



 **City of**
Carlsbad
California
2023 - 2030
PARKS & RECREATION
DEPARTMENT
MASTER PLAN UPDATE
APPENDICES - AUG. 2023






City of Carlsbad California 2023 - 2030

APPENDIX A -
STATISTICALLY
RELIABLE SURVEY
RESULTS



APPENDIX A - STATISTICALLY RELIABLE SURVEY RESULTS

REST OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Executive Summary

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary



PURPOSE

ETC Institute conducted a parks and recreation needs assessment survey for the City of Carlsbad during the summer of 2022. The survey was conducted as part of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan that will guide future improvements to facilities, programs, and services.

METHODOLOGY

The six-page survey, cover letter and postage-paid return envelope were mailed to a random sample of households in Carlsbad. The cover letter explained the purpose of the survey and encouraged residents to either return their survey by mail or complete the survey online. Ten days after the surveys were mailed, ETC Institute sent emails and text messages to the households that received the survey to encourage participation. The emails and texts contained a link to the online version of the survey to make it easy for residents to complete the survey.

The goal was to obtain completed surveys from at least 375 residents. This goal was met, with a total of 400 households completing the survey. The results for the sample of 400 households have a 95% level of confidence with a precision rate of at least +/- 4.9%.

This report contains the following:

- An executive summary of the methodology for administering the survey and major findings
- Charts showing the overall results of the survey (Section 1)
- Priority Investment Rating (PIR) that identifies priorities for facilities and activities (Section 2)
- Benchmarking analysis comparing Carlsbad's results to national results (Section 3)
- Tabular data showing the overall results for all questions on the survey (Section 4)
- A copy of the survey instrument (Section 5)

The percentage of “don't know” or “not provided” responses has been excluded from many of the graphs shown in this report to facilitate valid comparisons of the results from Carlsbad with the results from other communities where ETC Institute has conducted a community interest and opinion survey. Since the number of “don't know”/“not provided” responses often reflects the utilization and awareness of services, the percentage of those responses has been provided in the tabular data section of this report. When the “don't know”/“not provided” responses have been excluded, the text of this report will indicate that the responses have been excluded with either the phrase “*who had an opinion*” or “*who provided a response.*”

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary



USAGE AND RATINGS OF/PARKS AND FACILITIES

Eighty-five percent (85%) of households surveyed indicated their household visited City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities or sports fields during the year prior to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Of those who had visited parks or facilities, 41% who provided a response indicated they did so 2 times per week or more; 22% visited once per week, 21% visited 1 to 3 times per month, and 17% visited parks or facilities less than once per month.

Overall, 38% of respondents who visited parks or facilities in the year prior to COVID-19 and who had an opinion rated the physical condition as “excellent;” 55% rated the parks and facilities as “good,” 6% gave a rating of “fair,” and only 1% of those who visited parks or facilities rated the physical condition as “poor.”

REASONS PREVENTING HOUSEHOLDS FROM USING PARKS/FACILITIES MORE OFTEN

Eighteen percent (18%) of respondents indicated the lack of desired features prevented them from using City parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields more often. Other reasons include: lack of restrooms (11%), no feeling of safety when using parks (11%), lack of awareness of parks locations (11%), and use of parks in other cities (10%).

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT FACILITIES, PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Fifty-three percent (53%) of respondents indicated they learn about Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities, programs and activities through friends and neighbors. Other sources of information include: City website (47%), City community services guide (41%), emails (35%), temporary signs at parks or around the City (26%), and e-newsletter (19%).

Based on the sum of respondents’ top three choices, the *most preferred* methods of communicating about facilities, programs and activities were: 1) emails, 2) City website, and 3) City community services guide.

PARTICIPATION IN/RATINGS OF PARKS AND RECREATION PROGRAMS

Thirty-six percent (36%) of households surveyed indicated their household participated in programs offered by the City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Department during the year prior to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Of those who had participated in programs, 19% who provided a response indicated they participated in 4 programs or more; 40% participated in 2 to 3 programs, and 41% participated in one program.

Forty-three percent (43%) of respondents who participated in programs in the year prior to COVID-19 and who had an opinion rated the quality as “excellent;” 53% rated the quality of programs as “good,” and only 4% gave a rating of “fair.”

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary



REASONS PREVENTING HOUSEHOLDS FROM PARTICIPATING IN PROGRAMS MORE OFTEN

Thirty-four percent (34%) of respondents indicated the lack of knowledge of available programs prevented them from participating more often. Other reasons include: too busy/not interested (25%), program times are not convenient (15%), use programs of other agencies (10%), program not offered (10%), and fees are too high (9%).

SATISFACTION WITH VALUE RECEIVED FROM CARLSBAD PARKS AND RECREATION

Twenty-two percent (22%) of respondents who had an opinion were “very satisfied” with the overall value received from the City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Department; 48% were “satisfied,” 22% were “neutral,” and 7% were either “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied.”

PERCEPTION OF THE VALUE OF PARKS AND RECREATION SINCE COVID-19

Respondents were asked how their perception of the value of parks and recreation has changed since COVID-19. Twenty-eight percent (28%) who had an opinion believe the value has “increased;” 17% feel the value has “somewhat increased,” 48% believe there has been no change, and 7% believe the value of parks and recreation has decreased since COVID-19.

PRIORITIES FOR PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Respondents were asked how they would like to see the City place greater emphasis on parks and recreation projects, programs, and services. Sixty percent (60%) who had an opinion prefer to increase funding; 38% prefer to maintain existing funding, and only 2% indicated they prefer the City to reduce funding for parks and recreation project, programs, and services.


PARK FACILITY NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

Park Facility Needs: Respondents were asked to identify if their household had a need for 22 park facilities and rate how well their needs for each were currently being met. Based on this analysis, ETC Institute was able to estimate the number of households in the community that had the greatest “unmet” need for various facilities.

The four park facilities with the highest percentage of households that indicated a need for the facility were: community parks (77%), neighborhood parks (75%), family picnic areas (56%), and outdoor swimming pools (48%). When ETC Institute analyzed the needs in the community, these same four facilities had a need that affected more than 20,000 households.


ETC Institute estimates a total of 12,901 households in the City of Carlsbad that have a need, have unmet needs for outdoor pickleball courts. The estimated number of households that have unmet needs for each of the 22 park facilities that were assessed is shown on the following page.

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary



Park Facility Importance: In addition to assessing the needs for each park facility, ETC Institute also assessed the importance that residents placed on each. Based on the sum of respondents’ top four choices, the most important park facilities to residents were: community parks (43%), neighborhood parks (39%), off leash dog parks (23%), and outdoor swimming pools (22%). The percentage of residents who selected each facility as one of their top four choices is shown in the chart on the following page.

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary



Priorities for Park Facility Investments: The Priority Investment Rating (PIR) was developed by ETC Institute to provide organizations with an objective tool for evaluating the priority that should be placed on parks, trails, recreational facilities, and services. The PIR equally weights (1) the importance that residents place on facilities and (2) how many residents have unmet needs for the facility. [Details regarding the methodology for this analysis are provided in Section 2 of this report.]


Based the Priority Investment Rating (PIR), the following six park facilities were rated as high priorities for investment:

- Outdoor pickleball courts (PIR=149)
- Neighborhood parks (PIR=147)
- Community parks (PIR=142)
- Off leash dog parks (PIR=142)
- Community gardens (PIR=120)
- Outdoor swimming pools (PIR=112)

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary



The chart below shows the Priority Investment Rating for each park facilities that were assessed on the survey.



PROGRAMMING NEEDS AND PRIORITIES


Programming Needs. Respondents were asked to identify if their household had a need for 28 parks and recreation programs and rate how well their needs for each were currently being met. Based on this analysis, ETC Institute was able to estimate the number of households in the community that had “unmet” needs for each program.

The four programs with the highest percentage of households that had needs were: adult fitness and wellness programs (55%), senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) (43%), adult sports programs (39%), and aquatics programming (39%). When ETC Institute analyzed the needs in the community, all four of these programs had a need that affected more than 16,000 households.

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary




ETC Institute estimates a total of 14,173 households in Carlsbad that have a need, have unmet needs for adult fitness and wellness programs. The estimated number of households that have unmet needs for each of the 28 programs that were assessed is shown below.



Programming Importance. In addition to assessing the needs for each program, ETC Institute also assessed the importance that residents place on each. Based on the sum of respondents’ top four choices, the most important programs to residents were: adult fitness and wellness (31%), senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) (27%), aquatics programming (21%), and senior trips/other targeted senior programs (17%). The percentage of residents who selected each program as one of their top four choices is shown in the chart on the following page.

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary




Priorities for Programming Investments. Based on the priority investment rating (PIR), which was described briefly on page vi of this Executive Summary and is described in more detail in Section 2 of this report, the following eight programs were rated as “high priorities” for investment:

- Adult fitness and wellness programs (PIR=200)
- Senior adult and fitness programs (PIR=176)
- Senior trips/other targeted senior programs (PIR=128)
- Aquatics programming (PIR=122)
- Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) (PIR=122)
- Adult sports programs (PIR=118)
- Cultural arts programs (PIR=117)
- Outdoor skills/adventure programs (PIR=100)

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary



The chart below shows the Priority Investment Rating (PIR) for each of the programs that were rated.



CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

When analyzing the park facilities and programs offered by the City of Carlsbad, the following were the items for which the highest number of residents had a need: community parks, neighborhood parks, adult fitness and wellness programs, and senior adult and fitness programs. Focusing on these items would provide the greatest benefit for the largest number of residents in Carlsbad.

Making certain the City’s availability of facilities and programs encompasses the greatest number of households ensures funding is appropriately allocated to give the community the greatest benefit possible. In order to ensure that the City of Carlsbad continues to meet the needs and expectations of the community, ETC Institute recommends that the City sustain and/or improve the performance in areas that were identified as “high priorities” by the Priority Investment Rating (PIR).

City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Survey – Executive Summary




The facilities and programs with the highest PIR ratings are listed below.

Park Facility Priorities

- Outdoor pickleball courts (PIR=149)
- Neighborhood parks (PIR=147)
- Community parks (PIR=142)
- Off leash dog parks (PIR=142)
- Community gardens (PIR=120)
- Outdoor swimming pools (PIR=112)

Programming Priorities

- Adult fitness and wellness programs (PIR=200)
- Senior adult and fitness programs (PIR=176)
- Senior trips/other targeted senior programs (PIR=128)
- Aquatics programming (PIR=122)
- Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) (PIR=122)
- Adult sports programs (PIR=118)
- Cultural arts programs (PIR=117)
- Outdoor skills/adventure programs (PIR=100)



Tabular Data

Q1. Have you or any member of your household visited any City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields during the year before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020)?

| Q1. | Number | Percent |
|-------|--------|---------|
| Yes | 342 | 85.5 % |
| No | 58 | 14.5 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q1a. How often have you visited City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields during the last 12 months before the Covid-19 Pandemic?

| Q1a. | Number | Percent |
|--------------------------|--------|---------|
| More than 5 times a week | 34 | 9.9 % |
| 2-4 times a week | 97 | 28.4 % |
| Once a week | 71 | 20.8 % |
| 1-3 times a month | 67 | 19.6 % |
| Less than once a month | 54 | 15.8 % |
| Don't know | 19 | 5.6 % |
| Total | 342 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"

Q1a. How often have you visited City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields during the last 12 months before the Covid-19 Pandemic? (without "Don't Know")

| Q1a. | Number | Percent |
|--------------------------|--------|---------|
| More than 5 times a week | 34 | 10.5 % |
| 2-4 times a week | 97 | 30.0 % |
| Once a week | 71 | 22.0 % |
| 1-3 times a month | 67 | 20.7 % |
| Less than once a month | 54 | 16.7 % |
| Total | 323 | 100.0 % |

Q1b. Overall, how would you rate the physical condition of ALL the City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities and sports fields you have visited?

| Q1b. | Number | Percent |
|--------------|--------|---------|
| Excellent | 128 | 37.4 % |
| Good | 184 | 53.8 % |
| Fair | 19 | 5.6 % |
| Poor | 3 | 0.9 % |
| Not Provided | 8 | 2.3 % |
| Total | 342 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"

Q1b. Overall, how would you rate the physical condition of ALL the City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities and sports fields you have visited? (without "Not Provided")

| Q1b. | Number | Percent |
|-----------|--------|---------|
| Excellent | 128 | 38.3 % |
| Good | 184 | 55.1 % |
| Fair | 19 | 5.7 % |
| Poor | 3 | 0.9 % |
| Total | 334 | 100.0 % |

Q2. Please CHECK ALL the following reasons that prevent you or members of your household from using City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields more often.

| Q2 | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Use parks in other cities | 40 | 10.0 % |
| Too far from your home | 35 | 8.8 % |
| Parks are not well maintained | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Lack of features we want to use | 73 | 18.3 % |
| Lack of parking to access parks | 30 | 7.5 % |
| Do not feel safe using parks | 43 | 10.8 % |
| Lack of handicap accessibility | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Not aware of park locations | 42 | 10.5 % |
| Lack of transportation | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Lack of restrooms | 45 | 11.3 % |
| Lack of trust in government | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Other | 80 | 20.0 % |
| Total | 410 | |

Q3. From the following list, please CHECK ALL the service providers that you or members of your household used for recreation and sports activities during the year before the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020).

| Q3 | Number | Percent |
|------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Private schools | 28 | 7.0 % |
| Places of worship (e.g. synagogues, churches) | 73 | 18.3 % |
| Private and non-profit youth sports | 83 | 20.8 % |
| Public schools | 93 | 23.3 % |
| Private summer camps | 64 | 16.0 % |
| Neighboring cities | 124 | 31.0 % |
| Private clubs (tennis, health, swim, fitness) | 131 | 32.8 % |
| City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department | 189 | 47.3 % |
| YMCA programs | 50 | 12.5 % |
| Boys and Girls club | 18 | 4.5 % |
| Other | 26 | 6.5 % |
| Total | 879 | |

Q4. From the following list, please CHECK ALL the ways you currently learn about City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department facilities, programs and activities.

| Q4 | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| City community services guide | 164 | 41.0 % |
| City website | 189 | 47.3 % |
| Materials at recreation facilities | 65 | 16.3 % |
| Conversations with recreation staff | 13 | 3.3 % |
| Newspaper | 62 | 15.5 % |
| Friends and neighbors | 213 | 53.3 % |
| Temporary signs at parks or around the City | 102 | 25.5 % |
| Peachjar | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Emails | 138 | 34.5 % |
| E-newsletter | 76 | 19.0 % |
| Facebook | 44 | 11.0 % |
| NextDoor | 63 | 15.8 % |
| Instagram | 32 | 8.0 % |
| Twitter | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Flyers | 51 | 12.8 % |
| City Council meetings | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Other | 24 | 6.0 % |
| Total | 1260 | |

Q4-17. Other

| <u>Q4-17 Other</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Mailers | 2 | 8.3 % |
| mail | 2 | 8.3 % |
| Carlsbad Academy | 1 | 4.2 % |
| Libraries | 1 | 4.2 % |
| City manager's newsletters | 1 | 4.2 % |
| City mayer's email | 1 | 4.2 % |
| Need info of City Parks locations | 1 | 4.2 % |
| more mailings | 1 | 4.2 % |
| city manager's email letter | 1 | 4.2 % |
| word of mouth | 1 | 4.2 % |
| Family member | 1 | 4.2 % |
| Googling parks near our current locations | 1 | 4.2 % |
| Materials mailed to my home. | 1 | 4.2 % |
| Self Exploration | 1 | 4.2 % |
| WALKING AROUND, DISCOVER THEM | 1 | 4.2 % |
| DRIVING BY THEM | 1 | 4.2 % |
| CITY MANAGER NEWSLETTER | 1 | 4.2 % |
| city manager emails | 1 | 4.2 % |
| google | 1 | 4.2 % |
| Carlsbad magazine | 1 | 4.2 % |
| city managers email | 1 | 4.2 % |
| Drive by | 1 | 4.2 % |
| Total | 24 | 100.0 % |

Q5. From the list in Question 4, which THREE methods of communication would you MOST PREFER the City use to communicate with you about recreation facilities, programs and activities?

| <u>Top Choice</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| City community services guide | 58 | 14.5 % |
| City website | 57 | 14.3 % |
| Materials at recreation facilities | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Conversations with recreation staff | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Newspaper | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Friends and neighbors | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Temporary signs at parks or around the City | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Emails | 100 | 25.0 % |
| E-newsletter | 47 | 11.8 % |
| Facebook | 5 | 1.3 % |
| NextDoor | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Instagram | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Twitter | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Flyers | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Other | 4 | 1.0 % |
| None | 65 | 16.3 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q5. From the list in Question 4, which THREE methods of communication would you MOST PREFER the City use to communicate with you about recreation facilities, programs and activities?

| <u>2nd Choice</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| City community services guide | 39 | 9.8 % |
| City website | 53 | 13.3 % |
| Materials at recreation facilities | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Conversations with recreation staff | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Newspaper | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Friends and neighbors | 17 | 4.3 % |
| Temporary signs at parks or around the City | 36 | 9.0 % |
| Peachjar | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Emails | 44 | 11.0 % |
| E-newsletter | 40 | 10.0 % |
| Facebook | 16 | 4.0 % |
| NextDoor | 14 | 3.5 % |
| Instagram | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Twitter | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Flyers | 18 | 4.5 % |
| Other | 4 | 1.0 % |
| None | 87 | 21.8 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q5. From the list in Question 4, which THREE methods of communication would you MOST PREFER the City use to communicate with you about recreation facilities, programs and activities?

| 3rd Choice | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| City community services guide | 32 | 8.0 % |
| City website | 45 | 11.3 % |
| Materials at recreation facilities | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Conversations with recreation staff | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Newspaper | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Friends and neighbors | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Temporary signs at parks or around the City | 28 | 7.0 % |
| Peachjar | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Emails | 24 | 6.0 % |
| E-newsletter | 27 | 6.8 % |
| Facebook | 12 | 3.0 % |
| NextDoor | 13 | 3.3 % |
| Instagram | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Twitter | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Flyers | 19 | 4.8 % |
| City Council meetings | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Other | 3 | 0.8 % |
| None | 138 | 34.5 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

SUM OF TOP 3 CHOICES

Q5. From the list in Question 4, which THREE methods of communication would you MOST PREFER the City use to communicate with you about recreation facilities, programs and activities? (Top 3)

| Sum of top 3 choices | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| City community services guide | 129 | 32.3 % |
| City website | 155 | 38.8 % |
| Materials at recreation facilities | 34 | 8.5 % |
| Conversations with recreation staff | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Newspaper | 34 | 8.5 % |
| Friends and neighbors | 39 | 9.8 % |
| Temporary signs at parks or around the City | 76 | 19.0 % |
| Peachjar | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Emails | 168 | 42.0 % |
| E-newsletter | 114 | 28.5 % |
| Facebook | 33 | 8.3 % |
| NextDoor | 31 | 7.8 % |
| Instagram | 26 | 6.5 % |
| Twitter | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Flyers | 42 | 10.5 % |
| City Council meetings | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Other | 11 | 2.8 % |
| None | 65 | 16.3 % |
| Total | 975 | |

Q6. Has your household participated in any programs offered by the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department during the past 12 months before the COVID-19 pandemic?

| Q6. | Number | Percent |
|-------|--------|---------|
| Yes | 145 | 36.3 % |
| No | 255 | 63.8 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q6a. How many City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs did you or members of your household participate in during the 12 months before the COVID-19 pandemic?

| Q6a. | Number | Percent |
|--------------|--------|---------|
| One | 58 | 40.0 % |
| 2-3 | 57 | 39.3 % |
| 4-6 | 22 | 15.2 % |
| 7 or more | 6 | 4.1 % |
| Not Provided | 2 | 1.4 % |
| Total | 145 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"**Q6a. How often have you visited City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields during the last 12 months before the Covid-19 Pandemic? (without "Not Provided")**

| Q6a. | Number | Percent |
|-----------|--------|---------|
| One | 58 | 40.6 % |
| 2-3 | 57 | 39.9 % |
| 4-6 | 22 | 15.4 % |
| 7 or more | 6 | 4.2 % |
| Total | 143 | 100.0 % |

Q6b. How would you rate the overall quality of the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs in which your household has participated?

| Q6b. | Number | Percent |
|--------------|--------|---------|
| Excellent | 61 | 42.1 % |
| Good | 75 | 51.7 % |
| Fair | 6 | 4.1 % |
| Not Provided | 3 | 2.1 % |
| Total | 145 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"

Q6b. How would you rate the overall quality of the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs in which your household has participated? (without "Not Provided")

| Q6b. | Number | Percent |
|-----------|--------|---------|
| Excellent | 61 | 43.0 % |
| Good | 75 | 52.8 % |
| Fair | 6 | 4.2 % |
| Total | 142 | 100.0 % |

Q7. Please CHECK ALL the following reasons that prevent you and members of your household from participating in City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs more often.

| Q7 | Number | Percent |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Lack of quality instructors | 22 | 5.5 % |
| Outdated facilities | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Use programs of other agencies | 40 | 10.0 % |
| I don't know what is offered | 134 | 33.5 % |
| Lack of quality programs | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Fees are too high | 37 | 9.3 % |
| Too far from my home | 28 | 7.0 % |
| Program times are not convenient | 60 | 15.0 % |
| Classes are full | 35 | 8.8 % |
| Program not offered | 38 | 9.5 % |
| Registration is difficult | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Poor customer service by staff | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Lack of transportation | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Lack of right program equipment | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Too busy/Not interested | 98 | 24.5 % |
| Language / cultural barriers | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Other | 32 | 8.0 % |
| Total | 586 | |

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number.

(N=400)

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|------------|
| 01. Improves my (my household's) physical health and fitness | 39.0% | 30.8% | 17.5% | 1.5% | 0.8% | 10.5% |
| 02. Helps improve community safety and keep youth out of trouble | 38.3% | 34.8% | 11.8% | 1.0% | 0.8% | 13.5% |
| 03. Makes Carlsbad a more desirable place to live | 57.0% | 32.0% | 4.3% | 0.5% | 0.0% | 6.3% |
| 04. Preserves open space and protects the environment | 52.5% | 27.8% | 9.3% | 2.0% | 1.0% | 7.5% |
| 05. Increases my (my household's) property value | 37.8% | 29.8% | 18.5% | 2.0% | 0.5% | 11.5% |
| 06. Improves my (my household's) mental health and reduces stress | 35.3% | 30.0% | 20.3% | 2.8% | 0.5% | 11.3% |
| 07. Provides positive social interactions for me (my household/family) | 32.0% | 31.3% | 22.5% | 2.8% | 1.3% | 10.3% |
| 08. Helps to attract new residents and businesses | 25.0% | 31.5% | 26.3% | 2.0% | 0.8% | 14.5% |
| 09. Promotes tourism to the city and the region | 21.8% | 25.3% | 30.0% | 5.3% | 1.0% | 16.8% |
| 10. Positively impacts economic/business development | 24.3% | 28.5% | 26.5% | 3.3% | 1.0% | 16.5% |
| 11. Is accessible to all age groups | 35.0% | 37.0% | 12.8% | 3.3% | 1.8% | 10.3% |
| 12. Provides jobs/professional development for youth | 20.8% | 31.8% | 24.5% | 2.3% | 0.8% | 20.0% |

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number.

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|------------|
| 13. Provides community volunteer opportunities | 21.8% | 37.8% | 18.3% | 2.0% | 0.5% | 19.8% |
| 14. Provides access to specialized offerings for various groups e.g. Senior Center/Teen programs, etc. | 31.3% | 36.8% | 15.8% | 1.8% | 0.5% | 14.0% |

WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number. (without "Don't Know")

(N=400)

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| 01. Improves my (my household's) physical health and fitness | 43.6% | 34.4% | 19.6% | 1.7% | 0.8% |
| 02. Helps improve community safety and keep youth out of trouble | 44.2% | 40.2% | 13.6% | 1.2% | 0.9% |
| 03. Makes Carlsbad a more desirable place to live | 60.8% | 34.1% | 4.5% | 0.5% | 0.0% |
| 04. Preserves open space and protects the environment | 56.8% | 30.0% | 10.0% | 2.2% | 1.1% |
| 05. Increases my (my household's) property value | 42.7% | 33.6% | 20.9% | 2.3% | 0.6% |
| 06. Improves my (my household's) mental health and reduces stress | 39.7% | 33.8% | 22.8% | 3.1% | 0.6% |
| 07. Provides positive social interactions for me (my household/family) | 35.7% | 34.8% | 25.1% | 3.1% | 1.4% |
| 08. Helps to attract new residents and businesses | 29.2% | 36.8% | 30.7% | 2.3% | 0.9% |
| 09. Promotes tourism to the city and the region | 26.1% | 30.3% | 36.0% | 6.3% | 1.2% |
| 10. Positively impacts economic/business development | 29.0% | 34.1% | 31.7% | 3.9% | 1.2% |
| 11. Is accessible to all age groups | 39.0% | 41.2% | 14.2% | 3.6% | 1.9% |
| 12. Provides jobs/professional development for youth | 25.9% | 39.7% | 30.6% | 2.8% | 0.9% |
| 13. Provides community volunteer opportunities | 27.1% | 47.0% | 22.7% | 2.5% | 0.6% |
| 14. Provides access to specialized offerings for various groups e.g. Senior Center/Teen programs, etc. | 36.3% | 42.7% | 18.3% | 2.0% | 0.6% |

Q9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

(N=400)

| | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| 01. Universally accessible playground equipment | 22.3% | 77.8% |
| 02. Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 27.0% | 73.0% |
| 03. Bike park (pump/skills track) | 24.8% | 75.3% |
| 04. Community gardens | 43.3% | 56.8% |
| 05. Community parks | 76.5% | 23.5% |
| 06. Concessions | 18.0% | 82.0% |
| 07. Dining/retail | 29.5% | 70.5% |
| 08. Disc golf course | 16.3% | 83.8% |
| 09. Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered | 56.3% | 43.8% |
| 10. Game tables (e.g. chess, checkers, dominoes etc.) | 15.3% | 84.8% |
| 11. Multigenerational community center | 29.5% | 70.5% |
| 12. Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket) | 27.0% | 73.0% |
| 13. Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/ football/lacrosse/rugby) | 30.8% | 69.3% |
| 14. Neighborhood parks | 75.0% | 25.0% |
| 15. Off-leash dog parks | 40.3% | 59.8% |
| 16. Ornamental/interpretive gardens | 31.3% | 68.8% |
| 17. Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts | 33.0% | 67.0% |
| 18. Outdoor pickleball courts | 43.0% | 57.0% |
| 19. Outdoor swimming pools | 47.5% | 52.5% |
| 20. Skate parks | 20.0% | 80.0% |
| 21. Tennis courts | 32.0% | 68.0% |

Q9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| | Yes | No |
|-----------|------|-------|
| 22. Other | 9.3% | 90.8% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

(N=375)

| | Fully Met | Mostly Met | Partly Met | Not Met |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|---------|
| 01. Universally accessible playground equipment | 35.3% | 47.1% | 12.9% | 4.7% |
| 02. Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 6.1% | 7.1% | 23.5% | 63.3% |
| 03. Bike park (pump/skills track) | 9.1% | 19.3% | 25.0% | 46.6% |
| 04. Community gardens | 14.0% | 28.7% | 36.7% | 20.7% |
| 05. Community parks | 44.1% | 39.3% | 13.3% | 3.3% |
| 06. Concessions | 13.6% | 23.7% | 28.8% | 33.9% |
| 07. Dining/retail | 23.0% | 41.0% | 16.0% | 20.0% |
| 08. Disc golf course | 5.7% | 11.3% | 17.0% | 66.0% |
| 09. Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered | 30.2% | 42.6% | 23.3% | 4.0% |
| 10. Game tables (e.g. chess, checkers, dominoes etc.) | 4.3% | 17.4% | 32.6% | 45.7% |
| 11. Multigenerational community center | 20.6% | 32.0% | 26.8% | 20.6% |
| 12. Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket) | 33.0% | 54.9% | 11.0% | 1.1% |
| 13. Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/ football/lacrosse/rugby) | 32.1% | 50.5% | 16.5% | 0.9% |
| 14. Neighborhood parks | 38.9% | 38.5% | 17.6% | 5.0% |
| 15. Off-leash dog parks | 17.5% | 16.8% | 37.2% | 28.5% |
| 16. Ornamental/interpretive gardens | 9.2% | 24.8% | 34.9% | 31.2% |
| 17. Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts | 23.9% | 38.5% | 23.9% | 13.7% |
| 18. Outdoor pickleball courts | 9.3% | 21.2% | 35.8% | 33.8% |
| 19. Outdoor swimming pools | 26.6% | 34.3% | 21.9% | 17.2% |
| 20. Skate parks | 31.9% | 23.2% | 27.5% | 17.4% |
| 21. Tennis courts | 30.7% | 35.1% | 23.7% | 10.5% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| | Fully Met | Mostly Met | Partly Met | Not Met |
|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|---------|
| 22. Other | 10.5% | 15.8% | 15.8% | 57.9% |

Q10. Which FOUR facilities/amenities from the list in Question 9 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household?

| Top Choice | Number | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Universally accessible playground equipment | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Community gardens | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Community parks | 71 | 17.8 % |
| Concessions | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Dining/retail | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Disc golf course | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Multigenerational community center | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket) | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/football/lacrosse/ rugby) | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Neighborhood parks | 33 | 8.3 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 30 | 7.5 % |
| Ornamental / interpretive gardens | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 43 | 10.8 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 38 | 9.5 % |
| Skate parks | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Tennis courts | 15 | 3.8 % |
| None | 59 | 14.8 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q10. Which FOUR facilities/amenities from the list in Question 9 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household?

| <u>2nd Choice</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Universally accessible playground equipment | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Community gardens | 20 | 5.0 % |
| Community parks | 46 | 11.5 % |
| Concessions | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Dining/retail | 13 | 3.3 % |
| Disc golf course | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered | 20 | 5.0 % |
| Multigenerational community center | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket) | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/football/lacrosse/ rugby) | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Neighborhood parks | 55 | 13.8 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 25 | 6.3 % |
| Ornamental / interpretive gardens | 13 | 3.3 % |
| Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 23 | 5.8 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Skate parks | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Tennis courts | 11 | 2.8 % |
| <u>None</u> | <u>85</u> | <u>21.3 %</u> |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q10. Which FOUR facilities/amenities from the list in Question 9 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household?

| <u>3rd Choice</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Universally accessible playground equipment | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Community gardens | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Community parks | 35 | 8.8 % |
| Concessions | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Dining/retail | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Disc golf course | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered | 18 | 4.5 % |
| Game tables (e.g. chess, checkers, dominoes etc.) | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Multigenerational community center | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket) | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/football/lacrosse/ rugby) | 14 | 3.5 % |
| Neighborhood parks | 44 | 11.0 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 19 | 4.8 % |
| Ornamental / interpretive gardens | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 21 | 5.3 % |
| Skate parks | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Tennis courts | 13 | 3.3 % |
| None | 115 | 28.8 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q10. Which FOUR facilities/amenities from the list in Question 9 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household?

| <u>4th Choice</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Universally accessible playground equipment | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 14 | 3.5 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Community gardens | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Community parks | 21 | 5.3 % |
| Concessions | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Dining/retail | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Disc golf course | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered | 20 | 5.0 % |
| Game tables (e.g. chess, checkers, dominoes etc.) | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Multigenerational community center | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket) | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/football/lacrosse/ rugby) | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Neighborhood parks | 24 | 6.0 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 18 | 4.5 % |
| Ornamental / interpretive gardens | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Skate parks | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Tennis courts | 5 | 1.3 % |
| None | 192 | 48.0 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

SUM OF TOP 4 CHOICES**Q10. Which FOUR facilities/amenities from the list in Question 9 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household?****(Top 4)**

| Sum of top 4 choices | Number | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Universally accessible playground equipment | 38 | 9.5 % |
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 35 | 8.8 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 31 | 7.8 % |
| Community gardens | 63 | 15.8 % |
| Community parks | 173 | 43.3 % |
| Concessions | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Dining/retail | 43 | 10.8 % |
| Disc golf course | 20 | 5.0 % |
| Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered | 67 | 16.8 % |
| Game tables (e.g. chess, checkers, dominoes etc.) | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Multigenerational community center | 33 | 8.3 % |
| Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket) | 24 | 6.0 % |
| Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/football/lacrosse/ rugby) | 36 | 9.0 % |
| Neighborhood parks | 156 | 39.0 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 92 | 23.0 % |
| Ornamental / interpretive gardens | 46 | 11.5 % |
| Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts | 34 | 8.5 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 85 | 21.3 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 87 | 21.8 % |
| Skate parks | 26 | 6.5 % |
| Tennis courts | 44 | 11.0 % |
| None | 59 | 14.8 % |
| Total | 1208 | |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

(N=400)

| | Yes | No |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| 01. Adult fitness and wellness programs | 54.8% | 45.3% |
| 02. Adult sports programs | 38.8% | 61.3% |
| 03. Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.) | 38.5% | 61.5% |
| 04. Before and after school programs | 14.3% | 85.8% |
| 05. City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.) | 30.8% | 69.3% |
| 06. Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 31.0% | 69.0% |
| 07. Cultural arts programs | 36.0% | 64.0% |
| 08. Dancing | 25.3% | 74.8% |
| 09. Dog training | 21.3% | 78.8% |
| 10. Environmental education programs | 25.3% | 74.8% |
| 11. Esports programs/leagues/tournaments | 9.3% | 90.8% |
| 12. Intergenerational programming | 10.0% | 90.0% |
| 13. Gymnastics and tumbling programs | 12.8% | 87.3% |
| 14. Martial arts programs | 14.0% | 86.0% |
| 15. Outdoor skills/adventure programs | 26.5% | 73.5% |
| 16. Preschool programs | 12.3% | 87.8% |
| 17. Programs for individuals with disabilities | 10.8% | 89.3% |
| 18. Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) | 43.0% | 57.0% |
| 19. Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs | 30.5% | 69.5% |
| 20. Teen programs | 12.3% | 87.8% |
| 21. Teen Day Trips | 8.5% | 91.5% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| 22. Tennis programs | 20.8% | 79.3% |
| 23. Unstructured indoor play | 10.3% | 89.8% |
| 24. Youth enrichment camp programs | 17.0% | 83.0% |
| 25. Youth fitness and wellness programs | 16.3% | 83.8% |
| 26. Youth sports programs | 20.0% | 80.0% |
| 27. Youth summer camp programs | 19.0% | 81.0% |
| 28. Other | 5.0% | 95.0% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

(N=349)

| | Fully Met | Mostly Met | Partly Met | Not Met |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|---------|
| 01. Adult fitness and wellness programs | 8.6% | 31.4% | 34.9% | 25.1% |
| 02. Adult sports programs | 6.2% | 28.5% | 43.8% | 21.5% |
| 03. Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.) | 18.6% | 33.3% | 31.0% | 17.1% |
| 04. Before and after school programs | 4.8% | 14.3% | 61.9% | 19.0% |
| 05. City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.) | 23.5% | 41.8% | 23.5% | 11.2% |
| 06. Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 5.2% | 16.5% | 39.2% | 39.2% |
| 07. Cultural arts programs | 9.4% | 31.6% | 41.0% | 17.9% |
| 08. Dancing | 6.8% | 13.7% | 52.1% | 27.4% |
| 09. Dog training | 8.8% | 7.4% | 29.4% | 54.4% |
| 10. Environmental education programs | 8.9% | 26.6% | 40.5% | 24.1% |
| 11. Esports programs/leagues/tournaments | 7.1% | 21.4% | 35.7% | 35.7% |
| 12. Intergenerational programming | 8.0% | 16.0% | 52.0% | 24.0% |
| 13. Gymnastics and tumbling programs | 7.7% | 25.6% | 28.2% | 38.5% |
| 14. Martial arts programs | 2.4% | 14.6% | 48.8% | 34.1% |
| 15. Outdoor skills/adventure programs | 3.6% | 13.1% | 40.5% | 42.9% |
| 16. Preschool programs | 14.3% | 17.1% | 40.0% | 28.6% |
| 17. Programs for individuals with disabilities | 6.1% | 6.1% | 42.4% | 45.5% |
| 18. Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) | 9.8% | 21.8% | 41.4% | 27.1% |
| 19. Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs | 10.5% | 10.5% | 45.3% | 33.7% |
| 20. Teen programs | 2.9% | 11.8% | 52.9% | 32.4% |
| 21. Teen Day Trips | 9.1% | 4.5% | 50.0% | 36.4% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| | Fully Met | Mostly Met | Partly Met | Not Met |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|---------|
| 22. Tennis programs | 7.8% | 25.0% | 45.3% | 21.9% |
| 23. Unstructured indoor play | 0.0% | 31.0% | 34.5% | 34.5% |
| 24. Youth enrichment camp programs | 18.5% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 14.8% |
| 25. Youth fitness and wellness programs | 14.0% | 34.0% | 34.0% | 18.0% |
| 26. Youth sports programs | 23.3% | 41.7% | 31.7% | 3.3% |
| 27. Youth summer camp programs | 20.3% | 33.9% | 37.3% | 8.5% |
| 28. Other | 10.5% | 0.0% | 15.8% | 73.7% |

Q12. Which FOUR recreation programs from the list in Question 11 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household?

| Top Choice | Number | Percent |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Adult fitness and wellness programs | 58 | 14.5 % |
| Adult sports programs | 19 | 4.8 % |
| Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.) | 42 | 10.5 % |
| Before and after school programs | 9 | 2.3 % |
| City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.) | 13 | 3.3 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 17 | 4.3 % |
| Dancing | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Dog training | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Environmental education programs | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Esports programs/leagues/tournaments | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Intergenerational programming | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Gymnastics and tumbling programs | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Martial arts programs | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Outdoor skills/adventure programs | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Preschool programs | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Programs for individuals with disabilities | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) | 36 | 9.0 % |
| Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Teen programs | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Teen Day Trips | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Tennis programs | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Unstructured indoor play | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Youth enrichment camp programs | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Youth fitness and wellness programs | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Youth sports programs | 20 | 5.0 % |
| Youth summer camp programs | 5 | 1.3 % |
| None | 98 | 24.5 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q12. Which FOUR recreation programs from the list in Question 11 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household?

| <u>2nd Choice</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adult fitness and wellness programs | 34 | 8.5 % |
| Adult sports programs | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.) | 17 | 4.3 % |
| Before and after school programs | 6 | 1.5 % |
| City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.) | 14 | 3.5 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 19 | 4.8 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 18 | 4.5 % |
| Dancing | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Dog training | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Environmental education programs | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Esports programs/leagues/tournaments | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Intergenerational programming | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Gymnastics and tumbling programs | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Martial arts programs | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Outdoor skills/adventure programs | 13 | 3.3 % |
| Preschool programs | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Programs for individuals with disabilities | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) | 25 | 6.3 % |
| Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs | 22 | 5.5 % |
| Teen programs | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Teen Day Trips | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Tennis programs | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Unstructured indoor play | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Youth enrichment camp programs | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Youth fitness and wellness programs | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Youth sports programs | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Youth summer camp programs | 10 | 2.5 % |
| <u>None</u> | <u>130</u> | <u>32.5 %</u> |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q12. Which FOUR recreation programs from the list in Question 11 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household?

| <u>3rd Choice</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adult fitness and wellness programs | 21 | 5.3 % |
| Adult sports programs | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.) | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Before and after school programs | 11 | 2.8 % |
| City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.) | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 19 | 4.8 % |
| Dancing | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Dog training | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Environmental education programs | 14 | 3.5 % |
| Esports programs/leagues/tournaments | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Intergenerational programming | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Gymnastics and tumbling programs | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Martial arts programs | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Outdoor skills/adventure programs | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Preschool programs | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Programs for individuals with disabilities | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) | 31 | 7.8 % |
| Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs | 19 | 4.8 % |
| Teen programs | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Teen Day Trips | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Tennis programs | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Unstructured indoor play | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Youth enrichment camp programs | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Youth fitness and wellness programs | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Youth sports programs | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Youth summer camp programs | 7 | 1.8 % |
| <u>None</u> | <u>162</u> | <u>40.5 %</u> |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q12. Which FOUR recreation programs from the list in Question 11 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household?

| <u>4th Choice</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adult fitness and wellness programs | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Adult sports programs | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.) | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Before and after school programs | 7 | 1.8 % |
| City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.) | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Dancing | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Dog training | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Environmental education programs | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Esports programs/leagues/tournaments | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Intergenerational programming | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Gymnastics and tumbling programs | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Martial arts programs | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Outdoor skills/adventure programs | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Preschool programs | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Programs for individuals with disabilities | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs | 19 | 4.8 % |
| Teen programs | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Teen Day Trips | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Tennis programs | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Youth enrichment camp programs | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Youth fitness and wellness programs | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Youth sports programs | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Youth summer camp programs | 2 | 0.5 % |
| <u>None</u> | <u>229</u> | <u>57.3 %</u> |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

SUM OF TOP 4 CHOICES**Q12. Which FOUR recreation programs from the list in Question 11 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household? (Top 4)**

| <u>Sum of top 4 choices</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adult fitness and wellness programs | 125 | 31.3 % |
| Adult sports programs | 51 | 12.8 % |
| Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.) | 82 | 20.5 % |
| Before and after school programs | 33 | 8.3 % |
| City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.) | 41 | 10.3 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 59 | 14.8 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 65 | 16.3 % |
| Dancing | 29 | 7.3 % |
| Dog training | 36 | 9.0 % |
| Environmental education programs | 35 | 8.8 % |
| Esports programs/leagues/tournaments | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Intergenerational programming | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Gymnastics and tumbling programs | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Martial arts programs | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Outdoor skills/adventure programs | 41 | 10.3 % |
| Preschool programs | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Programs for individuals with disabilities | 17 | 4.3 % |
| Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) | 107 | 26.8 % |
| Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs | 68 | 17.0 % |
| Teen programs | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Teen Day Trips | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Tennis programs | 26 | 6.5 % |
| Unstructured indoor play | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Youth enrichment camp programs | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Youth fitness and wellness programs | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Youth sports programs | 36 | 9.0 % |
| Youth summer camp programs | 24 | 6.0 % |
| None | 98 | 24.5 % |
| Total | 1079 | |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

(N=400)

| | Very Supportive | Somewhat Supportive | Not Sure | Not Supportive |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------|----------------|
| 01. Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 25.5% | 20.8% | 37.3% | 16.5% |
| 02. Amphitheater | 38.5% | 24.0% | 29.3% | 8.3% |
| 03. Arena/speed soccer | 10.8% | 14.3% | 49.5% | 25.5% |
| 04. Better lighting in parks | 42.5% | 19.0% | 32.8% | 5.8% |
| 05. Bike park (pump/skills track) | 18.0% | 22.0% | 43.8% | 16.3% |
| 06. Botanical or ornamental gardens | 36.0% | 23.3% | 30.0% | 10.8% |
| 07. Community gardens | 36.8% | 22.8% | 31.0% | 9.5% |
| 08. Concessions | 11.0% | 17.0% | 47.5% | 24.5% |
| 09. Conference/trade shows /training center | 7.0% | 12.0% | 49.8% | 31.3% |
| 10. Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 21.0% | 23.3% | 40.8% | 15.0% |
| 11. Cultural arts programs | 29.8% | 23.5% | 34.0% | 12.8% |
| 12. Dining/retail | 17.5% | 17.0% | 42.5% | 23.0% |
| 13. Disc golf course | 14.3% | 14.8% | 44.5% | 26.5% |
| 14. Family picnic areas (covered and uncovered) | 36.5% | 29.5% | 29.3% | 4.8% |
| 15. More shaded areas in parks | 50.3% | 22.0% | 23.5% | 4.3% |
| 16. Multigenerational community center (fitness/recreation/meeting space) | 26.0% | 26.5% | 39.0% | 8.5% |
| 17. Multipurpose fields | 27.0% | 28.5% | 36.3% | 8.3% |
| 18. Off-leash dog parks | 29.8% | 16.0% | 34.3% | 20.0% |
| 19. Outdoor basketball courts | 19.8% | 28.5% | 39.3% | 12.5% |
| 20. Outdoor pickleball courts | 34.3% | 23.0% | 32.3% | 10.5% |
| 21. Outdoor swimming pools | 39.0% | 20.5% | 33.0% | 7.5% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| | Very Supportive | Somewhat Supportive | Not Sure | Not Supportive |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------|----------------|
| 22. Playground equipment | 35.0% | 22.0% | 35.0% | 8.0% |
| 23. Radio controlled aircraft/drone fields | 7.3% | 11.0% | 44.3% | 37.5% |
| 24. Senior center (age 50+) | 38.3% | 22.0% | 31.0% | 8.8% |
| 25. Skateboard parks | 18.5% | 25.3% | 38.8% | 17.5% |
| 26. Synthetic turf fields | 13.3% | 19.0% | 45.8% | 22.0% |
| 27. Teen center | 21.3% | 27.3% | 40.0% | 11.5% |
| 28. Tennis courts | 20.3% | 25.0% | 40.3% | 14.5% |
| 29. Unstructured indoor play | 12.3% | 18.0% | 50.0% | 19.8% |
| 30. Youth multi-purpose fields | 23.3% | 24.3% | 41.5% | 11.0% |
| 31. Other | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

Q14. Which FOUR actions from the list in Question 13 would your household be MOST WILLING to fund?

| Top Choice | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Amphitheater | 38 | 9.5 % |
| Arena/speed soccer | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Better lighting in parks | 28 | 7.0 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Botanical or ornamental gardens | 17 | 4.3 % |
| Community gardens | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Concessions | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Dining/retail | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Disc golf course | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Family picnic areas (covered and uncovered) | 7 | 1.8 % |
| More shaded areas in parks | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Multigenerational community center (fitness/recreation/ meeting space) | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Multipurpose fields | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 26 | 6.5 % |
| Outdoor basketball courts | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 33 | 8.3 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 26 | 6.5 % |
| Playground equipment | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Radio controlled aircraft/drone fields | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Senior center (age 50+) | 18 | 4.5 % |
| Skateboard parks | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Synthetic turf fields | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Teen center | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Tennis courts | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Unstructured indoor play | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Youth multi-purpose fields | 5 | 1.3 % |
| None | 84 | 21.0 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q14. Which FOUR actions from the list in Question 13 would your household be MOST WILLING to fund?

| <u>2nd Choice</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Amphitheater | 22 | 5.5 % |
| Arena/speed soccer | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Better lighting in parks | 24 | 6.0 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Botanical or ornamental gardens | 20 | 5.0 % |
| Community gardens | 17 | 4.3 % |
| Concessions | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Conference/trade shows /training center | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 13 | 3.3 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Dining/retail | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Disc golf course | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Family picnic areas (covered and uncovered) | 9 | 2.3 % |
| More shaded areas in parks | 29 | 7.3 % |
| Multigenerational community center (fitness/recreation/ meeting space) | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Multipurpose fields | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Outdoor basketball courts | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 20 | 5.0 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Playground equipment | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Radio controlled aircraft/drone fields | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Senior center (age 50+) | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Skateboard parks | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Synthetic turf fields | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Teen center | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Tennis courts | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Unstructured indoor play | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Youth multi-purpose fields | 3 | 0.8 % |
| <u>None</u> | <u>112</u> | <u>28.0 %</u> |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q14. Which FOUR actions from the list in Question 13 would your household be MOST WILLING to fund?

| 3rd Choice | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Amphitheater | 14 | 3.5 % |
| Arena/speed soccer | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Better lighting in parks | 17 | 4.3 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Botanical or ornamental gardens | 21 | 5.3 % |
| Community gardens | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Concessions | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Conference/trade shows /training center | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Dining/retail | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Disc golf course | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Family picnic areas (covered and uncovered) | 13 | 3.3 % |
| More shaded areas in parks | 18 | 4.5 % |
| Multigenerational community center (fitness/recreation/ meeting space) | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Multipurpose fields | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Outdoor basketball courts | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Playground equipment | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Radio controlled aircraft/drone fields | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Senior center (age 50+) | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Skateboard parks | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Synthetic turf fields | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Teen center | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Tennis courts | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Unstructured indoor play | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Youth multi-purpose fields | 3 | 0.8 % |
| None | 143 | 35.8 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

Q14. Which FOUR actions from the list in Question 13 would your household be MOST WILLING to fund?

| 4th Choice | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 10 | 2.5 % |
| Amphitheater | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Arena/speed soccer | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Better lighting in parks | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Botanical or ornamental gardens | 13 | 3.3 % |
| Community gardens | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Concessions | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Conference/trade shows /training center | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Dining/retail | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Disc golf course | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Family picnic areas (covered and uncovered) | 9 | 2.3 % |
| More shaded areas in parks | 26 | 6.5 % |
| Multigenerational community center (fitness/recreation/ meeting space) | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Multipurpose fields | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Outdoor basketball courts | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Playground equipment | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Radio controlled aircraft/drone fields | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Senior center (age 50+) | 21 | 5.3 % |
| Skateboard parks | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Synthetic turf fields | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Teen center | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Tennis courts | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Unstructured indoor play | 3 | 0.8 % |
| Youth multi-purpose fields | 6 | 1.5 % |
| None | 188 | 47.0 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

SUM OF TOP 4 CHOICES**Q14. Which FOUR actions from the list in Question 13 would your household be MOST WILLING to fund?****(Top 4)**

| <u>Sum of top 4 choices</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 51 | 12.8 % |
| Amphitheater | 82 | 20.5 % |
| Arena/speed soccer | 12 | 3.0 % |
| Better lighting in parks | 78 | 19.5 % |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 20 | 5.0 % |
| Botanical or ornamental gardens | 71 | 17.8 % |
| Community gardens | 51 | 12.8 % |
| Concessions | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Conference/trade shows /training center | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 28 | 7.0 % |
| Cultural arts programs | 43 | 10.8 % |
| Dining/retail | 24 | 6.0 % |
| Disc golf course | 23 | 5.8 % |
| Family picnic areas (covered and uncovered) | 38 | 9.5 % |
| More shaded areas in parks | 88 | 22.0 % |
| Multigenerational community center (fitness/recreation/ meeting space) | 33 | 8.3 % |
| Multipurpose fields | 21 | 5.3 % |
| Off-leash dog parks | 53 | 13.3 % |
| Outdoor basketball courts | 20 | 5.0 % |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 71 | 17.8 % |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 63 | 15.8 % |
| Playground equipment | 34 | 8.5 % |
| Radio controlled aircraft/drone fields | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Senior center (age 50+) | 63 | 15.8 % |
| Skateboard parks | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Synthetic turf fields | 9 | 2.3 % |
| Teen center | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Tennis courts | 23 | 5.8 % |
| Unstructured indoor play | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Youth multi-purpose fields | 17 | 4.3 % |
| None | 84 | 21.0 % |
| Total | 1157 | |

Q15. During the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020 - June 2021), what types of virtual programs/activities did you participate in?

| <u>Q15</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Virtual tours | 14 | 3.5 % |
| Virtual camps | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Virtual arts and craft classes | 22 | 5.5 % |
| Virtual fitness classes | 61 | 15.3 % |
| Virtual performing arts classes | 6 | 1.5 % |
| Virtual health and wellness programs | 33 | 8.3 % |
| Other | 19 | 4.8 % |
| Haven't participated in virtual programs/activities | 307 | 76.8 % |
| Total | 466 | |

Q15-7. Other

| <u>Q15-7 Other</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Virtual activities are a harmful replacement for physical activities. | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Gatherings | 1 | 5.3 % |
| language | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Foreign language lessons | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Gymnastics and guitar | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Non-profit leadership | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Virtual concerts in the park and TGIF | 1 | 5.3 % |
| In-person swim classes 1:1 | 1 | 5.3 % |
| I traveled | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Online mahjong | 1 | 5.3 % |
| virtual genealogy programs | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Still go to the gym. | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Osher | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Variety of virtual meet ups and discussion groups. | 1 | 5.3 % |
| COMPUTER/TECH CLASSES | 1 | 5.3 % |
| OSHER TECHNOLOGY, PHOTOGRAPHY | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Kids Library programming | 1 | 5.3 % |
| bridge online | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Beach Yoga. | 1 | 5.3 % |
| Total | 19 | 100.0 % |

Q16. Beyond the COVID-19 pandemic, what types of virtual programs/activities would you be interested in participating in?

| <u>Q16</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Virtual tours | 27 | 6.8 % |
| Virtual camps | 2 | 0.5 % |
| Virtual arts and crafts Classes | 44 | 11.0 % |
| Virtual fitness classes | 76 | 19.0 % |
| Virtual performing arts classes | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Virtual health and wellness programs | 61 | 15.3 % |
| Other | 5 | 1.3 % |
| Not interested in virtual programs/activities | 281 | 70.3 % |
| Total | 511 | |

Q16-7. Other

| <u>Q16-7 Other</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| language | 1 | 20.0 % |
| Non-profit informational classes | 1 | 20.0 % |
| Osher | 1 | 20.0 % |
| Educational subjects, historical information, discussion groups, etc. | 1 | 20.0 % |
| OSHER, TECH, PHOTO, CULINARY | 1 | 20.0 % |
| Total | 5 | 100.0 % |

Q17. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the overall value that your household receives from the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department.

| Q17 | Number | Percent |
|-------------------|--------|---------|
| Very Satisfied | 84 | 21.0 % |
| Satisfied | 180 | 45.0 % |
| Neutral | 84 | 21.0 % |
| Dissatisfied | 16 | 4.0 % |
| Very Dissatisfied | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Don't Know | 25 | 6.3 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "DON'T KNOW"

Q17. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the overall value that your household receives from the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department. (without "Don't Know")

| Q17 | Number | Percent |
|-------------------|--------|---------|
| Very Satisfied | 84 | 22.4 % |
| Satisfied | 180 | 48.0 % |
| Neutral | 84 | 22.4 % |
| Dissatisfied | 16 | 4.3 % |
| Very Dissatisfied | 11 | 2.9 % |
| Total | 375 | 100.0 % |

Q18. Given the recent COVID-19 pandemic, how has your and your household's perception of the value of parks and recreation changed?

| Q18 | Number | Percent |
|--------------------|--------|---------|
| Increased | 109 | 27.3 % |
| Somewhat increased | 65 | 16.3 % |
| No change | 187 | 46.8 % |
| Somewhat decreased | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Decreased | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Not Provided | 13 | 3.3 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"

Q18. Given the recent Covid-19 Pandemic, how has your and your household's perception of the value of parks and recreation changed? (without "Not Provided")

| Q18 | Number | Percent |
|--------------------|--------|---------|
| Increased | 109 | 28.2 % |
| Somewhat increased | 65 | 16.8 % |
| No change | 187 | 48.3 % |
| Somewhat decreased | 11 | 2.8 % |
| Decreased | 15 | 3.9 % |
| Total | 387 | 100.0 % |

Q19. Would you or your household like to see the city place a greater emphasis on parks and recreation projects, programs, and services?

| Q19 | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------|--------|---------|
| Increase funding | 197 | 49.3 % |
| Maintain existing funding | 126 | 31.5 % |
| Reduce funding | 8 | 2.0 % |
| Not Provided | 69 | 17.3 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"

Q19. Would you or your household like to see the city place a greater emphasis on parks and recreation projects, programs, and services? (without "Not Provided")

| Q19 | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------|--------|---------|
| Increase funding | 197 | 59.5 % |
| Maintain existing funding | 126 | 38.1 % |
| Reduce funding | 8 | 2.4 % |
| Total | 331 | 100.0 % |

Q20. Your gender:

| <u>Your gender</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Male | 197 | 49.3 % |
| Female | 201 | 50.3 % |
| Non-binary | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Not provided | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"

Q20. Your gender: (without "not provided")

| <u>Your gender</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Male | 197 | 49.4 % |
| Female | 201 | 50.4 % |
| Non-binary | 1 | 0.3 % |
| Total | 399 | 100.0 % |

Q21. Including yourself, how many people in your household are...

| | <u>Mean</u> | <u>Sum</u> |
|-------------|-------------|------------|
| number | 2.3 | 844 |
| Under age 5 | 0.1 | 39 |
| Ages 5-9 | 0.1 | 55 |
| Ages 10-14 | 0.1 | 30 |
| Ages 15-19 | 0.1 | 44 |
| Ages 20-24 | 0.1 | 37 |
| Ages 25-34 | 0.2 | 82 |
| Ages 35-44 | 0.3 | 110 |
| Ages 45-54 | 0.3 | 121 |
| Ages 55-64 | 0.4 | 156 |
| Ages 65-74 | 0.3 | 95 |
| Ages 75-84 | 0.2 | 61 |
| Ages 85+ | 0.0 | 14 |

Q22. Your age:

| Q22 Your age | Number | Percent |
|--------------|--------|---------|
| 18-34 | 73 | 18.3 % |
| 35-44 | 72 | 18.0 % |
| 45-54 | 74 | 18.5 % |
| 55-64 | 77 | 19.3 % |
| 65+ | 79 | 19.8 % |
| Not provided | 25 | 6.3 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"

Q22. Your age: (without "not provided")

| Q22 Your age | Number | Percent |
|--------------|--------|---------|
| 18-34 | 73 | 19.5 % |
| 35-44 | 72 | 19.2 % |
| 45-54 | 74 | 19.7 % |
| 55-64 | 77 | 20.5 % |
| 65+ | 79 | 21.1 % |
| Total | 375 | 100.0 % |

Q23. How many years have you lived in Carlsbad?

| Q23 | Number | Percent |
|--------------|--------|---------|
| 0-5 | 73 | 18.3 % |
| 6-10 | 63 | 15.8 % |
| 11-15 | 37 | 9.3 % |
| 16-20 | 41 | 10.3 % |
| 21-30 | 95 | 23.8 % |
| 31+ | 76 | 19.0 % |
| Not provided | 15 | 3.8 % |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 % |

WITHOUT "NOT PROVIDED"

Q23. How many years have you lived in Carlsbad? (without "not provided")


| Q23 | Number | Percent |
|-------|--------|---------|
| 0-5 | 73 | 19.0 % |
| 6-10 | 63 | 16.4 % |
| 11-15 | 37 | 9.6 % |
| 16-20 | 41 | 10.6 % |
| 21-30 | 95 | 24.7 % |
| 31+ | 76 | 19.7 % |
| Total | 385 | 100.0 % |

Q24. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?

| Q24 | Number | Percent |
|-------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Asian or Asian Indian | 36 | 9.0 % |
| Black or African American | 5 | 1.3 % |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 4 | 1.0 % |
| White | 319 | 79.8 % |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 4 | 1.0 % |
| Hispanic, Spanish, or Latino/a/x | 60 | 15.0 % |
| Other | 7 | 1.8 % |
| Total | 435 | |

Q24-7. Other

| Q24-7. Other | Number | Percent |
|-------------------|--------|---------|
| Mixed | 1 | 14.3 % |
| mixed asian/white | 1 | 14.3 % |
| More than one | 1 | 14.3 % |
| Multirace | 1 | 14.3 % |
| German-Polish | 1 | 14.3 % |
| Middle Eastern | 1 | 14.3 % |
| EurAsian | 1 | 14.3 % |
| Total | 7 | 100.0 % |



Survey Instrument



May 2022

Help plan future parks and recreation offerings!

Dear City of Carlsbad Resident:

Your response to the enclosed survey is important.

The City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department is conducting a community survey as part of the process to update its Parks & Recreation master plan. We would like your input on future improvements to parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services. You have been selected at random to take this survey.

We appreciate your time.

This survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. The feedback gathered will be considered when updating the master plan to ensure future parks and recreation services meet residents' needs and benefit the community.

Please complete and return your survey at your earliest convenience in the next two weeks . . .

We have selected ETC Institute, an independent market research and survey firm, as our partner to administer this survey. Please return your completed survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. If you prefer, you can complete the survey online at carlsbadsurvey.org.

Your responses will remain anonymous.

If you have questions, please feel free to contact special projects manager, Mick Calarco, at 442-339-2859, or via email at mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov. Thank you very much for your participation in this survey.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Kyle Lancaster'.

Kyle Lancaster
Parks & Recreation Director

Parks & Recreation Department

Administration 799 Pine Ave, Suite 200 | Carlsbad, CA 92008 | 442-339-2826 t



Parks & Recreation Department Needs Assessment Survey

Let your voice be heard today!

The City of Carlsbad needs your input to help determine the community's parks and recreation priorities. Parks and recreation facilities and services contribute significantly to Carlsbad's quality of life, and your input is very important to us. This survey will take 10-15 minutes to complete. When you are finished, please return it in the enclosed postage-paid, return-reply envelope. If you prefer, you can complete the survey online at carlsbadsurvey.org. We greatly appreciate your time!

1. Have you or any member of your household visited any City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields during the year before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020)?

___(1) Yes [Answer Q1a-b.] ___(2) No [Skip to Q2.]

1a. How often have you visited City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields during the last 12 months before the COVID-19 pandemic?

___(1) More than 5 times a week ___(3) Once a week ___(5) Less than once a month
___(2) 2-4 times a week ___(4) 1-3 times a month ___(9) Don't know

1b. Overall, how would you rate the physical condition of ALL the City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities and sports fields you have visited?

