Speaker slips will be available. Please fill out a slip and give it to the Chair prior to the meeting if you wish to speak to an item on the agenda. The Board may take action on any item listed on the Consent or Action agenda.

Introductions and Announcements

Approval of the Minutes of June 19, 2009

Executive Directors Report

Public Comment

This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on items of interest within the jurisdiction of the Board and not appearing on today's agenda. Comments relating to items on today's agenda are to be taken at the time the item is heard. Pursuant to the Brown Act, no action shall be taken by the Board on public comment items.

CONSENT

1. Recreational Trails Program Grant Application for Pamo Valley Trail (page 3)

2. FY 09/10 Budget Amendments (page 6)

ACTION

3. Report from JPA Wetland Advisory Committee (page 13)

4. Sale of Mitigation Credits on JPA Property (page 15)
INFORMATION

5. Rancho Santa Fe Polo Club (page 37)

6. San Dieguito Lagoon Center – Presentation and Discussion (page 40)

7. Coordination Reports (oral)
   a. San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
   b. Friends of the San Dieguito River Valley
   c. Volcan Mountain Preserve Foundation
   d. San Dieguito Lagoon Committee

8. Status Reports (Oral)
   a. River Park Projects

9. Jurisdictional Status Reports
   An opportunity for the Board members to report on actions taken within their jurisdictions to further the park planning process, or on problems which have arisen.

10. Communications

11. CLOSED SESSION, CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. The Board will meet in closed session pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(b)(1)(3) to confer with legal counsel regarding the Bernardo Mountain Utility Easement Access Issue.

THE NEXT REGULAR JPA MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2009.

If you have any questions, please call Dick Bobertz at (858) 674-2270.

****Due to the high cost of printing and mailing the JPA and CAC agendas, the JPA has converted to an email distribution of both agendas. Please advise the office at 858 674-2270 if you do not have an e-mail address and want other arrangements will be made. Full packets will continue to be mailed free of charge to JPA and CAC members upon request. For others, the cost of the full agenda, with backup material, is $45 per year, and the cost of the agenda without backup material is $10 per year. The agenda and minutes are available at no cost on the San Dieguito River Park web site at www.sdrp.org
TO: JPA

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Recreational Trails Program Grant Application

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Resolution Applying for Recreational Trails Program Grant Funds

SITUATION:

A. Summary and Recommendation

October 1st is the deadline to apply for grant funding for the Recreational Trails Program. This is a Federally funded program administered by the State Department of Parks and Recreation. Staff proposes to apply for funding for the Pamo Valley Trail. The Pamo Valley Trail would be located primarily adjacent to Pamo Road in Pamo Valley for about 3 miles, and would connect the existing 3-mile-long Lower Santa Ysabel Truck Trail and the existing 6-mile-long Upper Santa Ysabel Truck Trail, ending at Lake Sutherland. The new section of trail would be on City of San Diego Water Department property. This project has been a high priority of the CAC Trails Committee for a long time because with relatively little outlay it will result in a new 12-mile-long section of the Coast to Crest Trail. In addition, two staging areas are proposed, each at the junction of the truck trails with Pamo Road. Initial biological assessment and engineering has already been completed for this project with private donations provided by the San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy and the San Diego Foundation. Meetings have been held with the City Water Department, which supports the proposed trail, and a Site Development Permit from the City has been applied for.

In order to apply for grant funding, the State requires that the applicant certify and agree to certain conditions. Therefore, staff recommends that your Board adopt the attached draft resolution provided by State Parks.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan A. Carter
Deputy Director
Attachments:

1) Resolution
2) Map of proposed trail (available at meeting)
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SAN DIEGUITO RIVER PARK JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY APPROVING THE APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDS FROM THE RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the “Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users” provides funds to the State of California for Grants to federal, state, local and non-profit organizations to acquire, develop and/or maintain motorized and non-motorized trail Projects; and

WHEREAS, the State Department of Parks and Recreation has been delegated the responsibility for the administration of the program within the State, setting up necessary procedures governing Project Application under the program; and

WHEREAS, said procedures established by the State Department of Parks and Recreation require the Applicant to certify by resolution the approval of Application(s) before submission of said Application(s) to the State; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant will enter into a Contract with the State of California to complete the Project(s);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors hereby Approves the filing of an Application for the Recreational Trails Program; and

1. Certifies that the Project is consistent with the Applicant’s general plan or the equivalent planning document; and

2. Certifies that said Applicant has or will have available prior to commencement of any work on the Project(s) included in this Application, sufficient funds to operate and maintain the Project(s); and

3. Certifies that the Applicant has reviewed, understands, and agrees to the General Provisions contained in the Contract shown in the Procedural Guide; and

4. Appoints the Executive Director as agent to conduct all negotiations, execute and submit all documents, including, but not limited to Applications, agreements, amendments, payment requests and so on, which may be necessary for the completion of the Project.

5. Agrees to comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules, regulations and guidelines.

Approved and Adopted the _____day of ______________, 20______. 
I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution Number______ was duly adopted by the Board of Directors following a roll call vote:

Ayes:
Noes:
Absent:

______________________________
(Clerk)
TO: JPA  
FROM: Staff  
SUBJECT: Amend FY 09/10 Budget

RECOMMENDATION:
Adopt attached Amended FY 09/10 Budget

SITUATION:

A. Summary and Recommendation

Since your Board adopted the FY 09/10 budget last April, several items have been identified that should be appropriated in the FY 09/10 budget. These items are described below. It is recommended that your Board adopt the attached budget amendments to the Operating Fund, Trails/Land Management Fund and Capital Project Fund.

1. $12,000 in Community Enhancement Program grant funds have been received from Supervisor Pam Slater-Price and Supervisor Dianne Jacob for purchase of furnishings for the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse. Because this grant funding was not known when the budget was adopted, it was not included. The grant funds must be expended before June 30, 2010. To expend the grant funds, they must be appropriated in the FY 09/10 budget. (Cap. Project Fund)

2. The FY 08/09 budget included appropriations for several habitat recovery projects that were funded with a grant received by the San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy. When the budget was adopted, it was anticipated that the projects would be completed in 08/09. However, it was determined to phase the projects over two years. Therefore it is necessary to appropriate the funds, $95,324.57, that were not spent in FY 08/09 in FY 09/10. (Trails/Land Mgmt Fund)

3. As described in more detail in Item 4 of this agenda, your staff has negotiated a sale of mitigation rights on a portion of the 32.64 acre property that was donated to the JPA by Sunroad Corporation last year. The purchaser of 8.9 acres in mitigation rights is the Navy, as mitigation for expansion of the Miramar Brig. It is proposed that the proceeds of the sale, $275,000, will be
used to repay the loan your Board obtained to cover the funding shortfall on
the David Kreitzer Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge. This budget
amendment would enable the JPA to receive and expend those funds in this
manner, assuming Item #4 on this agenda is approved. (Operating Fund)

4. $1,425,000 in Transnet funding was received from SANDAG for the West
Bernardo Bike Path and Cantilever project. These funds must be appropriated
in the FY 09/10 budget before they can be used. (Trails/Land Mgmt Fund)

5. The MOU approved by your Board at your June meeting provides that
SANDAG will pay the JPA $440,000 upon execution of the agreement in
order to complete landscaping of the treatment ponds, grading of our 2.736
acre mitigation site, and initiation of water quality testing and reporting. These
funds are appropriated in the amended budget. (Capital Project Fund)

6. The San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy received an Environmental
Mitigation Program grant from SANDAG which provides funding for the JPA
to purchase a mini-dump loader for $32,184 and a GIS Tablet/Software for
$6,000. These funds are appropriated in the amended budget. (Trails/Land
Mgmt Fund).

Staff recommends that your Board adopt the attached budget amendments.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan A. Carter
Deputy Director

Attachments:
1. Proposed Amended FY 09/10 Operating Fund, Trail/Land Management Fund
   Budget and Capital Project Budget
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park</th>
<th>Adopted FY 08/09</th>
<th>Adopted FY 09/10</th>
<th>Amend #1 FY 09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ORG 91160</td>
<td>FUND 44625</td>
<td>9/18/09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Salaries and Benefits

| 1000 Object Account | 51110 Permanent Wages | 591,286 | 593,324 | 593,324 |
| 1 | 51115 Temporary Wages | - | - | - |
| 2 | 51410 Retirement - CERS | 110,570 | 97,364 | 97,364 |
| 3 | 51415 Retire Other Post Retirement (Health Supplement) | 12,831 | 12,875 | 12,875 |
| 4 | 51421 Non County POB Contributions | 69,772 | 72,208 | 72,208 |
| 5 | 51430 Retirement- CERS - County Offset | 42,573 | 42,838 | 42,838 |
| 6 | 51450 Retirement - OASDI & Medicare | 45,233 | 44,262 | 44,262 |
| 7 | 51510 Employee Group Health & Life Ins., Disability Ins., | 1,774 | 1,483 | 1,483 |
| 8 | 51530 Worker's Compensation Insurance | 4,730 | 4,984 | 4,984 |
| 9 | 51550 Flex Credit | 44,938 | 60,460 | 60,460 |
| 10 | 51560 Unemployment Insurance | 1,478 | 1,483 | 1,483 |
| 11 | Subtotal | 925,185 | 931,282 | 931,282 |

