation Department (PD) project.** County of San Diego is making changes at their building located on Ohio St., north of University Ave. They intend to tear down 50+ year old vacant building and construct a new building. Presenters: Adolfo Gonzales (Chief Probation Officer) and Marc Reigier (Special Projects Manager).

PD focused on getting community input and guidance (NPMS, NPPC) prior to even beginning this project, as they want to be good neighbors. Their revised facility plan comes from a model first implemented in New York, and brings probation office checks into the same area as where probation "clients" get services (mental health, substance abuse, food, clothes, tutoring) – increasing the usage of these helpful services. Juveniles come in the evenings after school and are provided transportation after their services are over. This type of facility has proven improved outcomes. The project is also planning a large meeting space that can be used by community with reservations (community asset). The project is looking at the feasibility of offering co-work space, and other possible shared spaces. Looking at possible parking options. Still exploring ideas and are in early stages of planning.

Public comment/questions

- i. Shirley Gibson. When will building start coming down? A: RFP for demolition is posted, will take time to select contractor and begin.
- ii. Ken Williams. How large is the lot and building? A: Current building is 24-25K sq/ ft. Part of examination is how much space is needed (1-story, 2-story, etc). Gonzales says it appears that the footprint of the new building will be smaller than existing.
- iii. Andrew Bowen. Will this go in front of the Board of Supervisors? A: Yes, the project will go back one more time.
- iv. Ted Coakley. Suggests they include rooftop garden.

Board comment/questions

- v. Gebreselassie. Concur on rooftop garden idea. Adjacent property is for sale, look into purchasing? A: It's been taken off the market, were unable to purchase at the time it was listed.
- vi. Callen. Wholeheartedly support what you're doing, has same traffic as before in terms of the clients being served.
- vii. Ferrier. Have you looked at building housing in conjunction with this project? A: It has been looked at, but with size of lot it would be challenging. Continuing to explore possibilities.

- viii. Taylor. Since we don't have a formal role in this approval process, we appreciate them coming.
- ix. Carlson. Please keep looking at underground parking, even though it is expensive, recognizing things become more dense. Has the New York model been tested anywhere else in Southern California? Will we get to see architectural plans when they are being drafted? A: The North Park location will be the pilot program. Not far enough along to even know how large the needs are yet, and won't know for quite a long time, but they will continue to be transparent with the community.
- x. Hilpert. Security related issues? A: In this new model, lines are not stacking outside and there is no loitering. The area is specifically for client services, and as such there are no takedowns or people getting arrested. It is a new open concept based on restorative justice.
- xi. Hill. Suggest looking at possible connections to internships in the restaurant field (Camp Barrett) with juveniles. A: There is a great culinary program in the Alpine probation center right now (the clients are getting food handlers certifications), and it would be great to extend that.
- xii. Kucharski, Velasquez, Gettinger, McAlear. Believe this type of targeted care will improve outcomes and this is an incredible plan.
- xiii. Nguyen. How can you say they won't get arrested? A: People get arrested when they're committing crimes. If people come in and test dirty they aren't immediately arrested, this is a new caring compassion and service-based probation plan.

The board thanked Chief Adolfo Gonzales and Marc Reigier for their presentation.

- b. **Community Choice Energy discussion.** Proposal for the City of San Diego to join California's 70+ cities and nine counties in the movement for clean energy, clean jobs, and local choice. Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) is a system allowing local governments/special districts to pool their electricity load in order to purchase and/or develop power on behalf of residents, with a focus in this case on clean/renewable production. Nicole Capretz, Climate Action Campaign presented.

The Climate Action Plan is what the City of San Diego created to achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets set forth by the State of California. San Diego decided to be a leader in developing solutions and innovations, and aims for all the electricity used in the City to be from renewable sources by 2035. San Diego is the solar panel capital of the nation. SDG&E released a formal statement that it is not feasible or possible to be 100% clean energy. Currently SDG&E has a monopoly on energy in the City. Community Choice is a non-profit program where profits are put back into City projects and infrastructure, and has created a public/private partnership where local governments can choose what electricity is on the grid and what the rates are. Other cities around the State have already implemented Community Choice programs. The San Diego Community Choice Feasibility study was independently verified: https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/san_diego_cca_feasibility_study_final_draft_main_report_7-11-17.pdf

Questions were held until after the presentation from item VI.c below.

- c. **Renewables and Emissions Reductions discussion.** Presentation by Sempra Services Corporation, not the same company as San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E). Sempra is not regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission. Frank Urtasun, Sempra Services and Peder Norby, consultant for Sempra Services.