___(4) Excellent ___(3) Good ___(2) Fair ___(1) Poor

2. Please CHECK ALL the following reasons that prevent you or members of your household from using City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields more often. [Check all that apply]

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ___(01) Use parks in other cities | ___(08) Not aware of park locations |
| ___(02) Too far from your home | ___(09) Lack of transportation |
| ___(03) Parks are not well maintained | ___(10) Lack of restrooms |
| ___(04) Lack of features we want to use | ___(11) Lack of trust in government |
| ___(05) Lack of parking to access parks | ___(12) Language/cultural barriers |
| ___(06) Do not feel safe using parks | ___(13) Other: _____ |
| ___(07) Lack of handicap accessibility | |

3. From the following list, please CHECK ALL the service providers that you or members of your household used for recreation and sports activities during the year before the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020).

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| ___(01) Private schools | ___(07) Private clubs (tennis, health, swim, fitness) |
| ___(02) Places of worship (e.g. synagogues, churches) | ___(08) City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department |
| ___(03) Private and non-profit youth sports | ___(09) YMCA programs |
| ___(04) Public schools | ___(10) Boys and Girls club |
| ___(05) Private summer camps | ___(11) Other: _____ |
| ___(06) Neighboring cities | |

4. From the following list, please CHECK ALL the ways you currently learn about City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department facilities, programs and activities.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ___(01) City community services guide | ___(10) E-newsletter |
| ___(02) City website | ___(11) Facebook |
| ___(03) Materials at recreation facilities | ___(12) NextDoor |
| ___(04) Conversations with recreation staff | ___(13) Instagram |
| ___(05) Newspaper | ___(14) Twitter |
| ___(06) Friends and neighbors | ___(15) Flyers |
| ___(07) Temporary signs at parks or around the City | ___(16) City Council meetings |
| ___(08) Peachjar | ___(17) Other: _____ |
| ___(09) Emails | |

5. From the list in Question 4, which **THREE** methods of communication would you **MOST PREFER** the City use to communicate with you about recreation facilities, programs and activities? *[Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 4, or circle "NONE."]*

1st: ____ 2nd: ____ 3rd: ____ NONE

6. Has your household participated in any programs offered by the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department during the past 12 months before the COVID-19 pandemic?

____(1) Yes *[Answer Q6a-b.]* ____ (2) No *[Skip to Q7]*

6a. How many City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs did you or members of your household participate in during the 12 months before the COVID-19 pandemic?

____(1) One ____ (2) 2-3 ____ (3) 4-6 ____ (4) 7 or more

6b. How would you rate the overall quality of the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs in which your household has participated?

____(4) Excellent ____ (3) Good ____ (2) Fair ____ (1) Poor

7. Please **CHECK ALL** the following reasons that prevent you and members of your household from participating in City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs more often. *[Check all that apply]*

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| ____(01) Lack of quality instructors | ____(10) Program not offered |
| ____(02) Outdated facilities | ____(11) Registration is difficult |
| ____(03) Use programs of other agencies | ____(12) Poor customer service by staff |
| ____(04) I don't know what is offered | ____(13) Lack of transportation |
| ____(05) Lack of quality programs | ____(14) Lack of right program equipment |
| ____(06) Fees are too high | ____(15) Too busy/Not interested |
| ____(07) Too far from my home | ____(16) Language / cultural barriers |
| ____(08) Program times are not convenient | ____(17) Other: _____ |
| ____(09) Classes are full | |

8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number.

| The parks and recreation system in Carlsbad... | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|------------|
| 01. | Improves my (my household's) physical health and fitness | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 02. | Helps improve community safety and keep youth out of trouble | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 03. | Makes Carlsbad a more desirable place to live | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 04. | Preserves open space and protects the environment | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 05. | Increases my (my household's) property value | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 06. | Improves my (my household's) mental health and reduces stress | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 07. | Provides positive social interactions for me (my household/family) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 08. | Helps to attract new residents and businesses | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 09. | Promotes tourism to the city and the region | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 10. | Positively impacts economic/business development | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 11. | Is accessible to all age groups | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 12. | Provides jobs/professional development for youth | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 13. | Provides community volunteer opportunities | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 14. | Provides access to specialized offerings for various groups e.g. Senior Center/Teen programs, etc. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| Type of Facility/Amenity | Do you have a need for this facility/amenity? | | If "Yes," how well are your needs being met? | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----|----------------------------------------------|------------|------------|---------|
| | Yes | No | Fully Met | Mostly Met | Partly Met | Not Met |
| 01. Universally accessible playground equipment | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 02. Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 03. Bike park (pump/skills track) | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 04. Community gardens | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 05. Community parks | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 06. Concessions | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 07. Dining/retail | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 08. Disc golf course | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 09. Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. Game tables (e.g. chess, checkers, dominoes etc.) | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. Multigenerational community center | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket) | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 13. Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/football/lacrosse/rugby) | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. Neighborhood parks | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 15. Off-leash dog parks | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16. Ornamental / interpretive gardens | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 17. Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 18. Outdoor pickleball courts | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 19. Outdoor swimming pools | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 20. Skate parks | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 21. Tennis courts | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 22. Other: _____ | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

10. Which FOUR facilities/amenities from the list in Question 9 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household? [Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 9, or circle "NONE."]

1st: ____ 2nd: ____ 3rd: ____ 4th: ____ NONE

11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| Type of Program | Do you have a need for this program? | | If "Yes," how well are your needs being met? | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----|----------------------------------------------|------------|------------|---------|
| | Yes | No | Fully Met | Mostly Met | Partly Met | Not Met |
| 01. Adult fitness and wellness programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 02. Adult sports programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 03. Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.) | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 04. Before and after school programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 05. City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.) | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 06. Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 07. Cultural arts programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 08. Dancing | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 09. Dog training | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. Environmental education programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. Esports programs/leagues/tournaments | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. Intergenerational programming | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 13. Gymnastics and tumbling programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. Martial arts programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 15. Outdoor skills/adventure programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16. Preschool programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 17. Programs for individuals with disabilities | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 18. Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 19. Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 20. Teen programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 21. Teen Day Trips | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 22. Tennis programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 23. Unstructured indoor play | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 24. Youth enrichment camp programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 25. Youth fitness and wellness programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 26. Youth sports programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 27. Youth summer camp programs | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 28. Other: _____ | Yes | No | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

12. Which FOUR recreation programs from the list in Question 11 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household? [Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 11, or circle "NONE."]

1st: ____ 2nd: ____ 3rd: ____ 4th: ____ NONE

13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| How supportive are you of having the City of Carlsbad renovate and/or develop new facilities for..... | Very Supportive | Somewhat Supportive | Not Sure | Not Supportive |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------|----------------|
| 01. Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 02. Amphitheater | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 03. Arena/speed soccer | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 04. Better lighting in parks | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 05. Bike park (pump/skills track) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 06. Botanical or ornamental gardens | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 07. Community gardens | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 08. Concessions | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 09. Conference/trade shows /training center | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. Cultural arts programs | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. Dining/retail | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 13. Disc golf course | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. Family picnic areas (covered and uncovered) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 15. More shaded areas in parks | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16. Multigenerational community center (fitness/recreation/meeting space) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 17. Multipurpose fields | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 18. Off-leash dog parks | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 19. Outdoor basketball courts | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 20. Outdoor pickleball courts | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 21. Outdoor swimming pools | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 22. Playground equipment | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 23. Radio controlled aircraft/drone fields | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 24. Senior center (age 50+) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 25. Skateboard parks | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 26. Synthetic turf fields | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 27. Teen center | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 28. Tennis courts | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 29. Unstructured indoor play | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 30. Youth multi-purpose fields | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 31. Other: _____ | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

14. Which FOUR actions from the list in Question 13 would your household be MOST WILLING to fund? [Write in your answers below using the numbers from the list in Question 13, or circle "NONE."]

1st: _____ 2nd: _____ 3rd: _____ 4th: _____ NONE

15. During the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020 - June 2021), what types of virtual programs/activities did you participate in? [Check all that apply.]

- _____ (1) Virtual tours
- _____ (2) Virtual camps
- _____ (3) Virtual arts and craft classes
- _____ (4) Virtual fitness classes
- _____ (5) Virtual performing arts classes
- _____ (6) Virtual health and wellness programs
- _____ (7) Other: _____
- _____ (8) Haven't participated in virtual programs/activities

16. Beyond the COVID-19 pandemic, what types of virtual programs/activities would you be interested in participating in? [Check all that apply.]

- _____ (1) Virtual tours
- _____ (2) Virtual camps
- _____ (3) Virtual arts and crafts Classes
- _____ (4) Virtual fitness classes
- _____ (5) Virtual performing arts classes
- _____ (6) Virtual health and wellness programs
- _____ (7) Other: _____
- _____ (8) Not interested in virtual programs/activities

FUNDING

17. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the overall value that your household receives from the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department.

___(5) Very Satisfied ___(3) Neutral ___(1) Very Dissatisfied
___(4) Satisfied ___(2) Dissatisfied ___(9) Don't Know

18. Given the recent COVID-19 pandemic, how has your and your household's perception of the value of parks and recreation changed?

___(1) Increased ___(3) No change ___(5) Decreased
___(2) Somewhat increased ___(4) Somewhat decreased

19. Would you or your household like to see the city place a greater emphasis on parks and recreation projects, programs, and services?

___(1) Increase funding ___(2) Maintain existing funding ___(3) Reduce funding ___(4) Not sure

DEMOGRAPHICS

20. Your gender: ___(1) Male ___(2) Female ___(3) Non-binary

21. Including yourself, how many people in your household are...

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|
| Under age 5: | ___ | Ages 15-19: | ___ | Ages 35-44: | ___ | Ages 65-74: | ___ |
| Ages 5-9: | ___ | Ages 20-24: | ___ | Ages 45-54: | ___ | Ages 75-84: | ___ |
| Ages 10-14: | ___ | Ages 25-34: | ___ | Ages 55-64: | ___ | Ages 85+: | ___ |

22. Your age: _____ years

23. How many years have you lived in Carlsbad? _____ years

24. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?

___(1) Asian or Asian Indian ___(5) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
___(2) Black or African American ___(6) Hispanic, Spanish, or Latino/a/x
___(3) American Indian or Alaska Native ___(99) Other: _____
___(4) White

25. Please share any additional comments that can assist the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department in improving their projects, programs, and services.

26. Would you be willing to participate in future surveys sponsored by the City of Carlsbad?

___(1) Yes [Answer Q26a.] ___(2) No

26a. Please provide your contact information.

Mobile Phone Number: _____

Email Address: _____

This concludes the survey. Thank you for your time!

Please return your completed survey in the enclosed return-reply envelope addressed to:
ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061

Your responses will remain anonymous. The information provided will ONLY be used to help identify the level of need and priorities in your area.
Thank you!

Q1. Have you or any member of your household visited any City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields during the year before the start of the Covid-19 Pandemic (March 2020)?

| N=400 | | Zip code | | | | Total |
|------------|--|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q1.</u> | | | | | | |
| Yes | | 85.3% | 86.7% | 80.3% | 85.6% | 85.5% |
| No | | 14.7% | 13.3% | 19.7% | 14.4% | 14.5% |

Q1a. How often have you visited City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields during the last 12 months before the Covid-19 Pandemic? (without "Don't Know")

N=400

| | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q1a.</u> | | | | | |
| More than 5 times a week | 12.5% | 12.3% | 8.7% | 7.5% | 10.5% |
| 2-4 times a week | 37.5% | 17.9% | 26.1% | 38.8% | 30.0% |
| Once a week | 22.5% | 22.6% | 23.9% | 21.3% | 22.0% |
| 1-3 times a month | 18.8% | 23.6% | 21.7% | 17.5% | 20.7% |
| Less than once a month | 8.8% | 23.6% | 19.6% | 15.0% | 16.7% |

Q1b. Overall, how would you rate the physical condition of ALL the City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities and sports fields you have visited? (without "Not Provided")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q1b.</u> | | | | | |
| Excellent | 27.5% | 40.2% | 31.3% | 52.4% | 38.3% |
| Good | 65.0% | 55.4% | 58.3% | 42.7% | 55.1% |
| Fair | 6.3% | 3.6% | 10.4% | 4.9% | 5.7% |
| Poor | 1.3% | 0.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.9% |

Q2. Please CHECK ALL the following reasons that prevent you or members of your household from using City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields more often.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q2</u> | | | | | |
| Use parks in other cities | 5.3% | 16.3% | 6.6% | 8.2% | 10.0% |
| Too far from your home | 4.2% | 14.1% | 4.9% | 9.3% | 8.8% |
| Parks are not well maintained | 2.1% | 0.0% | 3.3% | 2.1% | 1.8% |
| Lack of features we want to use | 21.1% | 12.6% | 19.7% | 21.6% | 18.3% |
| Lack of parking to access parks | 4.2% | 8.9% | 9.8% | 7.2% | 7.5% |
| Do not feel safe using parks | 23.2% | 3.7% | 14.8% | 6.2% | 10.8% |
| Lack of handicap accessibility | 1.1% | 3.0% | 3.3% | 1.0% | 2.0% |
| Not aware of park locations | 6.3% | 13.3% | 8.2% | 12.4% | 10.5% |
| Lack of transportation | 1.1% | 0.7% | 3.3% | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| Lack of restrooms | 14.7% | 9.6% | 11.5% | 9.3% | 11.3% |
| Lack of trust in government | 3.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.8% |
| Other | 21.1% | 19.3% | 24.6% | 19.6% | 20.0% |

Q3. From the following list, please CHECK ALL the service providers that you or members of your household used for recreation and sports activities during the year before the Covid-19 Pandemic (March 2020).

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q3</u> | | | | | |
| Private schools | 9.5% | 8.1% | 3.3% | 6.2% | 7.0% |
| Places of worship (e.g. synagogues, churches) | 20.0% | 14.1% | 16.4% | 23.7% | 18.3% |
| Private and non-profit youth sports | 23.2% | 20.7% | 23.0% | 14.4% | 20.8% |
| Public schools | 25.3% | 26.7% | 16.4% | 21.6% | 23.3% |
| Private summer camps | 18.9% | 17.0% | 16.4% | 13.4% | 16.0% |
| Neighboring cities | 30.5% | 32.6% | 24.6% | 34.0% | 31.0% |
| Private clubs (tennis, health, swim, fitness) | 27.4% | 35.6% | 23.0% | 40.2% | 32.8% |
| City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department | 45.3% | 39.3% | 57.4% | 55.7% | 47.3% |
| YMCA programs | 8.4% | 15.6% | 6.6% | 17.5% | 12.5% |
| Boys and Girls club | 6.3% | 5.2% | 4.9% | 2.1% | 4.5% |
| Other | 5.3% | 6.7% | 6.6% | 8.2% | 6.5% |

Q4. From the following list, please CHECK ALL the ways you currently learn about City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department facilities, programs and activities.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q4</u> | | | | | |
| City community services guide | 41.1% | 42.2% | 41.0% | 39.2% | 41.0% |
| City website | 53.7% | 48.9% | 36.1% | 45.4% | 47.3% |
| Materials at recreation facilities | 20.0% | 13.3% | 16.4% | 16.5% | 16.3% |
| Conversations with recreation staff | 5.3% | 3.0% | 3.3% | 2.1% | 3.3% |
| Newspaper | 12.6% | 17.8% | 13.1% | 17.5% | 15.5% |
| Friends and neighbors | 51.6% | 49.6% | 47.5% | 63.9% | 53.3% |
| Temporary signs at parks or around the City | 27.4% | 18.5% | 19.7% | 37.1% | 25.5% |
| Peachjar | 2.1% | 2.2% | 0.0% | 4.1% | 2.3% |
| Emails | 34.7% | 32.6% | 41.0% | 35.1% | 34.5% |
| E-newsletter | 15.8% | 17.8% | 29.5% | 17.5% | 19.0% |
| Facebook | 17.9% | 5.9% | 11.5% | 11.3% | 11.0% |

Q4. From the following list, please CHECK ALL the ways you currently learn about City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department facilities, programs and activities.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-----------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q4 (Cont.)</u> | | | | | |
| NextDoor | 14.7% | 16.3% | 19.7% | 14.4% | 15.8% |
| Instagram | 11.6% | 7.4% | 8.2% | 6.2% | 8.0% |
| Twitter | 2.1% | 2.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.3% |
| Flyers | 13.7% | 14.8% | 9.8% | 12.4% | 12.8% |
| City Council meetings | 2.1% | 3.0% | 3.3% | 2.1% | 2.5% |
| Other | 3.2% | 8.1% | 8.2% | 4.1% | 6.0% |

SUM OF TOP 3 CHOICES

Q5. From the list in Question 4, which THREE methods of communication would you MOST PREFER the City use to communicate with you about recreation facilities, programs and activities? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 3 Choices</u> | | | | | |
| City community services guide | 13.8% | 12.8% | 11.0% | 15.2% | 13.2% |
| City website | 13.4% | 16.6% | 13.7% | 17.7% | 15.9% |
| Materials at recreation facilities | 4.3% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 3.5% | 3.5% |
| Conversations with recreation staff | 0.9% | 0.3% | 0.7% | 0.4% | 0.5% |
| Newspaper | 2.6% | 4.5% | 2.7% | 3.5% | 3.5% |
| Friends and neighbors | 3.9% | 3.0% | 4.8% | 4.3% | 4.0% |
| Temporary signs at parks or around the City | 9.9% | 6.8% | 5.5% | 8.7% | 7.8% |
| Peachjar | 1.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.4% |
| Emails | 18.1% | 17.8% | 19.2% | 15.6% | 17.2% |
| E-newsletter | 9.9% | 13.6% | 13.7% | 10.0% | 11.7% |
| Facebook | 4.7% | 1.8% | 2.7% | 4.3% | 3.4% |

SUM OF TOP 3 CHOICES

Q5. From the list in Question 4, which THREE methods of communication would you MOST PREFER the City use to communicate with you about recreation facilities, programs and activities? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 3 Choices (Cont.)</u> | | | | | |
| NextDoor | 2.2% | 2.7% | 4.8% | 3.9% | 3.2% |
| Instagram | 2.6% | 3.3% | 2.7% | 1.7% | 2.7% |
| Twitter | 0.4% | 1.2% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.6% |
| Flyers | 4.7% | 4.7% | 6.8% | 2.2% | 4.3% |
| City Council meetings | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.3% |
| Other | 0.4% | 1.5% | 2.1% | 0.9% | 1.1% |
| None | 6.9% | 6.2% | 6.8% | 6.9% | 6.7% |

Q6. Has your household participated in any programs offered by the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department during the past 12 months before the Covid-19 Pandemic?

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q6.</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 40.0% | 31.9% | 29.5% | 42.3% | 36.3% |
| No | 60.0% | 68.1% | 70.5% | 57.7% | 63.8% |

Q6a. How often have you visited City of Carlsbad parks, recreation facilities, or sports fields during the last 12 months before the Covid-19 Pandemic? (without "Not Provided")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q6a.</u> | | | | | |
| One | 40.5% | 46.5% | 22.2% | 42.5% | 40.6% |
| 2-3 | 37.8% | 39.5% | 44.4% | 40.0% | 39.9% |
| 4-6 | 16.2% | 11.6% | 27.8% | 12.5% | 15.4% |
| 7 or more | 5.4% | 2.3% | 5.6% | 5.0% | 4.2% |

Q6b. How would you rate the overall quality of the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs in which your household has participated? (without "Not Provided")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q6b.</u> | | | | | |
| Excellent | 47.4% | 39.0% | 33.3% | 45.0% | 43.0% |
| Good | 44.7% | 58.5% | 66.7% | 52.5% | 52.8% |
| Fair | 7.9% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 2.5% | 4.2% |

Q7. Please CHECK ALL the following reasons that prevent you and members of your household from participating in City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs more often.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q7</u> | | | | | |
| Lack of quality instructors | 4.2% | 4.4% | 8.2% | 6.2% | 5.5% |
| Outdated facilities | 4.2% | 3.7% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 2.8% |
| Use programs of other agencies | 9.5% | 13.3% | 6.6% | 9.3% | 10.0% |
| I don't know what is offered | 29.5% | 38.5% | 26.2% | 37.1% | 33.5% |
| Lack of quality programs | 3.2% | 3.0% | 3.3% | 6.2% | 4.0% |
| Fees are too high | 10.5% | 8.9% | 9.8% | 6.2% | 9.3% |
| Too far from my home | 2.1% | 11.1% | 4.9% | 7.2% | 7.0% |
| Program times are not convenient | 13.7% | 11.9% | 18.0% | 16.5% | 15.0% |
| Classes are full | 8.4% | 9.6% | 9.8% | 8.2% | 8.8% |
| Program not offered | 10.5% | 10.4% | 8.2% | 9.3% | 9.5% |
| Registration is difficult | 3.2% | 3.0% | 1.6% | 8.2% | 4.0% |
| Poor customer service by staff | 3.2% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 1.0% | 1.3% |

Q7. Please CHECK ALL the following reasons that prevent you and members of your household from participating in City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department programs more often.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q7 (Cont.)</u> | | | | | |
| Lack of transportation | 2.1% | 0.7% | 1.6% | 1.0% | 1.3% |
| Lack of right program equipment | 2.1% | 0.7% | 4.9% | 2.1% | 2.0% |
| Too busy/Not interested | 17.9% | 27.4% | 24.6% | 28.9% | 24.5% |
| Language / cultural barriers | 1.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% |
| Other | 9.5% | 6.7% | 6.6% | 9.3% | 8.0% |

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number. (without "Don't Know")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>01. Improves my (my household's) physical health and fitness</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 44.8% | 40.0% | 42.3% | 45.5% | 43.6% |
| Agree | 32.2% | 31.7% | 40.4% | 37.5% | 34.4% |
| Neutral | 18.4% | 25.8% | 15.4% | 15.9% | 19.6% |
| Disagree | 2.3% | 2.5% | 1.9% | 0.0% | 1.7% |
| Strongly Disagree | 2.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.8% |
| <u>02. Helps improve community safety and keep youth out of trouble</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 58.2% | 39.7% | 38.6% | 41.0% | 44.2% |
| Agree | 27.8% | 44.8% | 45.6% | 44.6% | 40.2% |
| Neutral | 12.7% | 12.1% | 12.3% | 14.5% | 13.6% |
| Disagree | 1.3% | 1.7% | 1.8% | 0.0% | 1.2% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 1.7% | 1.8% | 0.0% | 0.9% |

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number. (without "Don't Know")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>03. Makes Carlsbad a more desirable place to live</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 68.2% | 56.7% | 53.4% | 65.6% | 60.8% |
| Agree | 26.1% | 39.4% | 41.4% | 28.9% | 34.1% |
| Neutral | 3.4% | 3.9% | 5.2% | 5.6% | 4.5% |
| Disagree | 2.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.5% |
| <u>04. Preserves open space and protects the environment</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 60.0% | 55.3% | 57.6% | 57.5% | 56.8% |
| Agree | 26.7% | 30.9% | 30.5% | 31.0% | 30.0% |
| Neutral | 10.0% | 11.4% | 6.8% | 9.2% | 10.0% |
| Disagree | 3.3% | 1.6% | 3.4% | 1.1% | 2.2% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 0.8% | 1.7% | 1.1% | 1.1% |

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number. (without "Don't Know")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>05. Increases my (my household's) property value</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 49.4% | 40.5% | 43.9% | 40.2% | 42.7% |
| Agree | 21.5% | 40.5% | 28.1% | 39.1% | 33.6% |
| Neutral | 25.3% | 15.7% | 24.6% | 19.5% | 20.9% |
| Disagree | 3.8% | 2.5% | 1.8% | 1.1% | 2.3% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 0.8% | 1.8% | 0.0% | 0.6% |
| <u>06. Improves my (my household's) mental health and reduces stress</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 48.2% | 33.1% | 44.2% | 35.2% | 39.7% |
| Agree | 28.2% | 33.9% | 30.8% | 42.0% | 33.8% |
| Neutral | 20.0% | 28.8% | 19.2% | 21.6% | 22.8% |
| Disagree | 2.4% | 4.2% | 5.8% | 0.0% | 3.1% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.6% |

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number. (without "Don't Know")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>07. Provides positive social interactions for me (my household/family)</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 44.2% | 30.0% | 32.1% | 39.1% | 35.7% |
| Agree | 33.7% | 32.5% | 37.5% | 37.9% | 34.8% |
| Neutral | 18.6% | 32.5% | 28.6% | 18.4% | 25.1% |
| Disagree | 2.3% | 4.2% | 1.8% | 2.3% | 3.1% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1.2% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 2.3% | 1.4% |
| <u>08. Helps to attract new residents and businesses</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 36.7% | 26.7% | 26.3% | 28.0% | 29.2% |
| Agree | 30.4% | 41.4% | 28.1% | 43.9% | 36.8% |
| Neutral | 30.4% | 28.4% | 42.1% | 24.4% | 30.7% |
| Disagree | 2.5% | 2.6% | 1.8% | 2.4% | 2.3% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 0.9% | 1.8% | 1.2% | 0.9% |

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number. (without "Don't Know")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>09. Promotes tourism to the city and the region</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 31.2% | 23.9% | 25.5% | 25.3% | 26.1% |
| Agree | 32.5% | 30.3% | 32.7% | 28.9% | 30.3% |
| Neutral | 29.9% | 36.7% | 38.2% | 39.8% | 36.0% |
| Disagree | 6.5% | 8.3% | 1.8% | 4.8% | 6.3% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 0.9% | 1.8% | 1.2% | 1.2% |
| <u>10. Positively impacts economic/business development</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 35.0% | 24.3% | 31.5% | 28.4% | 29.0% |
| Agree | 36.3% | 32.4% | 27.8% | 40.7% | 34.1% |
| Neutral | 23.8% | 39.6% | 31.5% | 27.2% | 31.7% |
| Disagree | 5.0% | 3.6% | 7.4% | 1.2% | 3.9% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.9% | 2.5% | 1.2% |

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number. (without "Don't Know")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>11. Is accessible to all age groups</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 47.7% | 35.6% | 30.9% | 40.2% | 39.0% |
| Agree | 38.6% | 39.0% | 45.5% | 43.7% | 41.2% |
| Neutral | 8.0% | 19.5% | 18.2% | 10.3% | 14.2% |
| Disagree | 5.7% | 4.2% | 1.8% | 2.3% | 3.6% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 1.7% | 3.6% | 3.4% | 1.9% |
| <u>12. Provides jobs/professional development for youth</u> | | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 27.5% | 26.9% | 32.7% | 20.8% | 25.9% |
| Agree | 43.8% | 34.6% | 38.8% | 44.2% | 39.7% |
| Neutral | 26.3% | 36.5% | 26.5% | 28.6% | 30.6% |
| Disagree | 2.5% | 1.9% | 2.0% | 3.9% | 2.8% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.9% |

Q8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning some potential benefits of the City of Carlsbad's parks and recreation system by circling the corresponding number. (without "Don't Know")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

13. Provides community volunteer opportunities

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Strongly Agree | 35.1% | 22.6% | 38.0% | 20.5% | 27.1% |
| Agree | 50.6% | 44.3% | 36.0% | 55.1% | 47.0% |
| Neutral | 13.0% | 30.2% | 26.0% | 17.9% | 22.7% |
| Disagree | 1.3% | 1.9% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 2.5% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.6% |

14. Provides access to specialized offerings for various groups e.g. Senior Center/Teen programs, etc.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Strongly Agree | 42.9% | 29.7% | 44.4% | 37.7% | 36.3% |
| Agree | 42.9% | 43.2% | 42.6% | 42.9% | 42.7% |
| Neutral | 13.1% | 22.9% | 13.0% | 16.9% | 18.3% |
| Disagree | 1.2% | 3.4% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 2.0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.6% |

Q9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>01. Universally accessible playground equipment</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 25.3% | 20.7% | 18.0% | 21.6% | 22.3% |
| No | 74.7% | 79.3% | 82.0% | 78.4% | 77.8% |
| <u>02. Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course)</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 31.6% | 25.9% | 27.9% | 22.7% | 27.0% |
| No | 68.4% | 74.1% | 72.1% | 77.3% | 73.0% |
| <u>03. Bike park (pump/skills track)</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 22.1% | 26.7% | 24.6% | 22.7% | 24.8% |
| No | 77.9% | 73.3% | 75.4% | 77.3% | 75.3% |

Q9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>04. Community gardens</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 47.4% | 43.7% | 44.3% | 37.1% | 43.3% |
| No | 52.6% | 56.3% | 55.7% | 62.9% | 56.8% |
| <u>05. Community parks</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 82.1% | 74.8% | 77.0% | 73.2% | 76.5% |
| No | 17.9% | 25.2% | 23.0% | 26.8% | 23.5% |
| <u>06. Concessions</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 13.7% | 20.7% | 21.3% | 17.5% | 18.0% |
| No | 86.3% | 79.3% | 78.7% | 82.5% | 82.0% |

Q9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>07. Dining/retail</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 30.5% | 28.9% | 39.3% | 22.7% | 29.5% |
| No | 69.5% | 71.1% | 60.7% | 77.3% | 70.5% |
| <u>08. Disc golf course</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 16.8% | 17.0% | 16.4% | 14.4% | 16.3% |
| No | 83.2% | 83.0% | 83.6% | 85.6% | 83.8% |
| <u>09. Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 55.8% | 54.8% | 65.6% | 52.6% | 56.3% |
| No | 44.2% | 45.2% | 34.4% | 47.4% | 43.8% |

Q9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>10. Game tables (e.g. chess, checkers, dominoes etc.)</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 18.9% | 10.4% | 19.7% | 15.5% | 15.3% |
| No | 81.1% | 89.6% | 80.3% | 84.5% | 84.8% |
| <u>11. Multigenerational community center</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 32.6% | 26.7% | 31.1% | 28.9% | 29.5% |
| No | 67.4% | 73.3% | 68.9% | 71.1% | 70.5% |
| <u>12. Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket)</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 36.8% | 23.7% | 24.6% | 21.6% | 27.0% |
| No | 63.2% | 76.3% | 75.4% | 78.4% | 73.0% |

Q9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>13. Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/football/lacrosse/rugby)</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 35.8% | 28.9% | 32.8% | 25.8% | 30.8% |
| No | 64.2% | 71.1% | 67.2% | 74.2% | 69.3% |
| <u>14. Neighborhood parks</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 75.8% | 74.1% | 77.0% | 74.2% | 75.0% |
| No | 24.2% | 25.9% | 23.0% | 25.8% | 25.0% |
| <u>5. Off-leash dog parks</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 44.2% | 43.0% | 36.1% | 34.0% | 40.3% |
| No | 55.8% | 57.0% | 63.9% | 66.0% | 59.8% |

Q9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>16. Ornamental/interpretive gardens</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 28.4% | 37.0% | 32.8% | 22.7% | 31.3% |
| No | 71.6% | 63.0% | 67.2% | 77.3% | 68.8% |
| <u>17. Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 30.5% | 31.1% | 41.0% | 30.9% | 33.0% |
| No | 69.5% | 68.9% | 59.0% | 69.1% | 67.0% |
| <u>18. Outdoor pickleball courts</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 40.0% | 43.7% | 37.7% | 45.4% | 43.0% |
| No | 60.0% | 56.3% | 62.3% | 54.6% | 57.0% |

Q9. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the City of Carlsbad parks and recreation facilities/amenities listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>19. Outdoor swimming pools</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 52.6% | 43.7% | 49.2% | 44.3% | 47.5% |
| No | 47.4% | 56.3% | 50.8% | 55.7% | 52.5% |
| <u>20. Skate parks</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 26.3% | 18.5% | 16.4% | 16.5% | 20.0% |
| No | 73.7% | 81.5% | 83.6% | 83.5% | 80.0% |
| <u>21. Tennis courts</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 29.5% | 35.6% | 31.1% | 29.9% | 32.0% |
| No | 70.5% | 64.4% | 68.9% | 70.1% | 68.0% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

N=375

| | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>01. Universally accessible playground equipment</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 30.4% | 46.2% | 27.3% | 33.3% | 35.3% |
| Mostly Met | 52.2% | 38.5% | 72.7% | 38.1% | 47.1% |
| Partly Met | 13.0% | 7.7% | 0.0% | 23.8% | 12.9% |
| Not Met | 4.3% | 7.7% | 0.0% | 4.8% | 4.7% |
| <u>02. Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course)</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 3.7% | 6.1% | 11.8% | 5.3% | 6.1% |
| Mostly Met | 11.1% | 3.0% | 11.8% | 5.3% | 7.1% |
| Partly Met | 25.9% | 27.3% | 23.5% | 15.8% | 23.5% |
| Not Met | 59.3% | 63.6% | 52.9% | 73.7% | 63.3% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=375 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q3. Bike park (pump/skills track)</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 9.4% | 7.1% | 10.5% | 9.1% |
| Mostly Met | 26.3% | 9.4% | 21.4% | 31.6% | 19.3% |
| Partly Met | 26.3% | 28.1% | 28.6% | 21.1% | 25.0% |
| Not Met | 47.4% | 53.1% | 42.9% | 36.8% | 46.6% |
| <u>Q4. Community gardens</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 17.9% | 16.4% | 12.5% | 3.6% | 14.0% |
| Mostly Met | 30.8% | 23.6% | 33.3% | 35.7% | 28.7% |
| Partly Met | 41.0% | 30.9% | 41.7% | 39.3% | 36.7% |
| Not Met | 10.3% | 29.1% | 12.5% | 21.4% | 20.7% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

N=375

| | Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>05. Community parks</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 43.3% | 48.4% | 35.9% | 45.2% | 44.1% |
| Mostly Met | 38.8% | 41.1% | 46.2% | 33.9% | 39.3% |
| Partly Met | 16.4% | 9.5% | 10.3% | 16.1% | 13.3% |
| Not Met | 1.5% | 1.1% | 7.7% | 4.8% | 3.3% |
| <u>06. Concessions</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 10.0% | 12.0% | 20.0% | 14.3% | 13.6% |
| Mostly Met | 30.0% | 16.0% | 40.0% | 21.4% | 23.7% |
| Partly Met | 10.0% | 44.0% | 20.0% | 21.4% | 28.8% |
| Not Met | 50.0% | 28.0% | 20.0% | 42.9% | 33.9% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=375 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>07. Dining/retail</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 21.7% | 25.0% | 31.6% | 15.8% | 23.0% |
| Mostly Met | 60.9% | 33.3% | 21.1% | 52.6% | 41.0% |
| Partly Met | 0.0% | 25.0% | 26.3% | 10.5% | 16.0% |
| Not Met | 17.4% | 16.7% | 21.1% | 21.1% | 20.0% |
| <u>08. Disc golf course</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 9.5% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 5.7% |
| Mostly Met | 7.7% | 4.8% | 37.5% | 10.0% | 11.3% |
| Partly Met | 15.4% | 19.0% | 12.5% | 10.0% | 17.0% |
| Not Met | 76.9% | 66.7% | 37.5% | 80.0% | 66.0% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=375 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>09. Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 26.7% | 39.1% | 29.7% | 22.2% | 30.2% |
| Mostly Met | 40.0% | 39.1% | 40.5% | 55.6% | 42.6% |
| Partly Met | 26.7% | 20.3% | 27.0% | 17.8% | 23.3% |
| Not Met | 6.7% | 1.4% | 2.7% | 4.4% | 4.0% |
| <u>10. Game tables (e.g. chess, checkers, dominoes etc.)</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 7.7% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 4.3% |
| Mostly Met | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 17.4% |
| Partly Met | 16.7% | 38.5% | 62.5% | 25.0% | 32.6% |
| Not Met | 58.3% | 53.8% | 25.0% | 41.7% | 45.7% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=375 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>11. Multigenerational community center</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 8.3% | 16.1% | 18.8% | 41.7% | 20.6% |
| Mostly Met | 50.0% | 25.8% | 31.3% | 20.8% | 32.0% |
| Partly Met | 20.8% | 35.5% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 26.8% |
| Not Met | 20.8% | 22.6% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 20.6% |
| <u>12. Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket)</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 37.5% | 42.9% | 16.7% | 26.7% | 33.0% |
| Mostly Met | 53.1% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 66.7% | 54.9% |
| Partly Met | 9.4% | 7.1% | 33.3% | 6.7% | 11.0% |
| Not Met | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=375 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>13. Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/football/lacrosse/rugby)</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 40.0% | 40.5% | 17.6% | 19.0% | 32.1% |
| Mostly Met | 46.7% | 48.6% | 47.1% | 61.9% | 50.5% |
| Partly Met | 13.3% | 10.8% | 29.4% | 19.0% | 16.5% |
| Not Met | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.9% | 0.0% | 0.9% |
| <u>14. Neighborhood parks</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 38.3% | 42.9% | 27.3% | 41.0% | 38.9% |
| Mostly Met | 40.0% | 37.4% | 40.9% | 39.3% | 38.5% |
| Partly Met | 20.0% | 14.3% | 27.3% | 13.1% | 17.6% |
| Not Met | 1.7% | 5.5% | 4.5% | 6.6% | 5.0% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=375 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>15. Off-leash dog parks</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 8.8% | 22.6% | 10.5% | 21.4% | 17.5% |
| Mostly Met | 20.6% | 13.2% | 21.1% | 17.9% | 16.8% |
| Partly Met | 35.3% | 30.2% | 52.6% | 42.9% | 37.2% |
| Not Met | 35.3% | 34.0% | 15.8% | 17.9% | 28.5% |
| <u>16. Ornamental/interpretive gardens</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 9.5% | 10.9% | 5.9% | 9.5% | 9.2% |
| Mostly Met | 23.8% | 34.8% | 5.9% | 19.0% | 24.8% |
| Partly Met | 47.6% | 19.6% | 58.8% | 42.9% | 34.9% |
| Not Met | 19.0% | 34.8% | 29.4% | 28.6% | 31.2% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=375 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>17. Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 24.0% | 28.9% | 21.7% | 19.2% | 23.9% |
| Mostly Met | 40.0% | 34.2% | 39.1% | 38.5% | 38.5% |
| Partly Met | 20.0% | 21.1% | 26.1% | 30.8% | 23.9% |
| Not Met | 16.0% | 15.8% | 13.0% | 11.5% | 13.7% |
| <u>18. Outdoor pickleball courts</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 6.3% | 7.3% | 5.0% | 15.8% | 9.3% |
| Mostly Met | 25.0% | 16.4% | 25.0% | 23.7% | 21.2% |
| Partly Met | 25.0% | 36.4% | 45.0% | 42.1% | 35.8% |
| Not Met | 43.8% | 40.0% | 25.0% | 18.4% | 33.8% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=375 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>19. Outdoor swimming pools</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 27.9% | 32.1% | 11.1% | 24.3% | 26.6% |
| Mostly Met | 30.2% | 37.5% | 33.3% | 40.5% | 34.3% |
| Partly Met | 23.3% | 14.3% | 40.7% | 21.6% | 21.9% |
| Not Met | 18.6% | 16.1% | 14.8% | 13.5% | 17.2% |
| <u>20. Skate parks</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 31.8% | 52.2% | 11.1% | 16.7% | 31.9% |
| Mostly Met | 13.6% | 26.1% | 22.2% | 33.3% | 23.2% |
| Partly Met | 27.3% | 13.0% | 55.6% | 25.0% | 27.5% |
| Not Met | 27.3% | 8.7% | 11.1% | 25.0% | 17.4% |

Q9. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for facilities/amenities of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

N=375

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

21. Tennis courts

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fully Met | 30.4% | 34.8% | 17.6% | 36.0% | 30.7% |
| Mostly Met | 34.8% | 34.8% | 41.2% | 36.0% | 35.1% |
| Partly Met | 26.1% | 21.7% | 23.5% | 20.0% | 23.7% |
| Not Met | 8.7% | 8.7% | 17.6% | 8.0% | 10.5% |

SUM OF TOP 4 CHOICES

Q10. Which FOUR facilities/amenities from the list in Question 9 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 4 Choices</u> | | | | | |
| Universally accessible playground equipment | 11.6% | 10.4% | 6.6% | 8.2% | 9.5% |
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 11.6% | 11.1% | 6.6% | 4.1% | 8.8% |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 4.2% | 11.9% | 11.5% | 4.1% | 7.8% |
| Community gardens | 12.6% | 18.5% | 14.8% | 14.4% | 15.8% |
| Community parks | 48.4% | 37.8% | 42.6% | 45.4% | 43.3% |
| Concessions | 1.1% | 4.4% | 3.3% | 3.1% | 3.0% |
| Dining/retail | 7.4% | 11.1% | 11.5% | 12.4% | 10.8% |
| Disc golf course | 4.2% | 4.4% | 4.9% | 6.2% | 5.0% |
| Family picnic areas - covered and uncovered | 12.6% | 19.3% | 19.7% | 14.4% | 16.8% |
| Game tables (e.g. chess, checkers, dominoes etc.) | 1.1% | 2.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| Multigenerational community center | 7.4% | 7.4% | 13.1% | 8.2% | 8.3% |

SUM OF TOP 4 CHOICES

Q10. Which FOUR facilities/amenities from the list in Question 9 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 4 Choices (Cont.)</u> | | | | | |
| Multipurpose diamond fields (e.g. baseball/ softball/cricket) | 7.4% | 5.2% | 6.6% | 6.2% | 6.0% |
| Multipurpose rectangular fields (soccer/ football/lacrosse/rugby) | 10.5% | 8.9% | 9.8% | 6.2% | 9.0% |
| Neighborhood parks | 34.7% | 40.7% | 42.6% | 40.2% | 39.0% |
| Off-leash dog parks | 21.1% | 25.2% | 21.3% | 20.6% | 23.0% |
| Ornamental / interpretive gardens | 3.2% | 15.6% | 16.4% | 11.3% | 11.5% |
| Outdoor basketball/volleyball courts | 4.2% | 11.1% | 11.5% | 8.2% | 8.5% |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 18.9% | 22.2% | 13.1% | 26.8% | 21.3% |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 26.3% | 18.5% | 21.3% | 19.6% | 21.8% |
| Skate parks | 9.5% | 4.4% | 8.2% | 5.2% | 6.5% |
| Tennis courts | 9.5% | 14.1% | 11.5% | 9.3% | 11.0% |
| None | 17.9% | 12.6% | 13.1% | 17.5% | 14.8% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

01. Adult fitness and wellness programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 54.7% | 50.4% | 60.7% | 59.8% | 54.8% |
| No | 45.3% | 49.6% | 39.3% | 40.2% | 45.3% |

02. Adult sports programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 38.9% | 31.9% | 49.2% | 43.3% | 38.8% |
| No | 61.1% | 68.1% | 50.8% | 56.7% | 61.3% |

03. Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.)

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 43.2% | 34.1% | 44.3% | 35.1% | 38.5% |
| No | 56.8% | 65.9% | 55.7% | 64.9% | 61.5% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

04. Before and after school programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 21.1% | 11.1% | 16.4% | 10.3% | 14.3% |
| No | 78.9% | 88.9% | 83.6% | 89.7% | 85.8% |

05. City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.)

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 31.6% | 23.7% | 41.0% | 34.0% | 30.8% |
| No | 68.4% | 76.3% | 59.0% | 66.0% | 69.3% |

06. Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.)

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 30.5% | 31.1% | 29.5% | 32.0% | 31.0% |
| No | 69.5% | 68.9% | 70.5% | 68.0% | 69.0% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

07. Cultural arts programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 34.7% | 38.5% | 37.7% | 34.0% | 36.0% |
| No | 65.3% | 61.5% | 62.3% | 66.0% | 64.0% |

08. Dancing

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 28.4% | 23.7% | 23.0% | 23.7% | 25.3% |
| No | 71.6% | 76.3% | 77.0% | 76.3% | 74.8% |

09. Dog training

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 29.5% | 18.5% | 23.0% | 16.5% | 21.3% |
| No | 70.5% | 81.5% | 77.0% | 83.5% | 78.8% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>10. Environmental education programs</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 27.4% | 20.7% | 32.8% | 25.8% | 25.3% |
| No | 72.6% | 79.3% | 67.2% | 74.2% | 74.8% |
| <u>11. Esports programs/leagues/tournaments</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 9.5% | 5.9% | 11.5% | 9.3% | 9.3% |
| No | 90.5% | 94.1% | 88.5% | 90.7% | 90.8% |
| <u>12. Intergenerational programming</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 16.8% | 8.9% | 8.2% | 5.2% | 10.0% |
| No | 83.2% | 91.1% | 91.8% | 94.8% | 90.0% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

13. Gymnastics and tumbling programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 15.8% | 11.1% | 16.4% | 8.2% | 12.8% |
| No | 84.2% | 88.9% | 83.6% | 91.8% | 87.3% |

14. Martial arts programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 17.9% | 13.3% | 16.4% | 8.2% | 14.0% |
| No | 82.1% | 86.7% | 83.6% | 91.8% | 86.0% |

15. Outdoor skills/adventure programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 33.7% | 25.2% | 24.6% | 22.7% | 26.5% |
| No | 66.3% | 74.8% | 75.4% | 77.3% | 73.5% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

N=400

| Zip code | | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|--|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | | |

16. Preschool programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 15.8% | 8.1% | 18.0% | 9.3% | 12.3% |
| No | 84.2% | 91.9% | 82.0% | 90.7% | 87.8% |

17. Programs for individuals with disabilities

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 10.5% | 8.9% | 19.7% | 7.2% | 10.8% |
| No | 89.5% | 91.1% | 80.3% | 92.8% | 89.3% |

18. Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+)

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 43.2% | 38.5% | 47.5% | 44.3% | 43.0% |
| No | 56.8% | 61.5% | 52.5% | 55.7% | 57.0% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

19. Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 32.6% | 25.2% | 34.4% | 33.0% | 30.5% |
| No | 67.4% | 74.8% | 65.6% | 67.0% | 69.5% |

20. Teen programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 15.8% | 13.3% | 11.5% | 7.2% | 12.3% |
| No | 84.2% | 86.7% | 88.5% | 92.8% | 87.8% |

21. Teen Day Trips

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 10.5% | 8.9% | 8.2% | 6.2% | 8.5% |
| No | 89.5% | 91.1% | 91.8% | 93.8% | 91.5% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

22. Tennis programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 21.1% | 22.2% | 19.7% | 17.5% | 20.8% |
| No | 78.9% | 77.8% | 80.3% | 82.5% | 79.3% |

23. Unstructured indoor play

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 13.7% | 8.1% | 13.1% | 7.2% | 10.3% |
| No | 86.3% | 91.9% | 86.9% | 92.8% | 89.8% |

24. Youth enrichment camp programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 18.9% | 12.6% | 27.9% | 14.4% | 17.0% |
| No | 81.1% | 87.4% | 72.1% | 85.6% | 83.0% |

Q11. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has a need for each of the recreation programs in the City of Carlsbad listed below by circling either "Yes" or "No."

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

25. Youth fitness and wellness programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 20.0% | 11.9% | 24.6% | 13.4% | 16.3% |
| No | 80.0% | 88.1% | 75.4% | 86.6% | 83.8% |

26. Youth sports programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 24.2% | 14.1% | 26.2% | 18.6% | 20.0% |
| No | 75.8% | 85.9% | 73.8% | 81.4% | 80.0% |

27. Youth summer camp programs

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Yes | 24.2% | 15.6% | 26.2% | 14.4% | 19.0% |
| No | 75.8% | 84.4% | 73.8% | 85.6% | 81.0% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>01. Adult fitness and wellness programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 10.8% | 8.3% | 13.8% | 4.3% | 8.6% |
| Mostly Met | 37.8% | 31.7% | 34.5% | 26.1% | 31.4% |
| Partly Met | 35.1% | 36.7% | 27.6% | 39.1% | 34.9% |
| Not Met | 16.2% | 23.3% | 24.1% | 30.4% | 25.1% |
| <u>02. Adult sports programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 3.4% | 0.0% | 17.4% | 8.6% | 6.2% |
| Mostly Met | 41.4% | 25.0% | 30.4% | 22.9% | 28.5% |
| Partly Met | 48.3% | 55.0% | 26.1% | 40.0% | 43.8% |
| Not Met | 6.9% | 20.0% | 26.1% | 28.6% | 21.5% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

03. Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.)

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fully Met | 18.8% | 20.9% | 20.0% | 10.3% | 18.6% |
| Mostly Met | 31.3% | 32.6% | 30.0% | 44.8% | 33.3% |
| Partly Met | 37.5% | 32.6% | 20.0% | 34.5% | 31.0% |
| Not Met | 12.5% | 14.0% | 30.0% | 10.3% | 17.1% |

04. Before and after school programs

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 4.8% |
| Mostly Met | 20.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 25.0% | 14.3% |
| Partly Met | 60.0% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 75.0% | 61.9% |
| Not Met | 20.0% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 19.0% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

05. City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.)

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fully Met | 22.7% | 17.9% | 35.0% | 23.1% | 23.5% |
| Mostly Met | 50.0% | 53.6% | 35.0% | 30.8% | 41.8% |
| Partly Met | 22.7% | 17.9% | 15.0% | 34.6% | 23.5% |
| Not Met | 4.5% | 10.7% | 15.0% | 11.5% | 11.2% |

06. Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.)

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fully Met | 4.8% | 2.7% | 15.4% | 4.3% | 5.2% |
| Mostly Met | 23.8% | 16.2% | 7.7% | 17.4% | 16.5% |
| Partly Met | 47.6% | 56.8% | 23.1% | 17.4% | 39.2% |
| Not Met | 23.8% | 24.3% | 53.8% | 60.9% | 39.2% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>07. Cultural arts programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 11.5% | 4.3% | 18.8% | 11.1% | 9.4% |
| Mostly Met | 19.2% | 34.8% | 31.3% | 40.7% | 31.6% |
| Partly Met | 53.8% | 50.0% | 31.3% | 22.2% | 41.0% |
| Not Met | 15.4% | 10.9% | 18.8% | 25.9% | 17.9% |
| <u>08. Dancing</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 11.8% | 0.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 6.8% |
| Mostly Met | 5.9% | 13.6% | 10.0% | 25.0% | 13.7% |
| Partly Met | 70.6% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 40.0% | 52.1% |
| Not Met | 11.8% | 36.4% | 30.0% | 25.0% | 27.4% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>09. Dog training</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 9.1% | 5.3% | 18.2% | 6.7% | 8.8% |
| Mostly Met | 9.1% | 0.0% | 18.2% | 6.7% | 7.4% |
| Partly Met | 22.7% | 31.6% | 18.2% | 40.0% | 29.4% |
| Not Met | 59.1% | 63.2% | 45.5% | 46.7% | 54.4% |
| <u>10. Environmental education programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 5.3% | 8.7% | 26.7% | 0.0% | 8.9% |
| Mostly Met | 21.1% | 17.4% | 33.3% | 38.1% | 26.6% |
| Partly Met | 57.9% | 39.1% | 20.0% | 38.1% | 40.5% |
| Not Met | 15.8% | 34.8% | 20.0% | 23.8% | 24.1% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>11. Esports programs/leagues/tournaments</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 7.1% |
| Mostly Met | 33.3% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 21.4% |
| Partly Met | 50.0% | 42.9% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 35.7% |
| Not Met | 16.7% | 42.9% | 50.0% | 37.5% | 35.7% |
| <u>12. Intergenerational programming</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 11.1% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 8.0% |
| Mostly Met | 30.0% | 11.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 16.0% |
| Partly Met | 50.0% | 44.4% | 100.0% | 66.7% | 52.0% |
| Not Met | 20.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 24.0% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>13. Gymnastics and tumbling programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 14.3% | 7.7% |
| Mostly Met | 33.3% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 14.3% | 25.6% |
| Partly Met | 25.0% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 42.9% | 28.2% |
| Not Met | 41.7% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 28.6% | 38.5% |
| <u>14. Martial arts programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.4% |
| Mostly Met | 16.7% | 13.3% | 14.3% | 16.7% | 14.6% |
| Partly Met | 41.7% | 46.7% | 57.1% | 50.0% | 48.8% |
| Not Met | 41.7% | 33.3% | 28.6% | 33.3% | 34.1% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>15. Outdoor skills/adventure programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 3.2% | 9.1% | 5.6% | 3.6% |
| Mostly Met | 13.6% | 9.7% | 9.1% | 22.2% | 13.1% |
| Partly Met | 40.9% | 35.5% | 63.6% | 27.8% | 40.5% |
| Not Met | 45.5% | 51.6% | 18.2% | 44.4% | 42.9% |
| <u>16. Preschool programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 25.0% | 28.6% | 14.3% | 14.3% |
| Mostly Met | 18.2% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 28.6% | 17.1% |
| Partly Met | 54.5% | 25.0% | 28.6% | 57.1% | 40.0% |
| Not Met | 27.3% | 50.0% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 28.6% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>17. Programs for individuals with disabilities</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 0.0% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 6.1% |
| Mostly Met | 0.0% | 9.1% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 6.1% |
| Partly Met | 57.1% | 45.5% | 42.9% | 28.6% | 42.4% |
| Not Met | 42.9% | 45.5% | 28.6% | 57.1% | 45.5% |
| <u>18. Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+)</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 3.8% | 4.5% | 22.7% | 13.9% | 9.8% |
| Mostly Met | 23.1% | 27.3% | 22.7% | 16.7% | 21.8% |
| Partly Met | 50.0% | 43.2% | 31.8% | 38.9% | 41.4% |
| Not Met | 23.1% | 25.0% | 22.7% | 30.6% | 27.1% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>19. Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 3.6% | 31.3% | 16.0% | 10.5% |
| Mostly Met | 13.0% | 7.1% | 6.3% | 16.0% | 10.5% |
| Partly Met | 56.5% | 64.3% | 25.0% | 28.0% | 45.3% |
| Not Met | 30.4% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 40.0% | 33.7% |
| <u>20. Teen programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 2.9% |
| Mostly Met | 0.0% | 13.3% | 33.3% | 16.7% | 11.8% |
| Partly Met | 66.7% | 46.7% | 0.0% | 66.7% | 52.9% |
| Not Met | 33.3% | 40.0% | 33.3% | 16.7% | 32.4% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

| N=349 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------------------------|----------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>21. Teen Day Trips</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 20.0% | 9.1% |
| Mostly Met | 0.0% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.5% |
| Partly Met | 33.3% | 60.0% | 0.0% | 60.0% | 50.0% |
| Not Met | 66.7% | 30.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 36.4% |
| <u>22. Tennis programs</u> | | | | | |
| Fully Met | 0.0% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 36.4% | 7.8% |
| Mostly Met | 25.0% | 19.2% | 50.0% | 18.2% | 25.0% |
| Partly Met | 56.3% | 61.5% | 12.5% | 18.2% | 45.3% |
| Not Met | 18.8% | 19.2% | 25.0% | 27.3% | 21.9% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

N=349

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

23. Unstructured indoor play

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Mostly Met | 30.0% | 25.0% | 60.0% | 20.0% | 31.0% |
| Partly Met | 40.0% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 34.5% |
| Not Met | 30.0% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 60.0% | 34.5% |

24. Youth enrichment camp programs

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fully Met | 18.8% | 20.0% | 25.0% | 10.0% | 18.5% |
| Mostly Met | 25.0% | 26.7% | 41.7% | 50.0% | 33.3% |
| Partly Met | 31.3% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 40.0% | 33.3% |
| Not Met | 25.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.8% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

N=349

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

25. Youth fitness and wellness programs

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fully Met | 13.3% | 7.1% | 27.3% | 11.1% | 14.0% |
| Mostly Met | 20.0% | 42.9% | 36.4% | 44.4% | 34.0% |
| Partly Met | 46.7% | 21.4% | 27.3% | 33.3% | 34.0% |
| Not Met | 20.0% | 28.6% | 9.1% | 11.1% | 18.0% |

26. Youth sports programs

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fully Met | 22.2% | 22.2% | 33.3% | 25.0% | 23.3% |
| Mostly Met | 38.9% | 61.1% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 41.7% |
| Partly Met | 33.3% | 16.7% | 33.3% | 41.7% | 31.7% |
| Not Met | 5.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.3% |

Q11. If "Yes," please rate how well your need for recreation programs of this type are being met using a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 means "Fully Met," and 1 means "Not Met."