### Services and Supplies

| 2000 Object Account | 52304 STIPEND to employees | 33,000 | - | - |
| 16 | 52062 Telephone/Cell/Fax/Satellite Service | 8,960 | 9,988 | 9,988 |
| 17 | 52130 Insurance - General and Property Liability, incl Auto | 5,600 | 6,160 | 6,160 |
| 18 | 52134 Insurance - Medical/Liability for Volunteers | 550 | 600 | 600 |
| 19 | 52182 Fuel for Vehicle, incl Tractor | 7,500 | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| 20 | 52186 Office Equipment Maintenance/Repair (Service Contracts) | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| 21 | 52220 Office Operation/Maintenance | 11,720 | 10,800 | 10,800 |
| 22 | 52220 Recycle ($180) | - | - | - |
| 23 | 52220 Dumpster Rental ($900) | - | - | - |
| 24 | 52220 Janitorial Service ($720) | - | - | - |
| 25 | 52220 Maintenance/Repair/Tires for Vehicles ($6,000) | - | - | - |
| 26 | 52220 Uniform Allowance ($3000) | - | - | - |
| 27 | 52220 Lake Hodges Bike/Ped Bridge Lease | 2,960 | 3,201 | 3,201 |
| 28 | 52220 Dept. of Health Services Permit, Hodges Bridge | - | 525 | 525 |
| 29 | 52220 Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse | - | 5,322 | 5,322 |
| 30 | 52270 Memberships | 500 | 200 | 200 |
| 31 | 52304 Miscellaneous, petty cash | 1,000 | 800 | 800 |
| 32 | 52330 Office Supplies | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 33 | 52332 Postage | 1,200 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| 34 | 52334 Printing (Stationery, maps) | 3,500 | 3,200 | 3,200 |
| 35 | 52370 Professional Services | 41,750 | 49,900 | 49,900 |
| 36 | 52370 Attorney Services ($30,000) | - | - | - |
| 37 | 52370 Bookkeeping Services ($6,600) | - | - | - |
| 38 | 52370 Auditor Services ($8,300) | - | - | - |
| 39 | 52370 County Services ($3,500) | - | - | - |
| 40 | 52370 Computer/Website Consulting Services ($1,500) | - | - | - |
| 41 | 52370 Stipends for Board Members (10 mtgs x $100 x 2) | 2,400 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| 42 | 52394 Maps, photos | 250 | 250 | 250 |
| 43 | 52304 Legal Notices | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| 44 | 52350 Volunteer/Event Program | 7,825 | 10,575 | 10,575 |
| 45 | 52350 Water/Ice/Refreshments ($1050) | - | - | - |
| 46 | 52350 Volunteer Recognition ($2,500) | - | - | - |
| 47 | 52350 Mailings - Activity Schedule and Newsletter | - | - | - |
| 48 | (included in postage & printing line items) | - | - | - |
| 49 | Scout Plaques/Awards ($625) | - | - | - |
## OPERATING BUDGET

**San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Adopted FY 08/09</th>
<th>Adopted FY 09/10</th>
<th>Amend #1 FY 09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Other Events (e.g., Earth Day) ($775)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Docent Training/Volunteer Patrol Training ($1050)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Intern Stipends/Education/Outreach ($2,875)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Kiosk Displays ($200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>20th Anniversary events ($1500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Books/Publications/Subscriptions</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Minor Equipment</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Utilities (at Undercrossing)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Out of County Travel</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Training (incl Seminars, Trails Conf.)</td>
<td>4,262</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Employee Auto Reimbursement</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Computer Software (Quickbooks, Antivirus renew, etc)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Email distribution service</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Total Services and Supplies</td>
<td>241,977</td>
<td>123,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Other Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Lease/Purchase Phone system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Lease/purchase copier equipment</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Amortization Reserve (for future truck replacement)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Loan Payments for Work Truck</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Total Other Charges</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Down Payment for 'Work vehicle for cargo, transports/tax/title/hitch/rack/trailer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Total Fixed Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Total Appropriations</td>
<td>1,183,262</td>
<td>1,071,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Transfer from Amortization Reserve</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Transfer from Trails/Land Mgmt fund for Admin Costs</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>230,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Transfer from Project fund for Admin Costs</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Transfer from Land Trust Fund (rent payments)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Transfer from Fire Recovery Fund</td>
<td>54,818</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Offtrack Betting</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Member agency assessments, includes endowment</td>
<td>819,679</td>
<td>707,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Stipend Reimbursements</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Donations transferred from SDRVC</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Mitigation Sale proceeds from Navy Brig 8.9 ac parcel</td>
<td></td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Ranger Reimbursement from SDRVC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>FEMA reimbursement for JPA staff time (transfer from Fire Recovery Fund)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Fees Received for Agenda Backup Material</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Nontaxable Sales</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Taxable sales (t-shirts/videos/books)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>1,183,262</td>
<td>1,071,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted by JPA Board 4/17/09
Trail & Land Management Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2000 Object Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6310 56311 Transfer to Operating Fund for Admin. Costs 230,408 230,408 230,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Land Mgmt $60,000; Interest, $10,000, EEMP grant $7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N.E.G. Crews $47,200; Trails Management $106,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2290 52220 Trail Maintenance/Construction/Open Space Mgmt General 15,770 15,770 15,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bernardo Mtn Fire Breaks ($1,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poway Fire Breaks ($1,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Herbicide - ($200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sign Materials ($600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Supplies, General Materials ($1150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Seeds/Plants ($350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jute Netting, Erosion Control ($500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Haz-Mat Dumping, dump fees ($600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tools Repairs/Replacement/Power Tools ($770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Work Crews ($4,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Equipment Rental ($600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Water Truck Rental ($400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fence materials ($1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mulch ($800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>D.G./Dirt/Gravel ($1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Culverts ($200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>First Aid Materials ($100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Dump Fees - 2 trips ($100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Haz-Mat Dumping Clean-up, estimate ($1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Training, Applicator Certificates 1,300 1,300 1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tractor/Trailer Repair 1,000 1,000 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Habib Ponds clean-up - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Streambank Cleanup 600 600 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bernardo Mountain - biological surveys - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2290 52220 Trailhead Portapotties (4 ADA at $193/mo, 3 regular at $81/mo) 12,180 12,180 12,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2376 52396 West Bernardo Bike Path &amp; Cantilever Project 343,000 343,000 1,768,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2290 52220 Coastal Trails Management - Tools, Equipment, Signage 32,792 32,792 32,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2376 52396 Exotic Species removal, monitoring &amp; mapping 40,000 40,000 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2376 52566 Tablet PC and GIS software for Field Use - - 6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2376 52396 Pamo Valley Trail Gap 25,000 25,000 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2376 52396 Heritage Trail Link construction - - 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2376 52396 Cactus Wren and Pond Restoration Projects - - 95,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2376 52396 Cloverdale Creek Mitigation Project - water 6,808 6,808 6,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Total Services and Supplies 708,858 708,858 2,250,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4509 54982 Ranger Truck for Coastal Unit 30,000 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4509 54982 Mini-Carrier - - 32,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Total Fixed Assets 30,000 - 32,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>6705 56042 General Reserve - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trail & Land Management Fund

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td><strong>Total Appropriations</strong></td>
<td>738,858</td>
<td>708,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td><strong>Account</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0640</td>
<td>26400</td>
<td>Deferred Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>9190</td>
<td>44105</td>
<td>Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>9742</td>
<td>47535</td>
<td>Land Management Income:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans Bernardo Mtn Endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeowner Association Fees (Golem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fenton North Endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fenton Ranch 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maderas Westridge 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandag Dean parcel 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SDRVC Bernardo Mtn Endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>9742</td>
<td>47535</td>
<td>Trails Management Income (SCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>SDRVC - SDF and NRCS grants for Habitat Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>State EEMP grant for West Bernardo Bike Path &amp; Cantilever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>SANDAG EMP grant for invasive species removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>SANDAG EMP grant for Heritage Trail Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>SANDAG EMP grant for mini-carrier &amp; GIS tablet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>SANDAG Transnet grant for West Bernardo Bike Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>9742</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>Caltrans for LH Bridge construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>Sandag for LH Bridge construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>State of California, River Parkway projects - for LH Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>State TEA for I-5 Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>45414</td>
<td>State of California, Coastal Conservancy, for I-5 Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>9990</td>
<td>47535</td>
<td>State of California, SWRCB for Treatment Ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>9990</td>
<td>47535</td>
<td>SDRVC - Pamo Valley Trail Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>9678</td>
<td>45848</td>
<td>SDRVC - Highland Valley/Poway Trail Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>NRCS WHIP Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>738,858</td>
<td>708,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Appropriations FUND 44655</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Services and Supplies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2000 Object Account</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transfer to Operating Fund for Admin. Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Concept Design Lagoon Nature Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lagoon Interpretive signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strategic Communications Framework/Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Water Quality Monitoring and Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Water Quality Treatment Ponds Landscaping, Irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Creation of 2.736 acre salt marsh mitigation site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wetland Concept Planning (W19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sikes Adobe Farmhouse Furnishings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grand Avenue Bridge Interpretive Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Total Services and Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Total Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Poseidon Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments per MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sempra via SDRVC for Lagoon Nature Center Designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Community Enhancement Program Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Boardwalk Plank Donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Transfer from Reserve Fund for Grand Ave Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Deferred Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted by JPA Board 4/17/09
TO: JPA

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Report from the JPA Wetland Advisory Committee

RECOMMENDATION:

Discuss and take action as desired.

SITUATION:

A. Summary and Recommendation

Your Board’s Wetland Advisory Committee (members Pam Slater-Price, Phil Pryde, Richard Ernest and David Roberts and public member Jacqueline Winterer) met on August 26th to discuss issues relating to the Fairgrounds and also to review the current concept plans for the San Dieguito Lagoon Center.

The Committee discussed the Fair Board’s use of large, unsightly trailers to advertise the Fair. Jacqueline Winterer reported that the Friends of the San Dieguito River Valley had requested the Fair Board to provide copies of permits the 22nd District had received to place these trailers on wetlands and use them for advertising purposes, but had not received a reply at the time of the meeting. The Committee determined to request General Counsel Wayne Brechtel to send a letter to the Fair Board objecting to the use of such advertising trailers without a permit, because of the sensitive location in wetlands and adjacent to the Coast to Crest Trail.

The Committee also discussed their concerns that after all these years the South Overflow Lot is still used for parking and no restoration of the lot has begun. In addition, there are delineated wetlands on the East Overflow Lot as well, that could be restored if they were not regularly used for parking. The Committee directed staff to explore the possibility of SANDAG working with the 22nd District to restore the wetland habitat on the current south and east overflow parking lots for mitigation credits. Ideally, the JPA would have a conservation easement or a management role in ensuring the delineated wetlands are protected. It was agreed that the Committee will be active in reviewing and commenting on the Master Plan EIR.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Carter
Deputy Director
TO: JPA
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: Sale of Mitigation Credits

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt attached resolution authorizing the sale of a conservation easement on a portion of the Sycamore Westridge property to the U.S. Department of the Navy and authorizing the Executive Director to take any and all further actions, including the execution of a purchase agreement and approval of further documents, which may be required to complete the Conservation Easement sale.