Sempra Services is separate entity from SDG&E. The organization petitioned to be able to form after the energy crisis (around the year 2000), to be part of the discussion so "you know what you're getting into." It is not electricity, but transportation that is San Diego's largest source of emissions. Across the nation, electricity is just as large a contributor, but in San Diego it's much less because they have de-carbonated our grid using renewable energies. San Diego electricity is currently produced 43% from renewable sources, and San Diego County is over 20%. Recommends that the committee take time with this decision and have all of the information. There is a concern that government is creating goals/programs that will

have unintended consequences, like the ~2000s energy crises. SB100 is an example; CCA proponents claim this is the way to get to 100% renewable. The Bill passed Senate and is expected to go to Governor's desk and be signed into law. The problem is that the total costs can't be determined because we don't know the exit fee (for leaving CCA or utility). A 10% increase could cause a \$2.8 billion liability in 2021. Additionally, this program takes over half the City's annual budget to get up and running. Question if it is under the City's purview, or is in its citizens' best interest, to get involved in energy issues. Sempra Services wants to be a conduit of information and maintains that there are serious cost/risk concerns with this plan.

Questions were posed to both Climate Action Campaign and Sempra Services and answered by both parties.

Public comment/questions

1. William Perno. Drives electric car, thinks it's great that there could be competition. Rooftop solar is changing the game.
 - a. Sempra. Solar goes hand in hand with the State's net metering program. When you create excess energy, it's fed back into the grid, but compensation past that is at wholesale rates. There is a concern the CCA will lead to fewer transmission lines. The Powerlink transmission line was put in to move renewable energy, and it is doing as promised but there are issues because they are required to get this service to far-away customers on old wooden pole infrastructure.
 - b. Climate Action Campaign. CCA gets to create own programs and it's a blank slate, like in Marin County, where they give retail rate and market value back to customers for energy from roof solar panels. Utilities don't want that, they want you to tailor to your use and not create excess. CCA will lead to expanding options (just like for internet providers).
2. Mark Gould. What are the exit fees?
 - a. Sempra. If you exit SDG&E and go to CCA, you'll get hit with your portion of the infrastructure that's been built. Utility companies are not allowed to make profit on production of solar, just on transmission. These two issues are between customers, not utility. If a City breaks away from a utility, i.e. San Diego is about 40% of SDG&E's load, they'd have too much energy.
 - b. Climate Action Campaign. Even with exit fee, market will remain competitive. The feasibility study is available online, and it predicts 5-7 years before CCA could make any meaningful purchases.
3. Amir Miraftab. How have CCAs been received in other Cities?
 - a. Climate Action Campaign: Hugely successful; thinks utilities will be able to become only responsible for transportation of energy, not production or storage.
 - b. Sempra: Look at rate structures, there is no rate relief. It's about 1% or less than 1% and some CCAs are higher.

Board comment/questions

1. Nguyen. Is there any pushback from CCAs?
 - a. Climate Action Campaign: Unsure of why Sempra is taking this course of action with CCAs in San Diego. The other two utilities in the state didn't form an independent group to oppose CCAs. Other utilities have gone in partnership. This plan only intends to take back control of supply...and SDG&E doesn't make money off of supply (only transmission) so it is not entirely clear why they are fighting.
 - b. Sempra: When utilities buy renewable energy, they enter into contracts to build infrastructure, and when they go into operation they cause fossil fuel sources not to run. CCAs are a different model that does not enter into long term contracts. They are only buying from existing resources and do not build renewable projects, so you're not achieving greenhouse gas reductions because they are buying electricity from existing markets (with or without a contract). Public Utilities Commission will rule on if exit fees will be a fixed cost. It doesn't matter if it's SDG&E or a CCA buying the energy, the issue is meaningful greenhouse gas reductions, and those are best targeted through improvements to emissions caused by transportation.