N=349

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

27. Youth summer camp programs

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fully Met | 22.2% | 10.5% | 30.0% | 27.3% | 20.3% |
| Mostly Met | 27.8% | 36.8% | 40.0% | 36.4% | 33.9% |
| Partly Met | 38.9% | 42.1% | 20.0% | 36.4% | 37.3% |
| Not Met | 11.1% | 10.5% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 8.5% |

SUM OF TOP 4 CHOICES

Q12. Which FOUR recreation programs from the list in Question 11 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 4 Choices</u> | | | | | |
| Adult fitness and wellness programs | 25.3% | 32.6% | 34.4% | 36.1% | 31.3% |
| Adult sports programs | 7.4% | 15.6% | 16.4% | 13.4% | 12.8% |
| Aquatics programming (swim lessons, recreation/lap swim, competitive training, etc.) | 24.2% | 18.5% | 19.7% | 19.6% | 20.5% |
| Before and after school programs | 8.4% | 7.4% | 8.2% | 8.2% | 8.3% |
| City-sponsored special events (Eggstravaganza, Holiday at the Rancho, Teen Scene, Movie Night, etc.) | 9.5% | 8.1% | 13.1% | 12.4% | 10.3% |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 9.5% | 17.0% | 11.5% | 19.6% | 14.8% |
| Cultural arts programs | 13.7% | 20.7% | 13.1% | 15.5% | 16.3% |
| Dancing | 9.5% | 8.9% | 3.3% | 6.2% | 7.3% |
| Dog training | 12.6% | 10.4% | 6.6% | 6.2% | 9.0% |

SUM OF TOP 4 CHOICES

Q12. Which FOUR recreation programs from the list in Question 11 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 4 Choices (Cont.)</u> | | | | | |
| Environmental education programs | 5.3% | 8.9% | 18.0% | 7.2% | 8.8% |
| Esports programs/leagues/tournaments | 1.1% | 2.2% | 1.6% | 4.1% | 2.3% |
| Intergenerational programming | 2.1% | 2.2% | 1.6% | 2.1% | 2.0% |
| Gymnastics and tumbling programs | 4.2% | 1.5% | 1.6% | 3.1% | 2.5% |
| Martial arts programs | 1.1% | 1.5% | 4.9% | 0.0% | 1.8% |
| Outdoor skills/adventure programs | 11.6% | 11.9% | 11.5% | 6.2% | 10.3% |
| Preschool programs | 4.2% | 3.7% | 8.2% | 2.1% | 4.0% |
| Programs for individuals with disabilities | 3.2% | 4.4% | 4.9% | 3.1% | 4.3% |
| Senior adult and fitness programs (age 50+) | 15.8% | 29.6% | 24.6% | 34.0% | 26.8% |
| Senior Trips/Other Targeted Senior Programs | 18.9% | 11.9% | 16.4% | 22.7% | 17.0% |

SUM OF TOP 4 CHOICES

Q12. Which FOUR recreation programs from the list in Question 11 are MOST IMPORTANT to your household? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 4 Choices (Cont.)</u> | | | | | |
| Teen programs | 5.3% | 3.0% | 1.6% | 0.0% | 2.5% |
| Teen Day Trips | 2.1% | 1.5% | 3.3% | 1.0% | 1.8% |
| Tennis programs | 5.3% | 7.4% | 4.9% | 8.2% | 6.5% |
| Unstructured indoor play | 4.2% | 0.7% | 4.9% | 1.0% | 2.3% |
| Youth enrichment camp programs | 3.2% | 3.7% | 4.9% | 4.1% | 3.8% |
| Youth fitness and wellness programs | 5.3% | 2.2% | 3.3% | 4.1% | 3.8% |
| Youth sports programs | 7.4% | 8.1% | 8.2% | 9.3% | 9.0% |
| Youth summer camp programs | 5.3% | 5.9% | 8.2% | 5.2% | 6.0% |
| None | 32.6% | 23.7% | 21.3% | 18.6% | 24.5% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>01. Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course)</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 28.4% | 31.1% | 26.2% | 16.5% | 25.5% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 20.0% | 21.5% | 16.4% | 22.7% | 20.8% |
| Not Sure | 35.8% | 36.3% | 41.0% | 38.1% | 37.3% |
| Not Supportive | 15.8% | 11.1% | 16.4% | 22.7% | 16.5% |
| <u>02. Amphitheater</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 45.3% | 35.6% | 36.1% | 40.2% | 38.5% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 20.0% | 23.0% | 32.8% | 23.7% | 24.0% |
| Not Sure | 27.4% | 34.1% | 23.0% | 29.9% | 29.3% |
| Not Supportive | 7.4% | 7.4% | 8.2% | 6.2% | 8.3% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>03. Arena/speed soccer</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 10.5% | 11.9% | 11.5% | 10.3% | 10.8% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 16.8% | 17.0% | 13.1% | 8.2% | 14.3% |
| Not Sure | 46.3% | 51.1% | 49.2% | 52.6% | 49.5% |
| Not Supportive | 26.3% | 20.0% | 26.2% | 28.9% | 25.5% |
| <u>04. Better lighting in parks</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 51.6% | 37.0% | 49.2% | 38.1% | 42.5% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 17.9% | 23.0% | 18.0% | 15.5% | 19.0% |
| Not Sure | 26.3% | 35.6% | 21.3% | 41.2% | 32.8% |
| Not Supportive | 4.2% | 4.4% | 11.5% | 5.2% | 5.8% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>05. Bike park (pump/skills track)</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 14.7% | 24.4% | 21.3% | 12.4% | 18.0% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 24.2% | 20.7% | 19.7% | 21.6% | 22.0% |
| Not Sure | 44.2% | 42.2% | 45.9% | 46.4% | 43.8% |
| Not Supportive | 16.8% | 12.6% | 13.1% | 19.6% | 16.3% |
| <u>06. Botanical or ornamental gardens</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 35.8% | 38.5% | 44.3% | 28.9% | 36.0% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 23.2% | 23.7% | 11.5% | 30.9% | 23.3% |
| Not Sure | 30.5% | 25.9% | 36.1% | 29.9% | 30.0% |
| Not Supportive | 10.5% | 11.9% | 8.2% | 10.3% | 10.8% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>07. Community gardens</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 35.8% | 37.8% | 41.0% | 35.1% | 36.8% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 24.2% | 20.0% | 21.3% | 26.8% | 22.8% |
| Not Sure | 31.6% | 33.3% | 27.9% | 29.9% | 31.0% |
| Not Supportive | 8.4% | 8.9% | 9.8% | 8.2% | 9.5% |
| <u>08. Concessions</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 8.4% | 10.4% | 13.1% | 13.4% | 11.0% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 13.7% | 19.3% | 19.7% | 16.5% | 17.0% |
| Not Sure | 48.4% | 45.2% | 54.1% | 44.3% | 47.5% |
| Not Supportive | 29.5% | 25.2% | 13.1% | 25.8% | 24.5% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>09. Conference/trade shows /training center</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 6.3% | 4.4% | 9.8% | 9.3% | 7.0% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 9.5% | 14.8% | 14.8% | 10.3% | 12.0% |
| Not Sure | 46.3% | 54.8% | 49.2% | 46.4% | 49.8% |
| Not Supportive | 37.9% | 25.9% | 26.2% | 34.0% | 31.3% |
| <u>10. Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.)</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 21.1% | 22.2% | 23.0% | 20.6% | 21.0% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 25.3% | 23.0% | 23.0% | 22.7% | 23.3% |
| Not Sure | 38.9% | 40.0% | 42.6% | 39.2% | 40.8% |
| Not Supportive | 14.7% | 14.8% | 11.5% | 17.5% | 15.0% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

11. Cultural arts programs

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Very Supportive | 23.2% | 32.6% | 34.4% | 33.0% | 29.8% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 28.4% | 24.4% | 18.0% | 17.5% | 23.5% |
| Not Sure | 34.7% | 34.1% | 32.8% | 34.0% | 34.0% |
| Not Supportive | 13.7% | 8.9% | 14.8% | 15.5% | 12.8% |

12. Dining/retail

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Very Supportive | 16.8% | 17.8% | 19.7% | 16.5% | 17.5% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 17.9% | 18.5% | 16.4% | 15.5% | 17.0% |
| Not Sure | 43.2% | 40.0% | 44.3% | 44.3% | 42.5% |
| Not Supportive | 22.1% | 23.7% | 19.7% | 23.7% | 23.0% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>13. Disc golf course</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 13.7% | 15.6% | 16.4% | 12.4% | 14.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 8.4% | 17.0% | 21.3% | 15.5% | 14.8% |
| Not Sure | 47.4% | 45.9% | 34.4% | 46.4% | 44.5% |
| Not Supportive | 30.5% | 21.5% | 27.9% | 25.8% | 26.5% |
| <u>14. Family picnic areas (covered and uncovered)</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 35.8% | 37.0% | 50.8% | 27.8% | 36.5% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 28.4% | 30.4% | 18.0% | 39.2% | 29.5% |
| Not Sure | 31.6% | 31.9% | 19.7% | 27.8% | 29.3% |
| Not Supportive | 4.2% | 0.7% | 11.5% | 5.2% | 4.8% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

N=400

| | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

15. More shaded areas in parks

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Very Supportive | 48.4% | 49.6% | 59.0% | 47.4% | 50.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 24.2% | 23.7% | 8.2% | 26.8% | 22.0% |
| Not Sure | 25.3% | 25.2% | 19.7% | 22.7% | 23.5% |
| Not Supportive | 2.1% | 1.5% | 13.1% | 3.1% | 4.3% |

16. Multigenerational community center (fitness/recreation/meeting space)

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Very Supportive | 23.2% | 26.7% | 31.1% | 25.8% | 26.0% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 30.5% | 25.9% | 26.2% | 24.7% | 26.5% |
| Not Sure | 37.9% | 40.0% | 31.1% | 43.3% | 39.0% |
| Not Supportive | 8.4% | 7.4% | 11.5% | 6.2% | 8.5% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>17. Multipurpose fields</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 34.7% | 23.0% | 24.6% | 26.8% | 27.0% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 26.3% | 34.1% | 32.8% | 22.7% | 28.5% |
| Not Sure | 31.6% | 37.8% | 32.8% | 40.2% | 36.3% |
| Not Supportive | 7.4% | 5.2% | 9.8% | 10.3% | 8.3% |
| <u>18. Off-leash dog parks</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 30.5% | 28.9% | 29.5% | 28.9% | 29.8% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 15.8% | 17.8% | 14.8% | 16.5% | 16.0% |
| Not Sure | 25.3% | 37.8% | 39.3% | 35.1% | 34.3% |
| Not Supportive | 28.4% | 15.6% | 16.4% | 19.6% | 20.0% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>19. Outdoor basketball courts</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 23.2% | 19.3% | 19.7% | 17.5% | 19.8% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 32.6% | 28.9% | 26.2% | 25.8% | 28.5% |
| Not Sure | 29.5% | 43.0% | 39.3% | 44.3% | 39.3% |
| Not Supportive | 14.7% | 8.9% | 14.8% | 12.4% | 12.5% |
| <u>20. Outdoor pickleball courts</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 26.3% | 36.3% | 29.5% | 43.3% | 34.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 30.5% | 23.0% | 21.3% | 17.5% | 23.0% |
| Not Sure | 32.6% | 32.6% | 34.4% | 29.9% | 32.3% |
| Not Supportive | 10.5% | 8.1% | 14.8% | 9.3% | 10.5% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>21. Outdoor swimming pools</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 37.9% | 35.6% | 50.8% | 38.1% | 39.0% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 24.2% | 21.5% | 14.8% | 21.6% | 20.5% |
| Not Sure | 27.4% | 40.7% | 27.9% | 28.9% | 33.0% |
| Not Supportive | 10.5% | 2.2% | 6.6% | 11.3% | 7.5% |
| <u>22. Playground equipment</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 38.9% | 34.8% | 39.3% | 32.0% | 35.0% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 21.1% | 21.5% | 16.4% | 25.8% | 22.0% |
| Not Sure | 31.6% | 37.8% | 32.8% | 35.1% | 35.0% |
| Not Supportive | 8.4% | 5.9% | 11.5% | 7.2% | 8.0% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

23. Radio controlled aircraft/drone fields

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Very Supportive | 8.4% | 5.2% | 6.6% | 10.3% | 7.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 13.7% | 11.1% | 11.5% | 9.3% | 11.0% |
| Not Sure | 42.1% | 45.2% | 54.1% | 39.2% | 44.3% |
| Not Supportive | 35.8% | 38.5% | 27.9% | 41.2% | 37.5% |

24. Senior center (age 50+)

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Very Supportive | 41.1% | 35.6% | 37.7% | 39.2% | 38.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 21.1% | 25.2% | 18.0% | 22.7% | 22.0% |
| Not Sure | 31.6% | 31.9% | 29.5% | 30.9% | 31.0% |
| Not Supportive | 6.3% | 7.4% | 14.8% | 7.2% | 8.8% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>25. Skateboard parks</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 18.9% | 21.5% | 16.4% | 16.5% | 18.5% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 29.5% | 23.7% | 18.0% | 27.8% | 25.3% |
| Not Sure | 33.7% | 40.7% | 44.3% | 38.1% | 38.8% |
| Not Supportive | 17.9% | 14.1% | 21.3% | 17.5% | 17.5% |
| <u>26. Synthetic turf fields</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 13.7% | 12.6% | 13.1% | 14.4% | 13.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 21.1% | 18.5% | 14.8% | 21.6% | 19.0% |
| Not Sure | 43.2% | 47.4% | 44.3% | 47.4% | 45.8% |
| Not Supportive | 22.1% | 21.5% | 27.9% | 16.5% | 22.0% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|--------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>27. Teen center</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 28.4% | 22.2% | 18.0% | 16.5% | 21.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 27.4% | 23.0% | 34.4% | 27.8% | 27.3% |
| Not Sure | 31.6% | 48.9% | 32.8% | 41.2% | 40.0% |
| Not Supportive | 12.6% | 5.9% | 14.8% | 14.4% | 11.5% |
| <u>28. Tennis courts</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 17.9% | 23.7% | 19.7% | 19.6% | 20.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 27.4% | 23.0% | 26.2% | 26.8% | 25.0% |
| Not Sure | 38.9% | 42.2% | 34.4% | 42.3% | 40.3% |
| Not Supportive | 15.8% | 11.1% | 19.7% | 11.3% | 14.5% |

Q13. The following is a list of actions the City of Carlsbad could take to improve the parks and recreation system. Please indicate your level of support for renovating or developing new facilities for each item by circling the corresponding number to the right.

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>29. Unstructured indoor play</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 15.8% | 13.3% | 11.5% | 9.3% | 12.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 14.7% | 21.5% | 18.0% | 16.5% | 18.0% |
| Not Sure | 52.6% | 51.1% | 49.2% | 47.4% | 50.0% |
| Not Supportive | 16.8% | 14.1% | 21.3% | 26.8% | 19.8% |
| <u>30. Youth multi-purpose fields</u> | | | | | |
| Very Supportive | 25.3% | 23.0% | 24.6% | 22.7% | 23.3% |
| Somewhat Supportive | 28.4% | 22.2% | 26.2% | 22.7% | 24.3% |
| Not Sure | 35.8% | 48.9% | 31.1% | 42.3% | 41.5% |
| Not Supportive | 10.5% | 5.9% | 18.0% | 12.4% | 11.0% |

SUM OF TOP 3 CHOICES

Q14. Which FOUR actions from the list in Question 13 would your household be MOST WILLING to fund? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 3 Choices</u> | | | | | |
| Adventure facility (rock wall, ropes course) | 13.7% | 17.0% | 9.8% | 9.3% | 12.8% |
| Amphitheater | 15.8% | 20.0% | 26.2% | 23.7% | 20.5% |
| Arena/speed soccer | 2.1% | 3.7% | 0.0% | 5.2% | 3.0% |
| Better lighting in parks | 21.1% | 19.3% | 19.7% | 16.5% | 19.5% |
| Bike park (pump/skills track) | 2.1% | 6.7% | 8.2% | 4.1% | 5.0% |
| Botanical or ornamental gardens | 16.8% | 18.5% | 19.7% | 17.5% | 17.8% |
| Community gardens | 10.5% | 15.6% | 9.8% | 12.4% | 12.8% |
| Concessions | 1.1% | 2.2% | 0.0% | 3.1% | 2.0% |
| Conference/trade shows /training center | 0.0% | 1.5% | 1.6% | 2.1% | 1.3% |
| Culinary arts (cooking, baking, etc.) | 5.3% | 7.4% | 6.6% | 9.3% | 7.0% |
| Cultural arts programs | 6.3% | 14.8% | 11.5% | 10.3% | 10.8% |
| Dining/retail | 4.2% | 5.9% | 1.6% | 10.3% | 6.0% |

SUM OF TOP 3 CHOICES

Q14. Which FOUR actions from the list in Question 13 would your household be MOST WILLING to fund? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 3 Choices (Cont.)</u> | | | | | |
| Disc golf course | 7.4% | 5.9% | 8.2% | 2.1% | 5.8% |
| Family picnic areas (covered and uncovered) | 13.7% | 8.1% | 9.8% | 7.2% | 9.5% |
| More shaded areas in parks | 27.4% | 17.8% | 19.7% | 24.7% | 22.0% |
| Multigenerational community center (fitness/recreation/meeting space) | 9.5% | 8.1% | 8.2% | 6.2% | 8.3% |
| Multipurpose fields | 7.4% | 5.2% | 3.3% | 4.1% | 5.3% |
| Off-leash dog parks | 14.7% | 12.6% | 16.4% | 11.3% | 13.3% |
| Outdoor basketball courts | 5.3% | 7.4% | 3.3% | 3.1% | 5.0% |
| Outdoor pickleball courts | 13.7% | 19.3% | 8.2% | 24.7% | 17.8% |
| Outdoor swimming pools | 13.7% | 17.8% | 21.3% | 10.3% | 15.8% |
| Playground equipment | 13.7% | 5.2% | 11.5% | 7.2% | 8.5% |
| Radio controlled aircraft/drone fields | 0.0% | 1.5% | 3.3% | 3.1% | 1.8% |
| Senior center (age 50+) | 10.5% | 17.0% | 11.5% | 20.6% | 15.8% |

SUM OF TOP 3 CHOICES

Q14. Which FOUR actions from the list in Question 13 would your household be MOST WILLING to fund? (Top 3)

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Sum of Top 3 Choices (Cont.)</u> | | | | | |
| Skateboard parks | 4.2% | 3.7% | 3.3% | 3.1% | 3.8% |
| Synthetic turf fields | 3.2% | 1.5% | 3.3% | 2.1% | 2.3% |
| Teen center | 4.2% | 5.9% | 1.6% | 1.0% | 3.8% |
| Tennis courts | 5.3% | 7.4% | 8.2% | 3.1% | 5.8% |
| Unstructured indoor play | 3.2% | 1.5% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 1.8% |
| Youth multi-purpose fields | 5.3% | 3.0% | 3.3% | 4.1% | 4.3% |
| None | 23.2% | 20.0% | 23.0% | 20.6% | 21.0% |

Q15. During the Covid-19 Pandemic (March 2020 - June 2021), what types of virtual programs/activities did you participate in?

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q15</u> | | | | | |
| Virtual tours | 4.2% | 2.2% | 1.6% | 5.2% | 3.5% |
| Virtual camps | 0.0% | 0.7% | 1.6% | 2.1% | 1.0% |
| Virtual arts and craft classes | 3.2% | 5.9% | 6.6% | 7.2% | 5.5% |
| Virtual fitness classes | 12.6% | 17.8% | 13.1% | 17.5% | 15.3% |
| Virtual performing arts classes | 1.1% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 1.5% |
| Virtual health and wellness programs | 4.2% | 8.9% | 11.5% | 10.3% | 8.3% |
| Other | 3.2% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 6.2% | 4.8% |
| Haven't participated in virtual programs/ activities | 82.1% | 76.3% | 77.0% | 70.1% | 76.8% |

Q16. Beyond the Covid-19 Pandemic, what types of virtual programs/activities would you be interested in participating in?

N=400

| | Zip code | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q16</u> | | | | | |
| Virtual tours | 4.2% | 5.2% | 8.2% | 10.3% | 6.8% |
| Virtual camps | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 1.0% | 0.5% |
| Virtual arts and crafts Classes | 6.3% | 8.9% | 18.0% | 14.4% | 11.0% |
| Virtual fitness classes | 17.9% | 16.3% | 24.6% | 21.6% | 19.0% |
| Virtual performing arts classes | 4.2% | 2.2% | 1.6% | 6.2% | 3.8% |
| Virtual health and wellness programs | 9.5% | 13.3% | 19.7% | 20.6% | 15.3% |
| Other | 1.1% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 2.1% | 1.3% |
| Not interested in virtual programs/ activities | 74.7% | 74.8% | 63.9% | 63.9% | 70.3% |

Q17. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the overall value that your household receives from the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department. (without "Don't Know")

| N=400 | Zip code | | | | Total |
|-------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |
| <u>Q17</u> | | | | | |
| Very Satisfied | 14.0% | 26.6% | 27.3% | 22.0% | 22.4% |
| Satisfied | 47.3% | 43.5% | 45.5% | 57.1% | 48.0% |
| Neutral | 30.1% | 25.0% | 16.4% | 16.5% | 22.4% |
| Dissatisfied | 7.5% | 0.8% | 9.1% | 2.2% | 4.3% |
| Very Dissatisfied | 1.1% | 4.0% | 1.8% | 2.2% | 2.9% |

Q18. Given the recent Covid-19 Pandemic, how has your and your household's perception of the value of parks and recreation changed? (without "Not Provided")

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

Q18

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Increased | 30.1% | 23.5% | 31.0% | 32.6% | 28.2% |
| Somewhat increased | 17.2% | 18.9% | 13.8% | 13.0% | 16.8% |
| No change | 44.1% | 54.5% | 50.0% | 45.7% | 48.3% |
| Somewhat decreased | 5.4% | 0.8% | 1.7% | 3.3% | 2.8% |
| Decreased | 3.2% | 2.3% | 3.4% | 5.4% | 3.9% |

Q19. Would you or your household like to see the city place a greater emphasis on parks and recreation projects, programs, and services? (without "Not Provided")

N=400

| Zip code | | | | Total |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 92008 | 92009 | 92010 | 92011 | |

Q19

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Increase funding | 66.3% | 58.1% | 63.8% | 56.0% | 59.5% |
| Maintain existing funding | 31.3% | 39.0% | 36.2% | 41.7% | 38.1% |
| Reduce funding | 2.4% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 2.4% | 2.4% |



City of Carlsbad California 2023 - 2030

APPENDIX B - INTERCEPT SURVEY RESULTS



APPENDIX B - INTERCEPT SURVEY RESULTS


From Feb. 14 through Feb. 23, 2020, the project team conducted 209 intercept surveys at 22 park sites and facilities. Data was collected at various times of the day, including mornings, afternoons, and early evenings to reach a diverse group of park users.

Park users were asked:


1. What do you like about parks and recreation services in Carlsbad?
2. What would make you more inclined to use parks and recreation services in Carlsbad?

| Location | Responses |
|---------------------------|------------|
| Alga Norte | 34 |
| Ann D. L'Heureux Dog Park | 21 |
| Cadencia Park | 5 |
| Calavera Hills | 26 |
| Chase | 4 |
| Hidden Canyon | 11 |
| Holiday | 3 |
| Hosp Grove | 10 |
| La Costa Canyon | 5 |
| Laguna Rivera Park | 7 |
| Leo Carillo | 11 |
| Levante Park | 15 |
| Magee | 1 |
| Magnolia | 3 |
| Maxton Brown | 3 |
| Monroe St Pool | 5 |
| Pine Ave | 10 |
| Poinsettia | 10 |
| Senior Center | 13 |
| Stagecoach | 10 |
| Zone 5 Business Park | 2 |
| TOTAL | 209 |


What do you like about parks & recreation services in Carlsbad?




What would you make more inclined to use parks & recreation services in Carlsbad?



Age of Respondents



Years lived in Carlsbad







APPENDIX C – ONLINE SURVEY

In addition to adding two virtual meetings in 2021, the project team conducted an online survey to provide an added opportunity for the community to provide input into the master plan:


1. Do you visit Carlsbad parks?
2. What would make going to city parks even better?
3. What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?
4. What is the main reason you don't visit city parks?
5. What specific sports leagues, fitness classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?
6. What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

The online survey collected 1,766 responses: 96.4% of respondents stated they visit City of Carlsbad parks. The most common themes are below with the number of times in parentheses.





What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?





City of Carlsbad California 2023 - 2030

APPENDIX C - SOCIAL MEDIA POLL RESULTS



APPENDIX C – SOCIAL MEDIA POLL RESULTS


Do you ever visit city parks?

- 600 views




What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

- 589 views
- 13 comments



What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?



What would make going to city parks even better?

- 570 views
- 22 comments

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  ivykonet Rec centers that had exercise equipment like a gym Reply > |  ivykonet Paved bike trails (separate from the street) Reply > |
|  robnsnphoto Outdoor exercise equipment. Reply > |  docklobster Let's get that bike park in before my kids are adults. Reply > |
|  coffeekidsandchaos2 Allowing dogs to be simply WALKED on leash. Reply > |  9633_mimi Lights at nifht Reply > |
|  andredefrates Safe and marked bike routes Reply > |  alwaysbettertogether5 Hand washing stations Reply > |



What would make going to city parks even better?

 jjennifermarie

More in Walking distance. 1. The village 2. Olde Carlsbad near the schools/tamarack

Reply >

 p12incedsd

More paths for bikes... long bike paths please!

Reply >

 tqoesunrise

Additional benches to chill in.

Reply >

 justinkosman

More bike parks

Reply >

 notacles

More of them

Reply >

 roselia101sanchez

Carlsbad police

Reply >

 roselia101sanchez

police department


Reply >

 ivykonet

Lower picnic table rental fees

Reply >

What would make going to city parks even better?





City of Carlsbad California 2023 - 2030

APPENDIX D - VIRTUAL WORKSHOP QUESTION & ANSWER REPORT



APPENDIX D – VIRTUAL WORKSHOP QUESTION AND ANSWER REPORT

DECEMBER 9, 2021

| Question | Answer |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| You mentioned no trails talk...does that include trails within a park? | Trails are part of a separate Trails Master Plan and not part of this plan specifically |
| What will this presentation be covering? | We are collecting public input for the Parks & Recreation Department master plan update. |
| What about special use areas such as the lagoon, school sites, etc.? | No lagoon; however we considered shared use (MOU) school sites as part of the master plan update and park inventory. |
| A big part of many of the parks are loaded with trails as an amenity, like a basketball court would be or otherwise. example, Veterans Park. I thought veterans park was up for discussion as well? | We are currently developing the Master Plan for Veterans Memorial Park as well which will include the trails through the park. |
| Pickleball is not listed on the MPI chart. | ESRI is not tracking pickleball yet for MPI but for overall participation trends it continues to be one of the fastest growing sports in the country. |
| If the pandemic has taught us anything, we value outdoor space and activities, especially including mountain biking, trail running and open space activities, how do we accelerate and kickoff Veterans Park and increase additional park initiatives to include more trails and access for these activities? | We are currently working on the Veterans Memorial Park Master Plan. We anticipate bringing it to Planning Commission and City Council for adoption in late summer 2022 |
| Is Monroe Swim Pool to be improved? | Please find the following information on our website regarding Monroe Street Pool Improvements: https://www.carlsbadca.gov/departments/parks-recreation/programs/aquatics/monroe-street-pool-improvements |
| Why was Cycling/Mountain Biking not on any of the activity charts? | We tried to list as many options as possible but wanted to provide an "other" option that may be added via chat and we will record it. Thank you. |
| Cycling has not been covered or included in the statistics or the presentation, what about cycling? You're missing a large user group. | Did you answer cycling in chat? We will make sure to record your reply. Thank you. |
| Is the vet park master plan discussed tonight? that's why I'm here...I heard it was. | The Veterans Park Master Plan is not on tonight's agenda. That will be coming very soon |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Question should reflect lack of time available at facility. | As a barrier to participation? We've got it. Thanks for adding. |
| Monroe Pool is shut down to 4 hours during the week not enough available swim time. | Your answer is understood and we've recorded it. Thanks. |
| I understand this isn't about trails but for the record: kids are riding bikes to get around town and as a sport. Connected bike infrastructure to trails is important. Thank you. | Live answered. |
| Open Swim access that does not conflict with the over-usage by private swim clubs at Alga and Monroe. | Thank you for your comment. We've got it. |
| Why is there limited time at Monroe pool - the hours on the weekend are devoted to sports clubs and just to a few hours on weekdays. | Thank you for your patience as we work on securing additional lifeguard coverage at Monroe Street Pool. We understand this situation has been frustrating and are doing everything we can to restore pool hours as much as possible as soon as possible. As we are exploring options, please know that only staff fully qualified and certified to perform pool lifeguard duties will be put in that role. |
| Again, pickleball is not listed as a choice? | We have limited space for listed amenities. Select other and enter "pickleball courts" in chat box. |
| Additional outdoor pickleball courts. | Appreciate the comment. |
| What's the status of locked school yards as part of parkland? | The school field use is in collaboration with the districts, and they have first priority for use. |
| Thank you for Veterans Memorial bike park plans. Please don't think that one facility is all it takes and checks the box as done. Look at cycling as a recreational need in Carlsbad and the connectivity of existing parks and open spaces. Local bike pump tracks and skills courses can be sited throughout the community. Will you address this in your master plan? | We will consider all input received (from a multitude of sources) as we develop our master plan update. That includes facility priorities that may include bike pump tracks and skills courses. |
| Carlsbad is in desperate need of a decent mountain bike trail system / bike park. Since these last 15 years. Trails access in Carlsbad has drastically decreased. As a result, conflicts between residents and different conservation organization arising, developing stay unresolved. | Thanks for your comment. We've added it to the other input we've collected tonight. |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| I also would like to reiterate that all trails are not equal and a boring gravel path/service dirt road does not offer the type of recreation Carlsbad residents are looking for. | Live answered. |
| Why isn't there a coastal park south of 5 in the south of Carlsbad? Wasn't there supposed to be a 6-acre park there to serve that community as well as the 62% of citizens who live in the southwest quadrant? Even those who live inland want a park to hang out by the beach and watch the sunsets. | Live answered. |
| But these fields are often locked when no one is using them. | Live answered. |
| Are there any plans to expand the park standard (acres/1000 people) in Carlsbad? | Live answered. |
| Thank you PROS Consulting and Carlsbad Parks & Rec for your continued support in our community. | Thank you. We appreciate you joining us tonight. |
| What plans are there to add more parks in SW quadrant? | Live answered. |
| Any plans for an expanded park at power plant site | Live answered. |
| Is there any thoughts about transferring management of the Carlsbad Highlands Ecological Reserve to the city of Carlsbad? | Live answered. |

DECEMBER 11, 2021

| Question | Answer |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>When will more pickleball courts be added to Poinsettia Park? We desperately need them!!</p> | <p>Good morning - we do not have any plans to add more pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park.</p> |
| <p>Are Community Gardens included?</p> | <p>Yes, community gardens are included in the master plan update process.</p> |
| <p>Can we make the existing tennis courts multi-use to include pickleball players? That would allow more use of the courts, which is better use of the community assets. Many seniors and high schoolers are doing that now at the High School, but we get kicked off by tennis players. The courts should be available to everyone in the community not just an exclusive group.</p> | <p>We have previously explored converting tennis courts to multi-use to include pickleball and the concept was not well received by either group.</p> |
| <p>All other Cities in San Diego County allow pickleball players on tennis courts. Why doesn't Carlsbad? Pickleball is the fastest growing sport, but it has not been addressed by Carlsbad, even though low cost options are available. No other City has mentioned noise as a factor to keep pickleball out of parks. Why is this an issue with Carlsbad?</p> | <p>We have previously explored allowing pickleball on tennis courts and it was not well received by either group. Additionally, it would require a change in the Conditional Use Permit for the park.</p> |
| <p>Thank you!</p> | |
| <p>Due to the shortage of pickleball courts has the city considered converting one or more tennis courts to pickleball courts? You can get 4 pickleball courts on 1 tennis court. The City of Encinitas has done this with stripping on tennis courts to accommodate and include pickleball courts. They use nets kept on the court in a locked storage box to assemble and disassemble after use. Most tennis players in Carlsbad enjoy singles play while pickleball is popular as doubles court play. Therefore, you have 2 tennis players utilizing the same space as $4 \times 4 = 16$ pickleball players. Pickleball is the fastest growing sport in America and Poinsettia Park courts are usually at maximum capacity with a large group of people waiting to play. Games are to 11 so turnover is fairly quick when there aren't overflow crowds waiting to play.</p> | <p>Please see previously answered questions.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| As I understand it, that was before COVID. Since then, pickleball has skyrocketed in popularity. The purpose of this meeting was to get an update, correct? Check out other cities around us, they all allow pickleball players on their courts. Orange County has tons of pickleball players and it is increasing here very quickly. | Benchmarking other cities will be part of this master plan update, including consideration of all feedback received in meetings and surveys. |
| Why isn't Pickleball on this slide? | It is such a new sport that ESRI has not begun tracking it yet. |
| Pickleball is the fastest growing sport! | |
| With pickleball not even on your charts, what are you doing to try to assess the need? | These questions are the same questions asked when we started the process in Dec. 2019 (for consistency). You may add pickleball in the comments (as you have) or specify "other" in the polling. |
| Why is pickleball not listed on the graph? | It is such a new sport that ESRI is not tracking it yet |
| These slides were shown in Feb 2020 at Alga Norte and Pickleball wasn't shown and you told us that it would be added? It has not been added, why? | These questions are the same questions asked when we started the process in Dec. 2019 (for consistency and comparison). You may add pickleball in the comments (as you have) or specify "other" in the polling. |
| Which groups are not receiving the need for more pickleball courts well? and why? | Historically, tennis players. |
| Why no Pickleball on this? | These questions are the same questions asked when we started the process in Dec. 2019 (for consistency and comparison). You may add pickleball in the comments (as you have) or specify "other" in the polling. |
| BTW I tried to submit questions in advance and computer rejected pros.consulting@proconsulting.com as a correct address? You might have not received some participation if there was a problem. | Live answered. |
| That doesn't answer my question, how are you tracking pickleball? | Meetings like this, website (carlsbadparksplan.com) input, surveys, etc. |
| The only thing I care about is pickleball. The courts at poinsettia are beyond capacity (people waiting to play) all day long. Please - this is the biggest and most important thing you can do. Add more pickleball courts or convert tennis courts. | We will soon be starting the master planning process for Robertson Ranch Park and I am sure that pickleball will be explored for that park. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>I read the tennis court guidelines and 2 players (singles) or 4 players (doubles) can have exclusive use of a court for 90 minutes if people are waiting to play. This seems like recreational tennis players are permitted to have extended use of the facilities for long periods of time. Pickleball players use of courts is much briefer with games to 11 and then rotate off the courts (with a two game maximum when people are waiting) on the social courts. Therefore, pickleball players are allowed much less time to enjoy their sport. Why can't we take steps to equalize the use of the facilities?</p> | <p>The City of Carlsbad's rules for tennis courts and pickleball courts are consistent with the rules in other cities.</p> |
| <p>During the presentation in 2019 it was stated that Pickleball would be added to the slide deck presentation and it has not been added. The slide deck should have been updated.</p> | <p>The questions remained the same for consistency and comparison. Please be assured, we receive and record all input (including pickleball).</p> |
| <p>This meeting seems to be more about statistics and survey of city services. Why isn't the moderator including the discussion and questions regarding pickleball?</p> | <p>Live answered.</p> |
| <p>Has the consultant been given all the correspondence from the last year regarding the lack of pickleball courts? The letters I sent to City Manager and Parks Department?</p> | <p>Yes.</p> |
| <p>Why can't we make some of the underutilized tennis courts, double use with tennis? many other parks have done this.</p> | <p>Live answered.</p> |
| <p>My comments refer to pickleball. How about league/tournament? Indoor pickleball in multiple use gyms. Convert unused tennis courts</p> | <p>We offer indoor pickleball at several of our community centers.</p> |
| <p>Pickleball courts</p> | <p>Live answered.</p> |
| <p>...and why does our cry for more pickleball courts keep being shut down? Is anyone walking the park to evaluate the need and to see firsthand the desperation of demand?</p> | <p>Live answered.</p> |
| <p>Thanks</p> | <p>Live answered.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Convert 1-3 tennis courts into permanent dedicated pickleball courts. This would be very inexpensive and shouldn't take 6 years like it did to construct the existing 6 dedicated courts. Also please include an expert pickleball player as part of the planning so we don't end up with unused covers on the courts that were made a part of the courts.</p> | <p>We've received your comment/request. It has been added to the master plan update project file. All comments will be tallied and considered. Appreciate you joining us today.</p> |
| <p>Are you going to present and or send to the city council of Carlsbad a statistically correct survey that doesn't have pickleball? Are you going to send out a mailer/questionnaire/survey without Pickleball?</p> | <p>Pickleball will be included on the statistically reliable and online surveys.</p> |
| <p>If multiuse of tennis courts with pickleball courts was not well received, what groups or individuals prompted the city to disregard the needs of pickleball enthusiasts? As I see it the City hasn't even included pickleball in their graphs. How can it be a consideration if you aren't using a metric to measure popularity with city residents?</p> | <p>At the time it was a combination of tennis players and pickleballers that didn't like the idea of shared tennis court use and/or conversion.</p> |
| <p>Four years ago, I submitted a request to the city with a petition of signed residents to exclude seniors from having to pay to play indoor pickleball at Calaveras Park. The Park and recreation manager didn't even consider my proposal. How is this inclusion of city resident input?</p> | <p>Live answered.</p> |
| <p>What can the pickleball community do to get the quick response basketball got at pine avenue for outdoor facilities?</p> | <p>Live answered.</p> |
| <p>I'm very active in the pickleball community and engage with hundreds of players. Not one of them that I know, would object to dual use of a couple tennis courts.</p> | <p>Live answered.</p> |
| <p>It was the park and recreation manager who dropped the ball on my proposal for waiver of fees to seniors.</p> | <p>Live answered.</p> |



City of Carlsbad California 2023 - 2030

APPENDIX E - VIRTUAL WORKSHOP CHAT



APPENDIX E – VIRTUAL WORKSHOP CHAT

DECEMBER 9, 2021

| Public Comments |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Thank you for considering inputs from citizens. If the “pandemic” has taught us anything is that outdoor recreation opportunities and facilities are as valuable as any civic investment a municipality can make on behalf of their constituents / residents. Please appropriately re-invest in parks, bike trails and bike parks. |
| You mentioned no trails talk...does that include trails within a park? |
| Why was Cycling/mtn biking not on the list? |
| What about cycling? It hasn't appeared in your presentation? |
| There was Pilates but no cycling. |
| I use the conference rooms as a part of a group that has meetings at the Senior Center. |
| I understand this isn't about trails but for the record, kids are riding bikes to get around town and as a sport. Connected bike infrastructure to trails is important. 🙌 |
| We need mountain bike trails. They are multi use and help hikers, bikers, and the like. Since the state (cdfw) shut down their half of Calavera, we have lost a huge venue to bike, etc. Veterans park will help with the addition of some more trails but I would argue it doesn't go far enough. Carlsbad should be leading the state and the other cities on this front. |
| Connectivity of trails for hiking and riding. Make trail use part of park master plan. |
| We need more community gardens and gardening classes. |
| Mountain Bike Specific trails |
| Pool availability at Monroe. why is it down to 4 hours during the week and almost always limited on weekend for club sports? |
| Bike trails! That's what we want! |
| You need another selection for #1 none apply or meet the need of additional trails, connected to improve mountain biking and youth biking. |
| More community gardens, more natural open space and trails. |
| Would love more bike-friendly trails. Maybe bike skills classes as well. |
| EBike safety classes. |
| Bike Park and mountain bike related infrastructure. I assume this isn't an option as it's already planned? |
| Need to hire more lifeguards for Monroe Street Pool |
| I'm seeing a lot of kids commuting by EBIke. Got to make the roads and trails safe for them and others. |

| |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| More protected natural open space. |
| My questions disappeared! |
| More volunteer programs. |
| Very disappointed by the poll options not including bicycle focused facilities and activities. Virtually every attendee has inquired about them yet that is not listed as an option in the polls. |
| Get MOA with school district for use of CHS outdoor track |
| I couldn't answer the last 2 questions because the questionnaire disappeared! |
| Carlsbad should look like a top tier outdoor city. Anytime I go through Mammoth, St. George UT, or Moab, I am so impressed with the community development with amenities pulling its population outdoors! More Bike trails, advanced features, Bike parks, and trails connecting the entire city, north, south, east, west. |
| Community gardens in the south part of the city. |
| More facilities and incentives to attract people to bicycle more and drive less. |
| Grass areas for dog parks off leash. |
| A system worthy of Carlsbad that is available throughout the city. |
| Bicycle facilities. |
| Community gardens in all quadrants of the city. |
| A Senior-friendly and well-trained senior staff at the senior center. |
| A large MTB park that had features from mild to wild. Beginner to advanced. |
| Expedite construction of Veterans Memorial, specificity bike park. Carlsbad is a national leader in Cycling companies, but infrastructure doesn't support them. |
| I would like the City of Carlsbad see the huge growth in cycling and continue to address this through the Veterans Memorial Bike Park and green space/ trail connectivity. |
| Additional progression of trails adding connectivity for commuting, riding progression and multi-use for all ages |
| Bike Park please with ADVANCED features, jump lines, technical aspects, etc. |
| Community that can be easily accessed by all for walking, hiking, biking with safety and amenities. |
| I'd like to see more family oriented parks- passive use for families that includes trees, grass areas for families with all ages to visit together, from toddlers to seniors |
| Enough sports field space to eliminate constant conflicts |
| Did anyone mention bike trails yet? ;) |
| Thanks for reminding me. Definitely more bike trails please... :) |
| Skateboarding Park in old Carlsbad. |

The pacific highlands pump track has been extremely popular for skateboarders - perhaps we need something in Carlsbad for skating and bikes.

DECEMBER 11, 2021

Public Comments

Why is pickleball not listed?

I enjoy using the Carlsbad trails - Hosp Grove Park trails and other bike/ped paths.

Hiking is one of the main activities, especially for older folks.

The pickleball community is not being heard. we often have to wait 30 minutes for ONE game, then come off to wait another 30 minutes, etc. (not for 1.5-2 hours of dedicated court time like tennis).

Pickleball @ Poinsettia Park. I would use this park even more if it was not so congested.

I don't think I've ever seen all tennis courts in use, and I always look.

Friday night 12/10 at Poinsettia Park at 4:30 pm Friday Nights Flag football was being held and all the parking lots were full, and people were parking on the residential streets. Even though parking was an issue, the pickleball courts were full. In fact, on the 4 social courts there were 23 paddles on the rack waiting to play. On the challenge court there were 13 paddles on the rack waiting to play. There were 5 empty tennis courts!

Need line dance.

Actually, communication is excellent with regular emails being sent out by the City Manager.

I would love to see more pickleball courts and bathrooms at Poinsettia Park.

Multi-purpose courts for tennis and pickleball

We need more community gardens

Shade at Poinsettia for pickleball

More trails, especially in South Carlsbad. Also might need a place for RC model airplanes, drones and model boats.

A conversion of at least ONE tennis court to a dedicated pickleball format. (Poinsettia Park) With SHADE for spectators.

Parking at sites.

Food in parks.

Litter management could be better. More trash cans with pick up.

Prioritize room for walkers and bikers over cars on the coast road.

More dedicated outdoor pickleball courts with shade for spectators.

More pickleball courts, especially challenge high level courts. A practice wall would be great too.

| |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>The one thing: MORE PICKLEBALL COURTS. please note that those 52% on the poll for more sports courts are advocating for pickleball. If we could specify, I'm confident.</p> |
| <p>Continue virtual programs-cooking, history, art.</p> |
| <p>A bike park (similar to Sweetwater Bike Park in Bonita/Chula Vista).</p> |
| <p>PLEASE... More pickleball courts and multi-purpose courts sooner than later.</p> |
| <p>More wild/native space for walking/hiking wildlife.</p> |
| <p>Trash and litter is a problem. We need more containers for litter throughout all areas, and a means to have that picked up regularly.</p> |
| <p>More parks and open space, especially in the SW quadrant which is deficient.</p> |
| <p>More community gardens.</p> |
| <p>Pickleball would be more represented, but the NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS are being played as we speak at Indian Wells.</p> |
| <p>Pickleball grew in 2020 to 4.2 million players in the US, an incredible growth rate of 21.3% from 2019 per the Sports & Fitness Industry Association's (SFIA) 2021 Topline Participation Report, released in Feb. 2021.</p> |
| <p>More parks down in so Carlsbad with parking.</p> |
| <p>Why is Carlsbad below the national average for parks? Even Oceanside and Encinitas have more parks per population!</p> |
| <p>Leo Carrillo isn't great for repeat visits however.</p> |
| <p>Thank you very much for building new restrooms at Poinsettia Park.</p> |
| <p>The new Olympus Park in Encinitas is great for kids.</p> |
| <p>When will you get it that we need more open space for hiking?</p> |
| <p>5 acres per 1000 residents rather than just 3. And parks need to be nearby to minimize driving. Kids under 16 and many seniors don't drive.</p> |
| <p>Less driving will mean less cars. We need to pay attention to the climate change threats.</p> |
| <p>You have done a great job and we have faith in you that it will continue. Thank you for listening to us.</p> |
| <p>All the fancy pix and slide shows do not change the fact that we need more open space to accommodate the growing population!</p> |
| <p>Veterans Park should not be considered park credit for all the quadrants. We need more parks in EVERY quadrant.</p> |
| <p>Thank you for engaging and listening to us. Good Parks and especially open space and trails make for a great city and benefit everyone.</p> |
| <p>Future planning is vital, and this is great for that. Poinsettia Park (Pickleball) has IMMEDIATE needs. PLEASE convert one tennis court to DEDICATED pickleball.</p> |
| <p>Mainly there are few activities at Leo Carrillo.</p> |
| <p>You allowed too many people at the winter celebration at Leo Carrillo ranch. People were way too close together for the Tree lighting!</p> |
| <p>So many nice things for children. I wish I had lived here when my child was small.</p> |

When our children were small, the air quality was much better!

I greatly appreciate you all seeking our input.

Thanks for your help. Looking forward to more outdoor and indoor concerts after this Pandemic is managed.

we live in an awesome city and I'm proud to be part of this community

There are over 40 public tennis courts in the City of Carlsbad and only 6 pickleball courts. The conversion of 1 or 2 tennis court into a multi-purpose court for tennis and pickleball could be a temporary solution for the need for more pickleball courts.

We are not getting dedicated courts, so let's share. We just need more courts to play on.



City of Carlsbad California

2023 - 2030

APPENDIX F - COMMENTS
VIA EMAILS & WEBSITE
PART 1



APPENDIX F – COMMENTS VIA EMAILS AND CARLSBADPARKSPLAN.COM

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

From: [Lance Schulte](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#)
Cc: [People for Ponto](#); [Council Internet Email](#); [Scott Chadwick](#); [Kyle Lancaster](#); [Lisa Urbach](#); [Kathleen@carlsbad.org](#); [Mike Pacheco](#); [Don Neu](#); [Erin Prahler](#); [Gabriel Buhr](#); [Cort Hitchens](#)
Subject: FW: Develop Ponto Right - prior Ponto Coastal Park Support Letters and public comments to be included in Parks Master Plan public Comments
Date: Monday, February 10, 2020 3:54:30 PM
Attachments: [Concerns and Requests emailed to Carlsbad CC-PC-PC & CCC as of 1-31-20.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Dear Mick:

I received an email blast from the City today titled: **Community Invited to Provide Input on Future of City's Parks and Recreation Offerings.**

As noted in the 2/6/20 email below citizens have since 2017 provided extensive input to the City on the need for a Ponto Park, including over 600 emails/signed petitions to the City in January 2020, and over 2,500 emails/petition signatures since 2017 via the People for Ponto website.

Citizen input citing the need for and request for a Ponto Park have also occurred as part of the City Budget Workshops and Veterans Park Workshops, and at 3 specific PowerPoint presentations to the City Council. The attached file of over 90-pages compiles most of that additional public input, and includes the date and how this input was addressed to at the City.

As noted in the 2/6/20 email (and documented in the attached) these additional public inputs have already been provided to the City. We request your confirmation that the attached along with the over 2,500 prior individual emails/petitions are included as public input on the Park Master Plan Update. Can you please kindly confirm?

Thanks,
Lance Schulte
People for Ponto

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 6, 2020 6:25 PM
To: info@peopleforponto.com; Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov; CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov; Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov; Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov; Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov
Cc: People for Ponto; mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov
Subject: RE: Develop Ponto Right - prior Ponto Coastal Park Support Letters and public comments to be included in Parks Master Plan public Comments
Importance: High

Dear City Council, Kyle Lancaster, Mike Pacheco, and Mick Calarco:

We would like to receive confirmation that all the People for Ponto and other public comments as part of the public comments submitted on the:

1. Shopoff developer proposed application to change the Local Coastal Program Land Use on

Planning Area F at Ponto,

2. the City Staff's proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment to change the Land Use on Planning Area F for the developer

be included in the City's Park Master Plan Update. Can you please confirm all this prior citizen input is also included in the Parks Master Plan Update?

These prior public comments and requests to the City Council and Kyle Lancaster, parks Director directly relate to Park needs at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad, and the City's Planning Area F LCP LUP Requirements to consider a Public Park at the site. The public input is from over 2,500 citizen and public communications already sent to the City Council and City Staff (as noted in the above To address list). In addition to those 2,500 citizen and public communications over 90-pages of extensive public comments and data showing among other things the City's Park Master Plan's Park Service Area deficit (Park Service inequity) at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad, Park Acreage Deficit in South Carlsbad, the lack of any City Park West of I-5 and rail corridor in all South Carlsbad, CA Coastal Act policies and Coastal Recreation data/issues, along with other City policy and regulation supporting a Park at Ponto. All this prior public input should be included in the Parks Master Plan Update. Can you please confirm that that is the case? Or do we have to re-email all these prior public comments?

Thanks,
Lance
People for Ponto

One example of prior public comments submitted about Park deficits at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad and request for a City Park at Ponto:

From: info@peopleforponto.com [mailto:info@peopleforponto.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 4:18 PM

To: Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov; CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov; Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov; Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov; Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov; info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Develop Ponto Right - Support Letter

Dear Mayor Hall, Carlsbad City Council, and California Coastal Commission:

I am informed that

1. Carlsbad must consider on Planning Area F at Ponto the need for a public park at Ponto as part of the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.
2. There is no public park at Ponto even though City Park Standards requires a minimum of 6.5 acres of parkland for Ponto.
3. There is a current 6.6 acre park deficit in Coastal Southwest quadrant of Carlsbad, (south of Palomar Airport Road and west of El Camino Real).
4. There are no Coastal Parks in all of South Carlsbad. 64,000 South Carlsbad citizens have no Coastal Park.
5. Ponto is at the center of a larger 6-mile stretch of coastline in that has no Coastal Parks.
6. Ponto has a city documented 30 acre open-space standard deficit that a Coastal Park

would help resolves.

7. And most importantly, I am informed that the City is currently ignoring these issues and in the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment is proposing to eliminate the last opportunity to create a much needed Coastal Park at Ponto

Accordingly, I am requesting and making my position known that:

- I want the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment to provide for a Coastal Park at Ponto.
- I want the City to provide a true Citizen-based Park Planning process for Ponto.
- I want the City of Carlsbad to budget money in their capital improvement program to purchase Planning Area F and build a park at Ponto to serve residents and visitors alike.
- I want to preserve what little Coastal Open Space Carlsbad has remaining for future generations and our visitor industry.
- I am not in favor of future residential development at Ponto, but think this last small amount of vacant Coastal land should be reserved for Coastal Recreation.

One of the reasons that this lovely community continues to attract residents and tourists is the beauty of our natural surroundings, including coastline , parks and open spaces. Residential development is highly desired.. but INLAND, please! Protect our Coastal open spaces, for our good, and our visitors, for now AND the future. Once we squander it, it cannot easily be reclaimed...

Thank you
Barbara M Kesten
bkesten01@gmail.com
7476 Capstan Drive

Date submitted: 1/28/2020 6:18:23 PM

*This email was sent on behalf of the person named in this email using peopleforponto.com Please reply directly to the sender of the email as detailed within the email above.

If you'd like to unsubscribe and stop receiving these emails [click here](#).

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Citizen concerns & requests regarding Ponto emailed to the Carlsbad City Council, Planning & Parks Commissions; & CA Coastal Commission From 2017 to 1-31-2020

Item #, page, first sent, issues

- 1, 1, 8 /31/17, Coastal South Carlsbad/Ponto PA F Park needs, City policy supporting Ponto Park
- 2, 7, 12/4 /17, PA F LCP compliance, requested City Council reset Ponto planning with community based approach
- 3, 10, 12/5/17, Growth Management OpenSpace Standard not met at Ponto (LFMP-9) & asking Council to fix per 21.90 of CMC
- 4, 12, 12/5/17, Survey of San Pacifico Community Association members on Ponto issues within their planned community
- 5, 19, 3/22/18, Corrections to misrepresentations in Shopoff's Aug 2017 mailer to citizens
- 6, 24, 7/31/18, Questions for City and Shopoff regarding Shopoff Planning Applications
- 7, 29, 8/17 & 8/18, Community offers to Shopoff regarding collaborative Land Swap for Park & Open Space at Ponto
- 8, 30, 7/7/19, Citizen presentations asking Council on 6/12, 7/24, & 10/23/18 to correct Ponto Park & GMP Open Space defects
- 9, 33, 2/8/19, San Pacifico Community Assoc. letter to Carlsbad City Council, Planning & Parks Commissions, & City & CCC Staff
- 10, 36, 11/14/19, DLCPA public comments/requests on flawed Ponto disclosure/participation/planning process, & call to reset
- 11, 42, 11/18/19, DLCPA public comments & 11 questions on Existing LCP & Draft LCPA policy moving Carlsbad Boulevard inland
- 12, 44, 1/28/20, DLCPA public comments citing 14 errors/omissions in 1/28/20 agenda Item #14 Staff Report to City Council
- 13, 49, 11/22/19 DLCPA public comments & data on "High-Priority" Low-Cost Visitor Accommodation land use
- 14, 57, 1/29/20, DLCPA public comments & data on "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation land use & deficits at Ponto/So. Carlsbad
- 15, 90, 1/29/20, DLCPA public comments citing City Park Master Plan Park Service (Equity) maps showing Ponto is unserved
- 16, 92, 1/30/20, DLCPA public comments submitting prior public comments on Shopoff's proposed LCPA at Ponto; and asking:
 - why City Staff is keeping the Shopoff LCPA application alive, and under what authority, and
 - why the City Staff is processing the Planning Area F speculative developer's proposed LCPA to change the Existing LCP non-residential reserve land use to low-priority residential and general commercial land uses
- 17, 94, 1/31/20, DLCPA public comments on LCP & CMC 21.90.130 addressing Ponto Coastal Park & Open Space Standards
- 18, 95, ?????, DLCPA public comments via People for Ponto website & surveys. Summary of public comments submitted

Item #1 – City Park Standard in SW and South Carlsbad & Planning Area F requirement to consider a Ponto Coastal Park; and General Plan justification to support a request that the City Council provide a Ponto Coastal Park

Emailed on 8/31/17 and 3/6/18 to: Carlsbad City Council council@carlsbadca.gov
Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Commission at mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov
Carlsbad Planning Commission at Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov
Kevin Crawford, City Manager at manager@carlsbadca.gov
Chris Hazeltine, Parks & Recreation, City of Carlsbad chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov
Don Neu, Planning, City of Carlsbad Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov

Subject: City Park Standard in Southwest and South Carlsbad

Dear Carlsbad City Council:

The San Pacifico Community Association (SPCA) represents over 450 homes (around 1,000 Citizens) in the Southwest Quadrant/Park District of Carlsbad, and is the primary component and stakeholder of the Poinsettia Shores Planned Community (Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program). SPCA supported the residents in creating the Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee (PBDR) to:

- Provide information to all San Pacifico residents (and surrounding neighborhoods) on the developments. (See www.PontoLocals.com)

- Obtain and consolidate constructive feedback from the residents. Give this feedback to the residents, developers and City so that we can have productive/timely input into the projects and their designs.
- Act as a strong, unified voice and with the support of our residents in upcoming Planning, Council and Coastal Commission meetings.

Since PBDRC has been formed there has been a growing participation and concurrence from other Carlsbad areas and groups on the consensus PBDRC has consolidated.

PBDRC and the SPCA are pleased that the City has taken action to fix a timeline defect in the Growth Management Program related to meeting a City Park standard. However there is another truly once in a lifetime opportunity to improve how the City Park standard is proposed to be met in Ponto and coastal South Carlsbad that we would like to request of the City Council. This opportunity stems from the fact that Ponto is the only vacant coastal land in South Carlsbad and is currently being evaluated for low-priority housing and other types of development. Should it be developed in this way, there will never be another opportunity to have a meaningful park in coastal Southwest Carlsbad west of Interstate 5. The request is to work with Pontolocal to provide a comprehensive and open process for citizens of the City [primarily Southwest and Southeast Carlsbad Citizens] to discuss and define possible better approaches to implement a coastal park in Southwest that can serve all of South Carlsbad. We recently had a community meeting attended by approximately 200 people and this letter reflects some of the near unanimous (90%+) concerns from that meeting. We believe these concerns are also likely to be reflective of many others living in South Carlsbad, and also in North Carlsbad.

The City Park Standard is “3.0 acres of Community Park or Special Use Area per 1,000 population **within the Park District**”. So for every 1,000 Citizens in a Park District, such as the coastal Southwest Quadrant Park District, there is to be 3 acres of City Park to meet the standard. The rationale for such a location specific standard is that parks should be distributed so as to be reasonably accessible by all citizens. It is also important to have reasonable and safe park access via walking and biking, not just by motor vehicles. The staff report on correcting the timeline defect in the Park Standard stated that correcting the timeline to correct the park quadrant deficits is “... specifically relevant to the southwest and southeast quadrants. As stated in the report a need for more park acreage in those two quadrants was identified four years ago (during FY 2012-13).” A 6.6 acre park deficit within the Southwest quadrant was identified in the Growth Management Monitoring Report for FY 2014-15. However the report indicates that “Based on the Fiscal Year 2015-16 Capital Improvement Program list of projects, Veteran’s Memorial Park (91.5 acres, with 22.9 acres applied to each quadrant) is proposed to be constructed prior to buildout.” Under this proposal the future Veteran’s Park, that is located in the Northwest Park District and located many miles away from the coastal Southwest and Southeast Quadrants and Park Districts, would be used meet the population and citizen demand for Parks for citizens within the coastal Southwest and Southeast Quadrant’s Park Districts. We know there is an outstanding opportunity for the City to do a great thing for the community and to add tremendous value to the quality of life by augmenting, enhancing, and/or adjusting planned park supply to better serve citizens and the City; and be more consistent with the General Plan and core values of the Growth Management Plan.

The fundamental intent of creating four Park Districts (one for each quadrant) and managing and matching demand and supply of City Parks into smaller geographical areas (quadrant park districts) is to make the supply of City Parks reasonably accessible to their demand and more equitably distributed for citizens. Equitable distribution of City Park facilities is the right thing to do and has many citizen and city benefits:

- Children and elderly can more easily walk and bike to City Parks when they are close by and within a safe walking and bicycling distance with properly designed access pathways;
- Park supply created so far away from park demand creates the need to drive in a car to access the park, thus increasing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Depending on locations this also limits park access for citizens without cars or unable to drive;
- When city parks are accessible to their demand by walking/bicycling then less city park land is need to park cars. Citizens get more actual useable park space for each acre of park land;
- When city parks are close to their demand busy families can quickly get to them after their workday which allows more park time for families during busy weekends;
- Nearby city parks create a stronger sense of stewardship for the “neighborhoods” park and city parks in general. Citizens watch out and care for their nearby park;
- Nearby city parks that are equitably distributed and based on surrounding neighborhood demand serve to strengthen neighborhood quality and property values by providing park amenities close by. It is both a good neighborhood and economic development strategy to assure park demand and supply are locationally matched; and
- Fundamentally it is the right thing to do to place park demand and supply in close proximity to each other and promote and equitable distribution public facility demand and supply.

In coastal Southwest Carlsbad and South Carlsbad we have some glaring gaps in demand and supply of city parks. For instance:

The Carlsbad General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, Figure 4-3 Parks: Shows no existing or planned coastal parks or special use areas west of Interstate 5 for all of South Carlsbad. In North Carlsbad there are 10, parks and special use areas west of Interstate 5 and on or close to the beach (9 of these are existing parks and 1 is a future park). This seems a clear and inherently unfair distribution of coastal park facilities. This unfair distribution severely reduces critical access to coastal park open space near the beach for South Carlsbad Citizens (half the City and over 26,000 homes, and over 64,000 citizens).

This unserved demand for city park space in coastal South Carlsbad is evidenced by the dangerous use of the Carlsbad Boulevard [old highway 101] road shoulder and bike lanes and campground road for recreational purposes, parking demand and the frequent unauthorized recreational use of Ponto vacant land. People are using whatever land they can for needed recreational use. South Carlsbad Citizens in Aviara, La Costa, Rancho Carrillo, Bressi Ranch, La Costa Valley and all the other South Carlsbad inland neighborhoods have no coastal South Carlsbad City Beach Park areas to access the coast. Their only option is to drive significant distances (with increase VMT and greenhouse gas emissions] crosstown to access city beach parks in the North, or travel to Encinitas. This forces increased VMT and greenhouse gas emissions which is counter to both State and General Plan goals. Citizens in South Carlsbad only have a State Beach pay parking lot and a retreating primarily steep cobble beach as their “local” beach. The non-beach portion of the South Carlsbad State Beach campground is a road and lodging facility for primarily out-of-town visitors that are near this beach. It is not a city park. The Campground is not designed to serve the park needs of Carlsbad citizens, but is a great place primarily for visitors to affordably pay to spend nights camping near the beach. The lack of any park facilities at the campground is evidenced by the frequent use of the campground driveway (a significant area of the campground) by children and adults as a play area.

There is an added benefit in that adding a coastal South Carlsbad Ponto Beach Park would help alleviate growing overcrowding, and increased traffic and parking congestion at North Carlsbad's coastal parks.

Citizens west of Interstate 5 in South Carlsbad have very limited access to a city park. Depending on the neighborhood one lives in, access our nearest park [Poinsettia Park] is between a 2 to 4 mile trip. Residents must cross Interstate 5 using one of only two crossings in the space of over 3 miles. These crossings are on major multi-lane, higher speed roadways (Poinsettia Lane or Palomar Airport Road). The route is not the most safe or direct, and it forces one to drive in a vehicle to access a park which increases VMT. Park access for children, the elderly, and those walking dogs west of Interstate 5 in South Carlsbad is severely restricted or effectively eliminated.

Coastal Southwest and all of South Carlsbad have not met their quadrant's Park area standard since 2012 (per the City's Growth Management Program). A specific comprehensive and open discussion with the Southwest and all if South Carlsbad citizens on how that deficient should be resolved should occur. The current City solution to meet local park needs of coastal Southwest and South Carlsbad with a paper allocation of park acreage in the Northwest part of the City that is many miles away does not seem right. It seems inconsistent with the core values and Vision of our City.

From Carlsbad General Plan Community Vision:

"...the Carlsbad Community Vision, which is the foundation for this plan." This is the foundation for the General Plan.

"...In the future, ... social connections will be enhanced through ... more public gathering places, family-friendly activities, and open spaces within walking distance of people's homes ..."

"The community is proud of the exceptional amount of open space in the city, and envisions a future of continued City commitment to open space protection and strategic acquisitions to further the city's open space system."

"Parks, Fields, and Facilities for All Ages: The network of parks and recreation facilities will be improved to meet the community's active lifestyle needs. Such improvements may include the strategic addition of more parks, ... New facilities will be located to maximize use and access by all neighborhoods, tailored to the needs of local populations, and designed with all ages in mind."

"Beach Uses and Improvements: The beach is an important outdoor recreational resource, and protecting and enhancing access to the beach and the quality of the beach experience is a top community priority."

"... Access to the beach and the quality of the beach experience will be improved through new compatible and supportive uses on or in close proximity to the beach, which may include ... a park ..."

"Tailored Tourism Strategy: Tourism is an important component of the city's economy today, and it remains an attractive economic sector for the future since it emphasizes the very resources that make the city attractive to existing residents—the ocean and beach ..."

"Easy and convenient pedestrian connections will be available from every neighborhood to help children get safely to schools and parks."

From General Plan Land Use Element:

“Beach Access and Activity: ...the community expressed an overwhelming preference for an active waterfront development strategy, which provides opportunities for activities and uses to be more integrated with the ocean. ... Access to the beach will be enhanced through ... open space, parking, and amenities ...”

General Plan Land Use Policy: “2-G.20 Develop an active ocean waterfront, with new growth accommodated west of Interstate 5, to enable residents and visitors to enjoy more opportunities for ... recreating along the coastline. Develop public gathering places and recreational opportunities along the coastal corridor.”

The City’s Park and Recreation Master Plan includes many areas of direction that strongly support a coastal park west of interstate 5 in South Carlsbad. Many of the most important park facilities and program needs identified in the City’s Park and Recreation Master Plan could be most efficiently addressed with a coastal park in the Ponto area. There are also significant and unique opportunities to create both public/private and public/public partnerships that would not only help reduce City recreation costs but also expand and create unique and special recreational program opportunities currently identified in the City’s Park and Recreation Master Plan.

A Ponto city coastal park also implements a major General Plan policy which calls for an active waterfront and creates solutions to long standing Local Coastal Program policy and State Parks Campground issues. There are very unique and special land use compatibility opportunities and synergy from a coastal city park in south Carlsbad and Ponto area that are inline and implement high priorities identified in the City’s Park and Recreation Master Plan.

In summary, Carlsbad has a once in a generation opportunity to create very special coastal South Carlsbad Ponto Beach Park in South Carlsbad. This opportunity will be true to our Carlsbad Community Vision and General Plan and the heart and soul of our Growth Management Plan’s standard of matching park demand with park supply within a particular park district. We believe this request benefits not only coastal Southwest Carlsbad and South Carlsbad but all of Carlsbad and is more consistent with the City General Plan, Growth Management Program, and Parks Master Plan and will result in a better, more valued and more sustainable City.