SITUATION:

A. Summary and Recommendation

Last fall your Board approved acceptance of a 32.64 acre parcel known as Sycamore Westridge (former Maderas) that was donated by the Sunroad Corporation. The parcel is located in the City of Poway adjacent to approximately 150 acres of natural open space owned by the JPA. JPA staff has negotiated a sale of mitigation rights on an 8.9 acre portion of the parcel. The purchaser of the 8.9 acres in mitigation rights is the U.S. Navy, as mitigation for expansion of the Miramar Brig. As proposed when this opportunity was first presented last fall, and when your Board accepted a loan to cover the funding shortfall on the David Kreitzer Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge, staff recommends that the proceeds of the sale, $295,925, be used to repay the loan and associated closing costs including commission costs.

In addition to the purchase price, this agreement requires the Navy to provide 1) an additional $13,707.59 to cover the Navy Conservation Easement’s proportionate share of initial year start up costs, including, among other things, reimbursement to the JPA for preparation of a Habitat Management Plan, Financial PAR and Biological Assessment; and 2) payment of a $52,955.00 endowment, which will be deposited in a non-wasting account at your Fidelity Investment Income Account; the income from this account will be used to fund long-term maintenance and management of the Navy Conservation Easement Area.

Staff recommends that your Board adopt the attached resolution and direct staff to
repay the loan with the proceeds from the purchase price.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan A. Carter
Deputy Director

Attachments: 1. Draft Resolution with Exhibits A and B
RESOLUTION NO. __________

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SAN DIEGUITO RIVER VALLEY REGIONAL OPEN SPACE PARK JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF AN 8.9-ACRE CONSERVATION EASEMENT TO THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

WHEREAS, The San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority (“JPA”) is empowered by its Joint Powers Agreement and by the State Joint Powers Law (Government Code Section 6500 et seq.) to acquire and manage property for open space, mitigation and natural wildlife preservation purposes; and

WHEREAS, the JPA obtained title to approximately 32.62-acres of real property located in the City of Poway that is commonly referred to as the Sycamore Westridge Property (“Westridge Property”) on August 5, 2009;

WHEREAS, the Westridge Property was obtained by the JPA to ensure its long-term preservation through the sale of mitigation credits and appropriate management of the wildlife and habitat resources it contains;

WHEREAS, the City of Poway approved the JPA’s acquisition of the Westridge Property and its use as mitigation property, provided the City is granted the right to enforce open space conditions that are placed on portions of the Westridge Property used for mitigation purposes; and

WHEREAS, the United States Department of the Navy desires to purchase a conservation easement over an 8.9-acre portion of the Westridge Property to satisfy mitigation requirements of a project at MCAS Miramar;”;

WHEREAS, the terms of the conservation easement that would be purchased by the Navy are set forth in the draft Grant of Conservation Easement attached hereto as Exhibit A (“Navy Conservation Easement”) and the specific area it would cover is described and depicted in Exhibit B attached hereto (“Easement Area”); and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority (“Board”) finds and determines that sale of the Navy Conservation Easement is appropriate and in the public interest,

NOW, THEREFORE, be it hereby resolved as follows:

1. The Board of Directors of the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority does hereby authorize and direct the sale of an 8.9-acre conservation easement to the United States Department of the Navy, in accordance with the terms of the draft Grant of Conservation Easement attached hereto as Exhibit A (“Navy Conservation Easement”) and the specific area it would cover is described and depicted in Exhibit B attached hereto (“Easement Area”).

The resolution is effective upon its adoption by the Board of Directors.

Adopted this ______ day of September, 2009.
1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

2. The Board hereby approves the sale of the Navy Conservation Easement, subject to the following terms and conditions:

   A. Purchase Price of $33,250.00 per acre, for a total purchase price in the amount of $295,925.00;

   B. Payment of an additional $13,707.59 to cover the Navy Conservation Easement’s proportionate share of initial year start up costs, including, among other things, preparation of a Habitat Management Plan, Financial PAR and Biological Assessment;

   C. Payment of a $52,955.00 endowment (“Endowment Funds”), which shall be used to fund long-term maintenance and management of the Navy Conservation Easement Area;

   D. The terms of the Navy Conservation Easement attached as Exhibit A shall not be modified without Board approval, excepting minor, non-substantive changes approved by General Counsel; and

   E. Additional contingencies or assurances as the Executive Director in consultation with General Counsel, may deem reasonably necessary and appropriate in the interests of the JPA prior to the sale of the Navy Conservation Easement;

5. The Board further instructs that the Endowment Funds be deposited into the San Dieguito River Park’s Fidelity Investment Income Account # 675-00221 (“Endowment Account”) and that the funds be managed in a manner that does not result in depletion of principal and further that withdrawals from the Endowment Account be limited to no more than 4% per year.

6. The Board further instructs that the City of Poway be granted a right to enforce the open space conditions of the Navy Conservation Easement pursuant to a recorded agreement acceptable to the City and Navy.

7. The Board authorizes its Executive Director, Dick Bobertz and/or Deputy Director, Susan Carter, to take any and all further actions, including the execution of a purchase agreement and approval of further documents, which may be required to complete the Conservation Easement sale. It is the express intent of this
Board in adopting this Resolution that no further action of this Board is required and that the JPA’s Executive Director and/or Deputy Director are fully authorized to complete the Conservation Easement sale conformance with its terms of this Resolution.

Passed and Adopted this Eighteenth Day of September, 2009 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

________________________________________
Pam Slater-Price, Chair

________________________________________
ATTEST: Jan Lines, Clerk
GRANT OF CONSERVATION EASEMENT

THIS GRANT OF CONSERVATION EASEMENT is made this ____ day of __________, 2009, by the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority, a political subdivision of the State of California, 14103 Highland Valley Road, Escondido, CA  92025 (“GRANTOR”) and the United States of America, acting by and through the Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest, hereinafter called (the “GRANTEE”), in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth herein. The nature or purpose of the Conservation Easement and the extent of the restrictions on the Property are as described in the following provisions:

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the GRANTOR is the fee simple owner of that certain property (“Property”) consisting of approximately 32-acres and more particularly described in Exhibits “A and A-1” attached hereto and incorporated by this reference; and

WHEREAS, GRANTOR desires to grant and GRANTEE desires to accept a Conservation Easement over a portion of the Property consisting of approximately 8.9-acres as described and shown with more particularity on Exhibits “B” and “B-1” attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference (“Easement Area”); and

WHEREAS, the GRANTEE operates the Navy Consolidated Brig on land at Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar, San Diego, CA; and

WHEREAS, the GRANTEE has requested the Conservation Easement in order to provide habitat mitigation acreage required for expansion of the existing confinement facility at MCAS Miramar into a Joint Regional Confinement Facility Southwest (JRCFSW) pursuant to the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) directive in accordance with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion dated 6 April, 2009 as shown in Exhibit “C”, attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof; and
WHEREAS, the GRANTOR meets the requirements specified in Exhibit “C” for a qualified land manager; and

WHEREAS, to effectuate the intentions of the parties, GRANTOR hereby grants to the GRANTEE a perpetual and irrevocable Conservation Easement (“Easement”) over the Easement Area, which in addition to the other rights conveyed, will extinguish irrevocably and perpetually the right of GRANTOR and GRANTOR’s successors to develop the Easement Area except as expressly permitted in this Easement,

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to Public Law 10 U.S.C. 2663(c) and for good and valuable consideration, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, and the mutual covenants, terms, conditions and restrictions contained herein, GRANTOR does hereby grant and convey to the GRANTEE, a perpetual easement to restrict the use and development of the Easement Area that would encumber, impede, limit or otherwise be incompatible with Exhibit “C”, and to provide for ingress and egress on, over and across said Easement Area.

1. Purpose. The purpose of this Easement is to preserve the Easement Area as natural open space and retain its wildlife and habitat values in perpetuity, and to prevent any improvement, development or use of the Easement Area that would otherwise be incompatible with the terms and conditions of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service’s “Biological Opinion for Construction of the Joint Regional Confinement Facility Southwest by Expansion and Alteration of the Naval Consolidated Brig, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, San Diego County, California” dated 6 April 2009 (Exhibit “C”) (“Biological Opinion”).

2. Rights of the GRANTEE. To accomplish the purpose of this Easement, the following rights are conveyed to the GRANTEE by this Easement:

a. Enforcement of Prohibitions. To prohibit residential and/or industrial and/or commercial development or use of the Easement Area as specified below.

b. Right of Entry. To enter upon the Easement Area at reasonable times for the purpose of exercising and enforcing the rights set forth herein or at any time upon an event of non-compliance with the terms of this Easement; provided that such entry shall be upon reasonable notice to the GRANTOR (reasonable notice shall consist of written notice ten (10) calendar days prior to the desired inspection date), except when a threat of imminent harm of personal injury or property damage exists. The GRANTEE shall not unreasonably interfere with GRANTOR’s use and quiet enjoyment of the Easement Area in monitoring GRANTOR’s compliance.

c. Prevention of Activities and Restoration of Easement Area. To prevent any activity on or use of the Easement Area that is not permitted by the Easement and to require the

---

1 “A qualified land manager is an organization or entity that meets the following criteria; (1) eligible to hold or manage endowment funds; (2) created for the purpose of long-term land stewardship or conservation, restoration, or management of natural lands, or similar purpose; (3) have relevant professional qualifications in the natural resource field (e.g., holds a B.S. or B.A. in wildlife management, natural resources, ecology, zoology, botany, biology, or similar degree); (4) have demonstrated experience in conservation land management in southern California (preferably San Diego County); and (5) experience in working with community groups”

Grantor’s initials ___________

Grantee’s initials ___________
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restoration of such areas or features of the Easement Area that may be damaged by any inconsistent condition, activity or use that is not permitted.