2. Stayner. Is transmission is going to get more expensive? A: Both groups agree there will not be a double charge. SDG&E has already gotten us over the minimum legislated. Stayner: Can I choose something different than my neighbor?
 - a. Climate Action Campaign. Yes, there are different supply portfolios and you do truly choose instead of having false “choice” from monopoly.
 - b. Sempra: The choices you would be provided with are not very different from what SDG&E currently offers.
3. Gettinger. How can we assess the success and failures of other cities that have implemented? The oldest is only 7 years old, and that doesn’t seem old enough.
 - a. Sempra: Check out Illinois, where communities are trying to extract themselves from CCAs because they are too expensive.
 - b. Climate Action Campaign: The CCAs in Illinois are not relevant, they were implemented entirely differently.
4. Velasquez, Taylor, Ferrier. This is relevant to our community. Want to read the feasibility study and start there. Council hears this topic in the coming months.
5. Hill. What has been the reception at other Community Planning Groups? A: Six have declined to write a letter. San Isidro wrote a letter, but expressed concern about exit fee resolution. Per Nicole, Climate Action Campaign has received 13 Planning Group letters in support.
6. Campbell. Lived in Florida where City ran and provided electricity, with many problems, so this causes concern. Haven’t seen evidence regarding how CCAs reduce greenhouse gas emissions; communities on the document have high density and high income. Don’t think this is a Planning Committee issue, or within our purview.
 - a. Climate Action Campaign: Chula Vista tried to implement a CCA a decade ago, and the mayor supported the initiative. But SDG&E came in and made a deal to end the initiative. A similar situation happened in San Marcos.
 - b. Sempra: The current CCA proposal asks you to suspend common sense, rolls back to state mandate of 33% by 2020 (SDG&E is already at 43%), 50% 2030, and assumes that California isn’t going to make the goals but San Diego is. Frank Urtasun was lead negotiator in Chula Vista and relays that situation referenced wasn’t about community choice and in the settlement agreements it clearly shows that. The real intention in those examples was full municipal takeovers of the transmission system.
7. Carlson. To Climate Action Campaign: can you talk about long term investment of green power, and alternative energy providers (trading certificates, not generating). To Sempra: SDG&E has shareholders to report to, found them to be resistant to taking input from communities on other topics. What’s the financial incentive, how does it impact shareholders?
 - a. Climate Action Campaign: we want to maximize rooftop solar, and generate electricity. Long-term contracts are a misnomer. Map on provided handout shows long term contracts.
 - b. Sempra: We are here to inform you of facts. We’re not financially hurt by this. We aren’t fighting it. There’s an issue with the exit fees. If San Diego breaks away there is a cost shift in the \$100s of millions of dollars to existing customers. New market entrants during the energy crisis learned how to drive up prices and cause outages, while continuing to send bills out. Per Carlson, The Public Utility Company (PUC) is going to set exit fees, and Sempra is heavily lobbying PUCs to raise exit fees.
 - c. Climate Action Campaign: exit fee will exist no matter what due to climate action goals to get us to 100%.
8. Ferrier. Supports choice.
9. Callen. Level of combativeness between presenting groups was unfortunate.
10. Gebreselassie. Anytime we give choice to customers, they win. Breaking up monopolies is good for people. Let the market decide. Effort to create one other choice? SDG&E seems to be looking for payouts based on people leaving, are you willing to take 3rd parties to provide energy?
 - a. Climate Action Campaign: Yes, one independent public agency, but they will have choices within this
 - b. Sempra: It’s already merchants that sell most of the energy that SDG&E distributes. You would have to pay more for 100% renewable energy.

It was suggested by board members to postpone voting on this item until the board has time to read the Feasibility Study and hear again in the month of October.

- d. **Valle Vista Historic District Nomination.** Update, Discussion of Period of Significance (1908 to 1942 vs 1950), and reclassification of Bungalow Court on Adams from non-contributing resource to a contributing resource. Additional information in separate attachment and in the link below. <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/historicpreservationplanning/historicdistricts>

Dionné Carlson provided info on criteria for evaluating Historical Resources. Of the 5 outside the timeframe, 3 property owners have identified a desire to extend the period so their properties can be included. Motion would simply support that the HRB give the property owners room to make their case. The bungalow hasn't been captured as an MLS (multiple listing)— but believe there's a case to be made under Criterion A. Only bungalow in historic district and very particular to being developed around the streetcar. Property owners were all noticed and invited to a workshop, and polled.

Eduardo Velasquez asked the meaning of historic designation or a property owner in a district? Carlson answered that there are specific building restrictions so that structures that don't fit in with the district. Improvements to existing properties must meet Secretary of Interior Standards. Sarah McAlear added that Historic designation provides tax incentives to a property owner. Being a part of a Historic District without designation provides no incentives, but burdens owner with having to maintain property up to the same historic standards as those receiving incentives. Hill asked whether this period was captured in our Community Plan. Per Carlson, yes.

MOTION: The North Park Planning Committee thanks Kelley Stanco and staff for their excellent work on the Valle Vista Terrace Historic District, and respectfully requests that the Historical Resources Board vote to approve the District with the following two changes:

1. ***Include as a “Contributing Resource” the Bungalow Court at 2206 Adams Avenue, since, even with some downsized windows, it still retains enough “historic integrity” to be recognizable as a historic bungalow court and to “convey its historic significance” in the District as multi-family housing that reflects an important housing type in a popular historic style.***
2. ***Extend the end of the District’s “Period of Significance” to end in 1950 instead of 1942, as requested by residents of the District, since the additional minimal traditional and ranch style houses reflect the post-World War II “infill” pattern of development and houses built in popular styles through the 1949 end of the Adams Avenue streetcar line and the 1950 build out of the District.***

Carlson/Vidales 12-0-2 (Velasquez requires more information about Historic Districts; Nguyen abstains as he owns a home in the proposed district)

VII. **Future NPPC Meeting Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2017

VIII. **Adjournment.** Meeting adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Sarah McAlear