We are a key Stakeholder in Ponto and the Poinsettia Shores Maser Plan and Local Coastal Program. We have been hearing similar concerns from other Carlsbad citizens about coastal beach park access and request that the City Council seize this opportunity to work with us to establish a comprehensive and open community discussion about the strategic acquisition of a coastal South Carlsbad Ponto Beach Park for South Carlsbad citizens and businesses. We also request before a solution to the 2012 Southwest quadrant park standard deficit is created we have an open citizen discussion with the Citizens of coastal Southwest Carlsbad on how that solution can better address the park demand created in the Southwest Park District with a better park supply created within that District. Like our City Park Standard says: “3.0 acres of Community Park or Special Use Area per 1,000 population **within the Park District**”. We request that a coastal City Park West of Interstate 5 be developed in South Carlsbad to be fair and equitable and to meet the needs of South Carlsbad for a coastal City Park to serve all the Citizens of South Carlsbad. This can take advantage of special land use synergies to help promote public/private collaboration, create added property and transit occupancy tax revenues for the City by creating a

valuable and synergistic amenity [where none now exists] for over half the City and over 26,000 homes, along with providing support to our City's visitor serving businesses and activities. It is the right and smart thing to do.

The San Pacifico Community Association and PBDRC as key Stakeholders in Ponto wish to be a key participant any proposed City or CCC actions regarding these subjects, and would like to meet with you to see how we can discuss and advance this for the benefit of South Carlsbad Citizens. As we are citizen volunteers we sincerely appreciate advance notification to allow for preparation and coordination with our work lives and to communicate back to our members and other South Carlsbad Citizens. We wish to be notified in advance of any proposed actions related to the issues in thus letter. The San Pacifico Community Association contact information is:

San Pacifico Community Association and PBDRC
c/o Walters Management, Lee Leibenson
9665 Chesapeake Drive, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92123
lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com

The Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee conducted the research cited in this letter. Along with general communications, please contact the following if you have technical questions regarding this letter. Key Committee contact information is:

jeanscamp@yahoo.com
sebbiessixpack@att.net;
meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net

Thank you for your consideration.

San Pacifico Community Association Board of Directors:

Mr. Jim Nardi jtnardi1@msn.com
Mr. Bill Van Cleve billvancleve@prodigy.net
Mr. Adriaan van Zyl Vanzyl.aakc@live.com
Mr. Tony Ruffolo tonyruffolo616@gmail.com
Mr. Chas Wick chaswick@reagan.com

cc:

Board of Directors
California Coastal Commission at Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov and gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov

Item #2 – Planning Area F Local Coastal Program Compliance & requesting the City Council reset the land use planning process and conduct a community based planning approach to compliance

Emailed on 12/4/17 & 3/6/18 to: council@carlsbadca.gov ; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov ; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov ; manager@carlsbadca.gov ; chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov ; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov ; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov ; debbie.fountain@carlsbadca.gov; with copy to: Jim Nardi jimn8916@gmail.com ; WILLIAM VAN CLEVE billvanclave@prodigy.net ; Avril van Zyl vanzyl.aakc@live.com ; Tony Ruffolo tonyruffolo616@gmail.com ; Chas Wick chaswick@reagan.com ; jeanscamp@yahoo.com ; sebbiessixpack@att.net ; Lance Schulte meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net ; Lee Leibenson lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning Commission and Planning Staff; and California Coastal Commission Staff

The following is being submitted by the San Pacifico Community Association Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee. The Committee is composed of about 20 citizens and is charged by the San Pacifico Community Association with identifying and communicating Community consensus on proposed development in our Ponto Community. We would appreciate receiving a reply; and if you have any questions regarding its contents please contact the following committee members at:

Jean Camp: jeanscamp@yahoo.com
Michael Sebahar: sebbiessixpack@att.net
Lance Schulte: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Gail Norman: gnorman_ca@yahoo.com
John Gamma: Johngama99@gmail.com

Copy:
Lee Leibenson: lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com
Jim Nardi: jtnardi1@msn.com

Subject: Shopoff Ponto West and Ponto East land use planning and development permit applications - 1st application submittal 5/1/15 - GPA-15-01, MP-175 (L), LCPA-15-03, HMP-15-04, MS-15-02 & MS-15-03, CT-15-02 & CT-15-03, PUD-15-07 & PUD-15-08, SDP-15-08, CDP-15-14 & CDP-15-15; and 2nd application submittal 4/20/17 - MP-16-01, LCPA-16-02 amend 2017-01, HMP-15-04 & HMP-16-02, MS-16-02, CT-16-03, PUD-16-01 & PUD-16-02, SDP-16-02, CDP-16-07 & CDP-16-08

The above applications propose planning changes to the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program [PSMP/LCP] and planning changes and development permits for Planning Area F of the PSMP/LCP. The City of Carlsbad's currently adopted Local Coastal Program [p. 101] for the site and the City's currently adopted PSMP/LCP zoning [p. 105] for the site is:

"PLANNING AREA F:

*Planning Area F is located at the far northwest corner of the Master Plan area west of the AT&SF Railway right-of-way. This Planning Area has a gross area of 11 acres and a net developable area of 10.7 acres. **Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area, for which land uses will be determined at a later date when***

more specific planning is carried out for areas west of the railroad right-of-way. A future Major Master Plan Amendment will be required prior to further development approvals for Planning Area F, and shall include an LCP Amendment with associated environmental review, if determined necessary.

The intent of the NRR designation is not to limit the range of potential future uses entirely to non-residential, however, since the City's current general plan does not contain an "unplanned" designation, NRR was determined to be appropriate at this time. In the future, if the Local Coastal Program Amendment has not been processed, and the City develops an "unplanned" General Plan designation, then this site would likely be redesignated as "unplanned." Future uses could include, but are not limited to: commercial, residential, office, and other uses, subject to future review and approval.

As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad. [Boldface and underline highlights added]

The current Carlsbad Local Coastal Program and PSMP/LCP for Planning Area F were adopted by the City and Coastal Commission in the mid-1990s. The City in late-1990s trying to create A Redevelopment Project Area and increase land use intensity and tax increment created another layer of planning with the planning effort called the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan [PBVVP]. Redevelopment [and the tax motivation to increase land use intensity] no longer exists in California.

Most importantly the PBVVP planning effort did not comply with the City's Local Coastal Program for Planning Area F as confirmed in Public Records Request 2017-260. This is a fundamental flaw in the planning effort as there is a strong desire to create a City Park in this unserved Coastal area. The additional layer of PBVVP planning effort was primarily focused on land owners/developers wants, and did not engage the San Pacifico Community even though the planning effort was looking to fundamentally change the character of the remaining portion of our Coastal Planned Community.

The 2008-2015 General Plan Update planning effort also did not follow the City's Local Coastal Program requirements for Planning Area F as confirmed in Public Records Request 2017-260. That planning effort for the site referenced the flawed PBVVP planning effort. Like the PBVVP planning effort the process did not directly involve/engage our San Pacifico Community, but instead had the developer's paid representative on the Envision Carlsbad Citizens' Committee working with City Staff to represent the developer's interests.

The failure to comply with the City Local Coastal Program when proposing the PBVVP and General Plan Update changes from the currently zoned "Non-residential Reserve" potentially invalidates those proposed changes, or at the very least seriously flawed those planning efforts. This can be corrected however in resetting the planning efforts for Planning Area F to the currently zoned "Non-residential Reserve" status and using a Community Based Planning Effort that follows the City's Local Coastal Program requirements for Planning Area F. The Community Based Planning Effort should also involve the larger Carlsbad Community of Citizens in that Planning Area F is the last significant vacant area along Carlsbad's South Coast, and our North San Diego County coast, which has critical gaps in City and Coastal Park access and acreage.

The attached August 31, 2017 letter was sent to the Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions and Carlsbad staff; and California Coastal Commission Staff. The letter is from the San Pacifico Community Association. The San Pacifico Community Association is the largest part of the Poinsettia Shores Planned Community of which Planning Area F is apart. The letter identifies some of

the Planning Area F park issues, provides City Policy direction that supports a Ponto Beach Park, and respectfully asks that the City provide a Community Based Planning Effort to address the issues of a Ponto Beach Park on Planning Area F. For instance:

- No City Coastal Parks west of Interstate 5 in all of South Carlsbad, while there are 10 City Coastal Parks west of Interstate 5 in North Carlsbad. This is inequitable. This also increases VMT and overcrowding at North Carlsbad Coastal Parks.
- Huge gaps in City Park access and resources in Southwest Carlsbad west of Interstate 5, as identified in the City Park and Recreation Master Plan.
- Southwest Carlsbad has an existing 6.6 acre deficient in meeting the minimum Growth management Program required City Park acreage demand from development within the Southwest Carlsbad. Planning Area F is about 6.5 acres in size.
- The City's 1980's approach to address the minimum requirements of SW Carlsbad's park deficient is to not follow the letter of the Growth Management Program and provide a City Park "within SW Carlsbad"; but to dislocate park demand and supply by providing the park 'outside SW Carlsbad' making SW Carlsbad's Park miles away from the development it is intended to serve, making it inaccessible by young and old, reducing that park size due to parking needed to serve distant users, and increasing VMT to access a distant park. We respectfully request a SW Carlsbad Park should be provided "within SW Carlsbad" to serve the needs of the development "within SW Carlsbad", consistent with the letter of the Growth Management Program.
- City policy allows and supports the creation of City Parks beyond the minimum acreage requirements of Growth Management Program minimum Park standard, and the City has created such City Parks in other areas of the City.
- The San Pacifico Community Association has conducted member meetings and a survey; and 92% wanted a park/recreational use. The complete survey was transmitted in a subsequent email.
- There appears to be a significant shortage of Growth Management Program Open Space acres in the area of Planning Area F, and a Ponto Beach Park would significantly help address this shortage.

Planning Area F is about the exact same size as Carlsbad's Holiday Park, and can provide ball and play fields, low-cost citizen and visitor recreational access to the coast, and synergistic enhancement to the surrounding and nearby commercial hotels and State Campground Coastal visitor accommodations. Like Holiday Park, Ponto Beach Park can be a special Carlsbad Community event place that is so consistent with Carlsbad's Core Values.

A Ponto Beach Park is a very positive thing for all Carlsbad and our Coast. Resetting the planning efforts at Planning Area F to follow the Carlsbad Local Coastal Program requirements and providing a Community Based Planned Effort to fully evaluate and consider a Ponto Beach Park that planning effort is the Right Thing to Do.

Thank you. We sincerely appreciate your consideration. As mentioned earlier if you have any questions please contact us, and we would sincerely appreciate receiving a reply.

Item #3 – Growth Management Program Open Space Standard not being met in Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9 [Ponto] and requesting the City require the developer(s) to amend the Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9 to show compliance with the City’s Growth Management Program Open Space Standard

Emailed Tuesday, December 5, 2017, 2:44:16 PM PST and 3/6/18 to: council@carlsbadca.gov ; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov ; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov ; manager@carlsbadca.gov ; chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov ; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov ; Erin.Praher@coastalca.gov
Copied to: jimn8916@gmail.com ; billvanclave@prodigy.net ; vanzyl.aakc@live.com ; tonyruffolo616@gmail.com ; chaswick@reagan.com ; jeanscamp@yahoo.com ; sebbiesixpack@att.net ; meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net ; lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com ; gnorman_ca@yahoo.com

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning Commission and Planning Staff; and California Coastal Commission Staff

The following is being submitted by the San Pacifico Community Association Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee. The Committee is composed of about 20 citizens and is charged by the San Pacifico Community Association with identifying and communicating Community consensus on proposed development in our Ponto Community. We would appreciate receiving a reply; and if you have any questions regarding its contents please contact the following committee members at:

Jean Camp: jeanscamp@yahoo.com
Michael Sebahar: sebbiesixpack@att.net
Lance Schulte: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Gail Norman: gnorman_ca@yahoo.com
John Gama: Johngama99@gmail.com

Copy:
Lee Leibenson: lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com
Jim Nardi: jtnardi1@msn.com

Subject: Shopoff Ponto West and Ponto East land use planning and development permit applications - 1st application submittal 5/1/15 - GPA-15-01, MP-175 (L), LCPA-15-03, HMP-15-04, MS-15-02 & MS-15-03, CT-15-02 & CT-15-03, PUD-15-07 & PUD-15-08, SDP-15-08, CDP-15-14 & CDP-15-15; and 2nd application submittal 4/20/17 - MP-16-01, LCPA-16-02 amend 2017-01, HMP-15-04 & HMP-16-02, MS-16-02, CT-16-03, PUD-16-01 & PUD-16-02, SDP-16-02, CDP-16-07 & CDP-16-08

The above applications propose planning changes and development permits that require amendment to the Local Facilities Management Plan [LFMP] for Zone. The developer applicant Shopoff has filed with the City the attached Amendment to the LFMP for Zone 9 to show their proposed compliance with the City’s Growth Management Standards.

The Current LFMP for Zone 9 says Zone 9 already meets the Growth Management Open Space standard, but no data or evidence supports this statement. A Public Records Requests PRR-2017-164 and PRR-2017-288 were submitted to see if there was any data or evidence, and the City has confirmed that there is no record of data or evidence that shows that LFMP Zone 9 meets the minimum Growth Management Open Space Standard. Data related to the City of Carlsbad Annual Open Space Status

Report for Fiscal Year 2016/2017 July 1, 2016- June 30, 2017 in fact seems to show the exact opposite - the Growth Management Open Space Standard is not being met in LFMP Zone 9. The LFMP for Zone 9 should be required to be updated to provide the data and evidence to clearly and accurately show compliance with the Standard. The City's Growth Management Ordinance [CMC 21.90.130] specifically states that:

"The city council may initiate an amendment to any of the plans at any time if in its discretion it determines that an amendment is necessary to ensure adequate facilities and improvements."

"If at any time it appears to the satisfaction of the city manager that facilities or improvements within a facilities management zone or zones are inadequate to accommodate any further development within that zone or that the performance standards adopted pursuant to Section 21.90.100 are not being met he or she shall immediately report the deficiency to the council. If the council determines that a deficiency exists then no further building or development permits shall be issued within the affected zone or zones and development shall cease until an amendment to the city-wide facilities and improvements plan or applicable local facilities management plan which addresses the deficiency is approved by the city council and the performance standard is met."

We respectfully request the City Manager and City Council require the developer amending the LFMP for Zone 9 to provide a Growth Management Program Open Space analysis and show compliance with the Growth Management Open Space Standard. We believe the developer's applications to change land use planning and then apply for development permits should be considered incomplete until without having clear and documented data [maps, tables, and analysis as required by CMC 21.90] that shows compliance with the Growth Management Facility Standards – including Open Space.

We also would like to request the process of evaluation of this request and subsequent Amendment to LFMP for Zone 9 be well published to the Community and boarder Carlsbad Community given the long term concern Citizens have regarding Open Space and Open Space issues being a Core Value adopted by the City: "Prioritize protection and enhancement of open space ..." and another Core Value to "Build on the city's culture of civic engagement ...". Involving the Community in analyzing and addressing the LFMP Zone 9 Open Space can be a very positive community effort and experience and show how our Growth Management Program works.

Thank you. We sincerely appreciate your consideration. As mentioned earlier if you have any questions please contact us, and we would sincerely appreciate receiving a reply.

Item #4 – Provided a survey of San Pacifico Community Association on community concerns and requests of the City regarding developers’ proposed development of last remaining vacant portions of our Coastal Planned Community’s [Ponto] Planning Area F by Shopoff, and Planning Areas G & H

Emailed on 12/5/2017, 2/19/2018 and 3/6/18 to: council@carlsbadca.gov;
mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov; manager@carlsbadca.gov;
chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov;

Copy:

Jim Nardi jimn8916@gmail.com ; WILLIAM VAN CLEVE billvancleve@prodigy.net ; Avril van Zyl
vanzyl.aakc@live.com ; Tony Ruffolo tonyruffolo616@gmail.com ; Chas Wick chaswick@reagan.com ;
jeanscamp@yahoo.com ; sebbiessixpack@att.net ; Lance Schulte meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net ; Lee
Leibenson lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning Commission and Planning Staff; and California Coastal Commission Staff

The following is being submitted by the San Pacifico Community Association Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee. The Committee is composed of about 20 citizens and is charged by the San Pacifico Community Association with identifying and communicating Community consensus on proposed development in our Ponto Community. We would appreciate receiving a reply; and if you have any questions regarding its contents please contact the following committee members at:

Jean Camp: jeanscamp@yahoo.com
Michael Sebahar: sebbiessixpack@att.net
Lance Schulte: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Gail Norman: gnorman_ca@yahoo.com
John Gamma: Johngama99@gmail.com
Copy:
Lee Leibenson: lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com
Jim Nardi: jtnardi1@msn.com

Subject: Shopoff Ponto West and Ponto East land use planning and development permit applications - 1st application submittal 5/1/15 - GPA-15-01, MP-175 (L), LCPA-15-03, HMP-15-04, MS-15-02 & MS-15-03, CT-15-02 & CT-15-03, PUD-15-07 & PUD-15-08, SDP-15-08, CDP-15-14 & CDP-15-15; and 2nd application submittal 4/20/17 - MP-16-01, LCAP-16-02 amend 2017-01, HMP-15-04 & HMP-16-02, MS-16-02, CT-16-03, PUD-16-01 & PUD-16-02, SDP-16-02, CDP-16-07 & CDP-16-08

The San Pacifico Community Association requests the community desires expressed in the following survey from our Community meeting on May 3rd be entered into the public record for the above planning applications, and any subsequent City and California Coastal Commission planning applications for the properties East and West of Ponto Road and North of Avenida Encinas [Shopoff option site]. The San Pacifico Community Association is the majority property association in the Poinsettia Shores Planned Community [Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program] of which the properties East and West of Ponto Road and North of Avenida Encinas [Shopoff option site] are also apart. The Community consensus does not think the above proposed land use planning and development permit applications are compatible with the established lower density land use, lower development intensity,

building height and mass, and character of our Coastal Planned Community and the Coastal Act, requirement that development be "visually compatible with the character of the surrounding area."

We wish the City would utilize a Community based planning approach vs. a developer driven and focused process to develop that last remaining vacant Coastal land in South Carlsbad.

The Community survey: On May 3rd, a San Pacifico Community meeting was held and approximately 200 citizens from San Pacifico attended. A Shopoff representative was invited and attended. The meeting provided summary information about the current planning processes and the two developers' proposals. Some paper surveys were available and about 60 were completed and returned that evening. Those unable to get a paper survey were able to complete an almost identical survey on-line at www.pontolocals.com. About 90 more surveys were completed on-line. The following tabulates both survey results.

Ponto East and Ponto West - Shopoff questions – May 3, 2017

1. **DWELLING DENSITY:** The area East of Ponto Road is now zoned R-23 (15 dwelling units per acre minimum to 23 dwelling units per acre maximum), not including State affordable housing density bonus:
 - Shopoff is proposing 137 dwellings on 6.5 net acres (= 21 dwelling units/acre)
 - Potentially with additional dwellings for an affordable housing density bonus

Should Shopoff's proposed density be reduced closer to the 15 dwelling an acre minimum as per the General Plan?

148/156 = yes = 95%

8/156 = no = 5%

2. **HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS:** currently proposed on the East side of Ponto Road are:
 - 40 feet high (3 story)
 - These buildings would be the tallest along the SW Carlsbad coast
 - Commercial buildings like hotels are limited to 35 feet tall
 - The building heights for the Poinsettia Shores Planned Community [which San Pacifico is majority of the development and the Shopoff and Kam Sang proposals are minor developments] limits building heights to 30-35 feet.
 - All San Pacifico residential buildings except Satalina [35 feet tall] are no taller than 30 feet and must have a minimum 3/12 roof pitch
 - The Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan that provides additional development guidance for the Shopoff proposed development specifically calls this area the "townhomes" area and shows 2-story [under 30 feet] townhomes as the 'vision' for the site.

Should the Shopoff proposed 3-story and 40 feet building heights be reduced to 2-story and/or no taller than 30-35 feet maximum to be consistent with the vision and more compatible with the Poinsettia Shores and San Pacifico community?

157/162 = yes = 97%

5/162 = no = 3%

3. **BUILDING INTENSITY:** The Shopoff proposed stack flat residential buildings have underground parking to allow more land use intensity and building mass. The proposed buildings run in a fairly contiguous cluster west of the railroad right-of-way from Avenida Encinas north to Ponto Storage.
- Shopoff's proposed residential square footage [not including any balconies, private recreation or ancillary buildings] is 247,100 square feet total in 3 stories at 40 feet high.
 - For reference the Carlsbad Costco building is about 115,500 square feet in 1 story at 35 feet high. So Shopoff's proposed residential building footprint is approximately 72% of the Carlsbad Costco, though it would be 5 feet higher than Costco.

Is Shopoff's proposed building intensity compatible with San Pacifico and the Poinsettia Shores Community and appropriate?

149/159 = no = 94%
10/159 = yes = 6%

Should Shopoff place story poles on-site to show and photo document the proposed building mass?

146/155 = yes = 94%
9/155 = no = 6%

4. **THE BEACHFRONT VILLAGE COMMERCIAL SITE:** west of Ponto Drive proposes some design issues that may be of concern:
- A driveway entrance/exit along Avenida Encinas will make pedestrian/bike travel to the beach less safe.
 - The site is proposed to filled with soil to lift the ground level at Coast Highway 9 feet higher and buildings put upon this higher 'building pad'
 - The proposed building designs and material qualities may be of concern
 - A proposed grassy park-like 'common area' that can be used by customers and community may connect with the City's land and planned trail under Coast Highway [Carlsbad Boulevard]

A. Should a driveway if needed be on Avenida Encinas or on Coast Highway?

68/108 = Coast Highway = 63%
56/98 = Ponto Road = 57%
22/108 = Avenida Encinas = 20%
4/59 = Both = 7%
3/59 = Neither = 5%

B. Should the site be filled 9 feet or to what height?

108/152 = no = 71%

14/152 = yes = 9%

30/152 = not sure = 20%

C. Are the proposed building design and qualities sufficient to be the commercial and community heart of the Ponto Beachfront Village? Suggestions?

31/43 = No = 72%

4/43 = yes = 9%

8/43 = did not respond = 19%

D. Is the proposed 'common area' desirable? If so, do you prefer seating, grass area, trail, or other?

102/150 = yes = 68%

29/150 = no = 19%

23/150 = don't know = 15%

36/91 = Grassy area = 39.6%

31/91 = Trail = 34.1%

17/91 = Other = 18.7%

16/91 = skipped = 17.6%

7/91 = Seating = 7.7%

5. THE POINSETTIA SHORES MASTER PLAN and Local Coastal Program require prior to any land use change on the Shopoff site [approximately 10 net acres] a documented evaluation of making the East of Ponto Drive site recreation facilities (i.e. "public park"), or lower cost beach visitor accommodations.

- Since 2012 the San Pacifico, Ponto and entire Southwest quadrant of Carlsbad have been in a Park standard deficient [not meeting the City's minimum 3 acres of Park per 1,000 population City Growth Management Program Standard].
- In 2015 our Southwest quadrant needed 6.6 acres of new City Park to comply with Growth Management Standards.

Should the Shopoff East site [or portion of the site] be: (circle one or more, give examples)

1. Recreational,

2. Lower cost visitor accommodations,

3. Residential, or

4. Visitor serving commercial/recreation uses?

5. Other

140/155 = Park/recreational = 92%

27/155 = Visitor serving commercial & recreation = 17%

6/155 = Residential = 4%

2/155 = Lower cost visitor accommodations = 1%

6. **PARKING:** There is not a lot of excess or extra parking in the current Shopoff proposal and this will not be a “Gated” community. Concerns have been raised regarding vacation rental by owner (VRBO) and beach access parking in this new development.
- Parking in this area is already a problem on weekends and during the summer
 - Additional residential units and VRBO will make this problem worse

A. Should Shopoff modify their development plans to accommodate more parking for potential VRBO parking in their development? Yes ___ or No ___.

125/160 = yes = 78%

23/160 = no = 15%

B. Have you experienced problems with VRBO and parking in your neighborhood and if so, explain.

79/139 = no = 57%

38/139 = yes = 27%

22/139 = did not respond = 16%

C. What parking solutions would you propose?

Following are the replies, it appears a good study to define the needed parking supply and design solution to assure sufficient parking is desired.

- Require city standards or adhere to city vision plan.
- A professional parking study should be conducted that evaluates the current and future PUBLIC parking demands, before it is a daily problem.
- A reasonably priced parking lot/structure.
- All new buildings must have sufficient parking planned onsite.
- Amble parking within Shopoff plans to cover daily business transactions, new homeowners, and beach parking which will inevitably be in that area.
- angled parking on street, underground parking
- Below ground parking garages
- Eliminate the proposed development.
- I propose that the city better address the vacation rental issue.
- I really do favor angled parking on Ponto as an alternative, regardless of the VRBO issue.
- I think underground would be ideal, however, what about water drainage and flooding being close to the water. Would homeless people make it a new home?
- I think VRBO and AirBnb needs to be addressed like it is in our community CC&Rs. They should not allow Vacation rentals for no less than 30 days minimum. Maybe even give them stricter rules. As for parking, the city needs to regulate the people

who camp and live in their vehicles on Ponto drive. Hopefully Shop off can help mitigate this growing problem with some type of solution.

- I'd propose angled parking on the street with meters and a requirement that homeowners park in their designated areas. I suggest Shopoff make the resident space sizes wide enough to include all vehicles, large and small.
- I'm not a parking expert but please don't try to use loop holes in the planning of buildings to wiggle out of providing proper parking.
- Increase parking for the airBandB demand. The issues parking, noise, use of common areas, change in neighborhood character are all fairly obvious and having to be addressed. The City needs to do its job to make sure the impacts are addressed. If City standards are out-of-date or inadequate then change them to address the impacts.
- Keep development parking to traditional Carlsbad standards. No "park in lieu" fees. Two bedroom condo or hotel suites should have two off road parking spaces. In recent history, Carlsbad has been allowing development without adequate parking!
- less buildings will mean less parking needed
- Lower density, stricter rules with rentals.
- mandatory two parking spaces/garage with no street park 11pm-5a.m
- More off-street parking.
- More parking at the beach on 101. Diagonal parking to allow for more -- explore parking on east side of 101.
- More parking spots within plan. Traffic appears to be a major problem now. More people...twice the cars.
- No VRBO should be allowed.
- Not have this development
- not sure
- parking garages
- Parking passes to hang in car window? BTW - THANK YOU for all your hard work. I am very appreciative for what you are doing for our neighborhood!
- Parking structure to the north
- Provide a larger area for VRBO as well as occasional day visitors. Only limited parking is presently provided. Lately as we have become more know more cars are parked on weekends on the streets.
- public underground parking
- rated parking in strip between Carlsbad state park and Carlsbad boulevard; train station; roadside in front of water plant on Encinas; park/ride at I-5 and La Costa Dr. in Encinitas
- Subterranean parking for all businesses and residents
- The job of a traffic engineer
- The more underground parking the better. Security at night to enforce only residential parking. Additional storage units for residents to store bicycles & surfboards.
- There simply should be REQUIRED the actual needed amount of parking according to the proposed density PLUS additional accommodation for public needs.
- underground
- Underground garage.

- **Underground parking**
- **underground parking**
- **Underground parking or drop the number of units. It's not rocket science**
- **What happened to underground parking? Look at the above ground parking structure Hilton put in do we want a series of parking structures west of the railroad?**

Item #5 – Correction of the 8/17 Shopoff mailer

Emailed: 3-22-18

To: council@carlsbadca.gov; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov; manager@carlsbadca.gov; chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; debbie.fountain@carlsbadca.gov; with copy to: Jim Nardi jimn8916@gmail.com; WILLIAM VAN CLEVE billvanclave@prodigy.net; Avril van Zyl vanzyl.aakc@live.com; Tony Ruffolo tonyruffolo616@gmail.com; Chas Wick chaswick@reagan.com; jeanscamp@yahoo.com; sebbiessixpack@att.net; Lance Schulte meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net; Lee Leibenson lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning Commission and Planning Staff; and California Coastal Commission Staff

The following is being submitted by the San Pacifico Community Association Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee. The Committee is composed of about 20 citizens and is charged by the San Pacifico Community Association with identifying and communicating Community consensus on proposed development in our Ponto Community.

We request that this communication and any replies be part of the official record for the Citywide Local Coastal Program Amendment process, the City's planning to address the City Park deficit in the Southwest Quadrant [South Coastal Carlsbad], and the applications to change City ordinances and plans and then apply for development permits listed the Subject line below.

We would appreciate receiving a reply. If you have any questions regarding the communication's contents please contact the following committee members at:

Jean Camp: jeanscamp@yahoo.com
Michael Sebahar: sebbiessixpack@att.net
Lance Schulte: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Gail Norman: gnorman_ca@yahoo.com
John Gamma: Johngama99@gmail.com

Copy:

Lee Leibenson: lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com
Jim Nardi: jtnardi1@msn.com

Subject: Citywide Carlsbad Local Coastal Program Amendment, City's SW Quadrant Park planning compliance, and Shopoff Ponto West and Ponto East land use planning and development permit applications - 1st application submittal 5/1/15 - GPA-15-01, MP-175 (L), LCPA-15-03, HMP-15-04, MS-15-02 & MS-15-03, CT-15-02 & CT-15-03, PUD-15-07 & PUD-15-08, SDP-15-08, CDP-15-14 & CDP-15-15; and 2nd application submittal 4/20/17 - MP-16-01, LCPA-16-02 amend 2017-01, HMP-15-04 & HMP-2017-01, MS-16-02, CT-16-03, PUD-16-01 & PUD-16-02, SDP-16-02, CDP-16-07 & CDP-16-08

Response to Shopoff mailer of August 15, 2017: The truth
Verifiable data from the Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee

Shopoff's letter of August 15, 2017, addressed to "Dear Neighbor" was highly misleading, and so the Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee feel compelled to shed light on the truth's and mistruth's related to Shopoff's mailer about the proposed Ponto Beachfront development.

1. NEIGHBOR AND PROPERTY OWNER

Shopoff is not, as they say, our neighbor who owns the property east of Carlsbad Blvd and north of Avenida Encinas. The actual 'property owner' is LSFS Carlsbad Holding LLC at 2711 North Haskell Avenue, Suite 700; Dallas, TX 75204.

Shopoff is a speculative land developer from Orange County, and during an initial meeting with your Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee (PBDRC), Shopoff said that they have a 5-year option to purchase the property. Shopoff's focus is not on the best interests of our neighborhood community, but on those of their investors, as explicitly stated by Shopoff on their website (www.shopoff.com): "Shopoff Realty Investments is a private real estate investment company with a proven track record of creating wealth for our investors — and a singular commitment to placing their needs above all else."

2. MISLEADING SHOPOFF INFORMATION - CHECK THE FACTS

Shopoff's PR firm (Roni Hicks) is creating PR pieces that misrepresent the facts and hide the complete information from you. As you read through the 8/15/17 Shopoff letter, you'll notice they do not provide citations or documentation that can be cross-referenced by you to verify their statements. Our link at www.pontolocals.com has the exact language from the current City and Coastal Commission's planning and zoning for Planning Area F of Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program including Shopoff's proposed changes, and the complete Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan.

Please let us know the questions you may have at www.pontolocals.com and/or talk with any of your PBDRC neighbors.

3. MEETINGS WITH NEIGHBORS

There are a few key, and very core, community issues we the PBDRC have heard from you, and have communicated to Shopoff. First, you would like a Ponto Beach Neighborhood Park for the east side of Ponto Road. However, if that part of our Planned Community is to be built out as a Townhome project (like the images in the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan) then it should be more compatible with San Pacifico, should have lower density and lower building heights, and should be less massive than what Shopoff is proposing. Shopoff has repeatedly said to the PBDC that Shopoff will NOT make changes to their development proposal to address your following core concerns:

- If there is to be a residential development, it should be like the images in the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan: Shopoff is proposing a tall and massive wall of stacked flat condos, not 2-story Townhomes as called for and shown in the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). See Shopoff's Stacked Flat images compared to the PBVVP Townhome images. See the PBVVP, and the 1st and 2nd Shopoff Planning Submittals at www.pontolocals.com
- Lower density: Even though Shopoff's development would be part of our Poinsettia Shores (San Pacifico, et al.) Planned Community, Shopoff is proposing residential density (21 dwelling

units/acre) that is 250% more than, or 3.5 times San Pacifico’s residential density (6 dwelling units/acre). The City’s General Plan promises only the minimum 15 dwelling units/acre density or 71% of the density Shopoff is proposing. See the “Ponto” unit capacity table below from the City of Carlsbad General Plan Housing Element Table B-1 that lists 98 dwellings for the site on the east side of Ponto Road and 11 optional dwellings on the west side of Ponto Road for 109 total units for both sites, v. Shopoff’s proposed 136 dwellings on the east side of Ponto Road. Table B-1 is on page B-2 of the City’s Housing Element on the city’s website: <http://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=29360>

| Table B-1: Vacant Sites for Lower and Moderate Income Housing | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----|----------|
| APN | General Plan Designation ¹ | Zoning District | Site Size (Acres) | Unit Capacity, by Household Income | | |
| | | | | Very Low | Low | Moderate |
| 2090901100 (Sunny Creek) | R15 (12 du/ac) | RD-M | 9.6 | - | - | 115 |
| 2161404300 (Ponto) | R23 | P-C | 6.5 | - | - | 98 |
| | GC (Mixed Use) ³ | P-C | 3 | - | - | 11 |

You can see the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program for our San Pacifico density and the Shopoff’s planning applications on www.pontolocals.com

- **Lower building heights:** Shopoff is proposing 40-foot-tall buildings. Almost all of the buildings in the Poinsettia Shores (San Pacifico, et al.) Planned Community are around 26 feet tall, with a maximum potential height of 30 feet. Only Santalina’s maximum potential building heights exceed that, at 35 feet - as they backup to Interstate 5. Shopoff’s proposed building height is 154% the height of most of our Planned Community. See Shopoff’s 2nd planning submittal at www.pontolocals.com

Shopoff should place “story-poles” on the site to allow you to see their actual proposed height and massiveness, so you can determine the appropriateness for San Pacifico.

4. SHORT TERM RENTALS AND PARKING

San Pacifico HOA has restrictions on short term rentals. Shopoff has agreed with your PBDRC suggestions to likewise restrict short-term rentals. However, Shopoff cannot prevent a future HOA Board from amending the CC&Rs and by-laws, which could allow short-term rentals in the future. In addition, Shopoff is providing minimal private streets and minimal public street parking, so any parking shortage will spill over to San Pacifico. Their design should address short term rental impacts, including noise, high occupancy/congestion, parking, etc.

5. ZONING

Shopoff states that their plans are consistent with current zoning. This is not true. The current zoning for the site is in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program, in which Shopoff (or the City) needs to make major changes to this zoning before Shopoff’s development proposals can be permitted by the City and California Coastal Commission. Look at the yellow signs on the sites which show Shopoff’s applications to change zoning (MP-16-01, and LCAP-16-02 to amend 2017-01). Go to www.pontolocals.com to see Shopoff’s actual proposed changes to the zoning. Changing the Master

Plan and Local Coastal Program will require approval from both the City of Carlsbad and the California Coastal Commission.

The current zoning (in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program) for the site is “Non-Residential Reserve”. That zoning requires that “As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad. ” The developer and City failed to consider and document these needs when the PBVVP and 2015 General Plan Update were approved. We are not sure if the Developer or City are considering and documenting this now. See page 101 of the City of Carlsbad Local Coastal Program at <http://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=24088>

6. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

The City’s General Plan update in 2015 did change the City’s General Plan land use designation to consider commercial and residential land uses for the site. However, because the site is in the California Coastal Zone, the California Coastal Commission must ‘certify’ the update to the City of Carlsbad Local Coastal Program before the City’s General Plan change is fully approved. See Carlsbad General Plan Land Use Element page2-26 at <http://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=24087> that states:

“The California Coastal Act regulates all development within the state-designated Coastal Zone. ...The Coastal Act requires that individual jurisdictions adopt local coastal programs (LCP) to implement the Coastal Act. ... Development in the Coastal Zone must comply with the LCP in addition to the General Plan. The city’s LCP Land Use Plan will be updated consistent with this General Plan. However, to take effect, the LCP must be certified by the Coastal Commission as well as adopted by the city. Until such time that this occurs, the existing (as of 2013) LCP must be adhered to. ... Within the Coastal Zone, no discretionary permit shall be issued by the city unless found to be consistent with the General Plan and the LCP. In the event of conflict between the provisions of the General Plan and LCP Land Use Plan, the terms of the LCP Land Use Plan shall prevail.”

The Coastal Commission staff has indicated that “The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City’s Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City’s land use and zoning maps as necessary. **This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area.**”

7. CITIZENS’ INPUT NEEDED

The City and California Coastal Commission have the discretion to approve or deny a developer’s application to change City regulations and developer’s proposed development applications. The process requires that the Carlsbad Planning Commission and City Council, and California Coastal Commission hold Public Hearings to hear community concerns before making any approval or denial of applications. If you want to provide your input and be notified of any of these upcoming Public Hearings, please contact Walters Management and www.pontolocals.com. Your PBDRC will consolidate and forward everyone’s email input to the City and Coastal Commission and notify you in advance to attend the public hearings.

8. PONTO BEACHFRONT VILLAGE VISION PLAN (PBVVP)

Shopoff claims in their letter that their design implements the 2-story Townhomes shown in the PBVVP. This is clearly not true. Shopoff is proposing 3-story, 40-foot-tall and massive, 60% lot coverage, Stacked Flats – not 2-story townhomes. The PBDRC has repeatedly asked Shopoff that if they are proposing residential dwellings, to build the Townhomes as showed on Chapter 3 pages 3-8 & 9 of the PBVVP. Shopoff has consistently refused to propose a 2-story Townhome project as shown in the PBVVP, and are misleading you. Go to www.pontolocals.com to see the PBVVP.

9. RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

Shopoff critically fails to tell you the entire truth that the minimum density for the R-23 land use category is 15 dwellings per acre. Developing at the minimum General Plan density would allow 98 dwellings on the East site of Ponto Road and 11 dwellings on the west side of Ponto Road for a total of 109 dwellings. Shopoff proposes 136 dwellings or about 125% the minimum density. See Carlsbad General Plan Housing Element “2161404300 (Ponto)” in Table B1 on page B2 at <http://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=29360>

10. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

For the site that Shopoff wants to develop, the City of Carlsbad requires at least 20% affordable housing. It is unlikely if Shopoff could even ask for a Density Bonus. The PBDC is checking into this.

11. TRAFFIC IMPACTS

Shopoff’s project will increase traffic in the area. The San Pacifico Community and its PBDRC have repeatedly asked Shopoff to lower their density, thus decreasing their traffic impacts. Shopoff has refused to reduce density and thus to reduce their traffic impacts.

12. COMMUNITY INPUT AND DESIGN

The proposal changes that Shopoff lists in their letter reflect some of the changes the PBDRC has conveyed to Shopoff as desires of the San Pacifico Community. Many of the changes that Shopoff lists were also identified by the City as needed changes to Shopoff’s proposals. Shopoff has acknowledged that these changes improved their prior proposals. However Shopoff has failed to make changes to address the most important and fundamental desires of the San Pacifico community:

- creating a Ponto Beach Neighborhood Park (the Local Coastal Program also requires that this site be considered for a park)
- reducing density to be near 15 dwelling units per acre
- withdrawing Shopoff’s proposed zoning change to transfer optional residential density from the west to the east side of Ponto Rd.
- limiting building height to no greater than 2-stories and no taller than 30-35 feet
- reducing building mass and intensity to be consistent with San Pacifico
- creating a wide public coastal view corridor along Avenida Encinas
- removing the proposed main commercial driveway entry on Avenida Encinas
- providing sufficient public beach parking

Go to www.pontolocals.com to see Shopoff’s proposed development.

13. NEXT STEPS

Concerns and requests submitted to Carlsbad City Council et. al.

In their letter's "Next Steps", Shopoff failed to disclose that they, or the City on the developer's behalf, will need to receive California Coastal Commission approval of Shopoff's needed amendments to the Local Coastal Program after all Carlsbad City approvals.

The Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program for the site requires that **"As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad."** Also the California Coastal Commission staff has stated that the City "shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City's Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City's land use and zoning maps as necessary. **This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area."**

Not completely disclosing the necessary and critical California Coastal Commission and public review and hearing process is yet another example of Shopoff misleading you.

The PBDRC has put on our www.pontolocals.com website the actual City and Coastal Commission Planning documents along with Shopoff's actual proposed changes to zoning and development proposal, so you can see and confirm the facts for yourself.

Thank you for caring about our coast and assuring we Develop Ponto Right.

Sincerely,
Your PBDRC

Item #6 – Questions for City and Shopoff regarding Shopoff Planning Applications

Emailed: 7-31-18

To: <matt.hall@carlsbadca.gov>, <council@carlsbadca.gov>, <manager@carlsbadca.gov>, <jason.goff@carlsbadca.gov>, <debbie.fountain@carlsbadca.gov>, <sheila.cobian@carlsbadca.gov>, <chrishazeltine@carlsbadca.gov>, <faviola.medina@carlsbadca.gov>, <don.neu@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: <meyers-schulte@scglobal.net>, <chaswick@reagan.com>, Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov, Gabriel.Buhr@coastal.ca.gov

Subject: Questions for City of Carlsbad and Shopoff re: Shopoff Planning Applications for Ponto Beachfront Development

Dear Matt Hall- Mayor City of Carlsbad; Council Members; City Staff,

Please find attached 3 pages of questions we have for the City Council, City staff and Shopoff regarding the Ponto Beachfront proposed development plans and applications. We thank you for taking the time to review our questions that we have attached. Please feel free to contact Lance Schulte or me with any questions you may have.

Respectfully,

Chas Wick

Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee

Erin, Gabriel,

Please find attached the questions we sent to City Council and staff regarding Shopoff's proposed plans and applications. Thank you for taking the time to review these questions. Thank you also for meeting with us awhile back in your offices and listening to our questions. Please call/ contact Lance or me if you have any questions about anything that may fall in your purview for this project.

Thanks,

Chas Wick

909-721-1765 chaswick@reagan.com

Questions for City and Shopoff re Shopoff Planning Applications

PLANNING QUESTIONS FOR THE CITY

- 1) Please provide information on what other residential developments in Carlsbad are at the proposed intensity of Shopoff's proposed residential development on a Floor to Area (FAR) Ratio. Shopoff's proposed development has an FAR of 1.79 that will be 3.5 times the intensity of the Hilton Cape Rey and we believe, based on public records requests, will be the most intense residential development in all of Carlsbad. It will propose a new intensity of residential buildings inconsistent with the long established residential character of the surrounding community and Carlsbad's Coastal Zone.
- 2) Please provide details and justification on why the City is entertaining 3 story, 40 foot tall structures in an area that should be 2 story, 30-35 foot high to be consistent with the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan images and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and comply with the policy requirements of the Local Coastal Program and California Coastal Act ?

- 3) Please provide details and justification as to why the City is entertaining allowing 136 dwelling units on a parcel that should have a minimum requirement of 98 dwelling units.
 - a. Please confirm whether or not you are considering allowing a density transfer from the commercial parcel to the residential parcel. If so, please confirm that you will first need to amend the General Plan and make General Plan findings to properly make this transfer.
 - b. Please confirm that if the density transfer between parcels goes through a General Plan Amendment, that the 25% portion of commercial land used for residential density and being transferred is retained as Open Space on the Donor commercial site. This prevents “Double Dipping”. If a density transfer is allowed (which means you are linking parcels), that you will require that Building Completion Certificates, Final Inspections and/or Occupancy Certificates are granted for the Commercial buildings PRIOR to any Occupancy Certificates being issued for the residential units. This will help ensure that the Commercial buildings are actually going to be built and not just that the Commercial property was used to gain dwelling units on the residential site.
 - c. Please explain how the Shopoff proposal of 21 du/acre fits with the Ponto Village Vision Plan of 12-16 du/acre and why you are not having Shopoff design at the minimum of R-23 which is 15 du/acre, as shown in the Housing Element.
- 4) On the previous issue of Shopoff’s plans dwg A1-1, there was a Common Area/Open Space of 0.57 acres next to the Commercial buildings. On the current Shopoff plan dwg A1-1, the Common Area/Open Space has been eliminated or deleted. (See their plans.)

In fact, we understand from the US Fish and Wildlife, that Shopoff mowed down too much of the protected sage scrub habitat (endangered gnatcatcher habitat) that was originally in this Open Space and will be penalized – likely having to increase protected habitat by 3 to 15 times that amount that Shopoff destroyed. Please explain how the City allowed this to happen?

- a. Please explain what happened to The Commons/0.57 acres of grassy space the community was originally promised? Was the City involved in this decision?
 - b. Please explain what will happen to the Commercial site layout once the protected habitat mitigation area is increased. Will parking be put underground? Will Shopoff reduce the current size of the Commercial buildings?
 - c. There appears to be a drainage basin proposed for the protected habitat area. Is a drainage facility consistent with habitat preservation? Is the drainage basin fenced? What will happen to this basin once the protected habitat area is increased?
- 5) Please explain why the City is entertaining a subdivision of 9 lots on the residential (5) and commercial (4) sites.
 - a. Will this increase set-backs on each buildable lot and if so, by how much? Have you taken that into consideration?

- b. Since the entitlements will likely be sold off to separate developers, how will the City ensure all the plan requirements are met?
 - c. How will the City ensure that the buildings provide a cohesive and consistent construction and visible quality/fit with one another?
 - d. How will the City ensure all residential and commercial projects go forward together in the most effective and shortest timeframe for surrounding neighbors?
 - e. How will ownership/HOAs be handled if you have a multitude of different developers for the 2 current parcels?
- 6) Please strongly consider angled parking on Ponto Road to maximize beach parking. Please explain why you continue to push for parallel parking on Ponto Road and what long-term beach parking demand analysis is being used to not provide angled parking that could maximize beach parking supply. Please detail how many cars you can get with angled parking versus parallel parking.
- 7) What other traffic measures and improvements are you having Shopoff make?
- 8) What are the Carlsbad Boulevard frontage improvements you are having Shopoff make?

Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program requires Shopoff to provide Carlsbad Boulevard frontage improvements. The City's ROW and older PCH ROW fronts Shopoff's site.

QUESTIONS FOR SHOPOFF ON THEIR PLANS AND APPLICATION

- 1) The pedestrian and bike travel paths on the Roundabout on Avenida Encinas appears unsafe. Please review and reply on how to make this a safer situation for all concerned.
- 2) There appears to be an unsafe pedestrian path at the commercial Avenida Encinas main entry. Please review and reply on how to make this a safer situation for pedestrians and bikes. A commercial main entry on Carlsbad Boulevard is a better approach and has been done many times in Carlsbad.
- 3) What are the UBC requirements on elevators? How many are required per unit/building? Does Shopoff's plans have enough? Will elevator equipment exceed building heights or require deeper subterranean infrastructure ?
- 4) How will Shopoff sewer the property?
- 5) Can you please provide a diagram that shows trash/recycling storage and how trash/recycling vehicles will enter, manage trash / recycles and exit the sites? It appears trash and recycles will be underground on the residential site.
- 6) What is the distance of balconies to the property line at Avenida Encinas? Is that per Code?

- 7) There appears to be insufficient landscape materials proposed for the hard surfaced wall facing the railroad and San Pacifico. Please provide proper noise buffering / noise absorbing materials on the wall and provide the technical information on their ratings compared to the proposed landscape plantings.
- 8) The Landscape map and tentative map are inconsistent with the pork chop/pedestrian crossing plans.
- 9) Some lights are up-facing and/or unshielded. Please confirm all exterior lights/pole lights will be downwards facing and not provide unnecessary light "pollution" to the adjacent neighborhoods or traffic on the adjacent roadways.
- 10) Please confirm whether or not Shopoff will provide materials on the buildings to increase wireless communication/reception within their and adjoining developments.

Item #7 Community offer to Shopoff to work towards Land Swap for Park and Open Space at Ponto and/or fundamental community desires for development

Email Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 10:07 AM

To: 'Brian Rupp' (brupp@shopoff.com)

Cc: Sebahar Family Email (sebbiesixpack@att.net); 'Harry Peacock'; matt.hall@carlsbadca.gov; Council Internet Email (CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov); 'Gail Norman'; 'John Gama'; Chas Wick (chaswick@reagan.com); 'Stacy King'; Erin Prahler (Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov); Gabriel Buhr (gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov); debbie.fountain@carlsbadca.gov; Chris Hazeltine

Subject: RE: Confirmation of Shopoff position on land swap solution

Importance: High

Brian:

We still have not heard back from you regarding the 2017 email below.

Recently we met with Matt Hall, and he asked we reach out to you again to restart a dialog. We want to see if we can dialog with you to explore solutions consistent with community desires and that work to the betterment of Carlsbad in providing equitable Open Space and Park facilities, and in providing land use intensity compatibility.

As you know last year we proposed to you an opportunity to work collaboratively for the betterment of Carlsbad in a land swap. We understand as your website says: "As a private investment firm, Shopoff Realty Investments places the needs of our investors above all else," however given the Growth Management Program Open Space and Parks issues, Local Coastal Program issues regarding priority uses and compatibility it maybe in the best interests of your investors to dialog about options.

You may think we are anti-development or anti-Shopoff, but that is not the case. We are pro Carlsbad and simply want to make sure as a City we Develop Ponto Right for present and future generations. We have already provided you creative solutions that, as your PMs indicated, were better and more resilient designs.

We offer to meet with you to dialog with you to explore solutions consistent with community desires and that work to the betterment of Carlsbad.

Let us know.

Lance

Included copy of email sent: Friday, August 18, 2017 10:04 AM

To: 'Brian Rupp' (brupp@shopoff.com)

Cc: Sebahar Family Email (sebbiesixpack@att.net); Jean Camp (jeanscamp@yahoo.com)

Subject: Confirmation of Shopoff position on land swap solution

Importance: High

Brian:

As we believe you know from our latest community polling approximately 95% of San Pacifico residents would like to see as a public park as the best land use for the 'east proposed residential site'. If the site is developed as residential, which we think is not the best use of this coastal land, then development consistent with the images and intensities shown in the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan – basically 2-story Townhomes and density closer to 15 dwellings per acre – is acceptable. However the desired land use is park and open space for an area of Coastal and South Carlsbad that is lacking in both those land uses.

John Sherritt communicated with you on June 22, and again as follow-up on July 6 2017 to communicate to you those community desires and to offer you an opportunity to work with the community in a collaborative and supportive partnership to achieve the primary and best use of the site as a public park. We researched, developed and John presented to you an approach that we could work with you to make Shopoff financially whole in creating a Ponto Beach Park on the site. That approach as outlined by John was to work with you and the City to 'land swap' the Ponto site for an equivalent land density and value on the westerly portion of Veterans Park. The sloped site provides extensive ocean/lagoon views, is adjacent to high quality high density residential, is surrounded by extensive Park and open space land uses and amenities, and is very near major employment centers and school sites – an ideal place for high density housing. A land swap approach would be similar to the Poinsettia 61 effort that can be a positive solution to all concerned. You would have community support for that solution.

John communicated back to the community that after your two meetings, that you had chosen to reject our solution and offer of collaboration. We simply would like to get your email confirmation that you rejected this solution, and if that rejection is permanent and not subject to any reconsideration in the future? Can you please confirm?

Thanks,
Lance

Item #8 Three (3) citizens' presentations made to the prior Carlsbad City Council asking they correct the Coastal Park gap and Growth Management Program Open Space defects in Coastal South Carlsbad

Sent: Sunday, July 7, 2019 10:11 AM

To: 'Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov'; 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov'; 'lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov'; 'Kathleen@carlsbad.org'; 'mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov'; 'gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov'; 'cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: prior Citizen presentation of requests and data to Carlsbad City Council to be provided to City Commissions and CCC public record regarding Coastal South Carlsbad Park and Open Space gaps-deficits and LCP requirements

Dear Mayor and Carlsbad City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Commission; and California Coastal Commission:

Attached please find three (3) presentations made in 2018 to the prior Carlsbad City Council regarding People for Ponto citizen requests to address the documented Coastal Park and Open Space gaps/deficits in Coastal South Carlsbad. We request these prior public communications along with the 4th attachment be part of the public record and be provided to and considered by the City Parks and Planning Commissions and City Council, and CA Coastal Commission in the Carlsbad Local Coastal Program (LCP), Planning Area F LCP and Master Plan, City's Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Plan updates, amendments to the Local Facility Management Plan for Zone 9, Veterans Park, real estate, and budget issues and other interrelated issues.

The 4th attachment is in reply to Carlsbad Councilperson Keith Blackburn's 10/23/18 request to show in an image how Poinsettia Park's service area effects the Coastal South Carlsbad park gap and deficit. The data in this attachment is from the City's Parks Master Plan and shows even with the City's 'broad abstract as the bird flies' defined service area of Poinsettia Park there remains a significant Coastal Park service gap at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad.

The unfulfilled Planning Area F LCP requirements to consider a Public Park at Ponto, the documented Growth Management Park and Open Space Standard deficits in Coastal South Carlsbad seem to justify a comprehensive, open and honest community-based planning process as initially requested by citizens in 2017.

Thank you.

Lance Schulte
People for Ponto, and Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3



FY 18-19 O&CIP
Budget agenda item 1

#1: 6/12/18 City Council meeting presentation by citizen of Carlsbad:



Park agenda item 19
of 7-24-18 City Council

#2: 7/24/18 City Council meeting presentation by citizen of Carlsbad:



2018.10.23 Carlsbad
CC mtg - GMP Update

#3: 10/23/18 City Council meeting presentation by citizen of Carlsbad:

#4: Updated image requested by Councilman Keith Blackburn to show Poinsettia Park's official service area relative to the South Coastal Carlsbad Park gap and deficit. The blue circle(s) show the City's adopted service areas from the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan for each City Park based on the park size and the population surrounding the park. A large circle represents a large park and/or low population surrounding the park. The image below shows all the City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except for Aviara Park that is east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). Data is compiled from City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan pp 87-88.

Issue #1 – 6.6 Acre Park Deficit No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



Item #9 A 2/8/19 emailed letter from San Pacifico Community Association Board of Directors to Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions, and Staff; and CA Coastal Commission

From: Melinda Young [mailto:myoung@waltersmanagement.com]

Sent: Friday, February 8, 2019 3:22 PM

To: council@carlsbadca.gov; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; don.neu@carlsbadca.gov; manager@carlsbadca.gov; debbie.fountain@carlsbadca.gov; chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; gabriel.buhr@coastal.ca.gov; erin.prahler@coastal.ca.gov; david.decordova@carlsbadca.gov; jennifer.jesser@carlsbadCA.gov; jason.goff@carlsbadca.gov

Cc: Lance Schulte; Melinda Young

Subject: Correspondence supporting the People for Ponto Committee as submitted by the San Pacifico Community Association

Good Afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of the San Pacifico communities, please review the attached [below] correspondence which is extremely pertinent to the development of the Ponto Beach area.

Thank you very much.

Melinda Young, PCAM CCAM

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT

WALTERS Management

YOUR COMMUNITY. OUR COMMITMENT.

CELEBRATING 45 YEARS | 1973-2013

direct (858) 576-5547 | **office** (858) 495-0900 | **fax** (858) 495-0909

email myoung@waltersmanagement.com | **online** www.waltersmanagement.com

San Pacifico Community Association, c/o Walters Management
9665 Chesapeake Drive, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92123
858-495-0900

DATE: February 8, 2019

TO: Carlsbad City Council
Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Commission
Carlsbad Planning Commission
Scott Chadwick, Carlsbad City Manager
Debbie Fountain, Community Development Director
Chris Hazeltine, Parks and Recreation Director
Don Neu, Planning Director
California Coastal Commission

FROM: Board of Directors, San Pacifico Community Association

RE: Development of Ponto Beach Area / People for Ponto

Over the past several years the San Pacifico Community Association Board of Directors has supported the efforts made by the “People for Ponto” public interest group <http://www.peopleforponto.com> in their efforts to provide reasonable solutions to the development of the Ponto Beach Area that borders the San Pacifico Communities.

The following statement was provided to the San Pacifico Community Board of Directors by the People for Ponto Committee requesting continuing support. On January 31, 2019, during a scheduled Board of Directors meeting, the San Pacifico Community Board of Directors voted and approved the continuing support of the People of Ponto and are in support of the following statement:

The proposed Ponto Developer Shopoff has inappropriately and selectively used a portion of the 2015 letter from our San Pacifico Community Association Board that is out of date and out of context to the consensus views of the Community and Board.

The 2015 letter was only our initial comments on the proposed planning changes at Ponto in the General Plan update. Because our San Pacifico Community Association was not directly invited to participate during the General Plan Update process on proposed changes to the planned land use in one of our San Pacifico Community’s Planning Areas (Planning Area F), and we as citizens San Pacifico and a Board had little time to provide any input/response, we did the best we could under a short ‘11th hour’ timeline to understand the issues and reply with some sense of our Community input in 2015.

This failure, at the beginning and throughout the General Plan Update process, to invite and engage our Community Association on facts relevant to the proposed land use changes to one of our Master Planned Community’s Planning Areas is a fundamental flaw in the General Plan Update planning effort for our area. To respond to that process flaw the Board endorsed a Ponto Beachfront Development Committee to:

- *Gather factual information on Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad land use planning issues*
- *Provide that information to the Community and gather Community consensus*
- *Present that consensus to the City, CA Coastal Commission and developers*

The Committee then started researching the planning issues at Ponto. The Committee found several key issues that were not disclosed or accurately represented during both the City’s and Developer’s Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning efforts. Most notably are:

- *A prior inaccurate exemption given to developers in LFMP Zone 9 that so far has allowed developers to inaccurately avoid complying with the Growth Management Open Space Standard. This resulted in developers over building in LFMP Zone 9 and not providing 30-acres of open space needed to meet the Minimum Growth Management Standard for Open Space. Shopoff the proposed developer has to formally amend the LFMP Zone 9 to account for their proposed change in LCP Land Use Zoning from the existing “Nonresidential Reserve” to a proposed Residential and Commercial land use. The developer is currently proposing to not address the Open Space facility standard deficit with their proposed LFMP Zone 9 Amendment.*

- *The failure to follow the Carlsbad Local Coastal Program (General Plan and Zoning requirements of the City of Carlsbad and the California Coastal Commission) for Planning Area F that required a formal consideration of a “Public Park and/or Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” prior to “any planning effort to change the “non-residential land use on our Community’s Planning Area F. The failure to consider a “Public Park and/or Lowcost Visitor Accommodations” occurred both at the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning efforts.*

Concerns and requests submitted to Carlsbad City Council et. al.

To confirm facts, the Committee requested over 20 official Carlsbad Public Records Requests to get answers to questions and then used accurate and documented data to ask our Community members on their opinions and desires on proposed planning and development of our Community's remaining vacant San Pacifico Community Association Planning Areas, and define a Community consensus on planning and development options. Since 2015 numerous communications documenting Community consensus on the issues has been sent have been including emails of 8/31/18, 12/4/17, 12/5/17, 3/6/18, 3/22/18, and 8/15/18, along with numerous individual emails.

As planning issues progress we kindly request to be proactively invited and involved in the processes.
Sincerely,

San Pacifico Community Association Board
People for Ponto Committee

cc: Dave de Cordova, Principal Planner
Jennifer Jesser, Senior Planner
Jason Goff, Senior Planner
Lance Schulte, People for Ponto
San Pacifico Community Association"

Item #10 A 11/14/19 emailed DLCPA public comments and requests regarding flawed planning process at Ponto including critical public disclosure/participation failures by the City, proposed Ponto land use changes in conflict with CA Coastal Act, request to restart Ponto planning

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2019 9:13 AM

To: 'Jennifer Jesser'

Cc: 'Melanie Saucier'; 'Celia Brewer'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Cort Hitchens'; 'Erin Prahler'; 'Gabriel Buhr'; 'Mike Sebahar'; 'Harry Peacock'; 'John Gama'; 'John Gama'; 'Chas Wick'; 'Stacy King'; 'Don Neu'; 'Nika Richardson'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Jim Nardi'; Lisa Urbach (lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov)

Subject: RE: LCPA public Comment - request for receipt of public comments & documents

Jenifer:

I would like to include this email and the attached document as part of the LCPA Public Comments and Requests related to Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and maintain the Existing Carlsbad LCP land use designation of "Non-residential Reserve" on Planning Area F until a truly comprehensive and Community-based planning process can determine the Forever "High-Coastal-Priority" land use needs at Ponto, South Coastal Carlsbad, and to assure no overconcentration of "High/Low-Coastal-Priority" land uses.

The proposed LUP defines the forever/buildout Coastal land use for Carlsbad, and as documented the prior Ponto planning processes (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan [PBVVP] and the General Plan Update that is based on PBVVP) were both fundamentally flawed by not disclosing to Citizens and the San Pacifico Community Association about the Existing Carlsbad LCP requirements for Planning Area F and inviting public participation and discussion of the Existing Carlsbad LCP requirements for Planning Area F. The proposed LUP's reliance on the fundamentally flawed prior planning (PBVVP and General Plan Update) at Ponto is inappropriate. These fundamental flaws in planning process and public participation cannot be remedied by simply a Staff Report discussion.

It seem logical that these fundamental flaws in the PBVVP, General Plan Update, and the LUP (which is based on the PBVVP and General Plan Update) are best corrected by maintaining the Existing LCP for Planning Area F and possibly leaving the entire Ponto Area as an Area of Deferred Certification until a truly comprehensive Community-based Planning process for Ponto can be completed. This is a reasonable and logical approach as the vacant Coastal land at Ponto is some of the last remaining significant sized vacant Coastal in all North San Diego County and is the in the center of a 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap with no Coastal Park. This logic is further amplified by the impacts of Sea Level Rise on "High-Coastal Priority" land uses at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad, and the CA Coastal Act policy to reserve Upland Areas for "High-Coastal Priority" land uses.