3. Prohibited Uses. Any activity or use of the Easement Area inconsistent with the purpose of this Easement is prohibited. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the following activities and uses are expressly prohibited:

   a. Human Habitation. The Easement Area may not be used for human habitation or transient overnight stays, including but not limited to temporary accommodations such as cabins, trailers, RVs, tents, etc. Constructing or placing any temporary or permanent structure, facility or improvement that detracts from the wild character of the land; that may encourage human use that is more than transient; that may encourage people to leave trash behind, requiring maintenance, or that may invite nuisance animals or insects’ including but not limited to picnic tables, trash cans, tent platforms; is prohibited.

   b. Subdivision. The division, subdivision, de facto subdivision or partition of the Easement Area, is prohibited. GRANTOR shall continue to maintain the parcel comprising the Easement Area, and all of GRANTOR’s interest therein, as though a single, legal parcel. All authorized uses of the Easement Area shall not result in significant soil degradation or significant pollution or degradation of any surface or subsurface waters; and all uses and activities shall be consistent with applicable laws and shall be exercised so as to prevent or minimize damage to the natural resources on the Easement Area.

   c. Construction. Construction of any structure or edifice, including but not limited to buildings, antennas, towers, power or telephone wires and any other additions to, or alterations of the Easement Area are prohibited. Construction of any residential and/or commercial and/or agriculture-related structures is prohibited.

   d. Uses. Any and all commercial, industrial, and residential uses are prohibited.

   e. Discharge; Dumping. Placing, filling, spraying, storing, injecting or dumping on or applying to the Easement Area trash, refuse, vehicle bodies or parts, rubbish, bio-solids, debris, junk, waste, garbage, sewage, sludge, hazardous or toxic substances, household garbage, or other unsightly or offensive material is prohibited. This provision does not prohibit burning or composting of excess brush or other plant material resulting from activities permitted herein. This provision does not prohibit application of pesticides for the purposes of habitat conservation and restoration. Disposal of any waste materials generated by activities permitted under this Easement shall be in accordance with any Federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

4. Reserved Rights and Obligations of GRANTOR. GRANTOR reserves to itself, its successors and assigns, all rights accruing from the ownership of the Easement Area that are not expressly prohibited herein and to the extent such rights are consistent with the purpose and terms of this Easement, and in accordance with the GRANTOR’s habitat management plan, “Sycamore Westridge Preserve Habitat Management Plan” dated June 2009, Exhibit “D”, attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof (“HMP”).

Grantor’s initials _________
Grantee’s initials _________
a. GRANTOR shall maintain and manage the Easement Area in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Easement, the Biological Opinion and the HMP.

b. Right to Transfer. GRANTOR may transfer the underlying fee of the Easement Area, subject to this Easement, to the State or a political subdivision of the State, or a private entity that has as its stated principal organizational purpose or mission the conservation, restoration, or preservation of land and natural resources.

c. Conservation Activities. Uses of the Easement Area for wildlife habitat preservation, restoration, management; controlling predatory and problem animals and plants by the use of selective control techniques, including pesticide application, and research that are consistent with Exhibit “D”. The natural condition existing on the Easement Area as of the date of this Easement is deemed consistent with the terms and conditions detailed in Exhibit “C”.

d. Fire Prevention. Thinning flammable vegetation on the Easement Area is authorized as necessary to protect and facilitate the Easement Area’s safe environment and operating conditions.

e. Fences. Construction of fencing is permitted where reasonably necessary for the permitted uses hereunder.

f. Signs. Erection and maintenance of a sign or other appropriate marker at a location on the Easement Area visible from the public road.


a. Notice of Intent to Undertake New Uses and/or Construction. GRANTOR shall notify the GRANTEE in writing not less than ninety (90) calendar days prior to the date that GRANTOR intends to undertake any actions that may have an adverse impact on the purpose of or rights granted to the GRANTEE under this Easement and applicable law. The notice shall describe the nature, scope, design, location, timetable, and any other material aspects of the proposed activity in sufficient detail to permit the GRANTEE to make an informed judgment as to its consistency with the purpose of the Easement.

b. GRANTEE’s Response. Within sixty (60) calendar days of receipt of the request, the GRANTEE will grant or withhold approval in writing. The GRANTEE’s approval may be withheld only upon a reasonable determination by the GRANTEE that the action proposed would have an adverse impact on the purposes of this Easement or rights granted to GRANTEE under this Easement and laws and regulations appertaining thereto, or would otherwise be inconsistent with this Easement.

6. Enforcement and Remedies. The GRANTEE is authorized to record or file any notices or instruments appropriate to assure the perpetual enforceability of this Easement. The current and subsequent owner(s) of the Easement Area agree to provide and execute any instruments appropriate or necessary to enforce this Easement. In the event of breach of by GRANTOR of any terms, conditions or obligations created by this Easement, the GRANTOR shall be afforded
sixty (60) days from the receipt of the GRANTEE’s notice of non-compliance to cure the subject breach, except where irreparable harm may result from any delay in curing a breach. The GRANTEE may grant a reasonable extension of time to complete the cure if it is determined by the GRANTEE to be necessary. In the event that the non-compliance is not cured within the sixty (60) day time frame, or an extension of time if granted by the GRANTEE, the GRANTEE may:

a. take necessary actions to correct the non-compliance and upon request by the GRANTEE. GRANTOR shall reimburse GRANTEE for its reasonable actual costs incurred to correct the non-compliance; and/or

b. institute mediation or other alternative dispute resolution strategy that is agreed to by the parties; or

c. institute suits to enjoin any breach or enforce any term by injunction. The GRANTEE’s remedies shall be cumulative and shall be in addition to any other rights and remedies available to the GRANTEE at law or equity.

7. **GRANTEE’s Discretion**. Enforcement of the terms of this Easement shall be at the discretion of the GRANTEE. No failure on the part of the GRANTEE to enforce any term hereof shall discharge or invalidate such term or any other term hereof or affect the right of the GRANTEE to enforce the same in the event of a subsequent breach or default.

8. **Acts Beyond GRANTOR’s Control**. The GRANTEE may not bring any action against GRANTOR for any change to the Easement Area resulting from causes beyond GRANTOR’s control, such as changes caused by fire, flood, storm, earth movement, or natural deterioration, or resulting from prudent action taken in good faith under emergency conditions to prevent or mitigate damage from such causes.

9. **Costs and Liabilities**. GRANTOR retains all responsibilities and shall bear all costs and liabilities of any kind related to the ownership and maintenance of the Easement Area, except as such costs or liabilities shall have resulted from the acts of the GRANTEE or the GRANTEE’s agents.

10. **Subsequent Transfers**. GRANTOR agrees to incorporate the terms of this Easement in any deed or other legal instrument by which GRANTOR divests of any interest, including but not limited to, a fee title or leasehold interest in the Easement Area. GRANTOR further agrees to give written notice to the GRANTEE of the transfer of any interest at least sixty (60) days prior to the date of such transfer.

11. **Severability**. If any provision of this Easement, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is found to be invalid, the remainder of the provisions of this Easement, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is found to be invalid, as the case may be, shall not be affected thereby.
12. **Easement Runs with the Land.** The covenants, terms, conditions, and restrictions of this grant of Easement shall run with the land in perpetuity and shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their respective personal representatives, heirs, successors and assigns and shall continue as a servitude running with the Easement Area.

13. **Controlling Law.** The interpretation, use, enjoyment and performance of this Easement shall be governed by applicable laws of the United States of America as it pertains to the rights and interests of the United States of America. Any general rule of construction to the contrary notwithstanding, this Easement shall be liberally construed in favor of the grant to effect the purpose of this Easement and the policy and purpose of limiting any development or use of the property that would be incompatible with Exhibit "C." If any provision in this instrument is found to be ambiguous, an interpretation consistent with the purpose of this Easement that would render the provision valid shall be favored over any interpretation that would render it invalid.

14. **Entire Agreement.** This instrument sets forth the entire agreement of the parties with respect to the conveyance of an Easement in the Easement Area, and supersedes all prior discussions, negotiations, understandings or agreements relating to this Agreement, all of which are merged herein.

15. **Recordation.** GRANTOR shall record this Easement in a timely manner in the official records for the county in which the Easement Area is located. The GRANTEE may re-record this Easement or any other documents necessary to protect its rights under this Easement or to assure the perpetual enforceability of this Easement.

16. **Notices.** Notices shall be considered as provided upon delivery to the respective owners of record for interests in Easement Area, unless otherwise agreed to in writing. Any notice, approval or communication that the GRANTOR is required to give to the GRANTEE in writing may be served personally or mailed to:

   Commanding Officer  
   Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest  
   Real Estate Division  
   1220 Pacific Highway  
   San Diego, CA 92132-5190

The GRANTOR is responsible for ensuring that the GRANTEE address is current at the time of notification.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, GRANTOR has caused this GRANT OF CONSERVATION EASEMENT to be executed the day and year written first above.

SAN DIEGUITO RIVER VALLEY REGIONAL OPEN SPACE PARK JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

By: _________________________________       ______________________
RICHARD BOBERTZ       Date
Executive Director
San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority

CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

State of California

County of ________________________

On __________________ before me, ______________________________________________, Date
personally appeared ____________________________________________________________, Name(s) of Signer(s)
who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify, under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature

Signature of Notary Public

Place Notary Seal Above

Grantor’s initials _________

Grantee’s initials _________
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IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the GRANTEE, acting by its Real Estate Contracting 
Officer thereunto duly authorized, has caused this GRANT OF CONSERVATION EASEMENT 
to be executed the day and year written first above.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 
Department of the Navy 

By: _________________________________       ______________________ 
KAREN P. RINGEL        Date 
Real Estate Contracting Officer 
Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest 

CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 

State of California 

County of ________________________  

On __________________ before me, ______________________________________________, Date               Here insert name and title of the officer 

personally appeared ____________________________________________________________, Name(s) of Signer(s) 
who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory 
evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are 
subscribed to the within instrument and 
acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the 
same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and 
that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument 
the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the 
person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify, under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the 
laws of the State of California that the foregoing 
paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature__________________________________ 
Signature of Notary Public

Place Notary Seal Above 

Grantor’s initials _________
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Grantee’s initials _________
Exhibits “A and A-1” to Easement
SDRVROSP-JPA Property Description
(Legal description, Assessor’s Parcel Map and Property Map to be attached)
Exhibits “B and B-1” to Easement
Easement Area Property Description
(Legal description, Assessor’s Parcel Map and Property Map to be attached)
Exhibit “C” to Easement