Confirmation receipt and any staff response are appreciated.

Thanks,

Lance

Attachment: Local Coastal Program requirements for Planning Area F at Ponto: Data from Official Carlsbad Public Record Requests by citizens group People for Ponto www.peopleforponto.com

Ponto is in the California Coastal Zone and land use and development decisions must not only be consistent with the City of Carlsbad General Plan and Ordinances but must also be consistent with the California Coastal Act (CCA). Per our Constitution, if there is a conflict between local City plans and the State's Coastal Act the Coastal Act prevails. The California Coastal Commission (CCC) is the State commission that makes development decisions in the Coastal Zone.


Relevant Basic Goals of the State of California for the Coastal Zone are to:

- Maximize public access to and along the coast and **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners.
- **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.**
- **The Legislature further finds and declares that the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning, conservation, and development; that achievement of sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support; and that the continuing planning and implementation of programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**

The CCA priority land uses to achieve the above basic California Coastal Act goals are:

- maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone
- Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.
- The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.
- Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible.
- Public facilities [such as Public Parks] shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.
- Assure priority for coastal -dependent and coastal-related development [i.e. lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) as noted in the Planning Area F LCP requirements]

The Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program (PSMP/LCP) adopted in 1996 is the City's and CA Coastal Commission Existing Adopted Coastal 'general plan land use and zoning' and regulations for Planning Area F in the San Pacifico Community at Ponto. See the following land use zoning map from the current PSMP/LCP:



The current City and CA Coastal Commission adopted land use zoning and regulations for this Planning Area F is found on page 101 Carlsbad’s Existing Local Coastal Program at <http://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=24088> and reads as follows (bold face added for emphasis):

“10. PLANNING AREA F: Planning Area F is located at the far northwest corner of the Master Plan area west of the AT&SF Railway right-of-way. This Planning Area has a gross area of 11 acres and a net developable area of 10.7 acres. **Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an “unplanned” area, for which land uses will be determined at a later date when more specific planning is carried out for areas west of the railroad right-of-way. A future Major Master Plan Amendment will be required prior to further development approvals for Planning Area F, and shall include an LCP Amendment with associated environmental review, if determined necessary.** The intent of the NRR designation is not to limit the range of potential future uses entirely to non-residential, however, since the City’s current general plan does not contain an “unplanned” designation, NRR was determined to be appropriate at this time. In the future, if the Local Coastal Program Amendment has not been processed, and the City develops an “unplanned” General Plan designation, then this site would likely be redesignated as “unplanned.” Future uses could include, but are not limited to: commercial, residential, office, and other uses, subject to future review and approval. **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.”**

Planning Area F was originally agriculture, then in 1985 Planning Area F's planned land use was changed to Travel Service Commercial uses. Then in 1996 was changed to the current Non-Residential Reserve (a blank holding zone) land use as noted above. Since Non-Residential Reserve had no planned land use associated with it a specific requirement of the PSMP/LCP for Subarea F was that: **"As part of any future planning effort, the city and developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad."** [see Planning Area F regulations on page 101 of current Carlsbad Local Coastal Program]

The City around 2005 adopted a Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP) that adopted with primarily speculative developer input a City vision for Planning Area F with a Mixed-use Commercial area west of Ponto Drive and a 2-story Townhouse Neighborhood east of Ponto Drive. **The City in this 2005 PBVVP 'planning effort' did not fully disclose to citizens the existence of the adopted Planning Area F LCP land use zoning requirements, nor did the City comply with the LCP for Planning Area F to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park)".** The City submitted the PBVVP to the CCC as a Local Coastal Program Amendment for Planning Area F; and in 2010 the CCC rejected the City's proposed LCP Amendment, Stating: "... there has been no evidence presented that would support the elimination of these areas [i.e. Planning Area F] for some lower cost overnight accommodations or public recreational amenities in the future." [see pages 6-11 of CCC action item F21a denying Carlsbad proposed LCP Amendment 3-07B/RF dated July 22, 2010]

The City then 5-years later updated its General Plan in 2015 after a 7-year planning process using the same PBVVP as the basis for Coastal land use changes at Ponto and Planning Area F. The updated General Plan changed the City's proposed general planned land uses for Planning Area F from Non-Residential Reserve to General Commercial (GC) west of Ponto Drive and R-23 (Residential 15-23 dwellings an acre) east of Ponto Drive. Again, the City in this 2015 'planning effort' did not as required by the Planning Area F LCP requirement publically disclose and then consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park).

The lack of public disclosure/discussion, and compliance with the Planning Area F LCP requirements in both the City's 2010 PBVVP and 2015 General Plan Update processes was confirmed in 2017 with the following 3 official Carlsbad Public Records Requests (sometimes referred to a freedom of information act):

- # 2017-260
- #2017-261 and
- #2017-262

We request that the above 3 official Carlsbad Public Records Requests, including City replies to follow-up questions, be fully included as Public Comments in the 2019 LCPA.

Why didn't the City publically disclose and follow the existing (since 1996) LCP requirements for Ponto/Planning Area F during the 2010 PBVVP and 2015 General Plan Update? The PBVVP and General Plan Update processes were/are both fundamentally flawed due to this non-disclosure and non-compliance and did not allow full and just consideration of Coastal Priority land uses for Planning Area F.

As noted the Public Records Requests confirmed that the City did not specifically disclose and reach out to Carlsbad Citizens and the San Pacifico Community Association specifically regarding the requirements

to propose changes to Planning Area F. Planning Area F is one of the planning areas of the San Pacifico Community Association.

The City's failure twice, both during the City's 2010 PBVVP and 2015 General Plan Update 'planning efforts' to fully disclose and implement the Planning Area F LCP requirements was and still is in conflict with CA Coastal Act goal indicating the **"public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning, conservation, and development; that achievement of sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support; and that the continuing planning and implementation of programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation"**

As noted it took until 2017 for the People for Ponto citizen group to first find the Planning Area F LCP requirements at Ponto and confirm the City's failure to publically disclose and implement the existence of the Planning Area F LCP requirements at Ponto by getting documented confirmation through Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and inquiries with CCC Staff. In 2017 Coastal Commission Staff indicated that: "The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City's Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City's land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area."

On 8/31/17 (see Item #1 of 'Concerns and requests emailed to the Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions; and California Coastal Commission as of 8-2-18' that was previously provided as public comment on the LCPA) People for Ponto emailed the Carlsbad City Council to ask that a Ponto Coastal Park be provided and that San Pacifico Community Association be invited and engaged in the planning discussions. The email cited numerous Carlsbad General Plan Community Vision statements and data on City Park Standard deficits at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad that clearly supported creation of a Ponto Coastal Park. The email was a request of the Carlsbad City Council to basically restart the Ponto Planning Effort on Planning Area F with an open and honest community-based planning effort before this last area of vacant Coastal land is committed to any development.

The email was resent to the City Council on 3/6/18 due to no City response to the initial 8/17/17 email. Although the City Staff has responded by rejecting Citizens' requests to reset and restart the Ponto Area Planning Effort to address the Public Park needs at Ponto; we did finally on 10/31/19 receive an email confirmation from City Staff that "Regarding concerns about recreation uses in the Ponto area, the staff reports will include an analysis of the need for lower-cost recreation and visitor accommodations in the Ponto area." The actual LCP requirement notes "(i.e. Public Park)" not just 'lower-cost recreation'. The 10/31/19 email is the first City acknowledgement since the initial 2017 People for Ponto email, that the City will follow the existing LCP requirements for Planning Area F. Unfortunately it likely is not the best way to address the of the existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and most importantly the Goals and Policies of the CA Coastal Act.

As further public comments we would like to suggest maintaining Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" Coastal land use (LUP) and Coastal zoning designation along with considering the entire Ponto area as a Deferred Area of LCP Certification to allow the City to reset the Coastal planning at Ponto and start anew with a comprehensive and open Community-based Planning Process that fully

addresses CA Coastal Act Goals and Policies and openly involves San Pacifico Community Association, the Citizens of South Carlsbad, and Citizens regionally. This is vitally important given Ponto is the last major vacant land in the center of a regional 6-mile coastal Park gap, and the only vacant Upland Area to a major regional Low-cost Visitor Accommodation (South Carlsbad State Campground) that is subject to destruction from sea bluff erosion due to sea level rise and increase weather events from climate change.

References:

1. California Coastal Act: see https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayexpandedbranch.xhtml?tocCode=PRC&division=20.&title=&part=&chapter=&article=

Item #11 a 11/18/19 emailed DLCPA public comments and questions regarding Existing LCP and Proposed Draft LCPA policy requirements to move Carlsbad Boulevard inland and movement of high-priority coastal land uses due to planned sea level rise and coastal erosion

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 8:30 AM

To: 'Jennifer Jesser'

Cc: 'Melanie Saucier'; 'Celia Brewer'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Cort Hitchens'; 'Erin Prahler'; 'Gabriel Buhr'; 'Mike Sebahar'; 'Harry Peacock'; 'John Gama'; 'John Gama'; 'Chas Wick'; 'Stacy King'; 'Don Neu'; 'Nika Richardson'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Jim Nardi'; 'Lisa Urbach'; Fred Sandquist (sandquist2@earthlink.net); David Hill (dashill4551@gmail.com); 'David Hill'

Subject: LCPA public Comment - Existing and LCPA Proposed policy-requirement to move Carlsbad Blvd inland in South Carlsbad & movement of High-Priority uses to respond to a new-natural shoreline-bluff

Jennifer:

The City required developers along Carlsbad Boulevard (aka, PCH) to move the Carlsbad Boulevard lanes inland. This can be seen on the most recent developments along Carlsbad Boulevard from Breakwater Road to Ponto Road. A few Public Comments questions on the Proposed LCPA are:

1. What Local Coastal Program (LCP) and/or City policy, ordinance, or criteria required the developers to move the Carlsbad Boulevard lanes inland?
2. What is/was the specific language and location citation for such policy, ordinance, or criteria?
3. Is that language being maintained in the Proposed LCP Amendment, and if so where and what is the language?
4. If not, why is it being eliminated or altered in the LCPA?
5. For the Cape Rey Resort development south of Ponto Road, the developer was not required to move the Carlsbad Boulevard lanes inland, like the developments to the north. Why is that?
6. I understand that the landscape frontage of the Cape Rey Resort is actually City property, is that true?
7. Will the City be required to fund and move Carlsbad Boulevard lanes inland along the Cape Rey Resort frontage at a later date?
8. I understood the requirement of moving Carlsbad Boulevard lanes inland in South Carlsbad was to provide space for the State Campground to migrate inland as coastal bluff erosion. Is this correct or is/was there another reason for moving Carlsbad Boulevard lanes inland in South Carlsbad?
9. The Proposed LCPA identifies increased Coastal Bluff erosion due in part to Sea Level Rise (SLR) that will create a new-natural shoreline and coastal bluff. But what is the Proposed LCPA plan and policies for accommodating the new-natural shoreline/bluff and preserving by migrating inland "High-Coastal-Priority" features and Land Uses like the beach and State Campground subject to the LCPA's projected and planned Coastal Bluff erosion and SLR?
10. The proposed LCPA identifies projected/planned SLR impacts on public access trails, a community nature center around East Batiquitos Lagoon. What is the Proposed LCPA plan and policies for accommodating the new-natural Batiquitos Lagoon shoreline and preserving by migrating inland "High-Coastal-Priority" features like the public access trails, and planning a new location for the community nature center subject to the LCPA's projected and planned SLR?
11. Are these "High-Coastal-Priority" features and Land Uses in the Proposed LCPA to be allowed and planned in the Proposed LCAP to move inland or to other locations as coastal erosion and

Concerns and requests submitted to Carlsbad City Council et. al.

SLR undermine, put underwater, or eliminate access to these “High-Coastal-Priority” features and land uses in their current locations?

Thank you for including and responding to these LCPA Public Comment questions.
Lance Schulte

Item #12 1/28/20 emailed public comments to The City of Carlsbad and City Council documenting errors/omissions/misrepresentations in the Staff Report for Agenda Item #14 on 1/28/20 City Council meeting and the Public Comments to be included as Public Comments on the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 4:29 PM

To: 'info@peopleforponto.com'; 'Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov'; 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov'; 'lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov'; 'Kathleen@carlsbad.org'; 'mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov'; 'gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov'; 'cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov'; 'jennifer.jesser@carlsbadca.gov'

Cc: 'Fred Sandquist'; 'David Hill'

Subject: RE: 2020 Jan 28 Carlsbad City Council meeting - Agenda item #14 citizen testimony - updated information

Dear City Council:

Please replace the prior testimony with the attached file. In the haste to get you comments ASAP before the meeting I forgot to include a correction to the Housing Element data staff provided. The actual Housing Element data is different from tonight's staff report, and the attached updated testimony includes a copy from the City Housing Element to show that correction.

Also, People for Ponto would like to request that this email and attached file be part of the official public comments on the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 2:37 PM

To: info@peopleforponto.com; Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov; CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov; Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov; Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov; Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov; jennifer.jesser@carlsbadca.gov

Cc: Fred Sandquist; David Hill

Subject: 2020 Jan 28 Carlsbad City Council meeting - Agenda item #14 citizen testimony

Importance: High

Dear City Council:

Please receive the attached information as part of your agenda Item #14 on 1/28/20 meeting. We apologize for the late input, but we were not aware of the agenda item or meeting. The attached notes some critical information that appears missing in the agenda report and attempts to provide more complete information. People for Ponto also asks, like other citizen groups, how we can talk with you to create a better process for the Staff proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
People for Ponto

Email Attachment:

Carlsbad City Council meeting of 1-28-20 agenda item #14

People for Ponto apologize for this late and hastily, review and comments. We just found out about the meeting this morning. We citizens know we can together achieve grate things if you allow us to work with you.

Staff
Report

Page clarification/correction:

1 The LCP Land Use Plan Update is in fact an Amendment to an Existing LCP Land Use Plan. The Existing LCP Land Use Plan is already certified by the CA Coastal Commission as being consistent with the CA Coastal Act, except for some Amendments needed to address Sea Level Rise impacts and some other issues.

The LCP Amendment proposes to change the Existing CA Coastal Commission certified LCP Land Use Plan's "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use and Policy on Planning Area F to consider and document the need for "i.e. Public Park" at Ponto .

- 1 Staff summarizes the CA Coastal Act objectives to "ensure maximum public access to the coast and public recreation areas."
- Carlsbad's Adopted Park Service Area/Equity Mapping shows there is no Park Service for the Ponto Area and Ponto Citizens, and no Park Service for the Coastal South Carlsbad area west of Interstate-5 and the rail corridor.
 - The City's mapping of land that meets the developer required Growth Management Open Space Standard of 15% Unconstrained land shows about 30-acres of this Open Space is missing at Ponto. This missing Open Space could have provided needed Park facilities that are missing at Ponto.
 - Citizens in over 2,500 emails to the City Council have cited the need for a Public Park at Ponto as part of the Existing LCP Land Use Plan Amendment proposed at Ponto. These requests area consistent with the CA Coastal Act.
- 3 2nd bullet: says city staff proposes to replace, amend, or retain various Existing LCP policies, so the Staff has a documented understanding how each Existing LCP policy and how each Existing policy is being treated in the proposed Amendment. Citizens asked in Oct 20, 2019 for this 'redline' version of the Existing LCP Policies and Land Use Maps so citizens can understand what the Amendments are so we as citizens could then provide informed public comment. This 'redline' version is also important for the City Council and Planning and other Commissions so they know what Amendments to Existing City LCP Land Use policy are being proposed. Citizens again request this 'redline' version that it appears the staff already has as they know what Existing LCP Land Use policies are being replaced, amended, or retained.

- 4 V is incomplete: the community asked on Oct 20, 2019 for 3 things: 1) a 'redline' version as noted above, 2) true Public Workshops to help inform and resolve community concerns about the proposed LCP Land Use Plan Amendments, and 3) more public review time to provide for the above two other requests. All 3 requests should be acknowledged in the staff report. All 3 requests are rational and reasonable considering the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is the "buildout" plan for Carlsbad's Coastal Zone and there were multiple documented fundamental "planning mistakes" regarding past City public information and participation in the Coastal Land Use planning. Providing such a process would help to correct these documented 'planning mistakes' that have gone on for many years. It is the right thing to do and most productive approach for all concerned.

- 7 Staff should accurately disclose that in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission in fact rejected the City's proposed Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for failing to disclose and comply with the then and current LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto. Carlsbad Public Record Requests confirmed the staff did not disclose to citizens the existence LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto, so citizens had no idea a Public Park at Planning Area F at Ponto needed to be considered. How can citizens, provide input if they don't have complete and accurate to review and comment on?

- 8 Staff should correctly disclose that the 2015 application at Planning Area F at Ponto is first for a Local Coastal Program Amendment and Master Plan Amendment. These are both applications to change City Land Use Plan Policy and Zoning regulations. The actual applications for 'development' permits can in fact not even be considered by the City the Local Coastal Program Land Use of "Non-residential Reserve" is changed and Master Plan rezoning is approved. Then the 'development' permit application can be applied for. The developer abandoned their application to change the LCP and Master Plan and then apply for developer permit review about a year ago. However, the city staff is keeping the application 'alive' even though there has been no progress on the application for over a year. It is unclear if the staff has authority to do this, or if the City Council has authority to withdraw the application due to non-activity. The City has permit standards that withdraw applications if applicants make no progress on the applications after 6-months. What is troubling is that it appears the city staff proposal is to process the developer's application to change the Existing LCP Land Use Plan for the developer.

Staff notes that the Planning Area F sites now designated as Residential R-23 and General Commercial by the Carlsbad General Plan Update. However, staff fails to disclose that until the Existing LCP Land Use Plan Amended is in fact approved by the CA Coastal Commission the Existing LCP Land Use Plan for Planning Area F supersedes the City's General Plan Update.

Carlsbad's General Plan Land Use Element clearly states this on page 2-26 "The city's LCP Land Use Plan will be updated consistent with this General Plan. However, to take effect, the LCP must be certified by the Coastal Commission as well as adopted by the city. Until such time that this occurs, the existing (as of 2013) LCP must be adhered to." So until the City Council adopts the staff's proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment, AND the CA Coastal Commission "certifies" that LCP LUP Amendment; the City's General Plan Update Land Use change cannot take effect. The General Plan Land Use at Ponto Planning Area F has in fact not been changed by the General Plan Update, but can only change with staff's proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment that the City Council can choose to approve or disapprove. Also official Public Records Requests have documented that the City's General Plan Update planning process was fundamentally flawed at Ponto. Again, like during Ponto Beachfront Village Vision

Plan planning process a few years earlier the city failed to comply with the then and current LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto. The flawed General Plan Update process at Ponto prevented Citizens from knowing the facts so they could properly participate and provide review and comment during the General Plan Update. The significant citizen comments to the City Council asking for a Ponto Coastal Park is reflective of the fundamental public disclosure and processing flaws that the city is only now acknowledging as one of the repeated 'planning mistakes' at Ponto. This is why citizens are asking for full disclosure of the facts and a complete planning process re-boot at Ponto. It also should be noted that the Existing LCP Land Use Policy for Planning Area F states that **"as part of any future planning effort ... consideration of a "Public Park" is required.** CA Coastal Commission Staff has indicated the City's proposed land use planning changes at Ponto as part of the General Plan Update are subject to change.

At the bottom of the page regarding SB 330, as noted above the "residential land use designation on the site" is not in effect until the currently proposed LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is both approved the City Council AND also certified by the CA Coastal Commission, so SB 330 does not apply. Also SB 330 has specific language that exempts land use in the Coastal Zone. SB 330 (Skinner) Section 13 states: **"(2) Nothing in this section supersedes, limits, or otherwise modifies the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976** (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code). **For a housing development project proposed within the coastal zone, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an affected county or an affected city from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition necessary to implement or amend a certified local coastal program consistent with the California Coastal Act of 1976** (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code)." This language is consistent with CA case law, and other housing laws that recognize the obvious – there is very limited amount of Coastal land v. significant land area inland. Limited Coastal Land per the CA Coastal Act is needed for "High-Priority" Coastal Land Uses" - i.e. Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodations. The CA Coastal Act identifies both residential and general commercial land uses as "low-priority". So although affordable housing is important there are other more appropriate locations, than on the last remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad will be needed to address the "High-Priority" Coastal Land Uses to serve Carlsbad and California's 'buildout' needs. CA case law recognizes the supremacy of the CA Coastal Act over CA Housing Laws as noted in "Kalnel Gardens, LLC v. City of Los Angeles". This case law data has already been provided to the City Council as part of Staff's housing discussions over the past few years. The staff report should have disclosed the above information, as it appears SB 330 is not a factor at Ponto.

- 13 2005-2010 Housing Element: As noted above the General Plan Land Use Element states the General Plan Land Use Plan is not effective until the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is both approved by the City Council AND certified by the CA Coastal Commission. So, the Housing Element Cannot recognizes the proposed residential use change at Ponto until then. Also as noted before there were multiple documented fundamental 'planning mistakes' in public disclosure, participation and process that flawed the Housing Element. It should be noted that these flaws occurred during the time the CA Coastal Commission specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan due to those flaws. The now City acknowledged 'planning mistakes' at Ponto prevented Carlsbad citizens from providing informed participation during the Housing Element.

Also, it is unclear why the staff misrepresented the amount of housing proposed in the Housing Element on the Ponto Planning Area F site as “the Ponto site for high density residential use at a minimum density of 20 dwellings per acre (128 units minimum)”; as this is not true. The City’s General Plan promises only the minimum 15 dwelling units/acre for the R-23 Land Use designation. See the “Ponto” unit capacity table below from the City of Carlsbad General Plan Housing Element Table B-1 on page B-2 that lists 98 dwellings for the site on the east side of Ponto Road and 11 **optional dwellings** on the west side of Ponto Road for 109 total units for both sites, v. the 128 units mentioned by staff. Not sure why staff misrepresented the density by 17 to 30%.

| Table B-1: Vacant Sites for Lower and Moderate Income Housing | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----|----------|
| APN | General Plan Designation ¹ | Zoning District | Site Size (Acres) | Unit Capacity, by Household Income | | |
| | | | | Very Low | Low | Moderate |
| 2090901100 (Sunny Creek) | R15 (12 du/ac) | RD-M | 9.6 | - | - | 115 |
| 2161404300 (Ponto) | R23 | P-C | 6.5 | - | - | 98 |
| | GC (Mixed Use) ³ | P-C | 3 | - | - | 11 |

2007 Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan: As noted several times above there were fundamental public disclosure and participation flaws with this plan. It was rejected by the CA Coastal Commission in 2010 part for those reasons. These flaws are confirmed by the City’s own data as a result of multiple Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests. This should be disclosed to the City Council and citizens.

- 14 2015 General Plan Update: As noted several times above there were fundamental public disclosure and participation flaws with this Update with regards to Ponto. These flaws are confirmed by the City’s own data as a result of multiple Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests. This should be disclosed to the City Council and citizens.

Citizens are asking the City Staff and City Council:

- for honesty, to fully and publicly recognize and disclose the past “planning mistakes” at Ponto, and fundamental flaws from the from those mistakes that prevented citizens from knowing about and participating in the planning process for Ponto.
- To keep the Existing LCP Land Use Plan at Ponto until a new open-honest and inclusive Community-based planning process can be achieved at Ponto.
- To be honest with respect to Park Serve Area and Equity issues at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad west of I-5 and the rail corridor.
- Consider the needs for inland South Carlsbad citizens, visitors and business to have their ONLY Coastal Park.
- Consider the larger regional Coastal Park need, and the forever ‘buildout’ Coastal Recreation needs for future generations.
- To be true and honest in translating and implementing our Community Vision

Item #13 11/22/19 emailed public comments on the Staff proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment regarding “High-Priority” Low-Cost Visitor Accommodation land use

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Friday, November 22, 2019 7:43 PM

To: 'Jennifer Jesser'

Cc: 'Melanie Saucier'; 'Celia Brewer'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Cort Hitchens'; 'Erin Prahler'; 'Gabriel Buhr'; 'Mike Sebahar'; 'Harry Peacock'; 'John Gama'; 'John Gama'; 'Chas Wick'; 'Stacy King'; 'Don Neu'; 'Nika Richardson'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Jim Nardi'; 'Lisa Urbach'; Fred Sandquist (sandquist2@earthlink.net); David Hill (dashill4551@gmail.com); Laura Walsh (lauraw@surfridersd.org); 'David Hill'

Subject: LCPA public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations

Jennifer:

Attached please find Public Comments on the proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment (DLCPA) to the Land Use Plan regarding Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations.

As provided in other Public Comments and expressed by several citizens at the 11-20-19 Planning Commission meeting, I along with others kindly request:

1. a publicly accessible “Redline” version of the Existing 2016 Local Coastal Program (LCP) showing the City’s proposed Draft disposition of the current Existing LCP Land Use Plan, policies and data. Without a “Redline” trying to understand the proposed Draft changes is very difficult,
2. true Citizen-based public Workshops on the Coastal Act goals-policies and LCP issues focused on the limited amount of key vacant (and soon to be vacant) Coastal lands in Carlsbad – such as Ponto, and
3. A 6-month extension of time review and provide informed public comments on the Redline LCP and DLCPA, and to provide time to conduct the aforementioned Workshops.

We are still working to try to review the LCP and DLCPA documents and provide public comments on the Coastal Recreation

Thank you for including and responding to these DLCPA Public Comments and questions.

Lance Schulte

Attachment:

Carlsbad’s proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment – People for Ponto comments

Low Cost Visitor Accommodations:

1. P. 3-3 cites CA Coast Act (CCA) Polices. But the City’s proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) Land Use Plan (LUP) in the Ponto Area, particularly for Planning Area F, appears inconsistent with these CCA policies:
 - a. Section 30213 – protect, encourage and provide Lower-Cost Visitor & Recreation Facilities.
 - b. Section 30221 – Visitor serving & Recreation uses have priority over Residential & General Commercial uses.
 - c. Section 30223 – Upland areas reserved to support coastal Recreation uses
 - d. Section 30252(6) – correlate development with Local Park acquisition & on-site recreation

2. Planning Area F used to be designated “Visitor Serving Commercial” as part of the original 1980’s LUP and LCP Samis Master Plan for Ponto. In the 1996 this LUP was changed to the now current LCP and LUP designation of “Non-Residential Reserve” with a specific LCP requirement to reconsider a high-priority recreation or visitor serving Coastal land use while other Ponto land uses were changed to low-priority residential uses (see Poinsettia Shores Master Plan/LCP). It seems appropriated that the LUP should re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space (“i.e. Public Park” in the existing LCP) to provide high-priority coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses: in part for the following reasons:
 - a. Planning Area F’s existing LCP requirement requires this consideration, but the City has never disclosed this requirement to Citizens nor follow this requirement during the Cities two prior ‘planning efforts’ in 2010 and 2015 as documented by official Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, 262.
 - b. Ponto developers (both Samis and Kaisza) were both allowed to overdevelop Ponto, by not providing the minimum Open Space required by Carlsbad’s and Citizen approved Growth Management Open Space Standard. Over 30-acres of land that should have been dedicated to Growth Management Open Space (a high-priority land use) was instead allowed to be developed with low-priority residential development. If the City’s Growth Management Open Space Standard was properly applied at Ponto there would be 30-acres more open space at Ponto then there is now. This is a significant impact to CCA policies that can be corrected by changes in the Ponto LUP to properly implement City Open Space Standards and CCA policies.
 - c. The LCPA acknowledges that past (2005-17) and near-term (2019-23) growth in Carlsbad visitor demand for coastal recreation and accommodations, and indicate high past hotel occupancy rates that implies current hotel supply is just meeting current demand. Although the LCPA does not discuss the high occupancy rates at the Low-Cost campground facilities, It is assumed the campground occupancy rate and demand is higher than that of hotels. This should be defined. Based on current and near term demand for visitor accommodations the LCPA states on page 3-12 “... the City should identify and designate land where new hotels and other visitor-serving uses can be developed.” It is clear where the ‘City should identify and designate [this] land’? What new land(s) should be so identified and designated? However, the LCPA does not disclose longer-term visitor accommodation needs beyond 2023, nor provide a long-term plan for meeting this long-term need. The LCPA should publicly disclose, analyze and provide for the longer-term (beyond present and to beyond 2023) needs for visitor Coastal accommodations, particularly Low-Cost Accommodations and Recreation needs because the LCPA’s LUP is a long-term plan for Carlsbad’s buildout estimated to extend beyond 2035. Also, given the fact that there are very few vacant Coastal Sites (like Ponto) that are still available to address these long-term high priority Coastal land uses – recreation and visitor serving – reserving these vacant lands for high priority coastal land uses is consistent with the CCA Polices. Following are some longer-term projections of resident demand for Coastal park and recreation needs. It seems logical that long-term visitor will increase at a similar rate as the general population increase rate, unless our coast becomes too overcrowded and unattractive vis-à-vis other visitor

destinations. A long-term visitor demand (to go with the below long-term resident demand long-term Sea Level Rise impacts) for Coastal recreation resources should be a part of the proposed LCPA and part of the long-term LUP to provide resources for those long-term needs and to mitigate for those long-term Sea Level Rise impacts.





- d. City in the LCPA inaccurately analyzes and misrepresents how much Visitor Serving Accommodations, particularly Low-Cost Accommodations, Carlsbad currently provides on a relative or comparative basis. The LCPA's inaccurate and simplistic analysis does not adjust for the different sizes of the Coastal Zone in the 3 cities (Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas) used in the analysis. Carlsbad's Coastal Zone is significantly larger than both the other cities, so it has more land and accommodations, just like San Diego's Coastal Zone is larger than Carlsbad's and San Diego is larger than its smaller neighbors Del Mar and National City. A simplistic how many accommodations are in your adjacent cities is an inappropriate analytical method for Carlsbad-Oceanside-Encinitas; just as it is inappropriate to compare the number of San Diego's hotels with the number of hotels in San Diego's smaller neighbors Del Mar and National City. The accurate method to do a comparative analysis is based on a common denominator, such as the amount of accommodations per 1,000 acres of Coastal Zone land along with comparing each city's relative percentages. This is a more accurate and appropriate analysis that the LCPA should provide, and not that provided on page 3-13. The LCPA analysis also does not fully discuss and compare "Low-Cost" accommodations that are part of the CCA policies; nor provide a mitigation approach for "Low-Cost" accommodations lost, just 'Economy hotel rooms'. Below is data from the LCPA and other LCPs that shows the proper and more accurate comparison of existing Visitor Serving Accommodations in Carlsbad-Oceanside-Encinitas and includes Low-Cost Accommodation

numbers/comparisons that are totally missing in the LCPA analysis. As the data shows, Carlsbad does not perform as well in Visitor Accommodations, and most particularly in “Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations”, as the LCPA states and proposes in the LUP relative to Oceanside and Encinitas. An honest analysis like below should be provided in the LCPA LUP, particularly given the very limited amount of vacant Coastal land left to provide for high-priority Coastal Uses. Ponto is one of the last remaining vacant Coastal areas.

Carlsbad's proposed 2019 LCPA uses comparative 3-city data to address how Carlsbad's 2019 LCPA addresses Visitor Serving Accommodation needs. “Low-Cost” Accommodations are an important CA Coastal Act issue


| <u>Visitor Serving Accommodations (VSA) data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | | <u>Data source</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Coastal Acres (i.e. in Coastal Zone) | 9,216 | 1,460 | 7,845 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019 & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| VSA rooms: total | 3,211 | 975 | 634 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, pp 3-12 - 15 |
| VSA rooms: Economy | 589 | 346 | 346 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, pp 3-12 - 15 |
| VSA rooms: Low-Cost (campsites) | 220 | 272 | 171 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, State Parks, Oceanside & Paradise-by-the-sea data Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019 does not evaluate other City’s Low-Cost Accommodations |
| | | | | 3-city | |
| <u>Data analysis</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>Average</u> | <u>Key Findings</u> |
| VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 348 | 668 | 81 | 366 | Carlsbad provides overall Visitor Accommodations at slightly below the 3-city average |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------|-----|-----|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| % of VSA rooms that are Economy | 18% | 35% | 55% | 36% | Carlsbad provides a percentage of Economy Accommodations about 50% below the 3-city average |
| Economy VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 64 | 237 | 44 | 115 | Carlsbad provides Economy Accommodations about 50% below the 3-city average |
| % VSA rooms that are Low-Cost | 7% | 28% | 27% | 21% | Carlsbad provides a percentage of Low-Cost Accommodations about 66% below the 3-city average Carlsbad LCPA also does not provide protection for loss of “Low-Cost” campground rooms, only “Economy hotel rooms” |
| Low-Cost VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 24 | 186 | 22 | 77 | Carlsbad provides Low-Cost Accommodations about 70% below the 3-city average |

- e. The LCPA is not providing for any new “Low Cost Visitor Accommodation” land uses in the proposed LUP for current/long-range needs, even though page 3-12 points out the current demand for accommodations, and the current Existing LCP has polices to increase “Low Cost Visitor Accommodation” land uses. We understand that “Low-cost Visitor Accommodation” occupancy rates at CA State Campground at near 90%. This occupancy rate is much higher [signifying higher demand] than the occupancy rates of both the hotels, and “Economy Visitor Accommodations” which the LCPA seeks to protect. The Proposed LCPA LUP should provide historic and current “Low-cost Visitor Accommodation” occupancy rate data at CA State Campground and compare to occupancy demand for other accommodations to determine the highest occupancy demands and therefore needs. Why is the Proposed LCPA LUP not protecting AND EXPANDING (for future growth and visitor demand) the supply of this higher demand for “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” at the State Campground, particularly given the Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies on this issue, long history of this issue documented in the Current Existing Carlsbad LCP Mello II Segment, and the fact that “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” are a Statewide ‘high-Coastal-priority’ land use in CA Coastal Act Goals and Policies? Why is the proposed LUP not recognizing and incorporating these issues? The Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies [see Existing Carlsbad LCP Mello II Segment polies 2.3, 4.1, 6.1, 6.4, 6.5, 6.9, 6.10, 7.5, and 7.15 for example] are not referenced

and discussed in the Proposed LUP nor is a comprehensive long-term analysis of the impact of the proposed LUP's elimination of these Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies vis-à-vis the CA Coastal Act Goals and Policies? How and why is the City proposing changes to these Existing Carlsbad LCP policies in the Mellow II Segment, particularly given the improved knowledge about Sea Level Rise, and Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff erosion impacts on the State Campground's "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations" - High-Coastal-Priority land use under the CA Coastal Act?

- f. At Ponto there is no low-cost/no-cost Recreational use as shown by the City of Carlsbad's adopted Parks Master Plan (pp 87-89) that show the City's adopted Park Service Areas in the following image. The image's blue dots are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City's adopted service areas:



Per the current Existing LCP requirements for Planning Area F at Ponto an "(i.e. Public Park)" must be considered. How is the Proposed LCPA LUP not reserving Upland Areas at Ponto for recreational uses given Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff erosion impacts as shown in Proposed LCPA LUP Attachment B, and Exhibits B6 and B7? There is very limited amount of vacant Upland Coastal land at Ponto and South Coastal Carlsbad to accommodate low-cost/no-cost Recreational use "(i.e. Public Park)", so why is this last remaining vacant Coastal land at Ponto not being reserved for "high-Coastal Priority Land Uses"? Why is the Proposed LCPA LUP proposing this last remaining vacant Coastal land at Ponto be converted from "Non-residential Reserve" to 'low-coastal-priority residential and general commercial land uses'?

3. The proposed LCPA approach to protect existing 'economy hotels' but not 'Low-cost Visitor Accommodations' appears inappropriate. Existing hotel owners providing 'Economy' rooms are penalized while all other more expensive 'non-economy hotel' owners are not required to mitigate for their not providing more affordable accommodations. It seems like a fairer and rational approach is to use the same framework as the City's inclusionary affordable housing requirements and have the requirement and burden of providing affordable accommodations required by all visitor accommodation providers, including short-term rentals of residential homes. Use of any per accommodation "in-lieu fee" should be SUFFICIENT TO FULLY MITIGATE for not providing a required affordable accommodation by being sufficient to fully fund a new 'affordable accommodation' on a one-for one basis. City Transit Occupancy Tax revenues could also potentially be used to provide a catch-up method for existing "non-low-cost and/or non-economy accommodation providers" to address what would nominally be their inclusionary contribution. It seems like the LCPA approach needs significant rethinking to provide a rational program to include reasonable long-term and sustainable affordability in visitor accommodation's, particularly give the Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff Erosion impacts on Carlsbad's Only "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations" and the State Campground and beaches and Carlsbad's Coastal access roadways.

4. The Proposed LCPA LUP does not provide a means for citizens to understand the proposed changes to the current Existing LCP goals and policies. There are numerous current Existing LCP goals and policies regarding "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations". These all should be listed in the Proposed LCPA LUP along with a description on how and why these current Existing LCP Goals and policies are being modified or removed in the Proposed LCPA LUP.

Item #14 1/29/20 emailed public comments on the Staff proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment regarding “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use and lack of that land use at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 1:56 PM
To: jennifer.jesser@carlsbadca.gov
Cc: 'Melanie Saucier'; 'Celia Brewer'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Cort Hitchens'; 'Erin Prahler'; 'Gabriel Buhr'; 'Mike Sebahar'; 'Harry Peacock'; 'John Gama'; 'John Gama'; 'Chas Wick'; 'Stacy King'; 'Don Neu'; 'Nika Richardson'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Jim Nardi'; 'Lisa Urbach'; Fred Sandquist (sandquist2@earthlink.net); David Hill (dashill4551@gmail.com); Laura Walsh (lauraw@surfridersd.org); 'David Hill'
Subject: LCPA Public Comment - Coastal Recreation at Ponto - from People for Ponto

Jennifer:

Attached please find Public Comments on the proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment (DLCPA) to the Land Use Plan regarding “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation at Ponto.

These People for Ponto comments reflect the significant Coastal Recreation and Coastal Land Use Plan issues at Ponto that clearly seem to justify, particularly after the City has receive to date of 2,500 public requests (and more are coming) for a Ponto Coastal Park, that a more productive, and overall more time efficient process to address public concerns be provided in the DLCPA process. I provide that thought based on successfully managed an award-wining LCPA amendment in under 2-years that was almost the exactly the same as the City of Carlsbad. Although the City Council in a 2-2 tie failed to provide for more productive and overall more time efficient process I hope within the DLCPA processing parameters Staff has you try to advance:

1. a publicly accessible “Redline” version of the Existing 2016 Local Coastal Program (LCP) showing the City’s proposed Draft disposition of the current Existing LCP Land Use Plan, policies and data. Without a “Redline” trying to understand the proposed Draft changes is very difficult,
2. true Citizen-based public Workshops on the Coastal Act goals-policies and LCP issues focused on the limited amount of key vacant (and soon to be vacant) Coastal lands in Carlsbad – such as Ponto, and
3. A 6-month extension of time review and provide informed public comments on the Redline LCP and DLCPA, and to provide time to conduct the aforementioned Workshops.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte
People for Ponto

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2019 7:43 PM
To: 'Jennifer Jesser'
Cc: 'Melanie Saucier'; 'Celia Brewer'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Cort Hitchens'; 'Erin Prahler'; 'Gabriel Buhr'; 'Mike Sebahar'; 'Harry Peacock'; 'John Gama'; 'John Gama'; 'Chas Wick'; 'Stacy King'; 'Don Neu'; 'Nika Richardson'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Jim Nardi'; 'Lisa Urbach'; Fred Sandquist (sandquist2@earthlink.net); David Hill (dashill4551@gmail.com); Laura Walsh (lauraw@surfridersd.org); 'David Hill'
Subject: LCPA public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations

Jennifer:

Attached please find Public Comments on the proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment (DLCPA) to the Land Use Plan regarding Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations.

As provided in other Public Comments and expressed by several citizens at the 11-20-19 Planning Commission meeting, I along with others kindly request:

4. a publicly accessible “Redline” version of the Existing 2016 Local Coastal Program (LCP) showing the City’s proposed Draft disposition of the current Existing LCP Land Use Plan, policies and data. Without a “Redline” trying to understand the proposed Draft changes is very difficult,
5. true Citizen-based public Workshops on the Coastal Act goals-policies and LCP issues focused on the limited amount of key vacant (and soon to be vacant) Coastal lands in Carlsbad – such as Ponto, and
6. A 6-month extension of time review and provide informed public comments on the Redline LCP and DLCPA, and to provide time to conduct the aforementioned Workshops.

We are still working to try to review the LCP and DLCPA documents and provide public comments on the Coastal Recreation

Thank you for including and responding to these DLCPA Public Comments and questions.

Lance Schulte

Attachment:

Carlsbad Staff proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment – People for Ponto comments

Coastal Recreation:

5. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City’s acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning “mistakes” regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City’s prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, “planning mistakes” would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant ‘unplanned’ area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) “Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**” The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City ‘mistakes’ and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn’t fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the

public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is “... dependent upon public understanding ...”**. The City’s past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City’s current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City’s Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior ‘planning mistakes’ facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City’s prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City’s acknowledged prior LCP and other “planning efforts” public participation processing and planning “mistakes” regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

6. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City’s proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City’s proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City’s proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
 - a. Disclose and provide a publically accessible ‘Redline Version’ of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.

- b. Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
- c. Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.

The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will be tainted or will miss many issues due to having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.


The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

7. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever 'Buildout' needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - a. Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County's 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide

land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.

- b. Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
- c. This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ... “; 2). This data be used in the City’s analysis and the public’s review and discussion about the City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount “maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone” and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to “assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”. Most of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

8. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City’s proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of


natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in our local streets to find a significantly large open area to play in. Ponto residents have to drive their kids to get to a park increasing VMT and GHG emissions. The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan ‘solution’ to Ponto’s no-park condition, along with the City’s need to add an additional 6.5 acres of new City parks in Southwest Carlsbad to comply with the Southwest Carlsbad’s 2012 population demand (at a ratio of 3-acre/1,000 population) is to provide a City Park – Veterans Park – over 6-miles away from the Ponto and Southwest Carlsbad population need. This makes a bad situation worse. The City’s proposed location is totally inaccessible to serve the needs of the population of children or anyone without a car, that it is intended to serve in South Carlsbad. This City proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan ‘solution’ seems inappropriate and inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act and common sense. During the City’s Veterans Park and budget community workshops citizens expressed a desire for a Ponto Park to be the solution to our Ponto and Southwest Carlsbad Park deficits. Those citizen requests were not apparently considered as part of the City’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan. Following is an image summarizing the magnitude of citizen needs/desires expressed at the City’s Budget workshop. Note the number and size of the text citing Ponto Park and South Carlsbad that reflects the number and magnitude/intensity of citizen workshop groups’ input. The failure to acknowledge this public participation and data in the Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan Park seems in conflict with CCA Sections 30006 and 30252(6):



For South Carlsbad there is a complete lack of any existing or planned City Coastal Park and park acreage west of I-5, while North Carlsbad has 9 existing and 1 planned City Coastal Parks totaling 37.8 acres of City Coastal W of I-5 North Carlsbad. Not only is this unfair to South Carlsbad, it is also unfair to North Carlsbad as it increases VMT and parking impacts in North Carlsbad because South Carlsbad is not providing the City Coastal Parks for South Carlsbad resident/visitor demands. This City Park disparity is shown on Figure 3-1 of the Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan; however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park

Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These ‘low-priority’ residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed ‘forever-buildout’ wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad’s Community Vision.



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F's Coastal Land Use designation to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.
- The City's currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city's comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City's comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.

- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens' requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
 - Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
 - Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad's 7-mile coastline.
 - The southern half of Carlsbad's coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
 - The City's proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.
9. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is a obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City's adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City's Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City's population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed 'solution' to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto


No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land is South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently “unplanned” Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F addresses SW Quad City Park deficit**



The image is a satellite map of the Ponto region in Carlsbad, California. The map shows the coastline on the left, with the Pacific Ocean. A yellow arrow points from the text on the left to a specific area on the map. An inset map in the top right corner provides a closer view of the area labeled 'Planning Area F'. Other landmarks visible on the map include San Diego Botanic Garden, San Diego State University, and the San Diego Zoo. The map is credited to Google.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.




How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail





One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



10. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:

- a. Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-

mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- b. Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County's Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

2050 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County's projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050.

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California's, the San Diego Region's and Carlsbad's Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- c. We request that the as part of the public's review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever 'Buildout' City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

11. Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- a. The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad's Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final 'buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaining undeveloped lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:
- i. Section 30212.5 "... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**";
 - ii. Section 30213 "... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**";
 - iii. Section 30222 "**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.**"
 - iv. Section 30223 "**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**" ,
 - v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development"

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment's inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft "buildout" LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a "Public Park" prior to changing the existing "unplanned Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will


eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- b. The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term 'Buildout' needs of "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for "low-priority" uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce "High-Priority" Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for "High-Priority" Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by "low-priority" uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.
12. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have been sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront


Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these “mistakes”. CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City “mistakes” and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated “mistakes” happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior “mistakes” by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto’s Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City’s prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.

13. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.
 - a. Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
 - b. Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
 - c. Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
 - d. Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is 'low-priority' residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is 'high-priority' Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for 'planned developments' to off-set loss open space from planned development

impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



14. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that 15% of unconstrained and

developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data
(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard
275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard
X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard
41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9
(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9
30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

15. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:
- a. Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
 - b. In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
 - c. In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to

- the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.
- d. Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
 - e. In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
 - f. In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without first disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
 - g. In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to either:

- i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of “Non-Residential Reserve” until such time as the City’s past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
- ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space (“i.e. Public Park”) to provide both “High-Priority” coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

16. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words “shall”) these “low priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B &C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP's planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP's planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City "may" or 'may not' choose (per the proposed "may" LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City's (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy 'shell game'. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two "may" criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only "low-priority" residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by "shall" policy) winners, and "high-priority" Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal 'long-shot' ("may" policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the documented "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation and Costal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it "promotes development of recreational use" but does not in fact do that. How is development of 'recreational use promoted' when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no "shall" statement) to 'promote' that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not 'promote' or require in any way "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential 'excess land' that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential 'excess' land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use

Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City's Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable 'excess land' to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad's, San Diego County's and California's High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague "may" policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered "shall" policy statements requiring and assuring that the 'Forever' "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City's proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan. This "shall" policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard:
Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City's minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment's Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a "maybe" implemented realignment, most of the "maybe" realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilities there will likely be little if any sufficiently dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City

Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed ‘High-priority’ Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use’ needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for “low-priority” uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be ‘forever’ and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of “Non-residential Reserve” for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City’s proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to “low-priority” land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

17. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3’ wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable (‘shall’) Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also be considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

18. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation is to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40’ landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard “maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources.” The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40’ setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthetic buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is illogical. If anything the minimum 40’ landscaped setback should likely be expanded near “environmental

resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

Item #15 1/29/20 emailed public comments on the Staff proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment submitting City Park Master Plan Park Service (park Equity) maps showing Ponto is unserved by City Parks, and South Carlsbad has no Coastal Park (west of I-5 and rail corridor)

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 9:47 AM
To: Jennifer Jesser <Jennifer.Jesser@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; Nika Richardson <richardson@waltersmanagement.com>; Chas Wick <chaswick@reagan.com>
Subject: FW: City Council reply to Citizens concerns and requests regarding Ponto development

Jenifer:

Please provide email confirmation of this email and attachments as public comments on the DLCPA for Ponto .

Thanks,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, April 6, 2018 10:00 AM
To: 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov'; 'manager@carlsbadca.gov'; 'chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov'; 'gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov'; 'debbie.fountain@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Celia Brewer'
Cc: 'Jim Nardi'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Avril van Zyl'; 'Tony Ruffolo'; 'Chas Wick'; 'jeanscamp@yahoo.com'; 'sebbiessixpack@att.net'; 'Lee Leibenson'; 'Gail Norman'; 'John Gama'; 'Harry Peacock'; 'Patti Travis'; 'colinrobertsonrealestate@gmail.com'; 'Farhad Sharifi'; 'Jim Burke'; 'Stacy King'
Subject: RE: City Council reply to Citizens concerns and requests regarding Ponto development

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions and City Staff:

We request that the attached files also be included in the public record for any City discussion on adjusting/amending the:

- City's Growth Management Program facilities standards,
- Growth Management Ordinance CMC 21.90,
- Citywide Facilities Improvement Plan and/or
- Local facilities Management Plan for Zone 9.

We have updated the Carlsbad Parks and Rec Master Plan exhibits to include an additional image showing the wider/longer Regional Coastal Park Gap which surrounds the Coastal Park void in Coastal South Carlsbad, and the many inland homes/population without a Coastal Park. We kindly request advance notification on any staff reports or meetings on the above as we would like to most effectively participate in public review and input. We are also available and happy to meet with you to discuss these attached issues in advance of consideration of any of the above. If we could receive a confirmation reply it would be most appreciated. Thank you for your consideration.

We sincerely care about the quality of life in our City and neighborhoods.

Concerns and requests submitted to Carlsbad City Council et. al.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 9:14 AM

To: council@carlsbadca.gov; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov; manager@carlsbadca.gov; chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; debbie.fountain@carlsbadca.gov; Celia Brewer

Cc: 'Jim Nardi'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Avril van Zyl'; 'Tony Ruffolo'; 'Chas Wick'; jeanscamp@yahoo.com; sebbiessixpack@att.net; 'Lance Schulte'; 'Lee Leibenson'; 'Gail Norman'; 'John Gama'; Harry Peacock; 'Patti Travis'; colinrobertsonrealestate@gmail.com; Farhad Sharifi; Jim Burke; 'Stacy King'

Subject: City Council reply to Citizens concerns and requests regarding Ponto development

Dear City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions:

The attached file includes 4 emails to you regarding Ponto development issues and requests that relate to our community concerns to Develop Ponto Right. One email was sent August 31, 2017 and three were sent December 5, 2017. As yet we have not received a reply to the requests within the emails. We respectfully request a reply soon to these 4 emails as we wish to inform our Community.

Also attached are 2 pages from the City's Park and Recreation Department Master Plan that graphically illustrate some of the Coastal Park inequalities/deficits in South Carlsbad that also impact Coastal North Carlsbad and Encinitas. Please note the Veteran's Park location mapping error on p 87, which we hope can be corrected – a response to correct this mapping would be appreciated.

It is important that we all work to Develop Ponto right as the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land to establish the long-term buildout Coastal environment for South Carlsbad and North San Diego County.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Lance Schulte

San Pacifico Community Association – Ponto Development Review Committee

Item #16 1/30/20 emailed public comments on the Staff proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment submitting the prior public comments on Shopoff's LCPA be included in the City's LCPA, questioning why City Staff is keeping the Shopoff LCPA application alive and under what authority, and why the City Staff is processing the Planning Area F speculative developer's proposed LCPA to change the existing LCP Non-residential reserve land use to low-priority residential and general commercial land uses

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 5:32 PM

To: 'Matthew Hall'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Scott Chadwick'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; 'Mike Pacheco'; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Don Neu'; 'Gary Barberio'; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Jeff Murphy'; jennifer.jesser@carlsbadca.gov

Cc: People for Ponto; jodi marie jones; Mike Sebahar; 'Harry Peacock'; Chas Wick; Nika Richardson; Fred Sandquist; David Hill; Laura Walsh

Subject: DLCPA public comment - including prior LCPA 2016-0002 public comments into the City staff proposed DLCPA public comments

As shown in the attached image of Shopoff application project numbers, a Local Coastal Program Amendment (LCPA 2016-0002) was applied for by this speculative land developer before or in 2016. In the City's application file there are many significant public comments from citizens regarding this LCPA and its related effects if that proposed LCPA is approved. These public comments on the above Shopoff Application Files should be included as official public comments on the City's proposed DLCPA for this site (Planning Area F). The City's DLCPA mirrors the Applicant's proposed LCPA from 2016 by proposing to change the existing "Non-residential Reserve" land use to residential and general commercial.

- Can you please provide email confirmation that the public comments in the Shopoff Application files are also included as public comments in the City's DLCPA?

Also, this speculative developer, Shopoff, quitclaimed interest in the Planning Area F site 1-year ago (Feb 2019) as documented in the attached 2019.2.11 Quitclaim file. At that time, Shopoff formally withdrew their application and asked the City for a refund of their application fees. However, the City Staff has made a choice to not follow standard City procedure of accepting the applicant's withdrawal of their application and returning their unused fees. The City Staff is currently keeping that application 'alive'.

- As a public comment on the DLCPA, we would like to know why the City Staff is doing this.

In addition, there has been no applicant progress on that application since before Feb 2019. The City has a municipal code requirement which 'withdraws' applications if applicants fail to make progress in processing their application within 6-months. We understand that particular City and State Law requirement is not fully applicable to all the Shopoff Applications, due to the need to first change the Existing LCP and MP (Master Plan or City Zoning Code) of "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use and Zoning before development design permits can even be applied for and processed. As a public comment on the DLCPA we would like to know:

- What city standard, policy, or legal process is the City Staff using to keep the application 'alive' when no applicant progress is being made on the application?
- Is this action by the City Staff solely a City Staff responsibility or is it subject to City Council review and direction?

Concerns and requests submitted to Carlsbad City Council et. al.

- Has City Staff provided or intend to provide the City Council a status report on the status of this application?
- Under what criteria would the City Staff withdraw the application due to inaction by the applicant?

Also, it is clear that the City Staff's proposed Draft LCPA Land Use Plan Amendment for Planning Area F is basically implementing the withdrawn Shopoff LCPA Application request to change the Existing LCP Land Use on Planning Area F from "Non-residential Reserve". As a public comment on the DLCPA, we would like to know:

- Why is the City Staff processing the withdrawn speculative developer's LCPA request to change the land use?

Attachments: Shopoff Quitclaim deed dated 2/11/19 & on-site sign listing Shopoff LCPA/MPA and development application numbers

Item #17 1/31/20 emailed public comments on the Staff proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment regarding Growth Management Ordinance 21.90.130 in dealing with Ponto Park and Open Space Standards deficits

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Friday, January 31, 2020 12:15 PM

To: 'Matthew Hall'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Scott Chadwick'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; 'Mike Pacheco'; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Don Neu'; 'Gary Barberio'; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Jeff Murphy'; jennifer.jesser@carlsbadca.gov

Cc: John Gama; 'Hilton Sher'; jodi marie jones

Subject: FW: City feedback from this am to ponto website

Dear City of Carlsbad and CCC Staff:

Please include the attached file from John as Public Comments on the Carlsbad City Staff proposed DLCP Land Use Plan Amendment. John mentioned he sent this via the www.peopleforponto.com website earlier and for some reason his comments were not received by our People for Ponto website and then transmitted to you.

Thank you for your consideration. We apologize for any inconvenience. People for Ponto is checking to see if other public comments are similarly in this 'no-man's land' and will work to get to you ASAP.

Email confirmation of receipt of this public comment is greatly appreciated.

Thanks again,

People for Ponto

Attachment:

We have a documented (GIS verified mapping) that there is approximately a 7 acre park space deficit and 30 acre open space deficiency in the southwest quadrant of Carlsbad. There is a statute in the Municipal Code of the City of Carlsbad that reads as follows:

Carlsbad Municipal Code (Growth Management Ordinance within the Zoning Code) Section 21.90.130 Implementation of facilities and improvements requirements....

(c) If at any time it appears to the satisfaction of the city manager that facilities or improvements within a facilities management zone or zones are inadequate to accommodate any further development within that zone or that the performance standards adopted pursuant to Section 21.90.100 are not being met he or she shall immediately report the deficiency to the council. If the council determines that a deficiency exists then no further building or development permits shall be issued within the affected zone or zones and development shall cease until an amendment to the city-wide facilities and improvements plan or applicable local facilities management plan which addresses the deficiency is approved by the city council and the performance standard is met.

The Mayor, City Council, City planners have all been made aware of these deficiencies (for the last 2 years) and they continue to ignore them and pursue high density/low income housing in Planning Area F/Ponto. Why won't they do the right thing and follow their own municipal code? No further development should occur until these deficiencies are addressed. Why do we as citizens have to work so hard to get the right thing to occur? Why is the Mayor and City Council more interested in the Developer's interest versus the interests of Carlsbad citizens? It begs the question of personal gain to be made? Is a lawsuit the only thing that will get your attention?

Please do the right thing and stop any development in Planning Area F until these deficiencies are addressed.

Concerns and requests submitted to Carlsbad City Council et. al.

Item #18 ?/?/20 Summary of DLCPA public comments and requests emailed from People for Ponto website and neighborhood surveys as of ????

Work in progress.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 10:53 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mike Tindall
E-mail tindallmike@hotmail.com
Comments Check the participation at the new Poinsettia park pickleball courts. There are players there all day and night. Usually many paddles waiting to play. We could use more courts. Check the dual use of tennis and pickleball on the same courts like Encinitas. I traveled there many times and witnessed cooperation between both sports. Cottonwood Creek is best example. Go see.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 6:00:24 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name gary cunitz
E-mail gc1150@gmail.com
Comments Hi, It is obvious that Pickleball is the largest growing sport in the country. With baby boomers and younger generations catching the pickleball fever why would not Carlsbad fast track additional courts? To keep with the sports growth additional courts are a necessity. Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 1:29 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Annette Maloney
E-mail amaloney01@yahoo.com
Comments I would LOVE to have more pickleball courts in Carlsbad, especially in the La Costa area. I have used the ones at Poinsettia park but they are not close and are over crowded. I think there is a real need for more courts since this sport is growing so rapidly.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 1:37 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Bill Maloney
E-mail wgmaloney@hotmail.com
Comments I wanted to express the fact that the city could use more pickleball courts, especially in south Carlsbad. I know that courts recently were opened at Poinsettia Park, but these are already crowded with players. Is there room at Alga Norte to add courts?

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 3:11 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Peg Reiter
E-mail pegreiter@gmail.com
Comments Please build more pickleball courts in all the parks!
People love this game, all ages can play, and there aren't enough courts to meet the demand.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mick Calarco

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 3:59 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Sue
E-mail Sabesmom@hotmail.com
Comments It would be great to have more Pickleball courts in the La Costa area. The Poinsettia courts are always busy!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 8:14 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Jan Lewis
E-mail jlewiscbad@gmail.com
Comments [Would like to see more outdoor pickleball courts adjacent to those at Poinsettia Park.](#)

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 10:11 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Tyrra Adams
E-mail Pk1a@yahoo.com
Comments More pickleball courts in the La Costa area. Poinsettia
Parks courts are too far and the courts are overcrowded.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 10:35 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Emelyne Sablan
E-mail resandiego@gmail.com
Comments More pickleball courts are needed in Carlsbad. I live near Kelly Park and would love a couple of courts there. The new Poinsettia courts were much anticipated and are now appreciated but so much that they are extremely crowded. It's laughable how 6 courts were squeezed in such a small enclosed space. There seems to be often 50 people in that space, rotating for our turn. When I walked to the bathroom I notice it is surrounded by many half empty tennis courts taking up 10 times more real estate with usually 2 people in a court. Would you consider converting 1 or 2 of those tennis courts into pickleball courts? That could be easily and inexpensively done.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 10:51 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Laura Mitchell
E-mail MitchIs4@gmail.com
Comments We need more pickle ball courts! Especially in the La Costa south and East Carlsbad area. poinsettia courts are too far and often overcrowded Alga Norte would be a great place! Please consider more dedicated pickle ball courts!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2020 4:46 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Heather Galarza
E-mail marehfleury@hotmail.com

Comments

We have a definite need for more pickleball Courts. Waiting 40 mins to play one game at Poinsettia Park (peak time of day) defines that need. Rather than wait for new courts or in the interim can we convert some tennis courts instead at Poinsettia park. Also the community centers while they host pickleball Sporadically the schedule is not always conducive to the public's availability. Bobby Riggs has converted all but 3 tennis courts into pickleball courts at their establishment. That is a true measurement of the sports rise in popularity. Please add new courts and convert tennis courts around the city for ease of play for the community. Thank you

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 9:58 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Larry Kesslin
E-mail Larry@kesslin.com
Comments It would be great to have additional pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park. The courts are extremely busy and well used and 6 more courts would be used as well.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2020 5:51 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Jane Sage
E-mail janesage358@gmail.com
Comments Pickleball originally came to San Diego as a Senior sport. It has now brought families, singles, and the community of multiple ages together to share a sport that all levels can enjoy. This is an investment in bringing the community together for enjoyment, health and wellness. More courts means more community togetherness.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 7:01:52 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Barbara Dunn
E-mail badunn1@sbcglobal.net
Comments Carlsbad needs more Pickleball courts. Each time I arrive at Poinsettia park there is a long wait to play and it will only get worst as Spring and Summer approach.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 7:20:56 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Robert Hotto
E-mail bobhotto@gmail.com
Comments Attached is the USAPA chart of pickleball vs another net sports places to play.
<https://cdn.dragdropr.com/410bed4f-e4a0-4c4f-970d-f8debb636a80/-/resize/749x/> Carlsbad needs to represent its population as per other locals Bob Hotto 8582057509

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 7:25:25 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Jill Kramer
E-mail jkcats210@gmail.com
Comments I support the addition of 10 more pickleball courts, with 2 of them being designated as Challenge, 2 of them for Beginners, and the remaining 6 as Social.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 9:00:05 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Patricia Nissan
E-mail pnissan1@me.com
Comments We need more pickleball courts to accommodate
the overcrowding at the current Carlsbad courts!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 9:45:12 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mark Nims
E-mail teamnims1@gmail.com
Comments We need to double the number of pickleball courts. I have been there when the paddle rack is completely full with 20+ players waiting to get a turn. Some players are leaving because it can take more than 30 minutes just for the opportunity to play one game and then you have to vacate the court and wait another 30 minutes to get a second game. The courts are very nice. We just need more.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 11:04:21 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Gad Brown
E-mail gadded61960@mypacks.net
Comments Additional outdoor pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park. Too many players too few courts!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 11:57:42 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name kenneth E Pace
E-mail kenpace@sbcglobal.net
Comments I suggest for the lack of pickleball court problem we convert one of the nearby tennis courts into multiple pickleball courts. These would be challenge courts. When Robinson Park opens have 4 pickleball courts at that location

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 12:45:41 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Ginny sharp
E-mail Gsharp@sharpsnet.com
Comments I was disappointed in the community meetings that there wasn't more emphasis on Pickleball courts. The ones you built are very nice but not enough for this community please consider Increasing the number of court you currently have.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check Yes the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 2:06:15 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Richard Toohy
E-mail cal2ee@aol.com
Comments In my 30 years living in carlsbad i have never seen a public or privat facility or aminety get the immediate response or use by so many and divers group of poeple. both young and mature,male and female.And it is only just begune. What is needed now ,is a restroom stadium court and two challeng courts. This would make this pickle ball facility WORLD CLASS Not in five years but NOW.Especially temporary restrooms. THANK YOU AND KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 4:18:48 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Terry Parsons
E-mail Terry@Parsons.org
Comments New pickleball courts at Poinsettia have been highly popular from the "get-go" and we need to add additional courts to reduce the wait time that is now common.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2020 9:47:34 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Amber Kaufman
E-mail kaufman5sd@gmail.com
Comments SHORT TERM SOLUTION TO MORE PICKLEBALL COURTS at POINSETTIA PARK: Paint shadow lines over 2 of the 8-10 tennis courts to make 6-8 pickleball courts. Provide nets in lock boxes (like moonlight and cottonwood creek parks in Encinitas). VERY LOW COST and can be done quickly with no extra space required. I dont think it will happen, but if all tennis courts are in use and the 2 are needed, tennis comes first (?).