United States Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service letter dated 6 April 2009 - “Biological Opinion for Construction of the Joint Regional Confinement Facility Southwest by Expansion and Alteration of the Naval Consolidated Brig, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, San Diego County, California”
Exhibit “D” to Easement
San Dieguito River Park Habitat Management Plan dated June 2009 –
“Sycamore Westridge Preserve Habitat Management Plan”
EXHIBIT "B"

MITIGATION PARCEL

THAT PORTION OF PARCEL 3 OF PARCEL MAP NO. 17989, IN THE CITY OF POWAY, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, PER MAP THEREOF FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY, FEBRUARY 25, 1998, BEING ALSO A PORTION OF THAT PARCEL OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED AUGUST 5, 2009, AS DOCUMENT NO. 2009-0436767, OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PARCEL MAP NO. 17989; THENCE ALONG THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY LINE OF SAID PARCEL MAP NO. 17989, SOUTH 01°46'11" EAST, 1967.55 FEET; THENCE LEAVING SAID WESTERLY BOUNDARY LINE AT A RIGHT ANGLE, NORTH 88°13'49" EAST, 20.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 3; THENCE ALONG SAID WESTERLY LINE OF PARCEL 3 THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) COURSES: NORTH 01°46'11" WEST, 1134.44 FEET; THENCE NORTH 72°13'26" EAST, 720.52 FEET [RECORD = NORTH 72°13'58" EAST, 720.53 FEET]; THENCE NORTH 40°44'25" EAST, 139.87 FEET [RECORD = NORTH 40°42'41" EAST] TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE ALONG THE WESTERLY AND NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 3 THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) COURSES: NORTH 40°44'25" EAST, 130.65 FEET [RECORD = NORTH 40°42'41" EAST]; THENCE NORTH 05°19'50" WEST, 385.36 FEET [RECORD = NORTH 05°19'42" WEST, 385.31 FEET]; THENCE SOUTH 89°46'02" EAST, 365.71 FEET [RECORD = NORTH 89°45'59" WEST] TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE PARCEL OF LAND PER SAID DEED; THENCE LEAVING SAID NORTHERLY LINE, ALONG THE EASTERN AND SOUTHERLY LINES OF SAID DEED THE FOLLOWING NINETEEN (19) COURSES: SOUTH 07°54'06" WEST, 69.97 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 09°42'38" EAST, 78.14 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 13°18'28" WEST, 137.81 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 58°32'17" WEST, 101.52 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 10°59'03" WEST, 91.21 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 36°59'26" WEST, 157.26 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 11°54'08" EAST, 332.27 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 01°19'44" EAST, 204.73 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 39°31'19" WEST, 48.09 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 03°15'09" WEST, 170.90 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 12°00'45" WEST, 154.76 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 16°40'07" WEST, 156.34 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 06°09'38" WEST, 68.07 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 09°25'13" EAST, 68.74 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 29°54'51" WEST, 113.24 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00°55'47" EAST, 175.67 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 77°58'25" WEST, 225.32 FEET; THENCE NORTH 58°33'03" WEST, 176.96 FEET; THENCE NORTH 77°20'10" WEST, 79.55 FEET TO THE EASTERN SIDELINE OF THAT CERTAIN RECREATION TRAIL EASEMENT GRANTED TO THE CITY OF POWAY PER SAID PARCEL MAP NO. 17989, SAID POINT BEING ON THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT 140.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE SOUTH, A RADIAL TO SAID POINT BEARS NORTH 23°08'49" WEST; THENCE EASTERLY, ALONG SAID EASTERLY SIDELINE AND ALONG SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 05°37'35" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 13.75 FEET; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG SAID EASTERLY SIDELINE THE FOLLOWING ELEVEN (11) COURSES: NORTH 72°28'46" EAST, 99.29 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A TANGENT 160.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY, ALONG SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 30°08'59" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 84.19 FEET; THENCE NORTH 42°19'47" EAST, 120.65 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A TANGENT 230.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY, ALONG SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 29°42'19" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 119.24 FEET; THENCE NORTH 12°37'28" EAST, 329.66 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A TANGENT 160.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE WEST; THENCE NORTHERLY, ALONG SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 16°32'08" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 46.18 FEET; THENCE NORTH 03°54'40" WEST, 63.91 FEET [RECORD = NORTH 03°54'41" WEST] TO THE BEGINNING OF A TANGENT 210.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE EAST; THENCE NORTHERLY, ALONG SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 26°53'35" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 98.57 FEET; THENCE NORTH 22°58'55" EAST, 44.09 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A TANGENT 190.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE WEST; THENCE NORTHERLY, ALONG SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 39°59'05" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 132.59 FEET, TO THE BEGINNING OF A REVERSE 110.00 FOOT...
RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE EAST, A RADIAL TO SAID POINT BEARS SOUTH 72°59'50" WEST; THENCE NORTHERLY, ALONG SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 39°04'36" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 75.02 FEET; THENCE NORTH 22°04'16" EAST, 180.13 FEET TO THE SOUTHERLY PROLONATION OF THE EASTERLY SIDELINE OF THAT CERTAIN EASEMENT GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, RECORDED MARCH 7, 2003 AS DOC# 2003-0260888, OFFICIAL RECORDS; THENCE ALONG SAID PROLONATION AND SAID EASTERLY EASEMENT SIDELINE, NORTH 03°35'06" WEST, 128.73 FEET; THENCE LEAVING SAID EASTERLY EASEMENT SIDELINE, SOUTH 86°24'54" WEST, 30.00 FEET TO THE WESTERLY SIDELINE OF THAT CERTAIN EASEMENT GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, RECORDED MARCH 12, 2003 AS DOC# 2003-0276467, OFFICIAL RECORDS, SAID POINT BEING THE BEGINNING OF A NON-TANGENT 170.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE, CONCAVE TO THE EAST, A RADIAL TO SAID POINT BEARS SOUTH 86°24'54" WEST; THENCE NORTHERLY, ALONG SAID WESTERLY EASEMENT SIDELINE AND ALONG SAID CURVE, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 37°21'48" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 110.86 FEET; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG SAID WESTERLY EASEMENT SIDELINE, NORTH 33°46'42" EAST, 14.44 FEET; THENCE LEAVING SAID WESTERLY EASEMENT SIDELINE, SOUTH 90°00'00" WEST, 141.65 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE EASEMENT (12' WIDE) GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO CONSOLIDATED GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY RECORDED SEPTEMBER 8, 1930 IN BOOK 1800, PAGE 412 OF DEEDS.

ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE EASEMENT (12' WIDE) GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO CONSOLIDATED GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY RECORDED SEPTEMBER 8, 1930 IN BOOK 1804, PAGE 389 OF DEEDS.

ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE EASEMENT (NO WIDTH GIVEN, ASSUME 2' WIDE) TO SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY RECORDED DECEMBER 13, 1950 IN BOOK 3896, PAGE 241 OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE EASEMENT (20' WIDE) FOR RECREATIONAL TRAIL PURPOSES GRANTED TO THE CITY OF POWAY PER PARCEL MAP NO. 17989.

ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE EASEMENT (20' WIDE) FOR RECREATIONAL TRAIL PURPOSES GRANTED TO THE CITY OF POWAY RECORDED FEBRUARY 14, 2001 AS DOC# 2001-0084322, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE EASEMENT (24' AND 4' WIDE) GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY RECORDED MARCH 6, 2001 AS DOC# 2001-0128529, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE EASEMENT (20' WIDE) GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY RECORDED MARCH 7, 2003 AS DOC# 2003-0260888, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE EASEMENT (10' WIDE) GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY RECORDED MARCH 12, 2003 AS DOC# 2003-0276467, OFFICIAL RECORDS

CONTAINS 8.9 ACRES (NET), MORE OR LESS

[Signature]
JOSEPH G. CRESTO DATE
PLS 8050
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EXHIBIT "B-1"

POINT OF COMMENCEMENT
NW CORNER
P.M. NO. 17989

MAP NO. 13708
N05°19'50"W 385.36'
[N05°19'42"W 385.31"
TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING
LOT 'D'
[N40°42'41"E 270.53']
N40°44'25"E 270.52'
[S72°13'58"E 720.52']
[S72°13'26"E 720.51']

SEE DETAIL "C"
ON SHEET 3
SAN DIEGUITO RIVER PARK PARCEL
SEE DETAIL "B"
ON SHEET 3
P.M. NO. 17989

PARCEL

SEE DETAIL "A"
ON SHEET 2

N88°13'49"E
20.00'
(TIE ONLY)

S88°13'49"W
0.00'

360.09'
79.55'

365.71'

SDP754'06"W 69.97'
SDP942'38"E 78.14'
S10°18'28"W 137.81'
S56°32'17"W 101.52'
S10°59'03"W 91.21'
S36°59'26"W 157.26'

LEGEND
INDICATES MITIGATION PARCEL
(8.9 ACRES NET)
[ ] INDICATES RECORD DATA PER P.M. NO. 17989

SAN DIEGUITO RIVER PARK PARCEL
MITIGATION PARCEL
POR. PARCEL 3, P.M. NO. 17989

STEVENS-CRESTO ENGINEERING, INC.
CIVIL ENGINEERS • PLANNERS • LAND SURVEYORS
9665 CHESAPEAKE DRIVE
SUITE 320
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1324
PHONE: 858.694.5680
FAX: 858.694.5681
www.stevenscresto.com

JN: 09010.01
DWG: 90100X01
PLOT: 08-19-09
EXHIBIT "B-1"

LEGEND
- Indicates mitigation parcel (8.9 acres net)
- Indicates record data per P.M. No. 17989

EASEMENT LEGEND

5. EASEMENT (12' wide) to San Diego Consolidated Gas and Electric Company recorded September 8, 1930 in Book 1804, Page 389 of Deeds.

8. EASEMENT (no width given, assume 2' wide) to San Diego Gas and Electric Company recorded December 13, 1950 in Book 3896, Page 241 of official records.

10. 20' wide recreational trail easement granted to the City of Poway per P.M. No. 17989.

20. 20' wide recreational trail easement granted to the City of Poway recorded February 14, 2001 as Doc# 2001-0084322, official records.