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Monday, February 24, 2020 8:31:25 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Jimmy Medina
E-mail Jmma08@hotmail.com
Comments SHORT TERM SOLUTION TO MORE PICKLEBALL COURTS at POINSETTIA PARK: Paint shadow lines over 2 of the 8-10 tennis courts to make 6-8 pickleball courts. Provide nets in lock boxes (like moonlight and cottonwood creek parks in Encinitas). VERY LOW COST and can be done quickly with no extra space required. I dont think it will happen, but if all tennis courts are in use and the 2 are needed, tennis comes first (?).

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Monday, February 24, 2020 9:26:09 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Bruce William Tipton
E-mail brucetipton99@gmail.com
Comments As a tennis player for 35 years; I conveyed to pickleball a couple years ago and anxiously awaited the Poinsettia courts to open, so thanks! And now, of course, the demand for use, far exceeds the number of courts available and there is nothing stopping this trend for pickelball interest. So...many more courts are needed, now and in the future. This huge snowball is rolling downhill at breakneck speed and the demographics support the need for an additional 10-15 PB courts. Please address this need and if you need proof, just show up at 9 am at the Poinsettia courts. Thanks.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Monday, February 24, 2020 10:36:18 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Amy Lohneiss
E-mail Anybecky@aol.com
Comments We need more pickleball courts!. There are not nearly enough, and the courts out there are always crowded.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Jacquelyn](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#)
Subject: Pickleball
Date: Monday, February 24, 2020 4:39:02 PM

Our family of 4 would love to see more pickleball courts like the ones at Poinisettia Park!
jx4pb

--

Jacquelyn Campbell, MPH, BSN, RN, RD, ACSM-HFI

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 3:15:38 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name [Mike Weir](#)
E-mail Mike@immersiverecovery.com
Comments [Please put in more Pickleball courts](#)

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. [Yes](#)

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 11:02:52 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Tina I Visingardi
E-mail tvisingardi@ccprograms.com
Comments I believe that more Pickleball courts should be added for consideration. While the Poinsettia Park courts are fabulous, the wait to play has gotten excessive. Please consider adding more courts in Carlsbad.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 2:34:27 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Melanie Sowa
E-mail Melsowa@yahoo.com
Comments We need more Pickleball courts! Poinsettia Park is great but always crowded. Thanks

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: City of Carlsbad - REVISED VISION

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Trudie Stapleton

E-mail stapleton@mindspring.com

Comments

My vision for the City of Carlsbad is more pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park. 1. Expanded Venue vs. Fragmented Venues a) One large venue location vs. several small venue locations 2. Potential revenue and publicity for the city a) Host special fund raising events b) City Leagues c) City Lessons 3. Regional/national tournament tourism destination 4. Enhance the city image as a pickleball tourism market

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 2:45:08 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Isabel
E-mail iescalle@roadrunner.com
Comments I am a Carlsbad resident and appreciate very much the new pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park. More are needed as they tend to be crowded. Perhaps some of the existing tennis court could be converted or painted for dual use. Thank you.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 4:05:25 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name David Epstein
E-mail d_a_epstein@yahoo.com
Comments The new pickleball courts at Poinsetta are a delight. Have met many wonderful people in the community. Great mix of young and older residents in a healthy environment. But we need more courts! Seems to be a low cost way to create improvements and use existing underutilized facilities by sharing tennis courts. Trudie and Jan are great and I would like to offer my support...thanks

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 4:38:07 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name BARBARA FUSCO
E-mail bf1on1@aol.com
Comments Carlsbad needs more pickleball courts on the
Alga / Melrose side .Poinsettia is way too
crowded!

**If you do not wish to
receive further emails
from us, please check
the box, and you will** **Yes**
**be removed from our
mailing.**

**CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the
sender and know the content is safe.**

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 5:55:11 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Patricia White
E-mail Patwhite99@hotmail.com
Comments We need more Pickleball courts. The ones at Poinsettia Park are beautiful but always crowded. Thank you for putting those in.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 6:12:08 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Claudia Defibaugh
E-mail braunwarth@cox.net
Comments There is a need for more outdoor pickleball courts in Carlsbad. The Poinsettia courts are very popular and always very crowded. Thank you for this opportunity to voice our opinion.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 7:15:04 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name yvonne lara
E-mail yvonnelarara52@yahoo.com
Comments We need more pickleball courts! Poinsettia Park is so overcrowded!!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 7:24:16 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Jane Sage
E-mail janesage358@gmail.com
Comments Pickleball changed my life from semi active to very active! Seniors, families, singles, and kids, are coming together to share something that will continue to grow. The problem is that as pickleball continues to grow, more courts are needed to help overcrowded courts. Please go view the courts and vote to build more courts in Carlsbad. Thank you. Jane Sage

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 7:41:10 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Alison Irwin
E-mail irwin1721@gmail.com
Comments Please considering building new pickleball courts in Carlsbad. Tonight 2.26.20 there where at least 50 people at the courts with wait times of 20+ minutes to play. Thanks

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 9:08:00 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name brent haws
E-mail bhaws@san.rr.com
Comments Love the pickleball courts at poinsettia park, cant wait to see some more!! Best in San Diego county!!!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 9:33:17 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Zell dwelley
E-mail Zdwelley@aol.com
Comments Poinsettia courts are way too crowded. Please add more

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 10:01:01 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Irene Hafner
E-mail renie737@aol.com
Comments HI I am a Carlsbad resident and have a love for Pickleball. So excited about the Poinsettia pickleball courts (they are beautiful) but I'm sure you have heard..very crowded. We need more courts...at least 2 more challenge courts and some beginner courts. Can we make a tennis court into 4 pickleball courts? Build more courts? Thank You for listening.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2020 2:34:27 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Melanie Sowa
E-mail Melsowa@yahoo.com
Comments We need more Pickleball courts! Poinsettia Park is great but always crowded. Thanks

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 7:28:09 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Kaye Thompson
E-mail kayet51@gmail.com
Comments More pickleball courts please. It is an extremely fast growing sport and the need will continue to increase.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 1:08:01 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Cami Fallis
E-mail cmfallis@yahoo.com
Comments I play Pickleball at Poinsettia on a regular basis,
and I believe more courts are needed and would
be appreciated.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 4:35:55 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name George scheer
E-mail Gscheer@ccprograms.com
Comments Thank you so much for the construction of the Pickleball courts at poinsettia park. Given the significant usage and resulting crowds participating I respectfully request consideration to construct additional Pickleball courts to handle the great number of players. Thank you for your consideration.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Friday, February 28, 2020 4:14:48 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Bill Meadows
E-mail bill.meadows@gmail.com
Comments Short term solution for more pickleball courts in Poinsettia Park: Paint shadow lines over 2 of the 8-10 tennis courts for some new pickleball courts. Temporarily you can only get one pickleball court centered in the tennis court. Challenge courts could go there. If permanently converted, you can get 4 pickleball courts out of the space of 1 tennis court.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Friday, February 28, 2020 8:02:00 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Lillie Droutsas
E-mail Lddroutsas@gmail.com
Comments Please build more Pickleball courts, thank you for your time. Lillie

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Saturday, February 29, 2020 7:58:39 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mike Shetler
E-mail Mshetler@hotmail.com
Comments It would be wonderful if more Pickleball courts could be constructed to release the over crowding at the Poinsettia Park Pickleball facility.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Saturday, February 29, 2020 12:36:51 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Kim Orozco
E-mail Kimeorozco@yahoo.com
Comments Love Pickleball !!! Please , City of Carlsbad
More courts , please Have tournaments , lessons
Please ... restroom near PB courts at Poinsettia
park . Thank you

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Monday, March 2, 2020 2:29:29 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Beth Robins
E-mail Blp416@gmail.com

Comments Unfortunately I was unable to attend your workshop, but wanted my voice to be heard. As a new resident, I have been able to quickly ease into a new social scene with the new Pickleball Courts at Poinsettia. The negative to this is that there are easily over 100 visitors to these 6 courts each day. While I walk around the area, I see mostly empty tennis courts while 30 or more people wait for available pickleball courts, especially in the morning hours. It would sure be great to have a few more courts there! Or converting 2 of the tennis courts to pickleball. This sport is taking off like wildfire with no signs of retreat. Trending with the times, Carlsbad needs to get ahead of this important MULTIGENERATIONAL sport ASAP by providing more opportunities for play with more courts throughout the city!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 2:15 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Maria Pike
E-mail mariajosepike@yahoo.com
Comments Love Carlsbad parks and recreation. Would love to see more Pickleball courts built . Maybe Alga Norte because the Poinsetia courts are always full and overcrowded. Thank you for making our town a wonderful place to live . Sincerely Maria Pike

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 1:19 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Meredyth Potter
E-mail meredythpotter@gmail.com

Comments Greetings! Thank you for the comment opportunity.
Please consider adding pickleball courts and/or
converting tennis courts to pickleball. I appreciate the
new Poinsettia courts but more are needed.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 12:39 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Ursula Centers
E-mail ursula.centers@gmail.com
Comments PLEASE add additional Pickleball courts or convert a few more Tennis courts. Pickleball is expanding faster than Tennis, so I ask that the City respond to this new demand.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 2:26 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name David Hill
E-mail dbhillj@aol.com
Comments New Pickleball Courts are great but crowded You may want to consider converting underutilized tennis courts to Pickleball Courts. Avoid placing any Pickleball courts too close together

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Monday, March 9, 2020 3:41:09 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Donna Anselmo
E-mail d.anselmo@sbcglobal.net
Comments Poinsettia Park pickle courts are great though very crowded. I agree with other suggestions made that more courts should be considered. Thank you for your consideration.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Monday, March 9, 2020 3:58:22 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Hannah
E-mail Hannahbruck04@gmail.com
Comments More permanent pickleball courts. The ones now are very crowded. Maybe covert lightly used or hardly used tennis courts permanently into pickleball courts

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2020 7:04:03 AM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Susan Shoemaker
E-mail Shoemom@roadrunner.com
Comments Since the Poinsettia Pickleball courts opened I still haven't gotten a chance to play on them. They are too crowded. Can you make room for more courts please?

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Admin](#)
To: [Mick Calarco](#); [Neelay Bhatt](#)
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input
Date: Monday, March 16, 2020 12:35:03 PM

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Kim Orozco
E-mail Kimeorozco@yahoo.com
Comments Thank you Parks and Recreation Dept & ithe City Of Carlsbad for listening to your residents , number one . I appreciate that . .I am in a pickle ball player 64 years old and I love the sport !m now very active and very socia. The courts at poinsettia park are a fantastic ! love them ! we need more please. The courts have a great reputation and more players are coming out . I've noticed many of the tennis courts at poinsettia park ate emptyI'm hoping it might be possible to convert maybe one or two of those tennis courts into a few more pickle ball courts ...and , if there's any money left (ha ha Ha) restroom by the courts would be absolutely great . thank you for listening thank you for excepting our feedback Tournaments would be great (generates revenue) and lessons . Sincerely Kim

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: FW: Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update - public input

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 12:18 PM

To: Neelay Bhatt <neelay.bhatt@proconsulting.com>; Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov

Cc: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin Prahler <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Gabriel Buhr <gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov>; Cort Hitchens <cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov>; People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: FW: Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update - public input

Neelay & Kyle:

Thank you for your well run the public input sessions.

We know that Kyle as provided the citizen input since 2017 regarding the lack of Public Park facilities at Ponto, the existing Parks Master Plan documentation of the lack of Park Service/Equity at Ponto, the since 1996 Existing Local Coastal Program requirement [still unmet and still not fully disclosed to citizens] that requires consideration of High-Coastal-Priority land use “Public Park” at Planning Area F [not only for Carlsbad citizens, but also to serve CA Statewide Coastal Recreation needs], the now City acknowledged repeated “planning mistake” at Ponto that fundamentality flawed public participation in Land Use and Park planning at Ponto, the significant amount of citizen input [about 2,500 emails/signed petitions and community surveys already emailed to the City] asking for a Ponto Coastal Park once the “planning mistakes” were uncovered and partially disclosed to citizens. A significant number of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and CA coastal visitors have asked for a Ponto Coastal Park, and for a new, true and community-based Ponto planning process that corrects the multiple acknowledged ‘planning mistakes” dating back over 10-years at Ponto and truly considers citizens needs/desires for a Public Park at Ponto.

Attached are files the City has of this public input that it said was including as public input for the Parks Master Plan Update. Neelay, I am sure you have this, but wanted to again send to you directly to make sure you have it and have read/considered it. Also, as we walk our Ponto neighborhood, we ‘see the need for a public park’ all the time, and have enclosed a few images of ‘people using Ponto for a needed Ponto Park’ that hopefully illustrates what a significant amount of citizens have been saying, and that is reflected in the Existing Park Master Plan Park Serve/Equity maps showing a clear lack of City Park at Ponto.

Thank you again for the well run initial public input session and for considering this public input since 2017 on the City Public Park needs at Ponto, and logical request to redo public participation in park and land use planning at Ponto based on 10-years of flawed “planning mistakes” that failed to disclose to citizens and thus failed to allow citizens to truly participate in the past planning at Ponto that is now acknowledged by the City as “planning mistakes”.

Your email reply acknowledgement of receipt and consideration of this public input in the Parks Master Plan Update is requested.

Sincerely,
Concerned Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto.

From: City of Carlsbad [<mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com>] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2020 3:01 PM
To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update





Thank you for participating in last week's Parks & Recreation Master Plan workshops. We appreciate your input on future parks and recreation offerings.

Next Steps

An online survey will be provided in the coming weeks to gather additional input. We'll let you know once the survey is live. Input gathered from the workshops and survey will be provided to city staff preparing the updated Parks & Recreation Master Plan. Upcoming milestones for the master plan development include:

- March - Online survey
- July/August - Preliminary draft plan
- September - Final plan adopted

More Information

- Parks & Recreation Master Plan [website](#)
 - Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859
-



[Visit the Website](#)



City of Carlsbad | 1200 Carlsbad Village Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](mailto:unsubscribe_meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net)

[Update Profile](#) | [About Constant Contact](#)

Sent by parksandrec@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: FW: Public input to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-mobility Commissions and CA Coastal Commission on City Budget -DLCPA-PMU processes - So Carlsbad Blvd. Realignment
Attachments: Carlsbad Budget-Draft LCP Amendment-Parks Master Plan - Public Comments - So Carlsbad Blvd Realignment.pdf; Carlsbad_Blvd_Realingment-1 .pdf

From: Kyle Lancaster
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 7:28 PM
To: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: RE: Public input to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-mobility Commissions and CA Coastal Commission on City Budget -DLCPA-PMU processes - So Carlsbad Blvd. Realignment

Lance-
Message received and will be delivered to the Parks & Recreation Commission and the Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan update consultant.

Thank you.
-Kyle

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 10:29 AM
To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <scott.chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Jennifer Jesser <Jennifer.Jesser@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Nathan Schmidt <Nathan.Schmidt@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Erin Prahler' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Cort Hitchens' <cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Gabriel Buhr' <gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Fred Sandquist' <sandquist2@earthlink.net>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'People for Ponto' <info@peopleforponto.com>; Lisa Urbach <lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov>
Subject: Public input to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-mobility Commissions and CA Coastal Commission on City Budget -DLCPA-PMU processes - So Carlsbad Blvd. Realignment

Dear Carlsbad City Council, and Planning, Parks and Traffic & Mobility Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission:

People for Ponto submits this email, and the two (2) attachments as public comments on the City Budget, Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, Parks Master Plan Update, and Livable Streets improvement processes. We request this email and attachment be provided to the Carlsbad City Council, and Planning, Parks and Mobility Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission as public input on the City Staff proposed 1) Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, 2) Parks Master Plan Update, and 3) Mobility improvement processes. Thank you.

Email confirmation of receipt and delivery of this email/attachment is requested. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
People for Ponto

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Carlsbad proposed Draft Budget, Local Coastal Program Amendment, & Parks Master Plan Update – Public Comments

City Budget, Draft LCP Amendment and Parks Master Plan Update issues – South Carlsbad Boulevard (PCH) Realignment land use policy/mapping clarity, and environmental and budget feasibility:

Please see and include the attached City of Carlsbad’s CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT STUDY PHASE II: PRELIMINARY FINANCIAL ANALYSIS dated October 4, 2001 in this public comment. The realignment study evaluated the City selling and/or leasing portions of the exiting South Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way for Commercial land use. This is concerning on serval levels.

This public comment requests that in the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment (DLCPA) and Parks Master Plan Update processes:

1. Provide clear public disclosure and discussion as to if the City’s:
 - a. proposed DLCPA Land Use policies [Pages/Figures: p. 1-5 Figure 1-1, p. 2-11 Figure 2-1, pp. 2-19 & 20 Figure 2-2b & 2-2c; and Pages/Policies: p. 2-22, Ponto/Southern Waterfront, p. 2-23 Draft Policy LCP-2-P.5, p. 2-24 Draft Policy LCP-2-P.7, p. 2-26 Draft Policy LCP-2-P.19]; or
 - b. existing General Plan Land Use Element [Pages: p. 2-35, p. 2-38, pp. 2-47-48; and Policies: 2-G.20, 2-P.51, 2-P.52, 2-P.53, 2-P.55, and 2-P.90] General Plan policies)

provide in any way the opportunity to convert South Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way into Commercial Land Use as part of realignment. Realignment was portrayed to Citizens as an elaborate way to provide a much needed pedestrian sidewalk/pathway, or Promenade along South Carlsbad Boulevard, not a ‘pathway to change open landscaped right-of-way land to Commercial uses’.

- Are the DLCPA Realignment Land Use policy and/or mapping allowing Commercial use on City designated right-of-way land like proposed in Carlsbad’s 2001 Realignment Study?
 - Does the City’s General Plan polices allow, support or imply Commercial use in any Realignment right-of-way land?
2. To even start having that important public disclosure and discussion, citizens must have both clear DLCPA Land Use Policies and Land Use Maps that show exactly “what and where” the City’s potential proposed Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment “is, and what and where it is not”.
 - The DLCPA Land Use Policies are vague and DLCPA Land Use Maps do not show any Land Use (Open Space or Commercial) associated with the Realignment. This vagueness is counter to the some very specific land uses and areas itemized in the City’s 2001 Study – why?

It is requested that both the DLCPA Land Use Policies and Maps be amended to be consistent and clear as to “what” and “where” the Realignment is and what proposed DLCPA policies apply to those areas, and what Land Uses are being proposed to be assigned to those areas in the Land Use Plan(s).

3. As part of this clear disclosure by the City and public discussion, it also seems logical to roughly update the 20-year old ‘preliminary study’ of realignment costs to have a general understanding if South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment is even environmentally/fiscally viable. Current costs could exceed \$75 million. Carlsbad Citizens and taxpayers need to know if the ‘Realignment Promenade/Linear Park’ is a viable project the City will be implementing and when. Or is the ‘Realignment Promenade/Linear Park’ more a ‘Trojan horse’ – outside an apparently attractive celebration, while truthfully hidden inside is disappointment resulting in ruin. The City’s 20-year old 2001 Realignment Study seems to point to this concern/possibility.
4. The DLCPA should add a clear and accountable Public Coastal Access, Livable Streets and Connectivity Policy (Section 4.8, at p. 4-41) that requires the City to fully fund and construct as soon as possible a sidewalk/pedestrian path/‘Promenade’ along South Carlsbad Boulevard to “Complete” and make “Livable” this street. The missing safe pedestrian Coastal Access along South Carlsbad Boulevard represents over ½ of Carlsbad’s coastline. The City’s CIP #60311 Budget already has \$3.2 million, which based on City costs for sidewalk construction, is sufficient to complete most of this needed sidewalk/pedestrian path/‘Promenade’. The sidewalk/pedestrian path/‘Promenade’ can be quickly, simply and cost effectively accomplished with an existing budget for that purpose, and within the existing right-of-way configuration. The few short sections along bridges can be cost effectively addressed with vehicle/bike lane restriping and maybe a ‘jersey barrier’ similar to what was done at Agua Hedionda. Again, the missing sidewalk/pedestrian path/‘Promenade’ can be substantially completed using existing budgeted CIP funds for that purpose. Special design and landscape qualities could be budgeted and incorporated to enhance to a ‘Promenade’ level, or be similar to North Carlsbad Boulevard’s ‘Promenade’ design. A community-based design process could define consensus on that.

As supporting data that should be factored in the above 4 requests, the Mayor stated in 2020 that the South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment would presently cost about \$75 million. This figure appears it maybe a rational estimate, but should be verified. Would South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment be the most expensive City project ever? The \$75 million Realignment cost is \$5 million more than the City’s Golf Course land acquisition and construction costs. The City Golf Course is 402.8 acres, and is understood to be the most expensive to acquire/build municipal golf course in the USA, and most expensive to-date Carlsbad City project.

Sadly in comparison, South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment does Not acquire or add any new land. Realignment simply realigns up to 54.5 acres of existing City owned landscaped right-of-way, to then repurpose only 4 - 10.8 acres for possible Park use under the 4 Land Use Alternatives as documented in the City’s 2001 Realignment Study. The \$75 million Realignment cost would thus cost \$7 - 19 million to simply repurpose each acre of existing City right-of-way land for Park use. This cost per acre appears

fiscally imprudent given much better alternatives. In comparison the Mayor stated the alternative 11 acre Ponto Coastal Park that is required to be studied under Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program would only cost \$20-22 million. The \$20-22 million figure also appears a rational estimate given vacant land costs in the area is roughly \$1.5 – 2 million per acre. So it is actually 7 to 9.5 times more cost effective to simply purchase vacant land that actually adds New land and is also required to be studied/considered for Park use. Again, the Relocation proposal's \$7 – 19 million cost per acre is NOT to buy any new land, but simply rearrange existing land the City already owns and is already landscaped and open as part of the roadway median. It seems logical to fully and publicly vet the proposed South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Land Use Policies/Map/Costs. The Realignment concept seems fiscally imprudent and a significant squandering of taxpayer resources.

These public comments are not against a much needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad as there is none and this is vitally needed to provide a Coastal Park for ½ of Carlsbad's citizens and for the thousands of Visitors staying at the thousands of South Carlsbad Resort and hotel rooms. As the Mayor stated this is the most cost effective solution providing MORE NEW parkland at a fraction of the cost of the Realignment. Over 2,500 emails from citizens and visitors have asked the City Council to provide this much needed Ponto Coastal Park.

These public comments are also not against a much needed sidewalk/pedestrian pathway (including a wider than normal pathway) to provide safe (Complete-Livable Streets) pedestrian Coastal Access along South CARLSBAD Boulevard - in fact just the opposite. The public comment #4 specifically asks for a clear, accountable, funded DLCPA Policy that achieves rapid implementation of a sidewalk/pedestrian path/Promenade within the existing South Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way configuration. This requested LCP Policy would address the critically needed Coastal Access, public safety, and mobility needs along South Carlsbad Boulevard, that has been delayed way too long. Citizens and visitors should not have to wait over 20-years for this much needed Coastal Access and public safety facility for over ½ of Carlsbad's coastline.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lance Schulte

Attachment: City of Carlsbad's CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT STUDY PHASE II: PRELIMINARY FINANCIAL ANALYSIS, dated October 4, 2001

Carlsbad Golf Course information: <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/politics/sdut-city-to-pay-off-golf-course-bond-debt-2016jul07-story.html>

ERA

Economics Research Associates

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD
REALIGNMENT STUDY
PHASE II: PRELIMINARY
FINANCIAL ANALYSIS**

Submitted to:
The City of Carlsbad

Prepared by:
Economics Research Associates
URS Corporation
Wallace, Roberts & Todd

October 4, 2001
ERA Project No. 14158

964 5th Avenue Suite 214
San Diego, CA 92101 ERA is affiliated with Drivers Jonas
619.544.1402 FAX 619.544.1404 www.erasf.com/erasf
Los Angeles San Francisco San Diego
Chicago Dallas Washington DC London



Economics Research Associates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. | Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. | Development Scenarios..... | 2 |
| III. | Land and Fiscal Value Estimates | 7 |
| IV. | Other Potential Sources for Funding Realignment Costs..... | 11 |
| | Appendix..... | 15 |



Economics Research Associates

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Table 1: Development Program Scenarios – Alternative 1..... | 3 |
| Table 2: Development Program Scenarios – Alternative 2..... | 4 |
| Table 3: Development Program Scenarios – Alternative 3..... | 5 |
| Table 4: Development Program Scenarios – Alternative 4..... | 6 |
| Table 5: Preliminary Revenue/Cost Comparison | 8 |

GENERAL LIMITING CONDITIONS

Every reasonable effort has been made to ensure that the data contained in this study reflect the most accurate and timely information possible, and they are believed to be reliable. This study is based on estimates, assumptions and other information reviewed and evaluated by Economics Research Associates from its consultations with the client and the client's representatives and within its general knowledge of the industry. No responsibility is assumed for inaccuracies in reporting by the client, the client's agent and representatives or any other data source used in preparing or presenting this study.

This report is based on information that was current as of *October 2001* or as noted in the report, and Economics Research Associates has not undertaken any update of its research effort since such date.

No warranty or representation is made by Economics Research Associates that any of the projected values or results contained in this study will actually be achieved.

Possession of this study does not carry with it the right of publication thereof or to use the name of "Economics Research Associates" in any manner without first obtaining the prior written consent of Economics Research Associates. No abstracting, excerpting or summarization of this study may be made without first obtaining the prior written consent of Economics Research Associates. This report is not to be used in conjunction with any public or private offering of securities or other similar purpose where it may be relied upon to any degree by any person other than the client without first obtaining the prior written consent of Economics Research Associates. This study may not be used for purposes other than that for which it is prepared or for which prior written consent has first been obtained from Economics Research Associates.

This study is qualified in its entirety by, and should be considered in light of, these limitations, conditions and considerations.

I. INTRODUCTION

The *Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study* is an analysis of alternative scenarios for realigning Carlsbad Boulevard away from the coast bluff edge and, in the process, creating opportunities for commercial, recreation, and open space uses. One of the study's objectives is to explore ways to generate revenue from useable public land created, including potential land sale or lease opportunities, and using this revenue to help offset the cost of realigning the road.

This Phase II report is a preliminary evaluation of each scenario's financial implications. The Phase I report, presented in April 1999, evaluated the market context in which development may take place. Some of the key rent and market assumptions presented in this report are based on the 1999 research, adjusted for inflation. A market analysis update has not taken place since 1999. The values presented here are preliminary estimates for planning purposes only, and should not be interpreted as valuations or appraisals since they are based on conceptual development programs, gross preliminary development cost factors, and two-year old market research. Valuations or appraisals will require greater due diligence regarding current market conditions, more specific development and site planning programs, and more detailed cost estimates.

II. DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS

URS Corporation and the City of Carlsbad have identified four alternative land use scenarios for a realigned Carlsbad Boulevard. The proposed realignment creates 4-6 new surplus land areas resulting 5-7 potential parcels (see the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study – Phase I and Phase II for more details regarding these alignments and surplus land areas). The consultant team prepared hypothetical development programs for each alternative. These hypothetical development programs are not recommendations; rather, they were devised to test the potential financial impact of the following alternative approaches towards reuse of the surplus land that is created with the road realignment. They were also designed to serve as a starting point for discussion of preferred uses and to allow the decision-makers to select and combine the elements from each alternative that they find most desirable. Finally, these scenarios serve as starting points for discussions with State Parks, which is critical for the pivotal Manzano parcel.

- Alternative 1 tests the financial impacts of a parks and open space scheme. It assumes that no major commercial development occurs and that the surplus parcels are used for parking, community facilities, parks, open space, and camping (concessionaire), as shown in Table 1.
- Alternative 2 tests the financial impacts of a predominately parks and open space scheme, with limited commercial development. It assumes that a time-share and executive meeting hotel is built on a small portion of Surplus Area 1, and that the rest of Surplus Area 1 and all of the other parcels are used for parking, community facilities, parks, or open space, as shown in Table 2.
- Alternative 3, as shown in Table 3, tests the financial impacts of a significant commercial development scheme. It assumes significant commercial development on almost half of Surplus Areas 1 (specialty retail, restaurants, and office) and 3 (hotel), and all of Surplus Areas 2 (time-share), 6A (time-share), and 6B (office), as shown in Table 3. More than half of Surplus Area 1 is used as park space and more than half of Surplus Area 3 remains open space. Parcels 4 and 5 provide parking and open space.
- Alternative 4 tests the financial impacts of a significant commercial development scheme for a majority of Surplus Area 1 (specialty retail, restaurants, time-share, and executive meeting hotel), with a neighborhood park on the remaining portion of Surplus Area 1, as shown in Table 4. Parcels 2, 3, and 6A remain open space, and 4, 5, and 6B contain public parking and open space.

Table 1: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 1 - Parks and Open Space

| | Units | Surplus Area: | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------|-----|------|-------|-----|-----|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B |
| Acreage | | 20.8 | 5.1 | 10.1 | 13.7 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Developable Commercial | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | - | - | - | 2.8 | - | - | - |
| Public parking | | 1.0 | 0.6 | - | 1.5 | 0.9 | - | 0.6 |
| Community facility | | 0.8 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| Active parks | | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open space | | 15.0 | 4.4 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial-Restaurants | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Time Share | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | - | 45 | - | - | - |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | - | 50 | - | - | - |
| Common facilities | | - | - | - | 3,000 | - | - | - |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spaces | 140 | 50 | - | 200 | 135 | - | 90 |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | 2,500 | - | - | 3,000 | - | - | - |
| Restrooms | Number | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | 15.0 | 4.4 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 |

Source: URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd; and Economics Research Associates

Table 2: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 2

| | Units | Surplus Area; | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------|-----|------|------|--------|-----|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B |
| Acreage | | 20.8 | 5.1 | 10.1 | 13.7 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Developable Commercial | | 5.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public parking | | - | 2.6 | 6.9 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.6 |
| Community facility | | - | - | - | 0.1 | 0.4 | - | - |
| Active parks | | - | 1.6 | 1.6 | - | 0.5 | - | 1.4 |
| Open space | | 15.8 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 10.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | - |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial-Restaurants | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Time Share | Rooms | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Common facilities | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spaces | - | 150 | 870 | 520 | 176 | 10 | 90 |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | - | - | - | - | 19,600 | - | - |
| Restrooms | Number | - | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | - | 1.6 | 1.6 | - | 0.5 | - | 1.4 |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | 15.8 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 10.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | - |

Source: URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd; and Economics Research Associates

Table 3: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 3

| | Units | Surplus Area: | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------|-----|------|---|---|-----|--------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B |
| Acreage* | | 20.8 | 5.1 | 10.1 | - | - | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Developable Commercial | | 10.0 | 5.1 | 4.3 | - | - | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Campground | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public parking | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Community facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Active parks | | 10.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open space | | - | - | 5.8 | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | 40,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial-Restaurants | s.f. | 40,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office | s.f. | 80,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 15,000 |
| Time Share | Rooms | - | 150 | - | - | - | 30 | - |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | 300 | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Common facilities | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spaces | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Restrooms | Number | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | 10.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | - | - | 5.8 | - | - | - | - |

*Acreages may not equal total due to rounding

Source: URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd; and Economics Research Associates

Table 4: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 4

| Units | Surplus Area: | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------|---|---|---|----|----|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B | |
| Acreage* | 20.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Developable Commercial | 15.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Campground | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Public parking | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Community facility | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Active parks | 5.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Open space | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | 45,000 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Commercial-Restaurants | s.f. | 45,000 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Office | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Time Share | Rooms | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Campground | | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Common facilities | | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spaces | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Restrooms | Number | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | 5.8 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | - | - | - | - | - | - | |

*Acreages may not equal total due to rounding

Source: URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd; and Economics Research Associates

III. LAND AND FISCAL VALUE ESTIMATES

ERA estimated the approximate residual land value and the capitalized value of the estimated fiscal revenue associated with each of the alternative alignments and development scenarios. The estimates are very preliminary since they are based on hypothetical development programs without architectural designs, rent assumptions based on 1999 research (updated to 2001 values), preliminary site capacity and site planning analysis, and gross development cost estimates for buildings and site development. The detailed analyses for each alternative are presented in Appendix A. These estimates, which are not appraisals, will need to be revised as development programs become more specific, and they do not form the basis for a financial offering, bond, or prospectus without additional planning, engineering, cost estimating, and due diligence.

The residual land value estimates translate into the potential revenue generated from commercial land sales, or the capitalized values of leases, of surplus land areas created by the road realignment. These estimates are preliminary approximations of what a developer might be willing to pay for the land in order to obtain a reasonable rate of return on total capital (debt and equity capital). In order to be conservative, no real appreciation was assumed; in other words, rents only rise with inflation. Some developers may speculate that rents will rise faster than inflation, which would result in higher values than estimated in this report. The fiscal revenue translates into the capitalized value of the potential fiscal resources to the City and Redevelopment Agency that could help finance some of the Carlsbad Boulevard realignment costs.

The total revenue from commercial land sales (or leases) and the capitalized value of fiscal revenue was compared to URS Corporation's preliminary estimate of road realignment costs (\$18.8 million), and Wallace, Roberts, and Todd's preliminary estimates of possible public parking, parks, open space, and community facility costs (\$8.5-12.1 million). While road realignment costs are required to produce the surplus parcels, costs to develop the open space are flexible. The estimates provided assume maximum improvements to the open space.

As shown in Table 5, Alternative 1, the least commercial scenario, generates very limited revenue, only \$1.1 million in commercial land value, and over \$0.2 million in the capitalized value of fiscal revenue, for a total of almost \$1.3 million. Other sources would have to fund over \$17.5 million in road construction costs, and \$9.0 million in public facility, parks, and open space costs, or the amount of improvements would have to be reduced.

Table 5: PRELIMINARY REVENUE/COST COMPARISON (Year 2001 Dollars)

| | Alternatives | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Revenues From Commercial Land Sales | \$ 1,131,000 | \$ 9,219,000 | \$ 28,155,000 | \$ 19,465,000 |
| Capitalized Value of Fiscal Revenues to City & RDA | \$ 217,000 | \$ 10,849,000 | \$ 24,743,000 | \$ 16,429,000 |
| Total Potential Revenues | \$ 1,348,000 | \$ 20,068,000 | \$ 52,898,000 | \$ 35,894,000 |
| Less: Road Construction Costs | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 |
| Net Revenues <Deficit> After Road Construction Costs | \$ (17,452,000) | \$ 1,268,000 | \$ 34,098,000 | \$ 17,094,000 |
| Less: Public Parking, Parks, Open Space, and Facilities | \$ 8,999,580 | \$ 12,062,589 | \$ 8,496,734 | \$ 9,358,925 |
| Net Revenues <Deficit> After Public Costs | \$ (26,451,580) | \$ (10,794,589) | \$ 25,601,266 | \$ 7,735,075 |

Source: Economics Research Associates; URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd



Alternative 2 generates over \$9.2 million in commercial land value, and \$10.8 million in fiscal revenue, for a total of \$20.1 million. This amount is enough to cover the \$18.8 million in road realignment costs, but not enough to cover the estimated \$12.1 million in potential public facility, parks, and open space costs. Other sources would have to fund approximately \$10.8 million in public facility, parks, and open space costs, or the amount or type of improvements would have to be reduced.

Alternative 3, the most commercial scenario, generates an estimated \$28.2 million in revenues from commercial land value, and \$24.7 million in capitalized fiscal revenue, for a total of \$52.9 million. This amount is substantially more than enough to cover the \$18.8 million in road realignment costs, and \$8.5 million in public facility, parks, and open space costs.

Alternative 4 generates an estimated \$19.5 million in commercial land value, and \$16.4 million in capitalized fiscal revenue, for a total of \$35.9 million, which is more than enough to cover the \$18.8 million in road realignment costs, and \$9.4 million in public facility, parks, and open space costs.

QUALIFICATIONS

While it appears that alternatives 3 and 4 generate enough revenue to cover development costs, the findings at this preliminary planning stage of analysis are qualified, as follows:

- The cost estimates are based on gross cost factors and need to be refined as project design becomes more specific.
- The cost estimates do not include any extraordinary off-site costs, such as for environmental or traffic mitigation.
- Some of the parcels identified for potential development, particularly those west of the alignment, may be vulnerable to long term erosion problems; therefore, their stability needs to be verified.

- A significant share of value and fiscal revenue in scenarios 2, 3, and 4 is attributable to hotels, which in 1999 demonstrated only average performance, especially among moderately priced hotels. Also, a new hotel has been developed since 1999. While the parcels identified for potential hotel development are competitive because of the views they offer, hotel development and financing are relatively risky.
- WRT has determined that the hypothetical development programs can fit on the parcels, and URS Corporation has initially determined that the circulation system can accommodate the development. However, there could be difficult site planning issues with some of the parcels that would limit their development potential to less than what is assumed in this analysis.
- The development cost estimates for the commercial development scenarios, for the most part, do not assume structured parking. If structured parking is required, development costs could be greater which would diminish residual land values unless higher rents are achievable.
- Most of the value is generated on Surplus Area 1, which is owned by the State of California. The City or Redevelopment Agency would not realize the value of Surplus Area 1 unless the State trades the parcel to the City or Agency for other considerations. Therefore, the City or Agency may not be able to apply proceeds from the value of Surplus Area 1 to road realignment and public facility costs. Nevertheless, under Alternative 3, the capitalized value of the fiscal revenue alone might be sufficient to cover road construction costs and a portion of public facility costs. The capitalized value of fiscal revenue under Alternative 4 comes close to covering road construction costs, but is not sufficient to cover other public facility costs.
- Competitive market conditions could change which would affect the market potential of the development programs assumed in the scenarios analyzed in this report. The estimated values are based on the hypothetical development programs for each parcel. If development programs change, the values will change.

IV. OTHER POTENTIAL SOURCES FOR FUNDING REALIGNMENT COSTS

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and State of California Transportation Department (CalTrans) are the traditional sources of funds for capital improvements to highways. For example, the Federal government offers approximately 70 different transportation-funding programs. The majority of these funds are made available for disbursement to regional entities such as SANDAG, while a small portion is made available directly to municipalities.

FUNDS AVAILABLE DIRECTLY TO MUNICIPALITIES

The CalTrans Local Assistance Program (LAP) is responsible for helping municipalities located in CalTrans District 11 identify which Federal and State funding programs for which they are eligible and guiding them through the application process. Each program is specifically tailored for a given need, and has very strict eligibility requirements. One such specialized program funds "Intelligent Transportation Systems". Funds are available to projects that integrate new technology (computer-related) with the road/highway project to improve traffic flow. Because this program is new, eligibility requirements are not yet well defined.

There is no program specifically for road or highway realignment. Moreover, it is estimated that for every 10 applicants to each of the programs above, only the most urgent project is funded, leaving 90 percent of the applications unsuccessful. Given the level of competition for funds, if the City of Carlsbad finds that portions of the road may fall into one or more of the eligible categories, the application should present as compelling a case as possible. In any case, once a specific construction plan has been determined, a representative from the City of Carlsbad should meet with a representative from the Local Assistance Program to discuss the program in detail and determine whether or not portions of the project are eligible for Federal or State aid.

Finally, another option is direct funding from special state legislative action.

REGIONAL FUNDS

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) administers the apportionment of funds from the larger, more general State and Federal transportation funding programs. The most likely source of funding for a project such as the realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard is the Regional Arterial Projects section of the Surface Transportation Projects.

For a project to receive an apportionment from SANDAG, it must be included in the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP). The City of Carlsbad is an active participant on the CTEC committee, the body that periodically updates the RTIP. However, it is important to note that the current RTIP (2000-2004) provides only \$153 million towards projects estimated to cost nearly \$392 million. Also, the current RTIP specifically states that "local governments will obtain private developer financing for those on- and off-site roadway and transit improvement necessary to accommodate the increased travel generated by private development."

The major source of Federal transportation funds administered by SANDAG is the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). In addition to highway and surface road construction and improvements, TEA-21 is a source of funds for driver safety initiatives, transit programs, rail projects, and transportation research. TEA-21 was established in 1998 and funded through 2003, thus funding levels beyond that time are unknown. The Surface Transportation Program (STP) is the section of TEA-21 relevant to the realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard. One STP program, Transportation Enhancement Activities Program, funds highway enhancement activities over and above mitigation, standard landscaping and other permit requirements for a normal transportation project. Project eligibility categories under the Transportation Enhancement Program which may be applicable to the realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard are: 1) Scenic or historic highway programs; 2) Landscaping and other scenic beautification; 3) Environmental mitigation to address water pollution due to highway runoff.

Currently, all TEA-21 funds, including STP, have been assigned to projects (detailed in SANDAG's 2000 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan); however, SANDAG continues to pursue additional discretionary funding available through TEA-21 on an annual basis.

In 1987, San Diego voters passed Proposition A, which authorized a one-half percent sales tax increase dedicated for transportation improvements. The first \$1 million in annual TransNet revenue is set aside for bicycle-related projects and the remainder is divided equally between highway, public transit and local street and road projects. Highway projects are approved for funding by SANDAG, CalTrans, the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board, and the North San Diego County Transit Development Board. Local street and road projects are approved for funding by the city councils of the 18 cities and the County Board of Supervisors. The Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project is a potential candidate project. TransNet funds have been programmed through 2004, and the measure will expire in 2008.

LOCAL SOURCES

Local sources include developer financed road improvements, transportation impact fees, tax increment financing in redevelopment project areas, infrastructure financing districts, assessment districts, Community Facilities Districts, General Obligation Bonds, and the General Fund.

To the extent that the realignment also increases road capacity that is required to mitigate the impacts of new development, developer financed road improvements or impact fees may apply. If the road realignment simply moves the road without enhancing capacity for future local developments, however, the nexus may not be strong enough for developer funding or impact fees to apply. Alternatively, the City may negotiate voluntary contributions to road realignment costs through development agreements on larger land development projects in the vicinity of Carlsbad Boulevard that require City discretionary approval.

Since the proposed Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project is within a newly adopted redevelopment project area, the City's Redevelopment Agency may use tax increment to finance some of the realignment costs. Tax increment financing does not result in higher tax rates; rather, the incremental gain in property tax revenues is directed toward certain improvements within a redevelopment project area. To the extent that the realignment creates parcels that are commercially developed, the realignment project will be directly responsible for the tax increment generated by those commercial developments. Because tax increment will not be generated until the parcels are developed with commercial uses, there may be a cash flow financing issue to overcome to fund the realignment costs that will occur in advance of tax increment.

Another type of property tax increment financing is the Infrastructure Financing District (IFD). It also is based on the incremental gain in property taxes rather than an increase in tax rates. The City of Carlsbad was one of the first jurisdictions in California to form an IFD. Unlike tax increment in redevelopment project areas, an IFDs do not have to be located in redevelopment project areas and, therefore, do not have to address blight or meet the "predominately urbanized" test of redevelopment law. The public facility that is financed must serve the community at large. However, unlike a redevelopment project area that can be formed by Council action, an IFD must be approved by two-thirds of the voters if 12 or more registered voters reside in the district. Otherwise, two-thirds of the property owners within the district must vote to approve the district. The affected taxing agencies must also approve the district and tax increment sharing must be negotiated.

Properties that benefit from the realignment may be assessed for a portion of the cost through a benefit assessment district, such as the *Municipal Improvement Act of 1913*. The assessments may be pledged to support debt service on bonds, issued under the *Improvement Bond Act of 1915*. The formation process must establish the scope of improvements, identify the benefiting parcels, and determine an equitable allocation of costs. Property owners vote for or against formation of an assessment district at a public hearing. Some of the benefiting properties that are owned by the State may not be assessed.

A Community Facilities District, commonly known as a Mello-Roos district, is a special tax that can be based on a formula that has a less strict benefit allocation. However, a Community Facilities District requires two-thirds voter approval of voters residing within the district. If there are fewer than twelve registered voters in the district, the qualified electors are defined as owners of land within the district, with each owner allowed one vote per acre.

General Obligation Bonds, backed by the full faith and credit of the City, are the most secure and lowest cost form of debt financing. However, it would require two-thirds voter approval among Carlsbad's electorate, which may be difficult for the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project unless it is perceived as a project that has citywide benefits.

Finally, the General Fund may be used to fund a portion of road improvements through the Capital Improvement Plan, either as direct allocations, or as annual lease payments on Certificates of Participation. Fiscal revenue from development on surplus parcels could help augment the General Fund, especially if a hotel or specialty retail is developed, to enable the City to use General Fund monies for some of the road realignment and other public facility costs.

CONCLUSION

Both the SANDAG representative and the CalTrans Local Assistance Program representative noted that most road or highway realignments are done to facilitate development. Policymakers are aware of this and generally design funding programs in a way that encourages the private sector to pay for as much of the project costs as possible. Programs are also designed to encourage municipalities to utilize funds from their share of the gas tax, TransNet, and even the General Fund and Community Development Block Grants before turning to State and Federal funds. Finally, due to the limited funds available, all funding sources give priority to projects of a regional significance over those of local importance.

APPENDIX**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1.A.1 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 1, Land Use Scenario A; Proforma Cash Flow – Preliminary Residual Land Value

Table 1.A.2 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 1, Land Use Scenario A; Fiscal Revenues

Table 1.A.3, 4, 5 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 1, Parcel 4, Land Use Scenario A; RV Operating Statement

Table 2.A.1 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 2, Land Use Scenario A; Proforma Cash Flow – Preliminary Residual Land Value

Table 2.A.2 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Fiscal Revenues

Table 2.A.3, 4, 5 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

Table 2.A.6 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Time Share

Table 3.A.1 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Land Use Scenario A; Proforma Cash Flow – Preliminary Residual Land Value

Table 3.A.2 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Land Use Scenario A; Fiscal Revenues

Table 3.A.3, 4 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Retail/Commercial Operating Statement

Table 3.A.5, 6 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Office Operating Statement

Table 3.A.7 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 2, Land Use Scenario A; Time Share

Table 3.A.8, 9, 10 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 3, Land Use Scenario A; Full Service Hotel



Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.11 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 6A, Land Use Scenario A; Time Share

Table 3.A.12, 13 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 6B, Land Use Scenario A; Office Operating Statement

Table 4.A.1 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 6B, Land Use Scenario A; Proforma Cash Flow – Preliminary Residual Land Value

Table 4.A.2 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Fiscal Revenues

Table 4.A.3, 4, 5 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

Table 4.A.6, 7 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Retail/Commercial Operating Statement

Table 4.A.8 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Time Share

Table 1.A.1

02-Oct-01

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Land Use Scenario A
PROFORMA CASH FLOW - PRELIMINARY RESIDUAL LAND VALUE
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)

| | Yr. 2001 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Value | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS**Net Sources of Funds By Land Use**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| RV - Concessionaire | - | (0.79) | (0.82) | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 5.40 |
| Sub-total | \$ - | \$ (0.79) | \$ (0.82) | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 5.40 |
| Net Cash Flow After Developer Costs | \$ - | \$ (0.8) | \$ (0.8) | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 5.4 |

Net Present Value After Developer Costs

| | | |
|---------------------|-------|----------------------------------|
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$1.20 million, Yr. 2003 dollars |
|---------------------|-------|----------------------------------|

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 1.A.2
CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Land Use Scenario A
FISCAL REVENUES

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| PROPERTY TAXES | | <i>Expressed In Millions of US Dollars</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Uses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RV | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| City's Share | 4.75% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| RDA's Non-housing Share | 60.00% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 |
| TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES | | <i>Expressed In Millions of US Dollars</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Service Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Transient Occupancy Tax @ | 10.00% of Room Revenue | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Gross Fiscal Operating Income From TOT & TI | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 |
| SALES TAX REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage & 50% of Other Hotel Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| TOTAL FISCAL REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total Fiscal Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL REVENUE | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 |
| Reversion @ | 7% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.47 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.50 |
| NET CASH FLOW | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.50 |
| Net Present Value @ 10% | | \$0.23 million Yr. 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 1.A.3

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Parcel 4, Land Use Scenario A
RV Concessionaire Operating Statement

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Number of RV Spaces | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | |
| Total Potential Number of nights | | - | - | - | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 55.0% | 60.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | |
| Avg. Daily RV Rate /1 | \$ 40 | 42 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 49 | 51 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 57 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 64 | |
| Number of Primitive Spaces | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | |
| Total Potential Number of nights | | - | - | - | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | |
| Avg. Daily RV Rate /1 | \$ 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Space Rental Revenues | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.83 | \$ 0.86 | \$ 0.88 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 0.93 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 0.99 | \$ 1.02 | \$ 1.05 | \$ 1.08 | |
| As % of Room Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage | 20% | - | - | - | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | |
| Other Revenues | 30% | - | - | - | 0.20 | 0.23 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.33 | |
| Subtotal (Non-Room Revenues) | 50% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 0.54 | |
| Gross Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.02 | \$ 1.14 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 1.28 | \$ 1.32 | \$ 1.36 | \$ 1.40 | \$ 1.44 | \$ 1.49 | \$ 1.53 | \$ 1.58 | \$ 1.63 | |
| Departmental Costs & Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | As % of Departmental Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spaces | 25% | - | - | - | 0.17 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Food & Beverage | 75% | - | - | - | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.16 | |
| Other Departments | 50% | - | - | - | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.16 | |
| Total Departmental Expenses (% of Gross Revenues) | 37% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 0.55 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.60 | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | 63% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.79 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.84 | \$ 0.86 | \$ 0.89 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 0.94 | \$ 0.97 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.03 | |

Notes:

/1 Rate, after discounts, per occupied room.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table I.A.4

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Parcel 4, Land Use Scenario A
RV Operating Statement**

| | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | - | - | - | - | - | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.91 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.03 | |
| Undistributed Operating Expenses | As % of Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 5.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 |
| Management Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Sales & Marketing | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| Energy Costs | 6.0% | - | - | - | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 |
| Repairs & Maintenance | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.07 |
| Total | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.27 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 |
| Gross Operating Profit | 41.3% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 0.55 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.67 |
| Fixed Expenses & Capital Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes (based on 1% of prior year capitalized value) | formula | - | - | - | - | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| Incentive Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Insurance | 1.0% | - | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Capital Reserve | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Total | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.12 |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | - | - | - | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 0.55 |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table I.A.5

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Parcel 4, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)
RV Operating Statement**

| | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | - | - | - | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 0.55 |
| Reversion @ 11.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.00 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.15 |
| Net Sales Proceeds | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.85 |
| Total Sources of Funds | - | - | - | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 5.40 |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Number of Spaces | 95 | 48 | 48 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Development Costs - Annual % | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Development Costs per space /1 | \$ 15,263 | 0.79 | 0.82 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Development Costs | \$ - | \$ 0.79 | \$ 0.82 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - | (0.79) | (0.82) | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 5.40 |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | - | (0.79) | (1.61) | (1.24) | (0.86) | (0.44) | (0.01) | 0.44 | 0.90 | 1.37 | 1.85 | 2.36 | 2.87 | 3.41 | 8.80 |
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$1.20 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 New development costs include direct costs, off-site & on-site costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

/2 Included in development cost per space

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.1

02-Oct-01

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Land Use Scenario A
PROFORMA CASH FLOW - PRELIMINARY RESIDUAL LAND VALUE
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| | Yr. 2001 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | Value | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS**Net Sources of Funds By Land Use**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Executive Mtg. Hotel Net Cash Flow | - | (11.06) | (11.40) | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.11 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.41 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 41.24 |
| Time Share | - | - | (11.54) | 9.24 | (2.72) | 9.81 | 10.10 | 10.40 | 1.07 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-total | \$ - | \$ (11.06) | \$ (22.93) | \$ 12.06 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 12.74 | \$ 13.12 | \$ 13.52 | \$ 4.28 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.41 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 41.24 |

Net Cash Flow After Developer Costs

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| \$ - | \$ (11.1) | \$ (22.9) | \$ 12.1 | \$ 0.1 | \$ 12.7 | \$ 13.1 | \$ 13.5 | \$ 4.3 | \$ 3.3 | \$ 3.4 | \$ 3.5 | \$ 3.6 | \$ 3.7 | \$ 41.2 |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|

Net Present Value After Developer Costs

| | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$9.78 million US dollars |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.2

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
FISCAL REVENUES**

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| PROPERTY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Uses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Executive Mtg. Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.34 |
| Time Share | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.67 | \$ 0.68 |
| Total Property Tax Increment | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 0.93 | \$ 0.95 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 0.98 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.02 |
| City's Share | 4.75% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.05 |
| RDA's Non-housing Share | 60.00% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.54 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.57 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.61 |
| TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Executive Mtg. Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.57 | \$ 6.18 | \$ 6.36 | \$ 6.55 | \$ 6.75 | \$ 6.95 | \$ 7.16 | \$ 7.38 | \$ 7.60 | \$ 7.83 | \$ 8.06 | \$ 8.30 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax @ | 10.00% of Room Revenue | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.83 |
| Gross Fiscal Operating Income From TOT & TI | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 1.06 | \$ 1.17 | \$ 1.28 | \$ 1.32 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.38 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.49 |
| SALES TAX REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage & 50% of Other Hotel Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| Total Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| TOTAL FISCAL REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.66 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.83 |
| Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| Total Fiscal Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.10 | \$ 1.20 | \$ 1.31 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.39 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.50 | \$ 1.54 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL OPERATING INCOME | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.10 | \$ 1.20 | \$ 1.31 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.39 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.50 | \$ 1.54 |
| Reversion @ | 7% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 23.64 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.10 | \$ 1.20 | \$ 1.31 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.39 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.50 | \$ 25.18 |
| NET CASH FLOW | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.10 | \$ 1.20 | \$ 1.31 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.39 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.50 | \$ 25.18 |
| Net Present Value @ | 10% | \$11.51 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.3

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hotel - Exec. Conf. Ctr. Number of Rooms | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| Total Potential Number of Room nights | | - | - | - | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 65.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% |
| Avg. Daily Rm. Rate Hotel 2 /1 | \$ 135 | 143 | 148 | 152 | 157 | 161 | 166 | 171 | 176 | 181 | 187 | 192 | 198 | 204 | 210 | 217 |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | |
| Room Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.57 | \$ 6.18 | \$ 6.36 | \$ 6.55 | \$ 6.75 | \$ 6.95 | \$ 7.16 | \$ 7.38 | \$ 7.60 | \$ 7.83 | \$ 8.06 | \$ 8.30 |
| As % of Room Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage | 45% | - | - | - | 2.51 | 2.78 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.04 | 3.13 | 3.22 | 3.32 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 |
| Other Revenues | 15% | - | - | - | 0.84 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.07 | 1.11 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.25 |
| Subtotal (Non-Room Revenues) | 60% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.34 | \$ 3.71 | \$ 3.82 | \$ 3.93 | \$ 4.05 | \$ 4.17 | \$ 4.30 | \$ 4.43 | \$ 4.56 | \$ 4.70 | \$ 4.84 | \$ 4.98 |
| Gross Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8.91 | \$ 9.88 | \$ 10.18 | \$ 10.49 | \$ 10.80 | \$ 11.13 | \$ 11.46 | \$ 11.80 | \$ 12.16 | \$ 12.52 | \$ 12.90 | \$ 13.28 |
| Departmental Costs & Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | As % of Departmental Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rooms | 25% | - | - | - | 1.39 | 1.54 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.79 | 1.84 | 1.90 | 1.96 | 2.02 | 2.08 |
| Food & Beverage | 75% | - | - | - | 1.88 | 2.09 | 2.15 | 2.21 | 2.28 | 2.35 | 2.42 | 2.49 | 2.56 | 2.64 | 2.72 | 2.80 |
| Other Departments | 50% | - | - | - | 0.42 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.62 |
| Total Departmental Expenses (% of Gross Revenues) | 41% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.69 | \$ 4.09 | \$ 4.22 | \$ 4.34 | \$ 4.47 | \$ 4.61 | \$ 4.74 | \$ 4.89 | \$ 5.03 | \$ 5.18 | \$ 5.34 | \$ 5.50 |
| Gross Operating Revenues | 59% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.22 | \$ 5.79 | \$ 5.97 | \$ 6.14 | \$ 6.33 | \$ 6.52 | \$ 6.71 | \$ 6.92 | \$ 7.12 | \$ 7.34 | \$ 7.56 | \$ 7.78 |

Notes:

/1 Rate, after discounts, per occupied room.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.4

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| | <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | | - | - | - | - | - | 5.97 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.71 | 6.92 | 7.12 | 7.34 | 7.56 | 7.78 | |
| Undistributed Operating Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 5.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.54 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.57 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | |
| Management Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Sales & Marketing | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.56 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.66 | |
| Energy Costs | 6.0% | - | - | - | 0.53 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.65 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.73 | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.80 | |
| Repairs & Maintenance | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.36 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | |
| Total | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.17 | \$ 2.24 | \$ 2.31 | \$ 2.38 | \$ 2.45 | \$ 2.52 | \$ 2.60 | \$ 2.67 | \$ 2.75 | \$ 2.84 | \$ 2.92 | |
| Gross Operating Profit | 36.6% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.26 | \$ 3.62 | \$ 3.73 | \$ 3.84 | \$ 3.95 | \$ 4.07 | \$ 4.19 | \$ 4.32 | \$ 4.45 | \$ 4.58 | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 | |
| Fixed Expenses & Capital Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes | formula | - | - | - | - | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.34 | 0.34 | |
| Incentive Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Insurance | 1.0% | - | - | - | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | |
| Capital Reserve | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Total | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.45 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.82 | \$ 0.84 | \$ 0.86 | \$ 0.88 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 0.93 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 0.98 | \$ 1.01 | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.11 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.41 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 3.85 | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.5

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)**
Hotel Operating Statement

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Sources of Funds | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | \$ 3.11 | \$ 3.21 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.41 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 3.85 |
| Reversion @ 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 38.54 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.16 |
| Net Sales Proceeds | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 37.38 |
| Total Sources of Funds | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | \$ 3.11 | \$ 3.21 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.41 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 41.24 |
| Development Costs | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | 75 | 75 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Development Costs - Annual % | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Development Costs per room - Hotel /1 | \$ 135,000 | 11.06 | 11.40 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Development Costs | \$ - | \$ 11.06 | \$ 11.40 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | - | (11.06) | (11.40) | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.11 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.41 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 41.24 |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | - | (11.06) | (22.46) | (19.64) | (16.80) | (13.87) | (10.85) | (7.74) | (4.53) | (1.22) | 2.19 | 5.71 | 9.34 | 13.07 | 54.31 |
| Net Present Value @ 14.0% | \$1.02 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 New development costs include direct costs, off-site & on-site costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

/2 Included in development cost per room

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.6

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A

Time Share

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Time Share (Number of Rooms) | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Available | | - | - | - | 2,550 | 2,550 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Sold Per Year | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Cumulative Intervals Sold | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 2,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | |
| Interval Sales Price | \$ 18,500 | \$ 19,627 | \$ 20,215 | \$ 20,822 | \$ 21,447 | \$ 22,090 | \$ 22,753 | \$ 23,435 | \$ 24,138 | \$ 24,862 | \$ 25,608 | \$ 26,377 | \$ 27,168 | \$ 27,983 | \$ 28,822 | \$ 29,687 | |
| Sales Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Annual Sales Volume | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 22.75 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 2.49 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Sales Volume | - | - | - | 21.45 | 43.54 | 66.29 | 89.72 | 113.86 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | |
| Cost of Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Per Room | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product Cost (excluding land cost) /1 | \$ 205,000 | - | - | 11.54 | - | 12.24 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Gross Profit Before Land Costs | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (11.54) | \$ 21.45 | \$ 9.85 | \$ 22.75 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 2.49 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Profit Before Land Costs | - | - | (11.54) | 9.91 | 19.76 | 42.51 | 65.95 | 90.09 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | |
| Costs & Expenses/2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Annual Gross Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commissions | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 | \$ 5.01 | \$ 5.16 | \$ 5.31 | \$ 0.55 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Marketing | 22.0% | - | - | - | 4.72 | 4.86 | 5.01 | 5.16 | 5.31 | 0.55 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Sales Overhead | 5.0% | - | - | - | 1.07 | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 0.12 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Administration | 7.0% | - | - | - | 1.50 | 1.55 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 0.17 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Acct./Legal/Counseling | 0.5% | - | - | - | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Depreciation | 0.3% | - | - | - | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Other | 0.1% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Total Cost & Expenses (% of Annual Gross Sales) | 56.9% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 12.20 | \$ 12.57 | \$ 12.95 | \$ 13.33 | \$ 13.73 | \$ 1.41 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (11.54) | \$ 9.24 | \$ (2.72) | \$ 9.81 | \$ 10.10 | \$ 10.40 | \$ 1.07 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (11.54) | \$ (2.29) | \$ (5.01) | \$ 4.80 | \$ 14.90 | \$ 25.30 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | |
| Net Present Value @ | 15.0% | \$8.09 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 Development costs include allocated share of onsite/offsite costs.