REFERENCE DRAWINGS
P.M. No. 17989, Map No. 13708
SDG&E Drawing A-3689, Dated July 1, 1030
SDG&E Drawing S-3333-59, Dated Feb 7, 2000

BASIS OF BEARINGS
The basis of bearings for this drawing is the westerly boundary of P.M. No. 17989, I.E., N01'46"11'W

DETAIL "A"
Scale: 1" = 100'

SAN DIEGUITO RIVER PARK PARCEL MITIGATION PARCEL
POR. PARCEL 3, P.M. NO. 17989

SITE

VICINITY MAP
No Scale

STEVENS-CRESTO ENGINEERING, INC.
CIVIL ENGINEERS • PLANNERS • LAND SURVEYSORS
9665 CHESAPEAKE DRIVE
SUITE 320
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121-1324
PHONE: 858-694-5640
FAX: 858-694-5661
www.scegr.com
TO: JPA
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: Rancho Santa Fe Polo Club Update

This item is for information.

Since the last report on this subject at your June meeting, the Rancho Santa Fe Polo Club has been working with City staff, the San Dieguito River Park, and other organizations to revise their plan in response to comments received. A field review meeting was held in June 2009 with City staff, Polo Club representative and consultants, JPA staff, and members of the CAC Project Review Committee (PRC) and Carmel Valley Community Planning Board. New plans were then submitted to the City by the Polo Club in July 2009. JPA staff submitted a comment letter on July 29th (Attachment 1).

The July 2009 plans included a public trail completely separated from the Polo Club’s proposed equestrian exercise track, and no longer shared with polo ponies. The revised plan also included restoring some areas along the river channel bank that were impacted over the years by the unpermitted exercise track. However, several issues, which are noted in the JPA’s July comment letter, still needed to be resolved. In addition, City staff’s August 2009 assessment letter included many issues that needed to be addressed in the Polo Club’s next submittal. Polo Club representatives and consultants have been meeting with City and JPA staff to address comments received. The Polo Club submitted a new set of plans to the City on September 8, 2009. These plans were presented as an information item at the September 11th CAC meeting by the applicant, and will be presented to your Board at today’s meeting.

This item will be brought back to the CAC and your Board for a recommendation to the City at a future meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawna Anderson
Principal Environmental Planner

Attachments:
1. JPA staff comment letter dated July 29, 2009
July 29, 2009

Ms. Jeannette Temple
City of San Diego Development Services Dept.
1222 1st Avenue, MS 501
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Comments on Rancho Santa Fe Polo Club Resubmittal, Project 169091

Dear Ms. Temple:

Thank you for providing the San Dieguito River Park JPA with the resubmittal plans for this project. JPA staff and our Project Review Committee have reviewed the plans and our comments are included herein. Due to the timing of the resubmittal, the revised plans have not yet been reviewed by the Citizens Advisory Committee or the JPA Board of Directors, although the comments below reflect the latest position taken by our JPA Board on this project (letter to Mayor Sanders dated April 23, 2009). Our comments address the Polo Club’s revised plans to remediate their grading violation and to restore the public trail on their lease site, but do not address issues regarding any possible lease renewal. The JPA reserves the right to comment on other land use matters should the Polo Club lease be considered for renewal.

The San Dieguito River Park JPA staff is pleased that the Polo Club’s revised plan includes a restored multi-use public trail that is separated from their proposed equestrian exercise track. The issue of a shared trail was addressed in the JPA’s April 23rd letter. We appreciate the recent collaborative effort on both the City’s and Polo Club’s part to resolve that issue. Issues raised in our April 23rd letter that have not been adequately addressed yet include:

1. We are concerned that the plan proposes to restore the public trail largely within the same area currently being used for the Polo Club’s equestrian track, which in some cases may not meet the City’s current environmental regulations (e.g., wetland buffer). More details (such as additional cross sections) should be provided to illustrate that the public trail can be located in a sustainable area that will not be subject to scour and erosion into the river. For example, cross section A-A on sheet 6 shows a 20-foot wide public trail along the very edge of the river channel with the habitat restoration occurring only on the stream bank. The public trail should be narrowed to 12 feet and located on the northern edge adjacent to the existing fence and away from the stream channel to provide more room for the Polo Club’s habitat restoration. The exact conditions vary along the lease area and more cross sections should be provided.

2. Together with a sustainable location, it is critical that the trail be stabilized with appropriate materials to minimize erosion into the stream bank. The Polo Club’s existing exercise track is eroding and sloughing into the river due to its proximity to the stream bank and its non-stable surface that is continually disked. Substantial ponding also occurs along the exercise track during the rainy season. This situation
did not exist prior to the illegally-placed exercise track, which has caused considerable impacts to the adjacent habitat and is in violation of current stormwater standards. In addition to habitat restoration to mitigate for those impacts, the Polo Club should restore the public trail to a sustainable condition that meets the Coast to Crest trail standards, which includes a stable surface such as compacted DG.

3. The plans should demonstrate how the Polo Club will maintain their equestrian exercise track without impacting the public trail where they are adjacent.

4. On sheet 6, the fence is shown on the north side of the public trail in cross section A-A, although the plan view appears to show a fence on the south side. Our understanding is that the public trail will be separated from the Polo Club’s operations and exercise track by an equestrian fence such as lodgepole.

5. The plans should provide more details with regard to the habitat restoration such as seed and plant palettes, soil preparation, and other details that meet the City’s biological and landscape guidelines.

6. It appears that the legend is generic and does not relate to the information shown on the plans. Symbols and lines are either missing or incorrectly labeled. For example, the legend does not include the symbol for a fence line and does not define the triangle shape shown on sheet 2.

Again, we are delighted that significant progress has been made and are optimistic that the issues listed above can be resolved in a timely manner to finally restore this area back to public use. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and we look forward to a continuing positive working relationship with City staff and the Polo Club.

Sincerely,

Shawna C. Anderson, AICP
Environmental Planner

Cc: Chris Collins, Polo Club
    Karen Ruggels, KLR planning
    Frisco White, Carmel Valley Community Planning Board
    Jan Fuchs, PRC Chair
TO: JPA
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: San Dieguito Lagoon Center Presentation and Discussion

RECOMMENDATION:
Discuss and Provide Input to Staff

SUMMARY:
At today’s meeting you will see a Powerpoint presentation showing the proposed Lagoon Center designs – site plan, floorplans, and 3D simulations. You may have seen them already, as the designs have been on the San Dieguito River Park website for public review and comment. The plan is that the designs will not be changed until all public comment on them has been gathered. A number of comments have been received to date, and those comments are attached for your review and information. At today’s meeting staff would like to hear comments from your Board on the plans and in response to the questions below. After today’s meeting, the architect team will synthesize the input they have received and make changes in the designs accordingly. The final package will be used for fundraising and grant applications.

Background

The Park Master Plan for the Coastal Area, adopted by the JPA Board in September 2000, included a Nature Center to be located on certain property known as the “Villages” property south of Via de la Valle and east of San Andres. This site is a disposal site where a large portion of the excavated materials from the wetland restoration project were deposited. The Sempra Foundation provided a grant of $60,000 to the San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy and the JPA for preparation of conceptual designs for the nature/visitor’s center at the San Dieguito Lagoon. After interviewing a number of qualified architectural teams, the JPA hired Roesling Nakamura & Terada Architects (RNT), along with Spurlock-Poirier Landscape Architects and The Acorn Group Interpretive Planning. The RNT team began by holding a series of meetings with various stakeholder groups (groups whose primary or strong focus is the San Dieguito Lagoon) to receive their input. The RNT team also
met with the entire River Park staff to hear their objectives for the facility. The San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy put together an advisory group of people, many of whom have expertise in teaching and science, to provide technical assistance with the designs and with the design process. The RNT team has met with them twice, and is scheduled to meet again after today’s meeting.

The RNT team and JPA staff visited a variety of Visitor/Nature Centers in San Diego and Orange County for comparison purposes. On the weekend of July 17-19, the RNT team held a 3 day design workshop. The public was able to participate in tours of the site where the Center will be located, provide input on their impressions, watch the architects and landscape architects as they worked, and provide feedback as they saw the plans begin to take shape.

**Site Plan** – although initially staff had suggested that the Center and associated landscaping should be focused on the western half of the property, it quickly became clear that it was desirable to utilize the entire site for several reasons. First, the western area is constrained by sizable encroachments from utility easements and the future expansion of Via de la Valle. Second, some of the best views were further to the east. Using the entire site enabled the various program elements to be spread out. The ranger garage/maintenance building could be tucked away in the westernmost corner of the site, the Center could be located in the central area where the property widens out, and the separate viewing platform could be isolated further east where visitors could enjoy contemplating nature in peace and quiet. Equestrian parking could be moved to the far eastern end to avoid conflicting with other user groups.

Because the existing site is manufactured and generally flat and featureless, a key design element is to reform the landscape to mimic the landforms on the north side of Via de la Valle, as if the road had not been built. This will suggest rolling hills and valleys, which will have recreated chaparral and coastal sage scrub on them; riparian habitat will also be created by using some of the water that drains from the site. This plan proposes to build some berms between the Center and Via de la Valle, to cut down on noise and other roadway impacts. Views of the site from the road will not be eliminated entirely, as there will be view corridors in several locations.

**Ranger Garage/Maintenance Building** – the Plan proposes a 1600 square foot facility, located in the far western corner of the site, roughly where the construction trailers are now, for storage of two park trucks and other equipment, office space for two rangers with windows for observation, a restroom with shower, and screened outdoor space for a plant nursery.

**San Dieguito Lagoon Center** – What’s in a name? Early discussions centered on
whether this is a Nature Center, a Visitor’s Center, an Interpretive Center, a Discovery Center, etc. All imply slightly different things. Now we are just calling it the Lagoon Center, as it will probably incorporate all of those things and more. Please feel free to comment on this issue.

The Lagoon Center is proposed to be located primarily in the space between the upper trail (the Coast to Crest Trail) and the lower trail (hiking only). This reduces the amount of structural mass that is visible. A portion of the lower level would be built into the ground and not exposed. The upper level would be visible from the upper trail and from the view corridor along Via de la Valle. The exposed portions of the lower level would be visible from the freeway.

The Lagoon Center will contain some administrative space (for the administrative ranger or director, interpretive and/or education specialist, docents and other volunteers); science research laboratory, reception/book store, exhibit space, classroom space, community meeting rooms, and viewing decks.

**Auxiliary Space** – The plans also include a small amphitheater for ranger talks and a viewing platform (mentioned earlier) for nature study and birdwatching, etc.

**Green Building**: The Center includes a number of features for sustainability. It is designed to maximize use of daylight. One notable feature is the tower that can be seen on the upper level. This is a “cooling tower”. It draws warm air from the Center up and out. The shade structure above the viewing deck will be composed of semi-translucent solar panels.

Following are some questions to stimulate discussion.

1. Who do you see as the major users of this facility: elementary or high school students, community groups, the average trail user, out-of-town or local visitors, repeat visitors? The answer to this question will help guide decisions on program uses at the Center.

2. A major emphasis is on education for all grade levels and possibly university level. Classroom space, a wet lab, a dedicated science classroom, outdoor gathering spaces (courtyard and amphitheatre) are all provided to support educational use. Do you feel this is appropriate? Do you feel that using the Center for education and research would negatively impact the lagoon or the experience of visitors to the lagoon? If you do, how could this be resolved?
Do you feel that all the educational experience should be outdoors and that there is no need for a classroom?

3. The architect tried to emphasize the outdoor experience with courtyards, viewing decks/platforms, outdoor exhibit space, space for outdoor science, direct connection to the Coast to Crest Trail and pedestrian trail, car parking away from center, and so on. Does the design adequately emphasize connections to the outdoors?

4. A 28 x 52 (1456 square foot) meeting/community room is provided on the upper level with seating for 100 people and a kitchen with direct access to viewing decks. The primary purpose of this room is to provide a space for community group meetings, classrooms, lectures, conference space, etc. This area could also be used to generate revenue to run the center by renting out the space for private parties, weddings, etc. Do you agree with using it for private gatherings? Do you think it is compatible with the surroundings and the River Park’s mission?

5. The center proposed two view decks, one with shade and one without. Do you think both decks are necessary?

6. If you are from the surrounding community do you think there is an unmet demand for community meeting spaces?

7. Do you think the site plan and buildings successfully respect the environmentally sensitive area and preserve views into the lagoon from the surrounding area while still providing a buffer from noise and intrusion from Via de la Valle and the freeway?

8. What is your view on the overall size and scale of the center? It is approximately 7,300 square feet in size not including the separate ranger maintenance facility. Does it seem too big, too small, or just right? If you think
the proposed Center is too large, what parts would you propose eliminating or reducing?

9. It is proposed that the parking area and circulation roads would be decomposed granite instead of asphalt. At the Center, the courtyard and steps are proposed as some type of concrete. Do you think there is too much “hardscape”? If you do, what would you reduce?

10. What do you like/dislike about the overall site plan – the separate buildings, the separate viewing platform to the east, the landform changes and native landscape, separated parking area, etc.?

Attachment: 1. Comments from Blog
**Lagoon Center Comment**

The Friends of the San Dieguito River Valley applaud the open design process for the proposed Nature Center but is concerned about the size and bulk of the building, particularly after viewing the 3D simulations on the website. The large interior spaces for a variety of specific functions and the amount of hardscape in the “interior courtyard” in the floor plans seem to contradict one of the design concepts goal: “to minimize indoor program and maximize outdoor programs.

Unfortunately the building design presents no unifying theme that would suggest its purpose as a nature center. It is uninviting in its presentation to the public and separates itself from the lagoon environment with bulk and hardscape. Coming in on the upper trail the public is confronted by a vast hard deck, stonewalls and harsh angles.

The size and specific limited uses of the interior spaces seem excessive:

1. Reduce the size of the Meeting Room with current seating for 100 people, and the AV Room. As proposed, if both these rooms were being utilized at capacity at one time there would simply not be enough parking spaces for persons coming in to view exhibits, go on the trails or provide “docenting” services. The traffic at the Via de la Valle/El Camino Real intersection, already congested, would also negatively impacted. More likely the rooms would be underutilized creating unnecessary interior space and exterior bulk to the buildings.

2. Incorporate into other spaces the Archive and Special Exhibit spaces. Given the size of the main exhibit room and the display seating area in the courtyard, there would seem to still be plenty of space for indoor exhibits. We recall that the conceptual plans also call for outdoor exhibits away from the main building. The current plan emphasizes indoor exhibits and meetings over outdoor programs and experience.

Space for the archives could easily be built along the northern wall of the Open Office. This would provide both security and staff support for this information, as well as a very valuable nearby conference room where documents could be spread out, reviewed and discussed with nearby staff, including the ranger!
The large Courtyard hardscape is out of scale with the overall project and its goals, and the large outdoor meeting space (Amphitheatre) is so wedged in between two buildings and away from a lagoon/valley view shed that it becomes more of an indoor rather than an outdoor experience. In the simulations, the amphitheatre hardscape dominates views from the lower trail presenting a harsh image against the proposed landscapes of chaparral, meadowland and coastal scrub. How about moving the Amphitheatre south toward the lagoon, reducing the width of the Courtyard and incorporating more “softscape” into the area: perhaps plantings that bring the adjacent landscaping into the building site itself or appropriate ground cover that invites visitors to sit and enjoy the lagoon view.

The Board was unanimous in its concern that the large meeting room might be used for private social functions such as weddings. We see this use as the antithesis to the experience of the lagoon and its habitat as well as limiting public access. Several Board members wanted the eastern wing removed entirely. Others suggested that the meeting room be placed on the ground level, again relating more specifically to the lagoon environment and reducing the visual impact of the building on the landscape. The minority thought a community room used for River Valley related purposes was appropriate but agreed that the size could be reduced.

The Board of the Friends is unanimous in its praise of the site plan and exterior landscape. We mention specifically the berm to separate the Center from the view and noise of Via de la Valle, vehicle parking in the northwest corner, equestrian staging to the east and the landscaping of the berms to duplicate and suggest a continuation over the Via de la Valle “cut” as well as the emphasis on coastal scrub, meadow and upland chaparral areas. We applaud the elongation of the lagoon experience from the water treatment platform to the west, across the whole site with special viewpoints all the way to interpretive places with small outdoor seating areas and special features, to Horse Park.

However as proposed in the floor plans and exterior design, we feel the main Center complex is uninviting, does not blend in with the “softer” lagoon environment or meet concept goals.
Lagoon Center Comment

Thank you for opportunity to comment on the design of your new center. Unfortunately, the modern design is not consistent with our community character. While the design maybe cost effective, it leaves one with the impression of a cold, sterile, prison structure. The orientation is acceptable, but the materials and design simply do not relate to the area or what we are viewing. Please reconsider this design and choose something that connects with the history of the area. Ultra modern metal is not it!
Ralph

Posted by San Dieguito River Park at 6:05 PM 1 comments
Labels: Modern Style Design

Lagoon Center Comment

I was pleasantly surprised by the outcome of the planning PROCESS. I do have a serious problem with the OUTCOME of that process. The architects really did listen to everybody and delivered on most if not all the “requests”.
The next step should be a major effort of either triage or editing or making an effort toward multi uses for these facilities: this project is simply TOO BIG.
The main goals of the San Dieguito River Park project is
a. to create a wildlife corridor along the San Dieguito River
b. to create a Coast to Crest trail
c. to educate the public.
From my perspective the educational effort should be toward informing the public how this Restoration could happen and how the public at large should become the steward of this wonderful project.
The educational effort should NOT be to replace or even complement the school system’s responsibility of teaching biology, etc...

1. Name
The SDRP is comfortable with long names:
The San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park or
The David Kreitzer Lake Hodges Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge!!!!!
Nobody can remember such long names.
Could the name for this facility
NOT BE:
Strawberry Center: obsolete
Visitor Center: dull
Nature Center: there is nothing natural about the Restoration, this project is nature re-engineered
SO could the name be:
San Dieguito Lagoon Center to be replaced by XYZ Lagoon Center when XYZ has been found to fund all this.

2. Seek to coalesce functions with multi-use rooms.....
Two examples:
A. In my comments I suggested that in spite of internet access, hard copies of crucial reference documents should be preserved.
The architects responded with to plan for a 12x17 Archive Room: very nice.
The preserving of these archival documents could be done equally well by lining up the blind wall of the Conference Room with locked book-cases.
This would be a saving of $ 100,000 in construction costs.

B. In the same vein.
- Rethink the first building east of the courtyard so that the exhibit room could be used as a very rare large meeting room (DO provide a large storage area).
- Exhibit hall: most people acquire information through the internet and do not visit exhibitions.
  * Entirely delete the eastern most building.
  * The laboratory cannot operate without a mother institution. And should be sharply reduced or deleted etc...

3. Campus like concept: many building.
This is a very good idea. The Payne Scripps Center is a good example on how that can be done elegantly.
The park should clarify in this final presentation what comes first.
A. Obviously the landscaping of the whole Villages Property. Is it realistic to believe that grants can be found for that?
B. In my eyes the principal function of the Lagoon Center is the one entrusted to the
rangers: their space requirement, equipment and staffing should come first.

C. The Lagoon Center should have a narrow focus program what it does what others cannot do: tell about the Restoration. This huge complex with new programs changes the original purpose of the Park; A wild life corridor and trail.

4. Financing.

This project is operating in a financial vacuum. This cannot be. When construction considerations are made, financing for staff and maintenance MUST be part of the equation.

I visited the San Elijo Lagoon Center yesterday and found out that they have 5 Rangers for an area that is probably very similar to the SDgto Lagoon.

• We have 2.5 rangers so that an endowment funding and extra 2.5 rangers is necessary.
• How many square feet does the project propose? San Elijo is 5525 sq ft and they seemed to think that that was sufficient.
• What is the average sq/ ft cost estimate?
• What are the staff needs for such a large project besides the rangers?
• Where is the money coming from to pay for a stable staffing force to man all those buildings?

* What are expected maintenance cost?

In conclusion this is a very large project but to be successful it must be severely reduced in size and scope.

No Taj Mahal, please.

Jacqueline

THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 2009

Lagoon Center Comment

On a recent road trip through Redwoods National Park, we stopped at the Prairie Creek Visitor Center to obtain a hiking permit for a particularly spectacular trail through the mountains. The actual park is strung out over many miles of coast to the west, highway to the north & south, and fingers of mountains and canyons interspersed with farms, towns
and secondary roads to the east. While at the Center, I noticed all their outdoor displays, but the most memorable one was a (roughly) 10 ft. X 5 ft. raised relief map of the park. Studying that display helped me put all the various pieces together in my mind, much like a large map would do, but with the added benefit that the raised relief provided a 3-dimensional view. I could see just how diverse the land features were within the park, from ocean to mountaintops, and could identify exactly where our hike would take us in the mountains.

Nearly everyone who saw the display took time to study it.

I have noted Jim’s comments in the blog where he recommends having a model of the watershed. If that’s what I’ve described above, I certainly agree with him. The San Dieguito River Park enjoys a similarly varied landscape as Redwoods National Park and it is interrupted in many spots by various types of development. Visitors to the Nature Center would easily be able to visualize the full extent of the river as it winds its way west from the mountains down through the woodlands and meadows to agricultural lands, then into the lagoon and finally the ocean. I strongly urge that consideration should be given to including a raised relief map to the Nature Center’s displays. People of all ages will benefit.

Liz

Posted by San Dieguito River Park at 9:13 PM 0 comments
Labels: 3D Display of River Valley

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2009

**Lagoon Center Comment**

The lead sentence in your draft narrative aptly describes a center that “supports an interpretive and contemplative experience and focuses on developing a series of de-compressive site and building experiences that foster a deeper appreciation and understanding of the River Valley, the Coast to Crest trail and the Lagoon and wetlands.” We would emphasize the word contemplative. We do not wish the center to become so busy with human activity that quiet contemplation becomes impossible.

We believe “form follows function” and strongly recommend that more time be spent
defining the center’s functions precisely. We assert that, once this task is accomplished, a reduction of the building mass and hardscape should, can and will follow. In keeping with the above quote from your draft narrative, the center’s functions must truly focus on nature and the out-of-doors. Let it be a portal, not an obstruction.

Kudos for:
Overall layout of structures and viewing platforms.
Focus on the outdoors and on the resources being preserved.
Placement of parking areas: appropriately divides equestrian-related parking from other.
Well designed landscaping, incorporating native plants and natural contours
Tucking the buildings into the landscape as appropriate and minimizing building impact.
Natural building materials proposed.
Buildings designed for low energy use.
Reception and book shop included.
Viewing platforms well placed.

Concerns:
The proposed Lagoon Nature Center calls for too large a footprint, too many buildings, too much square footage, too much apparent hardscape.
• Excess building space provides for too many functions that are not primary needs.
• Many interior spaces are single, specific purpose rooms.
• Excessive office space: “open office” could be smaller, allowing for “conference room to be larger and serve as conference/meeting room, eliminating the need for other meeting space.
• Interactive Lab space is inappropriate (indoors), costly to equip and unlikely to be utilized. (Whatever happened to working outdoors?) It seems “over the top.”
• Three different restroom facilities: expensive to build and difficult to maintain well.
• Amphitheatre is too large, requiring excess hardscape and drawing visitors from the viewing platforms and trails.
• Parking, as designed, appears inadequate for plans and uses depicted, but as stated in recommendations below, we support fewer uses and spaces anyway.

Recommendations:
• Combine uses of interior spaces to reduce the building footprint/reduce the number of rooms/buildings.
• Disperse interpretive signage throughout the outdoor spaces between/on building walls
e.g. in “courtyard,” which would reduce the interior exhibit space needs.
· Eliminate upper level buildings: Kitchen, Toilet and easternmost Meeting Room and Storage Room (below). Some of this square footage could be added as suggested below. A kitchen is unnecessary and would add long term user and maintenance expenses.
· Increase the footprint of and redesign the building space currently identified as AV Room/Reception/Bookstore/Exhibit/Special Exhibit (lower level) and View Deck (upper level) to include whatever meeting and storage space is needed.
· Instead of a courtyard (which we interpret as hardscape), why not plant that space as a garden of native species with appropriate identifiers on various plants? Provide pathways for viewer enjoyment, a few seating areas.
· Redesign amphitheatre by eliminating the upper (northern) portion; instead, create a landscape buffer there. Perhaps even narrow the amphitheatre.
· Combine restrooms/increase number of stalls and eliminate duplication.
· Do not add parking spaces to satisfy the conceptual design; instead, downsize the uses. More hardscape is not needed.
· Design the structure to eliminate future overhead and maintenance issues as upcoming SDRP budgets will still present challenges.

Liz, Jan & Bill

Posted by San Dieguito River Park at 10:01 PM 3 comments
Labels: Reduce size and hardscape

Lagoon Center Comment

Awesome drawings, what would be really nice is a little outdoor amphitheater for lectures, small concert by the wetlands, …., something to bring in more donations.

John

Posted by San Dieguito River Park at 9:46 PM 0 comments
Labels: Amphitheater
Addition to my comments after a few days of 90 degree weather.
We were discussing the Center at home and remembered that there will be no air-conditioning. We looked at the plans and realized that this structure would be like a greenhouse in hot weather. All the glass facing south west would make it very uncomfortable as well as glaring. We do not want to have air-conditioning for energy efficiency reasons but the architect should consider summer use and adjust the plans accordingly.

Freda
August 29, 2009 9:12 AM

I am trying, unsuccessfully again, to wrap my brain around the plans for the Nature Center. I cannot get too involved in the size of this and the view from that and the area of these and use of those. I am prepared to respect the expertise of the architects and planners on all of those bread-and-butter aspects of the building. I know they have consulted a zillion people and incorporated every idea into their plans. My problem is that I just don’t LIKE it. I find it sharp and intrusive and prickly.

Sorry if that isn’t specific enough. I feel that a building has to match its surroundings and make a pleasing hole in the sky. The Nature Center does not meet my standards on these two basic issues. But I am not one, in this case at least, to force my standard on others. And I never expected it to be one of the great architectural gems of the nation. But I did hope…… And why not?
I was hoping for something that would evoke the sinuous, meandering nature of a river. This is a Visitor Center for a river park, but you’d never know it. If you picked it up and moved it hundreds or thousands of miles away, would anyone say: "Take this away, it belongs in a river park." I don’t think so.

Mary

August 29, 2009 9:34 AM

San Diego Mom said...

BATHROOMS: I think that there should be 3, unisex/family bathrooms, all of which could be equipped with a small countertop for diaper changes. I am a mom (and therefore also a woman) and this is the best use of the space and will avoid lines.

SCIENCE CLASSROOM: There should be windows in the Science Classroom. It is inspiring to younger students to see scientists at work, whether they be adult professionals or high school students. These windowed areas are always the best part of any museum, aquarium, etc.

PUBLIC SPACE RENTAL: I think that stakeholders should be presented with whatever financial information is available regarding revenue from space rental for private group meetings and receptions, and given a chance to fully discuss the benefits and disadvantages of such uses, knowing what the potential revenue could be.

Lastly, I do not think that the design is cold or sterile (relating to the last comment). I think it is appropriate and well-designed; a lovely building! Any money spent to improve the aesthetics is money better-spent on other, more important priorities.

August 29, 2009 7:42 PM

Anonymous said...

First, let me applaud the SDRP for the very thorough and open process for getting public input, both at the open house sessions in July and the opportunity to express our opinions in blogs on the SDRP web site. However, I share the concerns that many others have expressed about the scale of the
project, especially the size of the main building(s) not being consistent with one of the design goals: "minimizing indoor program and maximizing outdoor program".

One aspect is mentioned in passing but needs to be given more weight in the design of the lagoon center: "The site is an important portal to the river valley".

In fact, it will probably be the MOST important portal because of the large population of potential users along the coast, easy access (as is noted) from the I-5 freeway and, for all practical purposes, will be the western end of the 55 mile long Crest-to-Coast Trail. (True, the trail will continue another mile or so out to the beach at the river mouth but parking there is already overwhelmed with beach goers. Also, bicycles and horses will not be permitted on the part of the trail west of the lagoon center.)

The Torrey Pines State Reserve, located south of Del Mar, has many of the same attractions that will be available in the lagoon area of the river park - trails, views and a Lodge staffed by Docent volunteers who provide information and that has exhibits of the animals and plants in the Reserve. A significant percent (possibly a majority?) of visitors go there only to exercise, mostly running or walking on the trails. Future use patterns of the lagoon area are likely to be the same.

Therefore, any lagoon center planning should provide for:

1. Adequate parking for BOTH users coming for activities at the visitor center AND for those using the trails at the same time.

2. A shaded kiosk meeting place with benches, bike racks, water fountain and trail map displays.

3. Adequate width of the trails to allow runners and bikers to pass, without crowding, slower walkers and those quietly enjoying the lagoon environment.

Stu
CONCLUSION

The proposed San Dieguito Lagoon Center is massive and needs to be revised.

SUGGESTIONS

The San Dieguito Lagoon Center should be sited as close as possible to the lagoon property line adjacent to Via de la Valle.
I understand that traffic noise is an issue, but habitat comes first. The rest is engineering for sound.

The Exhibit Space where rangers meet the public should be the only space with views of the lagoon.
Community rooms, science research laboratories, ranger offices, and storage lockers should be below ground. Possibly in the berm behind the building. The important point is to minimize habitat loss to construction.

All buildings, decking, and hard-scape should be as small as possible.
The footprint of the project as proposed is approximately the size of a football field: 300 feet by 150 feet not including parking. It should be reduced to 150 feet by 75 feet, approximately. The building should be cut into the side of the hill to minimize its impact on the environment, and all meeting rooms, storage lockers, and offices spaces should be placed below the viewing deck or below ground.

The one and only viewing deck should be on the roof of the San Dieguito Lagoon Center.
The roof of the building should be the only viewing area. No other decking is necessary.

The structure and its roof-top viewing area should not be visible the street. The Cooling Chimney should be obscured by vegetation.
The Ranger Garage/Maintenance building should be as close to Via de la Valle as possible.
It should be as below ground as possible to maintain functionality. Porous concrete should be used as appropriate, and all decisions to not use porous concrete should be clearly explained and presented for public review.

There should be nature (no hard-scape) tree-shaded areas for day-use groups to meet.

All parking should be as far from the structure as feasible. An area for handicap pick-up and drop-off but not parking should be near the building.

Ed
September 4, 2009 11:28 AM