/2 Selling and marketing expenses only. Operating expenses are covered 100% by annual fees.

Source: RCI Consulting, Inc.; and Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.1

02-Oct-01

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Land Use Scenario A
PROFORMA CASH FLOW - PRELIMINARY RESIDUAL LAND VALUE
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| | Yr. 2001 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | Value | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS**Net Sources of Funds By Land Use**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Commercial Retail Cash Flow | - | (2.95) | (3.04) | 1.74 | 2.13 | 2.20 | 2.26 | 2.33 | 2.40 | 2.47 | 2.55 | 2.62 | 2.70 | 2.78 | 30.38 |
| Office 1 | - | - | (9.90) | 1.59 | 1.84 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 2.13 | 2.19 | 2.25 | 2.32 | 2.39 | 2.46 | 2.54 | 27.97 |
| Time Share | - | - | (17.30) | 9.24 | 9.52 | (9.10) | 10.10 | 10.40 | 10.72 | 11.04 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Full Service Hotel | - | (20.49) | (21.10) | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.72 | 6.93 | 7.15 | 7.37 | 81.27 |
| Time Share 6A | - | - | (6.92) | 6.93 | 7.43 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office 6B | - | - | (1.71) | 0.30 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 5.24 |
| Sub-total | \$ - | \$ (23.44) | \$ (59.99) | \$ 25.36 | \$ 26.89 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 20.77 | \$ 21.39 | \$ 22.04 | \$ 22.71 | \$ 12.03 | \$ 12.40 | \$ 12.77 | \$ 13.16 | \$ 144.86 |

Net Cash Flow After Developer Costs

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| \$ - | \$ (23.4) | \$ (60.0) | \$ 25.4 | \$ 26.9 | \$ 1.2 | \$ 20.8 | \$ 21.4 | \$ 22.0 | \$ 22.7 | \$ 12.0 | \$ 12.4 | \$ 12.8 | \$ 13.2 | \$ 144.9 |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|

Net Present Value After Developer Costs

| | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$29.87 million 2003 dollars |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|

Table 3.A.2

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Land Use Scenario A

FISCAL REVENUES

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| PROPERTY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Uses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.20 | \$ 0.21 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.24 | \$ 0.24 | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.25 |
| Office 1 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.18 | \$ 0.19 | \$ 0.20 | \$ 0.20 | \$ 0.21 | \$ 0.21 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.23 |
| Time Share 2 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.73 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.89 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 0.92 | \$ 0.94 |
| Full-Service Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.55 | \$ 0.57 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 |
| Time Share 6A | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 |
| Office 6B | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| Total Property Tax Increment | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.17 | \$ 1.32 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.60 | \$ 1.76 | \$ 1.92 | \$ 2.08 | \$ 2.12 | \$ 2.17 | \$ 2.21 | \$ 2.25 |
| City's Share | 4.75% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 |
| RDA's Non-housing Share | 60.00% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.79 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 1.05 | \$ 1.15 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 1.27 | \$ 1.30 | \$ 1.33 | \$ 1.35 |
| | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Service Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 10.31 | \$ 11.44 | \$ 11.78 | \$ 12.14 | \$ 12.50 | \$ 12.88 | \$ 13.26 | \$ 13.66 | \$ 14.07 | \$ 14.49 | \$ 14.93 | \$ 15.38 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax @ | 10.00% of Room Revenue | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.03 | \$ 1.14 | \$ 1.18 | \$ 1.21 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 1.29 | \$ 1.33 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.41 | \$ 1.45 | \$ 1.49 | \$ 1.54 |
| Gross Fiscal Operating Income From TOT & TI | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.03 | \$ 1.90 | \$ 2.03 | \$ 2.16 | \$ 2.29 | \$ 2.42 | \$ 2.57 | \$ 2.71 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.85 | \$ 2.92 | \$ 3.00 |
| SALES TAX REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail Commercial | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 |
| Food & Beverage & 50% of Other Hotel Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 |
| Total Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 |
| TOTAL FISCAL REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.85 | \$ 0.94 | \$ 1.04 | \$ 1.14 | \$ 1.24 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.38 | \$ 1.40 | \$ 1.43 | \$ 1.46 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.03 | \$ 1.14 | \$ 1.18 | \$ 1.21 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 1.29 | \$ 1.33 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.41 | \$ 1.45 | \$ 1.49 | \$ 1.54 |
| Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 |
| Total Fiscal Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.34 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.69 | \$ 2.83 | \$ 2.99 | \$ 3.15 | \$ 3.23 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.40 | \$ 3.49 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL REVENUE | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.34 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.69 | \$ 2.83 | \$ 2.99 | \$ 3.15 | \$ 3.23 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.40 | \$ 3.49 |
| Reversion @ | 7% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 53.62 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.34 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.69 | \$ 2.83 | \$ 2.99 | \$ 3.15 | \$ 3.23 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.40 | \$ 57.11 |
| NET CASH FLOW | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.34 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.69 | \$ 2.83 | \$ 2.99 | \$ 3.15 | \$ 3.23 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.40 | \$ 57.11 |
| Net Present Value @ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10% | \$26.25 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.3

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A

Retail/Commercial: Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Rental Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Cumulative Gross Leasable Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | 40,000 | - | - | - | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | |
| Restaurants | 40,000 | - | - | - | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | |
| Total | 80,000 | - | - | - | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | |
| Occupancy Rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | |
| Restaurants | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | |
| Average NNN Base Rent Per s.f. Per Yr/1 | US\$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | \$ | 20.00 | 21.22 | 21.85 | 22.51 | 23.19 | 23.88 | 24.60 | 25.34 | 26.10 | 26.88 | 27.68 | 28.52 | 29.37 | 30.25 | 31.16 | 32.09 |
| Restaurants | \$ | 30.00 | 31.83 | 32.78 | 33.77 | 34.78 | 35.82 | 36.90 | 38.00 | 39.14 | 40.32 | 41.53 | 42.77 | 44.06 | 45.38 | 46.74 | 48.14 |
| Average Gross Sales Per Square Foot Per Year | US\$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | \$ | 250.00 | 265 | 273 | 281 | 290 | 299 | 307 | 317 | 326 | 336 | 346 | 356 | 367 | 378 | 389 | 401 |
| Restaurants | \$ | 375.00 | 398 | 410 | 422 | 435 | 448 | 461 | 475 | 489 | 504 | 519 | 535 | 551 | 567 | 584 | 602 |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Rent Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.85 | \$ 2.27 | \$ 2.34 | \$ 2.41 | \$ 2.48 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.63 | \$ 2.71 | \$ 2.79 | \$ 2.87 | \$ 2.96 | \$ 3.05 | |
| Gross Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.85 | \$ 2.27 | \$ 2.34 | \$ 2.41 | \$ 2.48 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.63 | \$ 2.71 | \$ 2.79 | \$ 2.87 | \$ 2.96 | \$ 3.05 | |
| Operating Expenses | % of Rev. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 4.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.12 | |
| Sales & Marketing | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | |
| Total | 6.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.17 | \$ 0.17 | \$ 0.18 | \$ 0.18 | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.74 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.33 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.87 | |

Notes:

/1 Triple-net rent where tenant pays for pro-rata share of common area charges, insurance, property taxes, and utilities in addition to base rent. No rent for tenant improvements; tenants pay for improvements.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.4

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Retail/Commercial: Operating Statement

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.74 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.33 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.87 |
| Reversion @ 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$28.66 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ 4.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ 1.15 |
| Net Sale Proceeds | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$27.51 |
| Total Sources of Funds | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.74 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.33 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$30.38 |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gross Leasable Area (s.f.) | 80,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Inflation Assumptions | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Commercial Retail | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Restaurants | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| New Development Costs/2 | \$ - | \$ 2.95 | \$ 3.04 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Total Development Costs | - | 2.95 | 3.04 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | - | (2.95) | (3.04) | 1.74 | 2.13 | 2.20 | 2.26 | 2.33 | 2.40 | 2.47 | 2.55 | 2.62 | 2.70 | 2.78 | 30.38 |
| CUMULATIVE CASH FLOW | - | (2.95) | (5.99) | (4.25) | (2.11) | 0.08 | 2.35 | 4.68 | 7.08 | 9.55 | 12.10 | 14.72 | 17.42 | 20.20 | 50.58 |

Residual Land Value = Net Present Value @ 14.0% \$8.28 million 2003 dollars

Notes:

/1 New development costs, include direct costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.5

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Office Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| | Yr. 2001 Value | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | | |
| Rental Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Office | New | 80,000 | - | - | - | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | | |
| Total GLA | | 80,000 | - | - | - | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 90% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | | |
| Occupied Space | | | - | - | - | 64,000 | 72,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | | |
| Average NNN Rent Per s.f.. Per Year | \$ | 22.80 | \$ 24.19 | \$ 24.91 | \$ 25.66 | \$ 26.43 | \$ 27.22 | \$ 28.04 | \$ 28.88 | \$ 29.75 | \$ 30.64 | \$ 31.56 | \$ 32.51 | \$ 33.48 | \$ 34.49 | \$ 35.52 | \$ 36.59 | |
| | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Gross Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.69 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.33 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | |
| Operating Expenses | % of Rev. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.11 | | |
| Sales & Marketing | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | | |
| Total | 6.0% | \$ - | - | - | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.17 | | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.84 | \$ 2.00 | \$ 2.06 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.19 | \$ 2.25 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.39 | \$ 2.46 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.61 | |

Notes:

/1 Triple-net rent where tenant pays for pro-rata share of common area charges, insurance, property taxes, and utilities in addition to base rent. No rent for tenant improvements; tenants pay for improvements.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.6

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)**

Office Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Sources of Funds | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.84 | \$ 2.00 | \$ 2.06 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.19 | \$ 2.25 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.39 | \$ 2.46 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.61 |
| Reversion @ | 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 26.14 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ | 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.78 |
| Net Sale Proceeds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 25.35 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.84 | \$ 2.00 | \$ 2.06 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.19 | \$ 2.25 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.39 | \$ 2.46 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 27.97 |
| Development Costs | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Gross Leasable Area | New | 80,000 | - | - | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 |
| Development Costs Annual % | New | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Development Costs | \$ 110.00 | per sf | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 9.90 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Total Development Costs | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 9.90 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | | - | - | (9.90) | 1.59 | 1.84 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 2.13 | 2.19 | 2.25 | 2.32 | 2.39 | 2.46 | 2.54 | 27.97 |
| CUMULATIVE CASH FLOW | | - | - | (9.90) | (8.31) | (6.47) | (4.47) | (2.41) | (0.28) | 1.91 | 4.16 | 6.49 | 8.88 | 11.34 | 13.88 | 41.85 |

Residual Land Value= Net Present Value @ 14.0% \$4.79 million 2003 dollars

Notes:

/1

New development include direct costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.7

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 2, Land Use Scenario A
Time Share

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Available | | - | - | - | 3,825 | 3,825 | 3,825 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Sold Per Year | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Cumulative Intervals Sold | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 2,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 6,000 | 7,000 | 650 | 650 | 650 | 650 | 650 | |
| Interval Sales Price | \$ 18,500 | \$ 19,627 | \$ 20,215 | \$ 20,822 | \$ 21,447 | \$ 22,090 | \$ 22,753 | \$ 23,435 | \$ 24,138 | \$ 24,862 | \$ 25,608 | \$ 26,377 | \$ 27,168 | \$ 27,983 | \$ 28,822 | \$ 29,687 | |
| Sales Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Annual Sales Volume | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 22.75 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 24.86 | \$ 25.61 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Sales Volume | - | - | - | 21.45 | 43.54 | 66.29 | 89.72 | 113.86 | 138.73 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | |
| Cost of Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Per Room | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product Cost (excluding land cost) /1 | \$ 205,000 | - | - | 17.30 | - | - | 18.91 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Gross Profit Before Land Costs | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 3.84 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 24.86 | \$ 25.61 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Profit Before Land Costs | - | - | (17.30) | 4.14 | 26.23 | 30.08 | 53.51 | 77.65 | 102.51 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | |
| Costs & Expenses/2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Annual Gross Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commissions | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 | \$ 5.01 | \$ 5.16 | \$ 5.31 | \$ 5.47 | \$ 5.63 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Marketing | 22.0% | - | - | - | 4.72 | 4.86 | 5.01 | 5.16 | 5.31 | 5.47 | 5.63 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Sales Overhead | 5.0% | - | - | - | 1.07 | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.24 | 1.28 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Administration | 7.0% | - | - | - | 1.50 | 1.55 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.79 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Aect./Legal/Consulting | 0.5% | - | - | - | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.13 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Depreciation | 0.3% | - | - | - | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Other | 0.1% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Total Cost & Expenses (% of Annual Gross Sales) | 56.9% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 12.20 | \$ 12.57 | \$ 12.95 | \$ 13.33 | \$ 13.73 | \$ 14.15 | \$ 14.57 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ 9.24 | \$ 9.52 | \$ (9.10) | \$ 10.10 | \$ 10.40 | \$ 10.72 | \$ 11.04 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ (8.06) | \$ 1.46 | \$ (7.64) | \$ 2.46 | \$ 12.86 | \$ 23.58 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | |
| Net Present Value @ | 15.0% | \$7.68 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 Development costs include allocated share of onsite/offsite costs.

/2 Selling and marketing expenses only. Operating expenses are covered 100% by annual fees.

Source: RCI Consulting, Inc.; and Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.8

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 3, Land Use Scenario A
Full Service Hotel**

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| DPI: 1.5 (Hotel 2 - Exec. Conf. Ctr.) Number of Rooms | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | |
| Total Potential Number of Room nights | | - | - | - | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 65.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | |
| Avg. Daily Rm. Rate Hotel 2 /1 | \$ 125 | 133 | 137 | 141 | 145 | 149 | 154 | 158 | 163 | 168 | 173 | 178 | 184 | 189 | 195 | 201 | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Room Revenues | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 10.31 | \$ 11.44 | \$ 11.78 | \$ 12.14 | \$ 12.50 | \$ 12.88 | \$ 13.26 | \$ 13.66 | \$ 14.07 | \$ 14.49 | \$ 14.93 | \$ 15.38 | |
| | As % of Room Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage | 55% | - | - | - | 5.67 | 6.29 | 6.48 | 6.68 | 6.88 | 7.08 | 7.29 | 7.51 | 7.74 | 7.97 | 8.21 | 8.46 | |
| Other Revenues | 30% | - | - | - | 3.09 | 3.43 | 3.54 | 3.64 | 3.75 | 3.86 | 3.98 | 4.10 | 4.22 | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.61 | |
| Subtotal (Non-Room Revenues) | 85% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8.77 | \$ 9.72 | \$ 10.02 | \$ 10.32 | \$ 10.63 | \$ 10.94 | \$ 11.27 | \$ 11.61 | \$ 11.96 | \$ 12.32 | \$ 12.69 | \$ 13.07 | |
| Gross Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 19.08 | \$ 21.16 | \$ 21.80 | \$ 22.45 | \$ 23.13 | \$ 23.82 | \$ 24.54 | \$ 25.27 | \$ 26.03 | \$ 26.81 | \$ 27.62 | \$ 28.44 | |
| Departmental Costs & Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | As % of Departmental Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rooms | 25% | - | - | - | 2.58 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.03 | 3.13 | 3.22 | 3.32 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.62 | 3.73 | 3.84 | |
| Food & Beverage | 75% | - | - | - | 4.25 | 4.72 | 4.86 | 5.01 | 5.16 | 5.31 | 5.47 | 5.63 | 5.80 | 5.98 | 6.16 | 6.34 | |
| Other Departments | 50% | - | - | - | 1.55 | 1.72 | 1.77 | 1.82 | 1.88 | 1.93 | 1.99 | 2.05 | 2.11 | 2.17 | 2.24 | 2.31 | |
| Total Departmental Expenses (% of Gross Revenues) | 44% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8.38 | \$ 9.30 | \$ 9.57 | \$ 9.86 | \$ 10.16 | \$ 10.46 | \$ 10.78 | \$ 11.10 | \$ 11.43 | \$ 11.78 | \$ 12.13 | \$ 12.49 | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | 56% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 10.70 | \$ 11.87 | \$ 12.23 | \$ 12.59 | \$ 12.97 | \$ 13.36 | \$ 13.76 | \$ 14.17 | \$ 14.60 | \$ 15.04 | \$ 15.49 | \$ 15.95 | |

Notes:

/1 Rate, after discounts, per occupied room.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.9

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 3, Land Use Scenario A
Full Service Hotel

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | - | - | - | - | - | 12.23 | 12.59 | 12.97 | 13.36 | 13.76 | 14.17 | 14.60 | 15.04 | 15.49 | 15.95 | |
| Undistributed Operating Expenses | As % of Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 5.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.95 | \$ 1.06 | \$ 1.09 | \$ 1.12 | \$ 1.16 | \$ 1.19 | \$ 1.23 | \$ 1.26 | \$ 1.30 | \$ 1.34 | \$ 1.38 | \$ 1.42 |
| Management Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 |
| Sales & Marketing | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.95 | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.12 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.26 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.42 |
| Energy Costs | 6.0% | - | - | - | 1.14 | 1.27 | 1.31 | 1.35 | 1.39 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.52 | 1.56 | 1.61 | 1.66 | 1.71 |
| Repairs & Maintenance | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.76 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.07 | 1.10 | 1.14 |
| Total | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.20 | \$ 4.66 | \$ 4.80 | \$ 4.94 | \$ 5.09 | \$ 5.24 | \$ 5.40 | \$ 5.56 | \$ 5.73 | \$ 5.90 | \$ 6.08 | \$ 6.26 |
| Gross Operating Profit | 34.1% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 6.50 | \$ 7.21 | \$ 7.43 | \$ 7.65 | \$ 7.88 | \$ 8.12 | \$ 8.36 | \$ 8.61 | \$ 8.87 | \$ 9.14 | \$ 9.41 | \$ 9.69 |
| Fixed Expenses & Capital Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes (based on 1% of prior year capitalized value) | formula | - | - | - | - | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.61 | 0.62 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 0.68 |
| Incentive Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 |
| Insurance | 1.0% | - | - | - | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capital Reserve | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 |
| Total | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.95 | 1.61 | 1.66 | 1.70 | \$ 1.75 | \$ 1.79 | \$ 1.84 | \$ 1.89 | \$ 1.94 | \$ 1.99 | \$ 2.04 | \$ 2.10 |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | - | - | - | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.72 | 6.93 | 7.15 | 7.37 | 7.60 |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.10

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 3, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)**

Full Service Hotel

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Sources of Funds | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | | - | - | - | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | \$ 6.14 | \$ 6.33 | \$ 6.52 | \$ 6.72 | \$ 6.93 | \$ 7.15 | \$ 7.37 | \$ 7.60 |
| Reversion @ | 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75.95 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ | 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.28 |
| Net Sales Proceeds | | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 73.68 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | - | - | - | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | \$ 6.14 | \$ 6.33 | \$ 6.52 | \$ 6.72 | \$ 6.93 | \$ 7.15 | \$ 7.37 | \$ 81.27 |
| Development Costs | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Number of Rooms | 300 | - | 150 | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Development Costs - Annual % | | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Development Costs per room - Hotel /1 | \$ 125,000 | - | 20.49 | 21.10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Development Costs | | \$ - | \$ 20.49 | \$ 21.10 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | | - | (20.49) | (21.10) | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.72 | 6.93 | 7.15 | 7.37 | 81.27 |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | | - | (20.49) | (41.59) | (36.04) | (30.44) | (24.67) | (18.72) | (12.58) | (6.25) | 0.27 | 6.99 | 13.93 | 21.07 | 28.44 | 109.71 |
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$3.94 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 New development costs include direct costs, off-site & on-site costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

/2 Included in development cost per room

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.11

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 6A, Land Use Scenario A
Time Share

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Time Share Rooms | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Available | | - | - | - | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Sold Per Year | | - | - | - | 750 | 780 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Cumulative Intervals Sold | | - | - | - | 750 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | |
| Interval Sales Price | \$ 18,500 | \$ 19,627 | \$ 20,215 | \$ 20,822 | \$ 21,447 | \$ 22,090 | \$ 22,753 | \$ 23,435 | \$ 24,138 | \$ 24,862 | \$ 25,608 | \$ 26,377 | \$ 27,168 | \$ 27,983 | \$ 28,822 | \$ 29,687 | |
| Sales Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Annual Sales Volume | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 16.08 | \$ 17.23 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Sales Volume | - | - | - | 16.08 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | |
| Cost of Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Per Room | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product Cost (excluding land cost) /1 | \$ 205,000 | - | - | 6.92 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Gross Profit Before Land Costs | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (6.92) | \$ 16.08 | \$ 17.23 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Profit Before Land Costs | - | - | (6.92) | 9.16 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | |
| Costs & Expenses/2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Annual Gross Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commissions | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.54 | \$ 3.79 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Marketing | 22.0% | - | - | - | 3.54 | 3.79 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Sales Overhead | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.80 | 0.86 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Administration | 7.0% | - | - | - | 1.13 | 1.21 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Acct./Legal/Counseling | 0.5% | - | - | - | 0.08 | 0.09 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Depreciation | 0.3% | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Other | 0.1% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Total Cost & Expenses (% of Annual Gross Sales) | 56.9% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 9.15 | \$ 9.80 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | 43% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (6.92) | \$ 6.93 | \$ 7.43 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (6.92) | \$ 0.01 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | |
| Net Present Value @ | 15.0% | \$3.10 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 Development costs include allocated share of onsite/offsite costs.

/2 Selling and marketing expenses only. Operating expenses are covered 100% by annual fees.

Source: RCI Consulting, Inc.; and Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.12

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 6B, Land Use Scenario A
 Office Operating Statement

| Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | | |
| Rental Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Office | New | 15,000 | - | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | | |
| Total GLA | | 15,000 | - | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | - | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | | |
| Occupied Space | | - | - | - | 12,000 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | | |
| Average NNN Rent per s.f., Per Year | \$ | 22.80 | \$ 24.19 | \$ 24.91 | \$ 25.66 | \$ 26.43 | \$ 27.22 | \$ 28.04 | \$ 28.88 | \$ 29.75 | \$ 30.64 | \$ 31.56 | \$ 32.51 | \$ 33.48 | \$ 34.49 | \$ 35.52 | \$ 36.59 | |
| | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Gross Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.52 | | |
| Operating Expenses | % of Rev. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | | |
| Sales & Marketing | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | | |
| Total | 6.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.49 | | |

Notes:

/1 Triple-net rent where tenant pays for pro-rata share of common area charges, insurance, property taxes, and utilities in addition to base rent. No rent for tenant improvements; tenants pay for improvements.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.13

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 6B, Land Use Scenario A
 (BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)
 Office Operating Statement

| Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | | |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Reversion @ | 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Less Cost of Sales @ | 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Net Sale Proceeds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.49 | |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Gross Leasable Area | New | 15,000 | - | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | | |
| Development Costs Annual % | New | - | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| New Development Costs | \$ 101.44 | per sf | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.71 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | |
| Total Development Costs | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.71 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | | |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | | - | - | (1.71) | 0.30 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | |
| CUMULATIVE CASH FLOW | | - | - | (1.71) | (1.41) | (1.05) | (0.67) | (0.29) | 0.11 | 0.52 | 0.94 | 1.38 | 1.83 | 2.29 | 2.77 | 3.26 | |
| Residual Land Value= Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$1.01 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1

New development costs include direct costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.1

02-Oct-01

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
PROFORMA CASH FLOW - PRELIMINARY RESIDUAL LAND VALUE
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| | Yr. 2001 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | Value | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

Net Sources of Funds By Land Use

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|------------|------------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Executive Mtg. Hotel Net Cash Flow | - | (11.06) | (11.40) | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.12 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 41.27 |
| Commercial Retail Cash Flow | - | (3.32) | (3.42) | 1.96 | 2.40 | 2.47 | 2.55 | 2.62 | 2.70 | 2.78 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.04 | 3.13 | 34.18 |
| Time Share | - | - | (17.30) | 9.24 | 9.52 | (9.10) | 10.10 | 10.40 | 10.72 | 11.04 | 7.39 | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-total | \$ - | \$ (14.38) | \$ (32.12) | \$ 14.02 | \$ 14.76 | \$ (3.70) | \$ 15.67 | \$ 16.14 | \$ 16.63 | \$ 17.13 | \$ 13.67 | \$ 6.47 | \$ 6.67 | \$ 6.87 | \$ 75.45 |

Net Cash Flow After Developer Costs

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| \$ - | \$ (14.4) | \$ (32.1) | \$ 14.0 | \$ 14.8 | \$ (3.7) | \$ 15.7 | \$ 16.1 | \$ 16.6 | \$ 17.1 | \$ 13.7 | \$ 6.5 | \$ 6.7 | \$ 6.9 | \$ 75.5 |
|------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|

Net Present Value After Developer Costs

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$20.65 | million 2003 dollars |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------------|

Table 4.A.2

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
FISCAL REVENUES**

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| PROPERTY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Uses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Executive Mtg. Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 |
| Commercial Retail | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.24 | \$ 0.24 | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.26 | \$ 0.26 | \$ 0.27 | \$ 0.27 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.28 |
| Time Share | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.73 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.97 | \$ 0.99 | \$ 1.01 | \$ 1.03 |
| Total Property Tax Increment | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.15 | \$ 1.29 | \$ 1.45 | \$ 1.56 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.62 | \$ 1.66 |
| City's Share | 4.75% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 |
| RDA's Non-housing Share | 60.00% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.69 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.94 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 0.97 | \$ 0.99 |
| TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Executive Mtg. Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.57 | \$ 6.18 | \$ 6.36 | \$ 6.55 | \$ 6.75 | \$ 6.95 | \$ 7.16 | \$ 7.38 | \$ 7.60 | \$ 7.83 | \$ 8.06 | \$ 8.30 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax @ | 10.00% of Room Revenue | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.83 |
| Gross Fiscal Operating Income From TOT & TI | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 1.02 | \$ 1.12 | \$ 1.22 | \$ 1.33 | \$ 1.44 | \$ 1.55 | \$ 1.67 | \$ 1.77 | \$ 1.81 | \$ 1.86 | \$ 1.90 |
| SALES TAX REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail Commercial | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.26 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 |
| Food & Beverage & 50% of Other Hotel Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| Total Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 |
| TOTAL FISCAL REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.84 | \$ 0.94 | \$ 1.01 | \$ 1.03 | \$ 1.05 | \$ 1.07 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.83 |
| Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 |
| Total Fiscal Revenue Available for Fiscal Operating Costs | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.85 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.48 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.83 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.09 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.38 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL OPERATING INCOME | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.85 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.48 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.83 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.09 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.38 |
| Reversion @ | 7% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 36.54 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.85 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.48 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.83 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.09 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 38.92 |
| NET CASH FLOW | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.85 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.48 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.83 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.09 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 38.92 |
| Net Present Value @ | 10% | \$17.43 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.3

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| | Yr. 2001 Value | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Hotel Rooms | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | |
| Total Potential Number of Room nights | | - | - | - | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 65.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | |
| Avg. Daily Rm. Rate Hotel 2 /1 | \$ 135 | 143 | 148 | 152 | 157 | 161 | 166 | 171 | 176 | 181 | 187 | 192 | 198 | 204 | 210 | 217 | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Room Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.57 | \$ 6.18 | \$ 6.36 | \$ 6.55 | \$ 6.75 | \$ 6.95 | \$ 7.16 | \$ 7.38 | \$ 7.60 | \$ 7.83 | \$ 8.06 | \$ 8.30 | |
| As % of Room Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage | 45% | - | - | - | 2.51 | 2.78 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.04 | 3.13 | 3.22 | 3.32 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | |
| Other Revenues | 15% | - | - | - | 0.84 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.07 | 1.11 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.25 | |
| Subtotal (Non-Room Revenues) | 60% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.34 | \$ 3.71 | \$ 3.82 | \$ 3.93 | \$ 4.05 | \$ 4.17 | \$ 4.30 | \$ 4.43 | \$ 4.56 | \$ 4.70 | \$ 4.84 | \$ 4.98 | |
| Gross Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8.91 | \$ 9.88 | \$ 10.18 | \$ 10.49 | \$ 10.80 | \$ 11.13 | \$ 11.46 | \$ 11.80 | \$ 12.16 | \$ 12.52 | \$ 12.90 | \$ 13.28 | |
| Departmental Costs & Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | As % of Departmental Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rooms | 25% | - | - | - | 1.39 | 1.54 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.79 | 1.84 | 1.90 | 1.96 | 2.02 | 2.08 | |
| Food & Beverage | 75% | - | - | - | 1.88 | 2.09 | 2.15 | 2.21 | 2.28 | 2.35 | 2.42 | 2.49 | 2.56 | 2.64 | 2.72 | 2.80 | |
| Other Departments | 50% | - | - | - | 0.42 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.62 | |
| Total Departmental Expenses (% of Gross Revenues) | 41% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.69 | \$ 4.09 | \$ 4.22 | \$ 4.34 | \$ 4.47 | \$ 4.61 | \$ 4.74 | \$ 4.89 | \$ 5.03 | \$ 5.18 | \$ 5.34 | \$ 5.50 | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | 59% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.22 | \$ 5.79 | \$ 5.97 | \$ 6.14 | \$ 6.33 | \$ 6.52 | \$ 6.71 | \$ 6.92 | \$ 7.12 | \$ 7.34 | \$ 7.56 | \$ 7.78 | |

Notes:

/1 Rate, after discounts, per occupied room.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.4

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | - | - | - | - | - | 5.97 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.71 | 6.92 | 7.12 | 7.34 | 7.56 | 7.78 | |
| Undistributed Operating Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 5.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.54 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.57 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 |
| Management Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 |
| Sales & Marketing | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.56 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.66 |
| Energy Costs | 6.0% | - | - | - | 0.53 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.65 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.73 | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.80 |
| Repairs & Maintenance | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.36 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 |
| Total | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.17 | \$ 2.24 | \$ 2.31 | \$ 2.38 | \$ 2.45 | \$ 2.52 | \$ 2.60 | \$ 2.67 | \$ 2.75 | \$ 2.84 | \$ 2.92 |
| Gross Operating Profit | 36.6% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.26 | \$ 3.62 | \$ 3.73 | \$ 3.84 | \$ 3.95 | \$ 4.07 | \$ 4.19 | \$ 4.32 | \$ 4.45 | \$ 4.58 | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 |
| Fixed Expenses & Capital Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes | formula | - | - | - | - | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.34 |
| Incentive Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 |
| Insurance | 1.0% | - | - | - | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 |
| Capital Reserve | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 |
| Total | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.45 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.81 | \$ 0.84 | \$ 0.86 | \$ 0.88 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 0.93 | \$ 0.95 | \$ 0.98 | \$ 1.00 |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.12 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 3.86 |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.5

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)**

Hotel Operating Statement

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | \$ 3.12 | \$ 3.21 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.42 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 3.86 |
| Reversion @ 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 38.57 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.16 |
| Net Sales Proceeds | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 37.42 |
| Total Sources of Funds | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | \$ 3.12 | \$ 3.21 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.42 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 41.27 |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Number of Rooms 150 | - | 75 | 75 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Development Costs - Annual % | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Development Costs per room - Hotel /1 | \$ 135,000 | 11.06 | 11.40 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Development Costs | \$ - | \$ 11.06 | \$ 11.40 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | - | (11.06) | (11.40) | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.12 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 41.27 |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | - | (11.06) | (22.46) | (19.64) | (16.80) | (13.87) | (10.85) | (7.73) | (4.52) | (1.20) | 2.21 | 5.73 | 9.36 | 13.10 | 54.38 |
| Net Present Value @ 14.0% | \$1.04 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 New development costs include direct costs, off-site & on-site costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.6

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Retail/Commercial: Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Rental Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Cumulative Gross Leasable Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | 45,000 | - | - | - | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | |
| Restaurants | 45,000 | - | - | - | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | |
| Total | 90,000 | - | - | - | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | |
| Occupancy Rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | |
| Restaurants | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | |
| Average NNN Base Rent Per s.f. Per Yr/1 | US\$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | \$ | 20.00 | 21.22 | 21.85 | 22.51 | 23.19 | 23.88 | 24.60 | 25.34 | 26.10 | 26.88 | 27.68 | 28.52 | 29.37 | 30.25 | 31.16 | 32.09 |
| Restaurants | \$ | 30.00 | 31.83 | 32.78 | 33.77 | 34.78 | 35.82 | 36.90 | 38.00 | 39.14 | 40.32 | 41.53 | 42.77 | 44.06 | 45.38 | 46.74 | 48.14 |
| Average Gross Sales Per Square Foot Per Year | US\$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | \$ | 250.00 | 265 | 273 | 281 | 290 | 299 | 307 | 317 | 326 | 336 | 346 | 356 | 367 | 378 | 389 | 401 |
| Restaurants | \$ | 375.00 | 398 | 410 | 422 | 435 | 448 | 461 | 475 | 489 | 504 | 519 | 535 | 551 | 567 | 584 | 602 |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Rent Revenue | \$ | - | - | - | 2.09 | 2.55 | 2.63 | 2.71 | 2.79 | 2.87 | 2.96 | 3.05 | 3.14 | 3.23 | 3.33 | 3.43 | |
| Gross Revenues | \$ | - | - | - | 2.09 | 2.55 | 2.63 | 2.71 | 2.79 | 2.87 | 2.96 | 3.05 | 3.14 | 3.23 | 3.33 | 3.43 | |
| Operating Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | % of Rev. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 4.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.14 | |
| Sales & Marketing | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | |
| Total | 6.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.17 | \$ 0.17 | \$ 0.18 | \$ 0.18 | \$ 0.19 | \$ 0.19 | \$ 0.20 | \$ 0.21 | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.86 | \$ 2.95 | \$ 3.04 | \$ 3.13 | \$ 3.22 | |

Notes:

/1 Triple-net rent where tenant pays for pro-rata share of common area charges, insurance, property taxes, and utilities in addition to base rent. No rent for tenant improvements; tenants pay for improvements.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.7

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Retail/Commercial: Operating Statement

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.86 | \$ 2.95 | \$ 3.04 | \$ 3.13 | \$ 3.22 |
| Reversion @ | 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$32.24 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ | 4.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ 1.29 |
| Net Sale Proceeds | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$30.95 |
| Total Sources of Funds | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.86 | \$ 2.95 | \$ 3.04 | \$ 3.13 | \$34.18 |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gross Leasable Area (s.f.) | 90,000 | - | 45,000 | 45,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Inflation Assumptions | | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 |
| Commercial Retail | | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Restaurants | | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| New Development Costs/2 | \$ 135.00 | \$ - | \$ 3.32 | \$ 3.42 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Total Development Costs | | - | 3.32 | 3.42 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | | - | (3.32) | (3.42) | 1.96 | 2.40 | 2.47 | 2.55 | 2.62 | 2.70 | 2.78 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.04 | 3.13 |
| CUMULATIVE CASH FLOW | | - | (3.32) | (6.74) | (4.78) | (2.38) | 0.09 | 2.64 | 5.26 | 7.96 | 10.74 | 13.61 | 16.56 | 19.60 | 22.73 |

Residual Land Value = Net Present Value @ 14.0% \$9.32 million 2003 dollars

Notes:

/1 New development costs, include direct costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.8

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A

Time Share

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Time Share (Number of Rooms) | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| Total Number of Intervals Available | | - | - | - | 3,825 | 3,825 | 3,825 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 |
| Total Number of Intervals Sold Per Year | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 650 | - | - | - | - |
| Cumulative Intervals Sold | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 2,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 6,000 | 7,000 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 |
| Interval Sales Price | \$ 18,500 | \$ 19,627 | \$ 20,215 | \$ 20,822 | \$ 21,447 | \$ 22,090 | \$ 22,753 | \$ 23,435 | \$ 24,138 | \$ 24,862 | \$ 25,608 | \$ 26,377 | \$ 27,168 | \$ 27,983 | \$ 28,822 | \$ 29,687 |
| Sales Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Annual Sales Volume | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 22.75 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 24.86 | \$ 25.61 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 27.14 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Cumulative Sales Volume | - | - | - | 21.45 | 43.54 | 66.29 | 89.72 | 113.86 | 138.73 | 164.33 | 181.48 | 181.48 | 181.48 | 181.48 | 181.48 | 181.48 |
| Cost of Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Per Room | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product Cost (excluding land cost) /1 | \$ 205,000 | - | - | 17.30 | - | - | 18.91 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gross Profit Before Land Costs | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 3.84 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 24.86 | \$ 25.61 | \$ 17.14 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Cumulative Profit Before Land Costs | - | - | (17.30) | 4.14 | 26.23 | 30.08 | 53.51 | 77.65 | 102.51 | 128.12 | 145.26 | 145.26 | 145.26 | 145.26 | 145.26 | 145.26 |
| Costs & Expenses/2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Annual Gross Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commissions | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 | \$ 5.01 | \$ 5.16 | \$ 5.31 | \$ 5.47 | \$ 5.63 | \$ 3.77 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Marketing | 22.0% | - | - | - | 4.72 | 4.86 | 5.01 | 5.16 | 5.31 | 5.47 | 5.63 | 3.77 | - | - | - | - |
| Sales Overhead | 5.0% | - | - | - | 1.07 | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.24 | 1.28 | 0.86 | - | - | - | - |
| Administration | 7.0% | - | - | - | 1.50 | 1.55 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.79 | 1.20 | - | - | - | - |
| Acct./Legal/Consulting | 0.5% | - | - | - | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.09 | - | - | - | - |
| Depreciation | 0.3% | - | - | - | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - |
| Other | 0.1% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | - | - | - | - |
| Total Cost & Expenses (% of Annual Gross Sales) | 56.9% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 12.20 | \$ 12.57 | \$ 12.95 | \$ 13.33 | \$ 13.73 | \$ 14.15 | \$ 14.57 | \$ 9.76 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | 43% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ 9.24 | \$ 9.52 | \$ (9.10) | \$ 10.10 | \$ 10.40 | \$ 10.72 | \$ 11.04 | \$ 7.39 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ (8.06) | \$ 1.46 | \$ (7.64) | \$ 2.46 | \$ 12.86 | \$ 23.58 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 |
| Net Present Value @ | 15.0% | \$9.27 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 Development costs include allocated share of onsite/offsite costs.

/2 Selling and marketing expenses only. Operating expenses are covered 100% by annual fees.

Source: RCI Consulting, Inc.; and Economics Research Associates

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 12:04 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mike Tindall
E-mail tindallmike@hotmail.com

Comments Good Morning, Can we expand the available pickleball courts by lining tennis courts throughout the city as they have done in Encinitas at Cottonwood Creek and Moonlight Beach. I have played at both locations many times and both groups courteously share the courts throughout the day. This would greatly expand the number of available nearby courts to a greater number of people at a savings of time and money. Before the Covid shutdown, the number of people waiting to play at Poinsettia Park would often exceed 20 in the evenings and weekends. Dual lines would also allow multiple activities similar to the function of gymnasiums- ie. basketball, volleyball, pickleball,etc. Thanks for your consideration. Mike Tindall

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 7:18 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name [chris paccione](#)
E-mail cspaccione@gmail.com
Comments [I would love to have more pickleball courts!](#)

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 12:31 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Peg Reiter
E-mail pegreiter@gmail.com
Comments We need more pickleball courts! Poinsettia Park pickleball courts are extremely busy. People can wait as long as one hour to get on a court. Meanwhile, the tennis courts are almost practically empty. One tennis court can be turned into FOUR pickleball courts that SIXTEEN people can enjoy (versus only two to four people on a tennis court. We need more pickleball courts.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 3:17 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Fred Gelin
E-mail fredlgelin@gmail.com
Comments This am, Oct 19th, there were about 45 people trying to play pickleball. Of course, only 4 of 6 cts available. On weekends pball is more crowded. We desperately need more cts .

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Master Plan Update

From: Carlsbad Web Team <webmaster@carlsbadca.gov>

Sent: Sunday, December 19, 2021 11:58 AM

To: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>

Subject: Master Plan Update

Message submitted from the <Carlsbad, CA> website.

Site Visitor Name: shirley cole

Site Visitor Email: shirley.cole@sbcglobal.net

After participating in the master plan update last week, I was shocked that your department posted signs at the high school tennis courts saying pickleball is not allowed. I spoke with a high school student (who had a pickleball class) who said he was yelled at to get off the courts due to these signs. You have created a "hostile environment" that puts the tennis players and pickleball players at risk. There is no reason to have such an adversarial approach to the courts use when they are usually half empty. Their use should be encouraged. The sound excuse of excessive noise can not be an issue, as this is a school with much louder games at play and do not have to go through a conditional use permit. After the many comments made during the master plan zoom meeting that support additional use of courts for pickleball, this step shows a lack of listening to the public throughout this whole process. Why does it take 7 years for Carlsbad to update recreation services that are in high demand when our neighboring cities were able to in a manner of months! Paint pickleball lines on the tennis courts at Carlsbad High School now. The community will even donate the paint and the labor to not cost the City a penny!!! Please no more excuses.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-PUPA Public Comments - Please read my letter into the record as a public comment at this weeks meeting

Attachments: P4P Letter to Mayor-City Council - LS.pdf; Untitled attachment 00776.html; FW: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA Public Comment - Coastal Recreation at Ponto - Jan 11 2020 from People for Ponto; FW: Carlsbad DLCP-PUPA Public Comments - Flawed Coastal Public Participation and Planning Activities (2010 Ponto Vision Plan & 2015 General Plan Update) at Ponto FW: RECORDS REQUEST - PRR-2017-260 Lance Schulte; FW: DRAFT: Ponto Area Update; FW: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations; FW: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations; FW: Protect Ponto *** Please read into general public comment January 13, 2021****; FW: SCBCAP initial listening session & Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues Public Input - initial data and comments on SCBCAP issues in DLCP-LUPA; FW: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues; FW: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues - PA F is for sale; FW: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues - Park Hyatt Ponto Park support letter; FW: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on inconsistencies apparent in the 1-26-21 Staff Report on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues ; FW: Jan26th Agenda item 12 - Protect Ponto; FW: 1-26-21 Agenda Item 12 Protect Ponto ; FW: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues Public Input - Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad's DLCP-LUPA's projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto; FW: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues Public Input - Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad's DLCP-LUPA's projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto; FW: Our Home Our Future citizen input - Why a park is needed within walking distance to multifamily housing & why a meaningful Coastal Park is needed for Ponto/South Carlsbad - public input to DLCPA, Housing and Park planning ; FW: 10-12-21 Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment - 3 choices and supporting data ; FW: Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment and 10/12/21 Council meeting on City proposed changes to 3 Existing Mellow II LCP Land Use policies regarding high-priority Coastal Land Uses; FW: Support for the Proposal for Open Park Space at Ponto Vote October 12, 2021; FW: Save Ponto; FW: 10/12/21 Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment regarding high-priority Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations Coastal Land Uses; FW: Support for the Proposal for Open Park Space at Ponto Vote October 12, 2021; FW: comments of - Discover easy, convenient alternative transportation options in Carlsbad; FW: comments of - Discover easy, convenient alternative transportation options in Carlsbad

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, January 3, 2021 10:07 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; David De Cordova <David.deCordova@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; 'Lisa Urbach' <lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>

Cc: 'info ponto' <info@peopleforponto.com>; Jane Naskiewicz <fabsdhomes@gmail.com>

Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-PUPA Public Comments - Please read my letter into the record as a public comment at this weeks meeting

Dear Carlsbad City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD:

The following Citizen public Comment to the Planning Commission raises another simple but undiscussed point how important Parks are and - in particular rare Coastal Parks that serve a far wider geographic area - are for Cities and Citizens that will forever be increasing packed into high-density housing that reduces or eliminates yards or recreational space on a per-capita basis. How a City reserves and plans for more parks and the equitable distribution of increasing MORE Parks to address this forever increase in high-density housing that create even more park demand. The issues Jane raise are basic and fundamental to creating a sustainable and desirable urban (and Coastal) environment of increasing residential density. These basic issues should be fully publicly considered and publicly discussed as part of Carlsbad Staff proposed Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment process. Thank you for receiving, considering and discuss the Citizen issues Jane presents.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte for People for Ponto,

From: Jane Naskiewicz [<mailto:fabsdhomes@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 11:43 AM
To: planning@carlsbadca.gov
Cc: info ponto; Mike Sebahar; Lance Schulte; jodi marie jones
Subject: Please read my letter into the record as a public comment at this weeks meeting

Dear Planning Commission, Please read my letter into the record as a public comment at this weeks Planning Commission meeting. It is 500 words or less.

Kindest Regards,
Jane Naskiewicz

Dear Mayor Matt Hall and Carlsbad City Council,

The wisest use of the land at Ponto is for open space and low cost visitor serving recreation, Not high density residential where only 20% are restricted to be affordable and 80% are highly unaffordable. Changing this land designation to high density residential is robbing the people of Carlsbad (and their children) of something incredibly precious, something that they can never get back.

As a licensed Real Estate professional and a Carlsbad resident for 16 years I would like to point out that many of the newly constructed homes in our city lack a yard of any size, not even a patio. You're lucky if you get a balcony big enough for a couple chairs. This goes for high end condos and townhomes which are the majority of the under \$1 million homes in our city. Most Apartment dwellers are paying \$2,000. To \$3,000 a month and don't have yards either. The trend is to pack more people into less space to make it more cost effective, but there is a cost to the residents.

We cannot continue to ignore the needs of tens of thousands of citizens in the southwest

quadrant of the city who have no coastal park or coastal open space. In normal times there would be thousands of visitors, hotel, and resort guests staying in southwest Carlsbad each week. What coastal parks can they go to? Maybe they drive to Encinitas or Del Mar and if so do they then spend their money on shops and restaurants there?

The need for coastal open space and recreation areas is great now but it will be even more consequential going forward as our density increases, and as sea levels continue to rise. Plus a Beach is Not the same as a Park. There are high tides and storms that take away the beach leaving only cobbles that are unfriendly to visitors. Plus not everyone is going to be able to (or want to) take their infant strollers, wheelchairs or walkers on the cobble beach, but they could access a nice park at Ponto.

A park at Ponto will give residents and visitors alike a unique coastal experience unlike anything else in the city. It could provide a venue for outdoor events and performances, and maybe a beachclub cafe with view decks for even more sunset and ocean views. This space should belong to the community and again, its wisest use is Visitor Serving Park and Open Space.

And why would we want to build more units here before correcting this very serious park deficit in the SW quadrant? Just look at how many people congregate on that tiny patch of grass in the Village at Pine Ave and Carlsbad Village Dr, or Cannon Park. Ponto could very easily become the most treasured park in the city, a grand statement to the outdoor lifestyle so many of us moved here for.

Jane Naskiewicz, Carlsbad resident, People 4 Ponto volunteer.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor Matt Hall and Carlsbad City Council,

The wisest use of the land at Ponto is for open space and low cost visitor serving recreation, Not high density residential where only 20% are restricted to be affordable and 80% are highly unaffordable. Changing this land designation to high density residential is robbing the people of Carlsbad (and their children) of something incredibly precious, something that they can never get back.

As a licensed Real Estate professional and a Carlsbad resident for 16 years I would like to point out that many of the newly constructed homes in our city lack a yard of any size, not even a patio. You're lucky if you get a balcony big enough for a couple chairs. This goes for high end condos and townhomes which are the majority of the under \$1 million homes in our city. Most Apartment dwellers are paying \$2,000. To \$3,000 a month and don't have yards either. The trend is to pack more people into less space to make it more cost effective, but there is a cost to the residents.

We cannot continue to ignore the needs of tens of thousands of citizens in the southwest quadrant of the city who have no coastal park or coastal open space. In normal times there would be thousands of visitors, hotel, and resort guests staying in southwest Carlsbad each week. What coastal parks can they go to? Maybe they drive to Encinitas or Del Mar and if so do they then spend their money on shops and restaurants there?

The need for coastal open space and recreation areas is great now but it will be even more consequential going forward as our density increases, and as sea levels continue to rise. Plus a Beach is Not the same as a Park. There are high tides and storms that take away the beach leaving only cobbles that are unfriendly to visitors. Plus not everyone is going to be able to (or want to) take their infant strollers, wheelchairs or walkers on the cobble beach, but they could access a nice park at Ponto.

A park at Ponto will give residents and visitors alike a unique coastal experience unlike anything else in the city. It could provide a venue for outdoor events and performances, and maybe a beachclub cafe with view decks for even more sunset and ocean views. This space should belong to the community and again, its wisest use is Visitor Serving Park and Open Space.

And why would we want to build more units here before correcting this very serious park deficit in the SW quadrant? Just look at how many people congregate on that tiny patch of grass in the Village at Pine Ave and Carlsbad Village Dr, or Cannon Park. Ponto could very easily become the most treasured park in the city, a grand statement to the outdoor lifestyle so many of us moved here for.

Jane Naskiewicz, Carlsbad resident, People 4 Ponto volunteer.

Mick Calarco

Subject: FW: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA Public Comment - Coastal Recreation at Ponto - Jan 11 2020 from People for Ponto
Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2020-Jan Updated Public Comments - Coastal Recreation.pdf

From: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 1:01 PM
To: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: Charlene Buckalew <Charlene.Buckalew@carlsbadca.gov>; Tim Selke <TIm.Selke@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: FW: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA Public Comment - Coastal Recreation at Ponto - Jan 11 2020 from People for Ponto

Mike-
Please ensure this message is forwarded to the PRC.
Thanks.
-Kyle

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 8:34 AM
To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; David De Cordova <David.deCordova@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA Public Comment - Coastal Recreation at Ponto - Jan 11 2020 from People for Ponto

Dear Carlsbad City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues** (see pages 4-29 in the attached file). The data and the 14 critical issues did not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

After reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park

and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a ‘Goal’ to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| Existing Parks with | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as |
| Parkland | | | | |

Anticipated Future Park development projects
Park - quadrant

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:**
 - **4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,**
 - **6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and**
 - **2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant**

| | Shortfall (excess) in Current Quadrant Park standard by | | Future Park | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | acres | population need | acres | % | <u>existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants</u> |
| NW quadrant standard & more people at min. park standard. | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. capacity for 4,733 |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant deficit | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a "Minimum". City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City's current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and

- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City's minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City's current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City's minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact 'unusable' as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the demand for that Park.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning; is highly detrimental to the City, City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness.

Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and City Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lance Schulte for People for Ponto

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 12:24 PM

To: 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Planning'; 'Scott Chadwick'; 'Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mike Pacheco'; 'david.decordova@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Scott Donnell'; 'Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal'; 'cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Lisa Urbach'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'; 'Bret Schanzenbach'; 'Kathleen@carlsbad.org'; 'planning@carlsbadca.gov'; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD'; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD'

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA Public Comment - Coastal Recreation at Ponto - from People for Ponto

Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD:

Carlsbad Citizens first became aware (due to extensive Public Records research) of the Carlsbad's failure (current and starting before 2010) to comply with the still existing Certified Local Coastal Program Land Use and Zoning Regulations (LCP) for Ponto Planning Area F (to specifically consider and document the need for a Ponto "Public Park" prior to changing the NRR land use on Planning Area F), and also developers' Growth Management Open Space Standard (GMP) non-compliance at Ponto in 2017. Since 2017 with this awareness Carlsbad and surrounding Citizens and Visitors have repeatedly documented the need for a Ponto Park and asked the Carlsbad City Council and Staff to provide for it on Planning Area F as the existing LCP provides for. Since 2017 over 2,800 emails/petitions have been sent to the City and CA Coastal Commission (CCC), over 200 pages of official written (emailed) data and public comments, along with numerous presentations to prior City Council meetings on the LCP and GMP.

In Dec 2, 2020 Carlsbad began the Planning Commission Public Hearing on the Staff proposed Draft Local Coastal Program-Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) to propose to the CA Coastal Commission a change to Planning Area F's existing NRR land use and zoning. The flood of over 450 emailed public input for that specific meeting overwhelmed the City email server. As part of that process the City said in the Dec 2 email below it was going to post on its website all the Citizen/public input received on the DLCP-LUPA. On Dec 3 People for Ponto asked the Carlsbad City Council, City Clerk and City DLCP-LUPA Staff - would that posting would include all the LCP communications since 2017 when Citizens first became aware started Public Input to the City and CCC on the Ponto LCP issues?

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 11:13 AM

To: 'Planning'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Cc: 'Jennifer Jesser'; 'Don Neu'; 'City Clerk'; 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Erin Prahler'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov)

Subject: RE: 121 undeliverable Protect Ponto petitions

To City of Carlsbad and Carlsbad Planning:

We assume when you say 'records department' you mean City Clerk?

We also assume you mean 'all comments submitted' includes written comments and attachments; and Ponto related communications, presentations, public testimony and Public Records Requests to the City since 2017 - when Citizens first became aware of Existing Ponto Planning Area F LCP regulations and received CCC direction to the City on those Regulations? Can you please confirm this as this is all part of the Citizen comments and data that is part of the public record regarding the subject matter? The City is [using] 2015 input to justify current City Staff proposals, so the City should acknowledge and include People for Ponto Citizen input since 2017 on the same subject matter.

Thanks,

People for Ponto

From: Planning [<mailto:Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 6:29 PM

To: info@peopleforponto.com

Cc: Jennifer Jesser; Don Neu

Subject: RE: 121 undeliverable Protect Ponto petitions

Hello,

At the conclusion of the meeting all comments will be submitted to the records department. The records department will make the full record available on the city's website. At that time, I would suggest reviewing the record in its entirety to compare to what you submitted. Thank you.

It has been almost 3-weeks without a City response to the Dec 3 email, so People for Ponto will start re-emailing to the City and CCC public input on Ponto LCP and DLCP-LUPA issues since 2017 as 'resent official Public Input' to the City Council and CCC for the upcoming City Council DLCP-LUPA Public Hearing and other City meetings dealing with land use at Ponto. This '2017-present Public Input' should be posted on the City's website as noted in the City's Dec 2 email. The 2017-present Public Input is critical because there are now different City Council and CCC members since 2017. The 2017-present public input is critical to assure a proper Public Participation process consistent with Carlsbad and CA Coastal Act principles and assure the new City Council and the current CA Coastal Commission has the information and understands the extensive amount of multi-year public input expressing concerns, needs and desires for Ponto.

Following and attached is one of those many inputs.

Sincerely,
People for Ponto

The following email/attachment has important data/comments on the Coastal Recreation needs at Ponto that are critical in Ponto Planning Area F LCP regulations, and need full consideration.

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 1:56 PM
To: jennifer.jesser@carlsbadca.gov
Cc: 'Melanie Saucier'; 'Celia Brewer'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Cort Hitchens'; 'Erin Prahler'; 'Gabriel Buhr'; 'Mike Sebahar'; 'Harry Peacock'; 'John Gama'; 'John Gama'; 'Chas Wick'; 'Stacy King'; 'Don Neu'; 'Nika Richardson'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Jim Nardi'; 'Lisa Urbach'; Fred Sandquist (sandquist2@earthlink.net); David Hill (dashill4551@gmail.com); Laura Walsh (lauraw@surfridersd.org); 'David Hill'
Subject: LCPA Public Comment - Coastal Recreation at Ponto - from People for Ponto
Importance: High

Jennifer:

Attached please find Public Comments on the proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment (DLCPA) to the Land Use Plan regarding "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation at Ponto.

These People for Ponto comments reflect the significant Coastal Recreation and Coastal Land Use Plan issues at Ponto that clearly seem to justify, particularly after the City has receive to date of 2,500 public requests (and more are coming) for a Ponto Coastal Park, that a more productive, and overall more time efficient process to address public concerns be provided in the DLCPA process. I provide that thought based on successfully managed an award-wining LCPA amendment in under 2-years that was almost the exactly the same as the City of Carlsbad. Although the City Council in a 2-2 tie failed to provide for more productive and overall more time efficient process I hope within the DLCPA processing parameters Staff has you try to advance:

1. a publicly accessible "Redline" version of the Existing 2016 Local Coastal Program (LCP) showing the City's proposed Draft disposition of the current Existing LCP Land Use Plan, policies and data. Without a "Redline" trying to understand the proposed Draft changes is very difficult,
2. true Citizen-based public Workshops on the Coastal Act goals-policies and LCP issues focused on the limited amount of key vacant (and soon to be vacant) Coastal lands in Carlsbad – such as Ponto, and
3. A 6-month extension of time review and provide informed public comments on the Redline LCP and DLCPA, and to provide time to conduct the aforementioned Workshops.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Friday, November 22, 2019 7:43 PM

To: 'Jennifer Jesser'

Cc: 'Melanie Saucier'; 'Celia Brewer'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Cort Hitchens'; 'Erin Prahler'; 'Gabriel Buhr'; 'Mike Sebahar'; 'Harry Peacock'; 'John Gama'; 'John Gama'; 'Chas Wick'; 'Stacy King'; 'Don Neu'; 'Nika Richardson'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Jim Nardi'; 'Lisa Urbach'; Fred Sandquist (sandquist2@earthlink.net); David Hill (dashill4551@gmail.com); Laura Walsh (lauraw@surfridersd.org); 'David Hill'

Subject: LCPA public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations

Jennifer:

Attached please find Public Comments on the proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment (DLCPA) to the Land Use Plan regarding Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations.

As provided in other Public Comments and expressed by several citizens at the 11-20-19 Planning Commission meeting, I along with others kindly request:

1. a publicly accessible “Redline” version of the Existing 2016 Local Coastal Program (LCP) showing the City’s proposed Draft disposition of the current Existing LCP Land Use Plan, policies and data. Without a “Redline” trying to understand the proposed Draft changes is very difficult,
2. true Citizen-based public Workshops on the Coastal Act goals-policies and LCP issues focused on the limited amount of key vacant (and soon to be vacant) Coastal lands in Carlsbad – such as Ponto, and
3. A 6-month extension of time review and provide informed public comments on the Redline LCP and DLCPA, and to provide time to conduct the aforementioned Workshops.

We are still working to try to review the LCP and DLCPA documents and provide public comments on the Coastal Recreation

Thank you for including and responding to these DLCPA Public Comments and questions.

Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 4-29 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| <u>Existing Parks with</u> | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| <u>Unusable Open Space acreage</u> | | | | |
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park |

In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. city identified unusable habitat open space 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% |

Anticipated Future Park development projects

Park - quadrant

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:**
 - **4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,**
 - **6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and**
 - **2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant**

Shortfall (excess) in Current Quadrant Park standard by

| | population | | Future Park | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <u>acres</u> | <u>need</u> | <u>acres</u> | <u>%</u> | |
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | <u>existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants</u> Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the demand for that Park.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning; is highly detrimental to the City, City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and City Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

1. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

2. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
 - a. Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - b. Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - c. Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

3. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - a. Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - b. Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - c. This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ...”; 2). This data be used in the City’s analysis and the public’s review and discussion about the City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount “maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone” and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to “assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”. Most of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

4. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City’s proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

5. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is a obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail




Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



Concept – detailed park planning once a park site

6. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:
 - a. Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - Source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- b. Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County's Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County's projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California's, the San Diego Region's and Carlsbad's Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- c. We request that the as part of the public's review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever 'Buildout' City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

7. Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- a. The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad's Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final 'buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.


Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- b. The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

8. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.


Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.

9. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.
 - a. Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
 - b. Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
 - c. Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
 - d. Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water

(the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



10. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that 15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a

summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

11. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiqitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:
 - a. Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
 - b. In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
 - c. In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.
 - d. Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's

Coastal land use ‘planning mistake’ by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F’s LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.

- e. In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal ‘planning mistakes’ by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City’s 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal ‘planning mistakes’ to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City’s over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by ‘restarting’ Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens’ requests have been rejected.
- f. In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land use, without first disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens’ requests.
- g. In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior ‘planning mistakes’ at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto’s Planning Area F to either:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of “Non-Residential Reserve” until such time as the City’s past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space (“i.e. Public Park”) to provide both “High-Priority” coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

12. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words “shall”) these “low priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur

in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds' low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment's proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this "High-Priority" low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the 'Buildout' condition due to coastal erosion. **So the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad's Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP's planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP's planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City "may" or 'may not' choose (per the proposed "may" LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City's (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy 'shell game'. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two "may" criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only "low-priority" residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by "shall" policy) winners, and "high-priority" Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal 'long-shot' ("may" policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the documented "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

13. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.
14. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback.

Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a “site constraint”? There should be some explanation of what a “site constraint” is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon’s adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon’s and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad’s landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

Mick Calarco

Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-PUPA Public Comments - Flawed Coastal Public Participation and Planning Activities (2010 Ponto Vision Plan & 2015 General Plan Update) at Ponto FW: RECORDS REQUEST - PRR-2017-260 Lance Schulte

Attachments: 2020 Dec 2 - Planning Area F existing LCP-LUP & CCC direction.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 8:36 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; David De Cordova <David.deCordova@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahl@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; 'Lisa Urbach' <lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-PUPA Public Comments - Flawed Coastal Public Participation and Planning Activities (2010 Ponto Vision Plan & 2015 General Plan Update) at Ponto FW: RECORDS REQUEST - PRR-2017-260 Lance Schulte

Dear Carlsbad City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD:

The following email sting provides more specific documentation of citizens' public comments and data presented on Staff's Draft LCP-LUP Amendment in a 12/1/20 11:57am email. The body of that 12/1/20 11:57am email has important issues that should be discussed and considered by the City, CCC and CA HCD.

Part of those issues is documentation of the City's prior 'flawed' Ponto "planning activities" going back over 10-years that undermines the City's General Plan Update at Ponto. Those flaws tainted the City's prior (and current) Ponto planning activities going back to the Ponto Vision Plan and including the General Plan Update. These flaws are still being advanced in the Staff proposed DLCP-LUPA that based on that Ponto Vision Plan and General Plan Update. These City Ponto planning flaws, or planning mistakes, are also in conflict with the CA Coastal Act, and City policy, regarding the City's ethical obligations for an honest and informed Public Participation process for Coastal and City planning activities.

The attached file titled '2020 Dec 2 – Planning Area F existing LCP-LUP & CCC direction' that was included in the 12/1/20 11:57am public comments in summary documents some of the City's prior and current Ponto planning flaws. That attached file includes specific DLCP direction the CA Coastal Commission Staff provided the City in 2017 regarding the Ponto Planning Area F.

The City's Ponto planning activity and public participation flaws were first documented in official Carlsbad Public Records Request PRR-2017-260. The following email string serves as additional documentation of these flaws. PRR-2017-260 simply asked to see the City's documentation that it informed Citizens of the Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Zoning Requirements "as part of any future (after 1986) planning activity"; and documentation of the City's compliance with the Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Zoning Requirements. PRR-2017-260 documented the City's Ponto planning flaws.

It should be clearly acknowledge that the Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Zoning Requirements apply to the land area included in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & LCP.

Reviewing the email string below clearly shows the City has no documents showing it ever fully publicly disclosed, discussed and complied with the Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Zoning Requirements.

In 2017 once Carlsbad citizens discovered the City's Ponto planning failures to public disclose, discuss and comply with the Ponto Planning Area F LCP, we began researching both the present and future adequacy of CA Coastal Act high-priority Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost Visitor accommodations at Ponto. Since 2017 the growing numbers of People for Ponto provided both data and extensive public comments on the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost Visitor Accommodations at Ponto Planning Area F in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & LCP. The two data and public comment sets directly relate to the Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Zoning Requirements.

1. On 11/22/19 7:34pm & 12/21/2020 12:59pm emails to the City and CCC with the subject line: LCPA Public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations. Those Public Comment emails provide 4 critical data sets and issues that show Carlsbad's proposed Draft LCP-LUPA preforms relatively poorly in planning for this high-priority Coastal land use.
2. On 1/29/20 1:56pm & 12/22/2020 12:24pm emails to the City and CCC with the subject line: LCPA Public Comment - Coastal Recreation at Ponto - from People for Ponto. Those Public Comment emails provide 14 critical Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public park) data sets and issues that also shows Carlsbad's proposed Draft LCP-LUPA preforms relatively poorly in planning and providing for Parks at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad. People for Ponto conducted additional analysis of City Park data, and that research further highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad's Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. That additional analysis was provided to the City and CCC in a 1/11/20 8:34am email.

These two sets of data and public comments and issues should be fully publicly considered and publicly discussed as part of Carlsbad Staff proposed Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment and Zoning Change process.

Thank you. We hope you do the right thing.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte for People for Ponto

From: Faviola Medina [<mailto:Faviola.Medina@carlsbadca.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Lance Schulte
Subject: RE: RECORDS REQUEST - PRR-2017-260 Lance Schulte

Good Afternoon Mr. Schulte,

Your follow up request for information includes questions which requires a City employee to read and provide answers to "yes/no" and narrative style questions.

Your request for information is authorized pursuant to the California Public Records Act ("CPRA") ("California Government Code §6250 – 6270). The responding entity is required to provide access to disclosable public records. **"Public records" includes any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics (§6252(e)).**

Therefore, the City has produced those records that are currently in existence. **The CPRA does not require an entity to either create a record that does not exist or to answer questions (form or interrogatory). In reviewing your email you**

are asking the City to answer questions about information not found in the documents of existence provided. The City is unable to assist you in this manner.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Planning Department for assistance at 760-602-4610.

Thank you,
Faviola



Faviola Medina
Deputy City Clerk
City of Carlsbad
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

760-434-2809 | 760-720-9461 fax | faviola.medina@carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Flickr](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#) |  Consider the environment before printing this e-mail

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 5:29 PM
To: Faviola Medina <Faviola.Medina@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: RE: RECORDS REQUEST - PRR-2017-260 Lance Schulte

Faviola:
Thanks. That is very much appreciated.
Have a great rest of the week.
Kindest regards,
Lance

From: Faviola Medina [<mailto:Faviola.Medina@carlsbadca.gov>]
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 3:58 PM
To: Lance Schulte
Subject: RE: RECORDS REQUEST - PRR-2017-260 Lance Schulte

Good Afternoon Mr. Schulte,

We have received your request for clarification and I am following up with the department responsive to the request.

I will provide you with their response upon receipt.

Have a great day!
Faviola



Faviola Medina
Deputy City Clerk
City of Carlsbad
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

760-434-2809 | 760-720-9461 fax | faviola.medina@carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Flickr](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#) |  Consider the environment before printing this e-mail

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2017 1:59 PM
To: Faviola Medina <Faviola.Medina@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: RE: RECORDS REQUEST - PRR-2017-260 Lance Schulte
Importance: High

Faviola:

Thank you. The files are extremely large and **cover issues outside the public records request. That request was:**

Both Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan [2015 update] analysis, consideration and documentation that implements the City of Carlsbad and California Coastal Commission legislation as part of the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program for Subarea F that requires: **“As part of any future planning effort, the city and developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad.”**

Consequently it took some time to scan the 10 files. In that scan I noticed two issues relative to the public records request I would like to get confirmation on.

1. **No information, files or documents were provided regarding the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan’s analysis, consideration and documentation of the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program for Subarea F requirement noted above.** I assume that since no information, files, or documents were provided by the City then there was no analysis, consideration, or documentation done for the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan that related to the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program requirement for Subarea F? Can you please confirm?
2. **The files provided in response to the public records request are, as you mentioned, extremely large. They all relate to the General Plan (2015) update. Is there page numbers within the files that specifically relate to the questions asked in the public records request? I did not find any analysis, consideration, and documentation that related to the public records request.** If there are no specific reference pages for the files provided, can I assume there is no files showing the that during the General Plan (2015) update there is no analysis consideration, documentation showing “As part of any future planning effort, the city and developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad.”?

Thanks. As mentioned I am just trying to understand, and be provided documentation that shows that “As part of any future planning effort, the city and developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad.”

Thanks again,
Lance

From: Faviola Medina [<mailto:Faviola.Medina@carlsbadca.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2017 2:18 PM
To: Lance Schulte
Subject: RECORDS REQUEST - PRR-2017-260 Lance Schulte

Good Afternoon,

Attached you will find a letter in response to your Public Records Request received on August 10, 2017.

This records request is now considered complete.

Have a wonderful day☺



Faviola Medina
Deputy City Clerk
City of Carlsbad
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

760-434-2809 | 760-720-9461 fax | faviola.medina@carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Flickr](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#) | 🌱 Consider the environment before printing this e-mail

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Comparison of Ponto Planning Area F’s existing v. Carlsbad proposed LCP LUP not fully correct. The table is from City of Carlsbad. The last paragraph of the Existing LCP notes “prior to any planning activity”. This was newer done as documented by official Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 2017-262, R000930-072419, R001280-021720, and R001281-02170, so the City’s “General Plan update” (of just the land use map) was done in violation of the Existing LCP LUP Policy – one of the City’s Ponto planning mistakes. As noted in 1-5 below, the CCC has noted these mistakes dating back to 2010 with the “Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan” and 2015 General Plan map, and is seeking to correct them in the 2016 and 2017 communications to the City. Also the City’s own documents verify these facts.

HOW THE EXISTING CITY OF CARLSBAD LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM (LCP) POLICIES ARE ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM UPDATE

| Row | EXISTING LCP POLICIES | HOW DRAFT LCP ADDRESSES EXISTING LCP POLICIES |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | WEST BATIQUITOS LAGOON/SAMMIS PROPERTIES SEGMENT | |
| 282 | <p>10. Planning Area F</p> <p>Planning Area F is located at the far northwest corner of the Master Plan area west of the AT&SF Railway right-of-way. This Planning Area has a gross area of 11 acres and a net developable area of 10.7 acres.</p> <p>Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an “unplanned” area, for which land uses will be determined at a later date when more specific planning is carried out for areas west of the railroad right-of-way. A future Major Master Plan Amendment will be required prior to further development approvals for Planning Area F, and shall include an LCP Amendment with associated environmental review, if determined necessary.</p> <p>The intent of the NRR designation is not to limit the range of potential future uses entirely to non-residential, however, since the City’s current general plan does not contain an “unplanned” designation, NRR was determined to be appropriate at this time. In the future, if the Local Coastal Program Amendment has not been processed, and the City develops an “unplanned” General Plan designation, then this site would likely be redesignated as “unplanned.” Future uses could include, but are not limited to: commercial, residential, office, and other uses, subject to future review and approval.</p> <p>As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.</p> | <p>As part of the General Plan update, the Coastal Commission approved residential and general commercial land use designations on the LCP land use map.</p> <p>This policy is updated to be consistent with the land use map designations and the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan. See draft LCP policy LCP-2-P.20.A and B.</p> <p>Regarding the need for lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities west of the railroad, analysis and documentation will be provided in the staff report to the Planning Commission.</p> |

CCC direction on why Draft LCP description is not accurate:

During the Jan 28, 2020 City Council Meeting (item #14), Carlsbad City staff for the first time as a side-bar comment admitted the City made some ‘Ponto planning errors’ going back over 15 years. Those City planning errors were first called out when the CA Coastal Commission (CCC) denied Carlsbad’s Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (the referenced foundation for Carlsbad’s 2015 General Plan Update) in 2010 in part due to the City’s mistake. Following are 4 documents that conflict with the above City interpretation of how the Draft LCP addresses Existing LCP Polies.

- 1) The CCC in denying in 2010 the Ponto Vision Plan (the foundation for Carlsbad’s 2015 General Plan Update at Ponto) specifically said with direct reference to Ponto Planning Area F:

“Currently, this area [Planning Area F] has an Unplanned Area land use designation. In order to facilitate **any type of development in this portion of the Ponto area, an LCP amendment modifying the land use will have to be brought forward to the Commission for review and approval.**”

“... the Commission would reject such proposed uses because there has been no evidence presented that would support the elimination of these [Planning Area F] areas for some lower cost overnight accommodations or public recreational amenities in the future. The Commission's past action of the **Poinsettia Shores Master Plan specifically called for such an assessment, and none has been submitted to date.** The concerns related to the lack of lower cost overnight accommodations in Area F (ref. Exhibit #7) are further discussed in the findings later.”

“City is inadvertently sending a message to potential developers that 1) the identified development (townhouses) is the primary type of use the City will support, or 2) that development type is consistent with the current land use and zoning designations. Neither of those assumptions is correct. As the previously certified **Poinsettia Shores Master Plan states, any type of development at this location would first require an LCP amendment to establish the land use and zoning, which would have to be certified by both the City and the Coastal Commission. Additionally, the Master Plan further states that some component of the development at this location must consider the need for the provision of lower cost accommodations or recreational facilities.**”

“While residential use is one of the land uses listed for this area in the Poinsettia Shores Specific Plan, it may not be the most appropriate designation. As previously stated, the project will at least need to consider the incorporation of some kind of lower cost accommodations, and any proposed zoning designation for the site will have to be found consistent with the policies contained in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan. Furthermore, the standard of review for any change to the current land use designation is the Coastal Act, and thus will also have to be found consistent with all its applicable policies.

Recently, the Commission has become concerned with the lack of lower-cost accommodations statewide. Thus, the establishment of a residential land use at this location may not be what is ultimately determined to be certified as consistent with the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, or the Coastal Act.”

“B. High-Priority Uses - Lower Cost Visitor Accommodations in ‘Area F’: The Coastal Act has numerous policies promoting public access to the beach and state:

Section 30210 - In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and **recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people** consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

Section 30213 - Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. **Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.** The commission shall not: (1) require that overnight room rentals be fixed at an amount certain for any privately owned and operated hotel, motel, or other similar visitor-serving facility located on either public or private lands; or (2) establish or approve any method for the identification of low or moderate income persons for the purpose of determining eligibility for overnight room rentals in any such facilities.

Section 30221 **Oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for in the area.**

Section 30222 - **The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.**"

"... in 1996, the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan was certified as part of the City's LCP, and replaced the [Visitor serving] land use designation as an "Unplanned Area." **In an attempt to maintain a lower-cost visitor-serving component at this location, the Commission, through a suggested modification, required language within the Master Plan that would serve to protect this type of use.** The language in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, for this location, "Area F," included: **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**"

"The Ponto Beachfront area is an area that could be considered as a high-priority location for lower cost overnight accommodations. While located across the street from a State Park (South Carlsbad State Park) containing camping facilities, **during peak summer months, the campground is consistently at capacity. ... If at any time in the future, this State Beach campground is converted to day use sites, the market and the need for low cost overnight accommodations will be significantly amplified. Thus the Vision Plan, as proposed by the City, cannot be found consistent with the Coastal Act.**"

"H. Conclusions: ... **concerns regarding the determination of preferred land uses in an 'unplanned' area, the lack of provision of lower-cost accommodations and recreational uses, ... remain. All of these oversights could result in impacts to public access and recreation and other coastal resources and, therefore, the Vision Plan, as submitted, is therefore inconsistent with the Coastal Act, and therefore, shall be denied as submitted.**"

- 2) Following is from a 7/3/17 CCC letter to City Staff on the City's proposed land use changes at Planning Area F. City Staff for the 1st time provided this to City Council on 1/28/20:

"The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad. This is an issue that the San Pacifico HOA community group is raising in regards to the Shopoff/Ponto development proposal, and this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. **If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost**

visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”

- 3) In 2017 after citizens received the City’s reply to Public Records Request 2017-260, citizens meet with CCC staff to reconfirm the City failed since before 2010 to publicly disclose and comply with Planning Area F’s LCP requirements. CCC Staff acknowledged the City has not yet complied with the LCP and in an 8/16/2017 email said:

“The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City’s Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City’s land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area.”

- 4) In 2016, the CCC told City that Carlsbad’s proposed 2015 General Plan land use map could change based on the outcomes of both a Citywide Coastal Recreation needs Study, and also the specific Planning Area F LCP requirement to study Park needs at Ponto.
- 5) Currently and since 2016 the City acknowledged that the existing LCP, City and LCP Master Plan Zoning of “Non-Residential Reserve” land use needs to be changed by BOTH the City and CA Coastal Commission to only then allow any proposed development on Ponto Planning Area F. Also, since 1996 the Local Facilities Management Plan for Zone 9 (Ponto) has the planned land use and zoning of Ponto Planning Area F as “Non-Residential Reserve” that has no land use. The LFMP-Zone 9 must be amended to account for any City and CA Coastal Commission change from “Non-Residential Reserve” and address the land use impacts on all the Growth Management Program Facility Standards in Zone9 such as the current Park deficit, and also the recently discovered false exemption of the Open Space Standard in Zone 9. The false exemption being that Zone 9 was not developed in 1986 nor have the land use changes since 1986 complied with the 15% ‘unconstrained’ Open Space Standard.

The City currently and since 2016 acknowledges the existing LCP, City and LCP Master Plan Zoning of “Non-Residential Reserve” land use of Ponto Planning Area F needs to be changed by BOTH the City and CA Coastal Commission as evidenced on page 14-15 of City’s Planning Pending Applications as of November 2020 at <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=46332> as it shows:

“PONTO BEACHFRONT 12/20/2016

| <u>Legislative application</u> | <u>applied on</u> | <u>description</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| AMEND2017-0001 | 1/19/17 | LFMP AMENDMENT FOR ZONE 9 |
| LCPA2016-0002 | 12/20/16 | USES PROPOSED FOR PLANNING AREA F |
| MP2016-0001 | 12/20/16 | USES PROPOSED FOR PLANNING AREA F |

– Carlsbad City Planner = Goff”

The City is apparently failing to fully disclose to Citizens these facts and the City’s prior “Ponto Planning Area F planning mistakes dating back over 10-years when the land was purchased by speculative investors.

Mick Calarco

Subject: FW: DRAFT: Ponto Area Update
Attachments: CC SR - Carlsbad Parks Update 7.24.18 - Final pdf.pdf; 19. Lancaster. Parks Update - 7.24.18.pdf

From: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 2:05 PM
To: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: DRAFT: Ponto Area Update

Dear Commissioners:

The Community Development Department (which includes the Planning Division) is heading up a comprehensive presentation to the City Council on the Ponto Area, tentatively scheduled for the City Council Meeting of Jan. 26, 2021. The City Manager's Office determined this item should be heard by the City Council once the District 4 vacancy was filled, and Council Member Acosta had an opportunity to become acclimated and briefed.

The draft staff report is currently under final review/edit, and includes discussion of not only city parks and open space standards/requirements/opportunities, but also open an overview/history of the particular property in question, city housing element requirements, private property ownership/development rights, city funding and allowable spending, potential public vote considerations, adherence to the city's Local Coastal Plan, etc. I contributed significantly to the drafting of the staff report, especially on the sections directly related to city parks. I will also likely be involved with the presentation or at least available to answer questions of the City Council.

From a city parks perspective, the messaging will be very consistent with the first four pages of the attached City Council Staff Report that was presented on July 24, 2018. I'm relatively certain that City Council Staff Report and/or corresponding PowerPoint from July 24, 2018, was previously forwarded to the Parks & Recreation Commission. Recognizing we currently have two new(er) Commissioners, however, I'm attaching both documents hereto for your respective review.

We will forward the link to the Jan. 26, 2021 City Council Staff Report, once it is posted on the city's website (which is typically by the Friday preceding the Tuesday meeting). We will also make mention during the Parks & Recreation Commission Meeting on Jan. 25, 2021, of Community Development Department staff's pending presentation to the City Council. The Ponto Area will not, however, be an agenized item for the Parks & Recreation Commission Meeting, so staff's mention of the update will be more of an announcement and an encouragement to review the City Council Staff Report and/or watch the City Council Meeting, for each Commissioner's edification.

Sincerely,
Kyle



Kyle Lancaster, CPRP
Parks & Recreation Director
Parks & Recreation Department
City of Carlsbad
799 Pine Ave., Ste. 200

Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

760-434-2941 | 760-434-5088 fax | Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#)



CITY COUNCIL
Staff Report

Meeting Date July 24, 2018
To: Mayor and City Council

From: Kevin Crawford, City Manager
Staff Contact: Kyle Lancaster, Parks Services Manager
kyle.lancaster@carlsbadca.gov or 760-434-2941

Subject Carlsbad Parks Update

Recommended Action

Receive an informational report on the current and future Carlsbad Parks inventory.

Executive Summary

On May 8, 2018 several members of the public expressed concerns to the City Council regarding the amount of park acreage in the southwest quadrant of the city, particularly in the coastal region. These concerns were linked to a Capital Improvement Program Budget request for \$200,000 to initiate master planning of the Veterans Memorial Park site. The City Council subsequently directed staff to hold a workshop to provide an update on the current and future parks inventory.

On June 12, 2018, several members of the public again expressed concerns to the City Council regarding the amount of park acreage in the southwest quadrant of the city, particularly in the coastal region. Staff advised that the 'Parks Update' item had been agendaized for the City Council Meeting of July 24, 2018, and indicated the item would provide an overview of where the city is at, and where the city is headed, with respect to parks.

This report provides the requested information via review of the applicable sections of two significant documents - the Carlsbad Citywide Facilities and Improvements Plan, and the Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department Needs Assessment/Master Plan. The review of the Carlsbad Citywide Facilities and Improvements Plan will illustrate that all of Carlsbad's quadrants are currently compliant with the plan's parks performance standard. It will also illustrate that scheduling Veterans Memorial Park for construction will result in the park inventory for all city quadrants exceeding the projected required acreage at buildout.

The review of the Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment/Master Plan will illustrate that, as a result of significant input received during public outreach efforts, the document reflects what was determined to be Carlsbad's parks and recreation values and priorities. It will also illustrate that the department has addressed, or is in the process of addressing, each of the key action items for Capital Improvement Program planning, and park, facility and amenity development.

Discussion

On May 8, 2018, the City Council received a presentation on the introduction of the proposed FY 2018-19 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Budget. During the comment period of that agenda item, several members of the public expressed concerns regarding the amount of park acreage in the southwest quadrant of the city, particularly in the coastal region. These concerns were linked to a CIP Budget request for \$200,000 to initiate the master planning – including public outreach efforts and conceptual design development - of the Veterans Memorial Park site. At the end of the comment period, by minute action, the City Council directed staff to hold a workshop to provide an update on the current and future parks inventory (Exhibit 1). As further communicated, staff was to provide a workshop or education on where the city is at with parks and the plan.

On June 12, 2018, the City Council received a presentation on the adoption of the proposed FY 2018-19 Operating and CIP Budgets. During the comment period of that agenda item, several members of the public again expressed concerns regarding the amount of park acreage in the southwest quadrant of the city, particularly in the coastal region. Staff advised that the 'Parks Update' item had been agendaized for the City Council Meeting of July 24, 2018, and indicated the item would provide an overview of where the city is at, and where the city is headed, with respect to parks.

Carlsbad Citywide Facilities and Improvements Plan

In 1986, Carlsbad voters approved the Carlsbad Growth Management Program, which reduced the total projected population of Carlsbad from approximately 250,000 to approximately 130,000. The program also put in place standards that must be met for new development to be approved so that as Carlsbad grows, the quality of life can be maintained. The Growth Management Program sets forth policies to ensure that adequate city facilities and city services are provided as residential development occurs. These facilities and services are specified in 11 public facility performance standards, covering items such as parks. The City Council created the performance standards through adoption of the Carlsbad Citywide Facilities and Improvements Plan (Facilities and Improvements Plan) in September 1986.

Staff annually monitors compliance with the Facilities and Improvements Plan via a Growth Management Monitoring Report. The most recent publication of this report is for FY 2016-17. If the performance standards are not met within a specific planning area (referred to as Local Facility Management Zones), no new development may be approved in that area until the standards are met, or until satisfactory arrangements have been made to guarantee the facilities and improvements.

The parks performance standard is three acres of community parks or special use areas per 1,000 population within the park district. There are four parks districts within Carlsbad, which correspond to the city's quadrants. If the service level is not met due to population increase within a given quadrant, the city is required to schedule a park for construction within five years, beginning at the time the need is identified, but beginning no sooner than August 22, 2017 (City Council Resolution No. 2017-170). The phrase "scheduled for construction" means [a] the park site has been selected and has been or is being acquired by the city, [b] the improvements for the park site have been designed, and [c] a financing plan for construction of the park has been approved by the City Council (City Council Resolution No. 97-435).

Initially, the city was required to schedule a park for construction within five years, beginning at the time the need was identified, or before the private construction of 1,562 dwelling units per quadrant. The requirement, however, was changed per the City Council's adoption of amendments to the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the Carlsbad General Plan (GPA No. 2017-0002), and the Carlsbad Citywide Facilities Improvements Plan (OAJ No. 17-0004), pursuant to a Carlsbad General Plan lawsuit Settlement Agreement dated March 14, 2017, between the City of Carlsbad and North County Advocates. This change was requested due to concerns linking the timing of scheduling the construction of a park to the construction of 1,562 dwelling units per quadrant, as the Carlsbad General Plan anticipated future residential capacity in the southwest and southeast quadrants to be less than 1,562 dwelling units. Current compliance with the parks performance standard for all four districts/quadrants is shown below.

| City Quadrant | Parks Acreage Current Parks | Parks Acreage Current Need |
|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| NW | 105.2 | 90.4 |
| NE | 45.3 | 44.5 |
| SW | 70.2 | 76.8 |
| SE | 114.9 | 117.1 |
| Total | 335.6 | 328.8 |

To date, the inventory of parks acreage exceeds the parks performance standard acreage needed, except for 6.6 acres in the southwest quadrant, and 2.2 acres in the southeast quadrant. These two quadrants, however, are currently compliant with the parks performance standard, as the five-year period noted above does not conclude until Aug. 21, 2022.

The scheduling of Veterans Memorial Park for construction will address the parks performance standard in all city quadrants. Pursuant to the Facilities and Improvements Plan, the 91.5 acre Veterans Memorial Park site will equally count toward satisfying the parks performance standard in all city quadrants (i.e., 22.875 acres applied to each city quadrant). Because of this community park's size and central location, it is intended to serve as a regional recreation source. The methodology of applying a quarter of the Veterans Memorial Park acreage to each city quadrant was also included within the update to the Carlsbad General Plan, approved by the City Council on Sept. 22, 2015 (City Council Resolution No. 2015-042)

Thus far, the city has [a] acquired the Veterans Memorial Park site, [b] set aside \$200,000 in the FY 2018-19 CIP Budget to initiate master planning of the park site, and [c] set aside approximately \$23,000,000 in the CIP Budget for construction of the park. Carlsbad Community Facilities District No. 1 was established in 1991, creating a special tax lien on vacant properties throughout the city. The purpose of this Community Facilities District was to finance the construction of specific public facilities of citywide obligation and benefit, including Veterans Memorial Park. The funds from the district cannot be used for facilities other than those specified at the time the district was formed. Scheduling Veterans Memorial Park for construction will result in the parks inventory for all city quadrants exceeding the projected needed acreage at buildout, as shown below.

| City Quadrant | Buildout Population | Parks Acreage Projected Need | Parks Acreage Current Parks | Parks Acreage Veterans Park | Parks Acreage Projected Parks |
|---------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| NW | 38,606 | 115.8 | 105.2 | 22.875 | 128.075 |
| NE | 22,488 | 67.5 | 45.3 | 22.875 | 68.175 |
| SW | 28,113 | 84.3 | 70.2 | 22.875 | 93.075 |
| SE | 42,315 | 126.9 | 114.9 | 22.875 | 137.775 |
| Total | 131,523 | 394.6 | 335.6 | 91.5 | 427.1 |

The table above does not include the following park sites, listed in the CIP as “unfunded” or “partially unfunded”: Zone 5 Business Park Recreational Facility (9.3 acres); Cannon Lake Park (6.8 acres); or Robertson Ranch Park (11.2 acres). Should alternative funding mechanisms be determined, and these parks are constructed, the additional acreage would further aid in exceeding the parks performance standard. The table above also does not include the Buena Vista Reservoir site (3.1 acres), nor the northern Terramar Area Coastal Bluff Top (2.9 acres). The Buena Vista Reservoir site is currently under design to be converted to a neighborhood park, as the result of a settlement and community benefit agreement, which the city entered into on Mar. 14, 2017 (City Council Resolution No. 2017-044). The northern Terramar Area Coastal Bluff top is currently under design to be improved as a linear passive park, as the result of a settlement agreement between the City of Carlsbad/CMWD and Cabrillo Power, et al., which the city entered into on January 14, 2014 (City Council Resolution No. 2014-010). Should these parks be constructed/improved, the additional acreage would likewise further aid in exceeding the parks performance standard. The following table includes each of these park sites, in the column for Parks Acreage – Current Parks + Above Parks and in the column for Parks Acreage - Projected Parks.

| City Quadrant | Buildout Population | Parks Acreage Projected Need | Parks Acreage Current Parks + Above Parks | Parks Acreage Veterans Park | Parks Acreage Projected Parks |
|---------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| NW | 38,606 | 115.8 | 127.3 | 22.875 | 150.175 |
| NE | 22,488 | 67.5 | 56.5 | 22.875 | 79.375 |
| SW | 28,113 | 84.3 | 70.2 | 22.875 | 93.075 |
| SE | 42,315 | 126.9 | 114.9 | 22.875 | 137.775 |
| Total | 131,523 | 394.6 | 368.9 | 91.5 | 460.4 |

Based on the review within this report, the Carlsbad Growth Management Program, and in particular the Facilities and Improvements Plan, continues to meet its objectives of assuring adequate public facilities (e.g., parks) concurrent with the need created by new development.

Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department Needs Assessment/Master Plan

In 2012, staff began the process of developing the current Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department Needs Assessment and Comprehensive Action Plan (Needs Assessment). After hiring a consultant specializing in the development of such strategic documents, public outreach on this process commenced. Over the next year, staff administered the following public outreach:

- Seven focus group meetings with major parks user groups, city staff and other stakeholders
- Ten interviews with community/nonprofit leaders, commissioners and council members
- Two open public meetings
- A statistically-reliable survey of Carlsbad residents
- An open online survey
- Two presentations at joint Senior and Parks & Recreation Commission Meetings
- Two presentations at City Council Meetings
- Citywide newsletters, social media, email blasts, media print, and a YouTube video

As a result of significant input received during these public outreach efforts, the draft Needs Assessment reflected what was determined to be Carlsbad's parks and recreation values and priorities. It also identified key action items for CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development over the next five years. On Dec. 17, 2013, the City Council accepted the Needs Assessment (City Council Resolution No. 2013-295).

In 2014, the department began seeking national accreditation through the Commission for Accreditation of Park & Recreation Agencies (CAPRA). The CAPRA standards for national accreditation provide an authoritative assessment tool for parks and recreation departments, and through compliance with the standards assures that an accredited department has been independently evaluated against established benchmarks as delivering high quality programs and services. Two fundamental standards for CAPRA accreditation - a park and recreation system master plan and a strategic plan - required the department make minor modifications to the Needs Assessment.

While the department already had the elements of these two fundamental standards in place, the elements needed to be assembled into a master document to comply with the CAPRA requirement. Therefore, minor organizational modifications were made to the Needs Assessment and its name was changed to the Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan (Master Plan). Details were also added to the action items, including estimated capital cost outlay, lead division responsibility, performance metrics, and ties to the city's adopted organizational values and goals. On March 24, 2015, the City Council accepted the Master Plan (City Council Resolution No. 2015-074).

The following provides a brief status of each of the key action items for CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development included in the Needs Assessment/Master Plan.

- **Complete a feasibility study/business plan on the potential for programming, partnering and operational success for an indoor, multipurpose, multigenerational community center. If feasible, commence development within three years of the Needs Assessment acceptance.**
 - *A feasibility study for an indoor, multipurpose, multigenerational community center at Poinsettia Community Park was completed and accepted by the City Council on Aug. 22, 2017 (City Council Resolution No. 2017-172). Space limitations eliminated the option to include the desired amenities. This reduced footprint (compared to the larger, originally envisioned footprint) was not conducive to, nor reflective of, a multigenerational community center experience*

as recommended in the Needs Assessment/Master Plan. Poinsettia Community Park was therefore deemed not a feasible site for the community center.

- **Complete a feasibility study/business plan on the potential for programming, partnering and operational success for an outdoor adventure activity park. If feasible, commence development within five years of the Needs Assessment acceptance.**
 - *A feasibility study for an outdoor adventure activity park was completed and accepted by the City Council on Aug. 22, 2017 (City Council Resolution No. 2017-172). Due to existing space limitations, neighborhood impacts, mitigating noise and use impacts, and environmental concerns on the city-owned park sites, an outdoor adventure activity park was deemed not feasible. However, given the data collected during the study process, and the popularity/expressed community need for outdoor adventure amenities, individual offerings may be considered in future park development projects, as opportunities arise.*
- **Update master plans for future facilities to ensure amenities are consistent with the community vision as identified in the Needs Assessment.**
 - *After extensive public outreach, the Master Plans for Pine Ave., Aviara, and Poinsettia Community Parks were updated by the project team, and accepted by the City Council on Dec. 9, 2014 (City Council Resolution No. 2014-280).*
 - *The Pine Ave. Community Park Master Plan – Phase II includes a multigenerational community center, and both ornamental gardens and community gardens.*
 - *The Aviara Community Park Master Plan – Phase II includes a large passive outdoor community gathering space with picnic areas, and a catering support/restroom facility.*
 - *The Poinsettia Community Park Master Plan – Phase III includes a multigenerational community center, a multi-sport arena field, an expanded playground with equipment for two age groups, and an off-leash dog park.*
 - *After specific public outreach, the Leo Carrillo Ranch Historic Park Master Plan - Phase III Project Prioritization and Cost Estimate was updated. On Sept. 22, 2015, the City Council accepted a staff report noting that two projects - the restoration of the original stables and the construction of a new restroom facility - had been rated at the top of the project prioritization list (City Council Resolution No. 2015-239).*
- **Modify two existing tennis courts in well served areas to accommodate outdoor pickleball courts as determined by the equity mapping.**
 - *Two existing tennis courts were identified for modification to pickleball courts at Laguna Riviera Park. On Dec. 9, 2014, after receiving concerns from the public regarding the potential modification of the tennis courts at Laguna Riviera Park, the City Council directed staff to forego modification of those courts and instead explore locations at other parks for the construction of dedicated pickleball*

courts (City Council Resolution No. 2014-280). Staff subsequently identified a suitable location for such courts at Poinsettia Community Park. On Sept. 27, 2016, the City Council approved the contract documents, plans and specifications for the Poinsettia Community Park – Phase III Construction Project, which included six outdoor pickleball courts (City Council Resolution No. 2016-199).

- **Design and develop the entryway to Calavera Hills Community Park.**
 - *The entryway to Calavera Hills Community Park has been preliminarily designed. That design includes new monument signage, a looped pathway with exercise stations, picnic areas and landscaping. Staff is currently reviewing the contract documents, plans and specifications, and anticipates bringing them to the City Council for approval in the near future.*
- **Complete development of one additional community garden at Calavera Hills Community Park.**
 - *The development of one additional community garden at Calavera Hills Community Park was completed in June 2014. It contains over two dozen raised community planters for lease, garden committee demonstration planters, composting bins, an information kiosk, and a community gathering area.*
- **Create a plan to identify an additional dog park.**
 - *In 2017, staff sought public input on the concept of relocating a dog park from the location initially identified in the Poinsettia Community Park Master Plan – Phase III to the location initially identified for a multigenerational community center. On Feb. 13, 2018, based on the results of the public input survey, the City Council directed staff to pursue the relocation of the dog park (City Council Resolution No. 2018-020). Staff is currently initiating conceptual design development, environmental document review, and master plan update tasks with the project design team.*
- **Tie in all future park and facility development with the trails plan to ensure greater community connectivity within the system.**
 - *Staff continuously takes into account park and facility development with connectivity to the Carlsbad citywide trails system. The revised draft of the Carlsbad Trails Master Plan, and the corresponding environmental documents and proposed General Plan Amendment were presented to the City Council on June 29, 2017. Staff is currently working on final revisions to these documents, and anticipates bringing them to the City Council for adoption in the near future.*
- **Aligned with the General Plan, continue expanding to meet the growing/changing park, facility, program and special event needs of the community.**
 - *On May 20, 2014, the City Council approved a right of entry permit with the State of California Department of Parks & Recreation to improve and maintain the Upper Picnic Facilities at Tamarack State Beach and the Coastal Bluff at Tamarack/Frazee State Beach (City Council Resolution Nos. 2014-098). The boundary of the Upper Picnic Facilities includes 1.5 acres of passive turf,*

hardscape, raised planters, trees, picnic tables and benches, trash receptacles, outdoor showers, a stairway, a blockhouse restroom and a corresponding wastewater pump station. The boundary of the Coastal Bluff includes 4.8 acres of slopes which contain a mixture of both non-native and native plant material, and at-grade irrigation. These sites were added to the city's parks inventory. Staff continues to administer maintenance of the sites, under an annual permit.

- *On Aug. 26, 2014, the City Council approved an updated Joint Use and Community Recreation Agreement with the Carlsbad Unified School District, to maintain and utilize multipurpose field areas, tennis courts and school grounds after school hours (City Council Resolution No. 2014-207). This agreement included two school sites – Kelly Elementary of 2.9 acres and Hope Elementary of 2.8 acres - which were not included in prior agreements with the district. These sites were added to the city's parks inventory. Staff continues to administer maintenance of the sites, under the ongoing agreement.*
- *On Mar. 14, 2017, the City Council entered into a settlement and community benefit agreement, which amongst other provisions, obligates the city and Lennar Homes to execute a park construction agreement for a neighborhood park at the Buena Vista Reservoir site of 3.1 acres. The park is to include passive amenities, such as playground equipment, picnic tables, shade structures, interpretive signage, landscaping and security lighting. Upon completion of the construction, this site would be added to the city's parks inventory. Staff would administer maintenance of the site, under ownership.*
- *On July 17, 2018, the City Council received an update on the Terramar Area Coastal Improvement Project, which includes a coastal bluff top at the north end of Terramar of 2.9 acres. This bluff top is to include walking paths, beach access, low benches, trash receptacles, and native landscaping. Upon the City Council's acceptance of an Irrevocable Offer of Dedication and approval of the project, and completion of the construction, this site would be added to the city's parks inventory. Staff would administer maintenance of the site, under at least an easement.*
- **Update the needs assessment for the next five years to ensure relevance and concurrency with existing conditions and population in Carlsbad.**
 - *\$100,000 in funding was set aside in the City Council approved FY 18-19 Operating Budget to commence updating the Needs Assessment/Master Plan (City Council Resolution No. 2018-.093). Periodically updating this document is also adherent to Section 4.19 of the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element of the City Council approved Carlsbad General Plan.*

Based on the review within this report, the department has addressed, or is in the process of addressing, each of the key action items for CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development included in the Needs Assessment/Master Plan.

Fiscal Analysis

There is no direct fiscal impact associated with the receiving this informational report.

Next Steps

Unless directed otherwise by the City Council, staff will continue with its CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development, as identified in the Carlsbad Citywide Facilities and Improvements Plan and the Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department Needs Assessment/Master Plan.

Environmental Evaluation (CEQA)

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21065, receiving this informational report does not constitute a "project" within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in that it has no potential to cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the environment, and therefore does not require environmental review.

Public Notification

Public notification of this item occurred via staff response to the City Council's minute action at its regularly scheduled meeting of May 8, 2018, and via staff advisement at the City Council's regularly scheduled meeting of June 12, 2018. In addition, this item was noticed in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act and was available for public viewing and review at least 72 hours prior to the scheduled meeting date.

Exhibits

1. Minutes of City Council Meeting on May 8, 2018 – Item No. 9, FY 2018-19 CIP Budget Report
2. Letter from the City of Carlsbad to the San Pacifico Community Association, of June 11, 2018



CITY COUNCIL
Minutes

May 8, 2018, 6 p.m.

EXHIBIT 1

Council Chamber
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONCURRENT MEETINGS: None.

ROLL CALL: M. Schumacher, C. Schumacher, M. Packard.
Absent: M. Hall, K. Blackburn.

INVOCATION: None.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Council Member C. Schumacher led the Pledge of Allegiance.

CITY ATTORNEY COMMENT:

City Attorney Celia Brewer noted for the record that certain actions require a unanimous vote of the Council because this meeting only has a majority of the quorum and it requires a majority of the entire Council.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of the Special Meeting held March 20, 2018.
Minutes of the Regular Meeting held March 27, 2018.

Motion by Council Member M. Schumacher, seconded by Council Member C. Schumacher, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously, 3/0/2 (M. Hall, K. Blackburn – Absent).

PRESENTATION:

Proclamation in recognition of Water Safety Month

Council Member M. Schumacher presented the proclamation to Paramedic Firefighter John MacIsaac, Fire Chief Davis and Fire Division Chief Lopez. Paramedic Firefighter MacIsaac thanked the Council and gave a few words.

Introduction of CERT Academy Graduates

Council Member Packard introduced Emergency Preparedness Manager David Harrison. Mr. Harrison introduced the CERT Academy Graduates.

PUBLIC REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION:

City Attorney Brewer reported that Council initiated litigation against TB Penick & Sons Inc. for construction related issues at Alga Norte Community Park. – 3/0/2 (M. Hall, K. Blackburn – Absent).

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mary Lucid requested that more staff be assigned to the senior center.

Stephen Makeoff spoke about the Kim Center and the resources it offers.

The following students from Jefferson and La Costa Heights spoke about the SWPPP internship: Jennifer Hernandez, Isaiah McCoy, Max Chase, Rowan Christenson, Ben Esquivel, Case Crane, Aaron Losey, Robert King, Angel Ramos, Brielle McBarron, Zane Paqua, Madelaine Morton, Alex Vennemeyer.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Motion by Council Member M. Schumacher, seconded by Council Member C. Schumacher, to approve Consent Calendar Item Nos. 1 through 6. Motion carried unanimously, 3/0/2 (M. Hall, K. Blackburn – Absent).

1. REPORT ON CITY INVESTMENTS – Acceptance of report on City Investments as of March 31, 2018. (Staff contact: Nancy Sullivan, Administrative Services)
2. NEW AND REVISED JOB CLASSIFICATIONS – Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-061 approving new job classifications, revising current job classifications, and amending the Carlsbad City Employees' Association Salary Schedule and the Management Salary Schedule. (Staff contact: Drew Cook, Administrative Services)
3. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT WITH ADMINSURE INC. – Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-062 awarding a one year agreement in the amount of \$123,300 for the third party administration of Workers' Compensation Claims to Adminsure Inc. (Staff contact: Donna Hernandez, Administrative Services)
4. APPROVAL OF PURCHASE OF NETAPP DATA STORAGE FROM CDW-G - Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-063 approving the purchase of NetApp data storage from CDW-G in an amount not to exceed \$304,975.29. (Staff contact: Maria Callander, Administrative Services)
5. ADVERTISE FOR BIDS FOR 2018 SLURRY SEAL – Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-064 approving the plans and specifications and authorizing the City Clerk to advertise for bids for the 2018 Slurry Seal, Project No. 6001-18SS. (Staff contact: Emad Elias, Public Works)

6. AUTHORIZE RIGHT OF ENTRY PERMIT WITH STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS & RECREATION – Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-065 authorizing a Right of Entry Permit with the State of California Department of Parks & Recreation to maintain the upper picnic facilities at Tamarack State Beach and the Coastal Bluff at Tamarack/Frazer State Beach. (Staff contact: Kyle Lancaster, Parks & Recreation)

ORDINANCES FOR INTRODUCTION:

7. AWARD OF CONTRACT TO AMERICAN ASPHALT SOUTH AND AMENDMENT TO CARLSBAD MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 10.40.080 – Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-066 accepting bids and awarding a contract to American Asphalt South for an amount not to exceed \$44,270 for the construction of the Carlsbad Boulevard and Beech Avenue restriping project, Project No. 6079, and appropriating funds from the Parking In-Lieu Fund in the amount of \$55,000; and, Introduction of Ordinance No. CS-331 amending Carlsbad Municipal Code Section 10.40.080 to establish angle parking on Beech Avenue. (Staff contact: John Kim, Public Works)

City Manager's Recommendation: Adopt the resolution and introduce the ordinance.

City Attorney Celia Brewer titled the Ordinance.

Motion by Council Member M. Schumacher, seconded by Council Member C. Schumacher, to approve Resolution No. 2018-066 and introduce Ordinance No. CS-331. Motion carried unanimously, 3/0/2 (M. Hall, K. Blackburn – Absent).

ORDINANCES FOR ADOPTION: None.

PUBLIC HEARING:

8. 2018-2019 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM ACTION PLAN – Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-067 approving and authorizing the submission of the 2018-2019 Action Plan for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. (Staff contact: Courtney Pene, Community & Economic Development)

City Manager's Recommendation: Take public input, close the public hearing and adopt the resolution.

Management Analyst Courtney Pene and Community and Economic Development Director Debbie Fountain presented the report and reviewed a PowerPoint presentation (on file in the Office of the City Clerk).

Council Member Packard opened the duly noticed Public Hearing at 6:42 p.m.

Joaquin Blas gave historical information regarding La Posada de Guadalupe and the resources they offer to the community.

Council Member Packard closed the duly noticed Public Hearing at 6:45 p.m.

Motion by Council Member M. Schumacher, seconded by Council Member C. Schumacher, to approve Resolution No. 2018-067. Motion carried unanimously, 3/0/2 (M. Hall, K. Blackburn – Absent).

DEPARTMENTAL AND CITY MANAGER REPORTS:

9. **FY 2018-19 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM REPORT** – Acceptance of report on FY 2018-19 Capital Improvement Program and set the public hearing date for June 12, 2018. (Staff contact: Helga Stover, Administrative Services)

City Manager's Recommendation: Receive and file report.

Transportation Director Marshall Plantz and Finance Manager Helga Stover presented the report and reviewed a PowerPoint presentation (on file in the Office of the City Clerk).

Council Member Packard invited the public to the Citizen's Budget Workshop on Tuesday, May 29, 2018 at the Faraday Administration Building located at 1635 Faraday Avenue, Room 173B at 6 p.m.

Chas Wick expressed his support for relocating veteran's park to the southwest quadrant.

Deborah Mossa spoke on behalf of the Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation expressing their requests for more funding to be used for the issues in each quadrant.

David Hill spoke on behalf of the Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation providing information of what the foundation is known for.

Steve Oetting spoke about the local parkland deficit in the southwest corridor.

Carter McLarand spoke about the different community outreaches that were given to the public to provide their input about the development of the Shopoff development.

Jean Camp expressed her support for a regional park at Ponto.

John Gama expressed his opposition to the Shopoff development and support in funding a park at Ponto.

Lance Schulte expressed his support for a coastal park at Ponto.

Julie Peebles Peterson spoke about solutions for improvements at the Monroe Street pool.

John Sherritt spoke in favor of the planning process for the City of Carlsbad.

Stacy King spoke about the airport, Monroe Street pool and the park at Ponto.

Jan Bandich spoke about her support in funding a park in South Carlsbad.

John Davison spoke about the Monroe Street pool and the noise, traffic, parking and access issues that have yet to be addressed.

Pat Bleha expressed her opposition to staff's recommendation.

Diana Lincoln expressed her support to save some of the land at Faraday but also to develop a park in the southwestern quadrant of the city.

De'Ann Wiemer expressed her opposition in spending funds in Veteran's Park.

Paige DeCino thanked Council for the valve replacement of the Calavera dam and her opposition in spending funds in Veteran's Park.

Natalie Shapiro expressed her opposition in spending funds in developing Veteran's Park.

Dr. Howard Krausz spoke in opposition of staff's recommendation.

Motion by Council Member M. Schumacher, seconded by Council Member C. Schumacher, to hold a workshop to provide an update on the current and future parks inventory. Motion carried unanimously, 3/0/2 (M. Hall, K. Blackburn – Absent).

Motion by Council Member M. Schumacher, seconded by Council Member C. Schumacher, to set the public hearing date for June 12, 2018. Motion carried unanimously, 3/0/2 (M. Hall, K. Blackburn – Absent).

10. **AUTHORIZE PURCHASE OF EIGHT POLICE VEHICLES** – Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-068 authorizing the purchase of eight Ford Explorer Police Interceptor vehicles from Downtown Ford for \$449,216, appropriating an additional budget allocation of \$93,216, and authorizing the Administrative Services Director to appropriate and transfer these funds from the General Fund to the Fleet Replacement Fund. (Staff contact: Shawn Gaskari, Public Works)

- ① **City Manager's Recommendation:** Adopt the resolution.

Management Analyst Shawn Gaskari and Police Lieutenant Jeff Smith presented the report and reviewed a PowerPoint presentation (on file in the Office of the City Clerk).

Motion by Council Member M. Schumacher, seconded by Council Member C. Schumacher, to adopt Resolution No. 2018-068. Motion carried unanimously, 3/0/2 (M. Hall, K. Blackburn – Absent).

PUBLIC COMMENT: Continuation of the Public Comments

Jim Burke spoke regarding different legislation that is currently being considered statewide.

COUNCIL REPORTS AND COMMENTS:

Mayor and Council Members reported on activities and meetings of some committees and sub-committees of which they are members.

Saturday, May 19, 2018 – 10 a.m.

Grand Opening
Pine Park Community Center and Gardens
3209 Harding St.
Carlsbad, CA

Monday, May 21, 2018 – 5:30 p.m.

Special City Council Meeting
Faraday Administration Building
1635 Faraday Avenue, Rooms 173A and B
Carlsbad, CA

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS: None.


CITY ATTORNEY COMMENTS: None.

CITY CLERK COMMENTS: None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.


for Faviola Medina, CMC
Senior Deputy City Clerk



June 11, 2018

Jean Camp
Lance Shulte
Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee
San Pacifico Residents

Thank you for your various emails, telephone calls, City Council inquiries, public record requests, and meetings with city staff regarding the proposed Ponto area private development application, as submitted by Shopoff, and your statement of facts, opinions and concerns regarding the proposed project's compliance with the city's Growth Management Program as related to the open space and parks performance standards.

It is my understanding that you have now received all documents from the city that we believe are responsive to your requests and inquiries. Each of your questions have been treated as a public records request and the city has provided those documents or city records which respond to your questions regarding the facts in the record at the time the City Council approved the Growth Management Program and related policies and documents. As shared with you in several past conversations and correspondence, the Growth Management Plan Monitoring Report for FY 2016-17 indicates that public facilities related to parks and open space are currently meeting the adopted growth management performance standards in all zones. The parks standard is analyzed on a quadrant basis. The open space standard is analyzed on a Local Facility Management Zone (LFMZ) basis, for which Zone 9 has an approved exception. This correspondence provides a response to your process questions related to the applicability to the proposed Ponto development.

Based on documented actions taken by the City Council, city staff will continue its review of the proposed Ponto development according to the existing council-approved growth management program which has **excepted** Zone 9 (which includes the Ponto development) from compliance with the open space performance standards set forth within the City Council approved *Citywide Facilities and Improvement Plan* (approved in 1986). City Council and city staff understand that the approvals associated with the Growth Management Program are complicated and varied, and it may be difficult to follow all of the various discussions and approvals by City Council. Staff, however, is relying on the final adopted *Citywide Facilities and Improvements Plan* which was approved by the City Council on September 23, 1986. Because the decision of the City Council was not appealed at that time, the decision as set forth in City Council Resolution No. 8797 is the final authorizing instrument for implementation of the *Citywide Facilities and*

Community & Economic Development Department, 1635 Faraday Avenue, Carlsbad, Ca. 92008
Office: (760) 602-2710

Improvements Plan, which does not require Zone 9 to comply with the open space performance standard. An ongoing debate or questioning of the reasons for the exception is not productive at this point because the Council approved the plan and its implementation, and property owners relied on those approvals for development purposes. No corrective action is required of the City Council because the Plan was formally adopted following the applicable public review process; all appeal periods have long since expired and the development community has relied on these approvals in submitting development applications for review and consideration by the City Council since that time.

While the Ponto development proposed by Shopoff may not be required to analyze its compliance with the open space performance standard set forth in the *Citywide Facilities and Improvements Plan*, it does need to be reviewed against a number of other city policies and regulations, as well as the policies set forth in the Local Coastal Program and under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Staff continues to review the application against all applicable city and coastal act policies and regulations. No date is yet set for a hearing of the application by the City Council, and there is not yet a staff recommendation on the proposed project. The project concerns and comments of the residents have and will continue to be taken into consideration in the staff recommendation on the proposed development.

Below are several other key points of clarification on the growth management standards for parks and open space in the Southwest Quadrant:

Based on the General Plan build out projections, the SW quadrant will be required to have a total of 84.3 acres of park; it currently has 70.2 acres (Poinsettia Park and Aviara Park both serve the Southwest Quadrant). Construction of Veterans Park (a community park) prior to build out will result in an increase of 22.9 acres of park in each quadrant. This means that the SW Quadrant is projected to have an excess of park inventory at build out according to the approved *Citywide Facilities and Improvements Plan*. **No additional parks are needed to meet the parks performance standard; Veterans Park will satisfy the existing projected deficit in the SW Quadrant.**

Per the approved *Citywide Facilities and Improvements Plan*, adopted by the City Council in 1986, LFMZs 1 through 10, and 16 were excepted from the open space performance standard at the time of adoption because the developments in those zones already had approved applications or met other criteria for an exception. **No performance standard was applied to Zone 9 (which includes San Pacifico and Ponto development area), and as a result there is no open space deficit that must be addressed by the developer or the city.**

The Southwest Quadrant is made up of LFMZs 4, 9, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23. Zones 4 & 9 have no performance standard that is required to be met under growth management as noted above. **Zones 19, 20, 21, and 23 subsequently were required to provide 15% open space to meet the applicable growth management performance standard as they were developed;**

these developments will/have met the required performance standard for open space through build out according to their approved development permits.

Per the Growth Management Plan Monitoring Report for 2016-17, LFMZ 22 is still developing and will provide open space as development occurs; this is the area north of the Ponto development and west of I-5. **As the area develops per the General Plan, the 15% requirement for open space will continue to be applied to all private development plans in Zone 22.**

It is important to note that "Open Space" has a broad definition and includes private, public and semi-public open space areas within developed areas, including pocket parks, homeowners ball fields, planned residential development common areas, golf courses, tot lots, swimming pools, tennis courts or other areas containing passive or active recreational facilities, including major power line easements.

The General Plan designation for the Ponto development area allows for residential and commercial development, and it has an allocation of residential units to the area per City Council approval as part of the General Plan approval. There is a requirement for other land use documents to be made consistent with the General Plan designation, and the developer is being required to amend the appropriate documents to ensure consistency. Neither the General Plan nor the Parks Master Plan identify the Ponto properties for a public park. Therefore, there is no action currently being pursued by the city or developer to allow for development of a public park on the subject property. This does not mean, however, that there may not be some open space or public spaces (such as a public plaza) built into the development. Environmental impacts will also be studied through the appropriate environmental review required for the development, and appropriate coastal act policies will be applied to the project.

Thank you again for your comments. While we understand that you may disagree with this position, this represents the city's final opinion on the applicability of the performance standards for growth management as related to open space and parks. Also, please note that I will be your single point of contact for the growth management program as it relates to the noted development. However, you may submit any additional public records requests directly to the City Clerk and each request will be processed accordingly. We do not find it necessary to complete any additional research for you based on the finding we noted above. I do encourage you to stay engaged and continue to participate in public meetings/hearings on the development application submitted by Shopoff, and provide collaborative comments on the residential and commercial project proposed by the applicant.

Sincerely,



Debbie Fountain

Community & Economic Development Director

San Pacifico Community Association

June 12, 2018

Page 4

C: Mayor & City Council
City Manager
Chief Operations Officer
City Attorney
Parks & Recreation Director
City Planner
Project Planner – Jason Goff

John Sherritt
7428 Capstan Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92011

July 23, 2018

TO: Matt Hall, Mayor, City of Carlsbad
Keith Blackburn, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Carlsbad
Mark Packard, Council Member, City of Carlsbad
Cori Schumacher, Council Member, City of Carlsbad
Michael Schumacher, Council Member, City of Carlsbad
Chris Hazeltine, Director, Parks and Recreation

RE: CARLSBAD PARKS UPDATE – Information report on the current and future Carlsbad Parks Inventory

Dear Mayor Hall and Carlsbad City Council:

I am a long time resident of San Pacifico community in South Carlsbad and, in fact, have been here since its inception. Like many, I am proud to be a Carlsbad resident, in part because of its great parks system. My family and I have been fortunate to be able to enjoy an ample trail system, a beautiful lagoon, and miles of beach ALL within a short walk from our home.


I understand that some of my neighbors would like to see the piece of property on Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas become open space and/or park space as they feel there is not enough of this kind of land in the South Quadrant of Carlsbad; however, I do not support this and feel it is an inappropriate area for a park.

The City of Carlsbad has established their parks plan and policies over the course of many years and has done an excellent job in implementing those plans. In fact, it is one of the many reasons my family chose to make Carlsbad our home many years ago. Additionally, much like the Parks Master Plan, this piece of property in the Ponto area has been planned for by the City through the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and the Carlsbad General Plan.

While everyone is entitled to their own opinions and may well have different personal goals and objectives than does the City of Carlsbad, it's important that decisions are made based on facts and well thought out planning. The facts are, that this property has never been designated as Open Space in the Carlsbad General Plan nor in the City's Zoning codes, yet it has been carefully planned for by a city that is recognized as having some of the highest standards for open space in the entire region. I speak not only as a long-term resident of San Pacifico but also as a professional in the local real estate development industry of which I am a proud member of. I was a member of the design and entitlement team that initiated the Master Plan for San Pacifico and I continue to support the implementation of the plan for our community as it was initially designed and approved by the City.

Again, I'm a proud Carlsbad resident and I fully support the City of Carlsbad's Parks and Recreation Department Master Plan and look forward to watch that vision continue to be executed. Thank you for making Carlsbad a great city.

Sincerely,



John Sherritt
San Pacifico Resident

Morgen Fry

Subject: FW: CARLSBAD PARKS UPDATE – July 24th Council Meeting
Attachments: Stricula, Justin.pdf

From: Justin and Lauren Stricula
Sent: Sunday, July 22, 2018 8:34 PM
To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: CARLSBAD PARKS UPDATE – July 24th Council Meeting

TO: Matt Hall, Mayor, City of Carlsbad
Keith Blackburn, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Carlsbad
Mark Packard, Council Member, City of Carlsbad
Cori Schumacher, Council Member, City of Carlsbad
Michael Schumacher, Council Member, City of Carlsbad
Chris Hazeltine, Director, Parks and Recreation

RE: CARLSBAD PARKS UPDATE - July 24th City Council Meeting

Dear Mayor Hall and Carlsbad City Council:

While I am not able attend the July 24th City Council Meeting, I wanted to express my support for the City of Carlsbad's Parks and Recreation Department Master Plan.

I have heard some residents in the area are dissatisfied with the City of Carlsbad's future plans for parks and open space; however, I and many neighbors and friends of mine do not feel that way, in fact, it's quite the opposite. We believe that the City of Carlsbad has one of the best parks and habitat preservation systems in the County, and for many of us, it was the number one reason we moved here and made Carlsbad our home.

While not every space can be a park or open space, Carlsbad has made a great effort to ensure ample opportunities and continue to create these special areas where it's feasible. Don't let the desires of a few unreasonable homeowners on the coast derail the many years and taxpayer dollars that the City has invested in making the superior parks infrastructure the amazing benefit to the City it is today.

Thank you,

Justin Stricula
Calavera Hills Resident

July 23, 2018

TO: Matt Hall, Mayor, City of Carlsbad
Keith Blackburn, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Carlsbad
Mark Packard, Council Member, City of Carlsbad
Cori Schumacher, Council Member, City of Carlsbad
Michael Schumacher, Council Member, City of Carlsbad
Chris Hazeltine, Director, Parks and Recreation

RE: CARLSBAD PARKS UPDATE – Information report on the current and future Carlsbad Parks Inventory


Dear Mayor Hall and Carlsbad City Council:

As a resident of South Carlsbad, I am writing to express my support for the City of Carlsbad's Parks and Recreation Department Master Plan that has been created and vetted for over several years. The City is doing an excellent job at seeing that vision through to fruition.

It has come to my attention that some of my neighbors are dissatisfied with the current parks plan and would like to see additional park space in a specific area in the South Quadrant. While I am not opposed to additional parks or open space, I believe that the City of Carlsbad has created a superior parks system that has contributed to the high standard of living and recreation opportunities Carlsbad residents enjoy today. With nearly 50 miles of trails, 40 parks, ample open space, and miles of beaches, it is clear that the City of Carlsbad has invested in its residents.

Again, I applaud the City of Carlsbad and its parks plan and look forward to what's to come.

Thank you,



Eric Weitz
South Carlsbad Resident (Bay Collection)

"Good Evening. My name is Mary Anne Viney and I reside at James Drive in Carlsbad.

I'm the President of the Friends of Buena Vista Reservoir Park non-profit, whose mission is to preserve and protect the neighborhood park approved for construction at the reservoir site, and which represents the interests of the many volunteers in our neighborhood.

I'm requesting that Council prioritize the physical health and mental well-being of Carlsbad citizens by creating neighborhood parks that residents can walk to, especially in neighborhoods like Ponto Beach where park standards have not yet been met, and thus amend the outdated Growth Management Program.

Public health studies indicate the many health benefits that neighborhood parks can provide when they are located close enough so that residents can walk to them. Other benefits include strengthening the community, important positive environmental impacts, and increased property values.

With the historic City of Carlsbad 'Community Benefits Agreement' that I participated in, many community members worked together successfully on key terms for our neighborhood park, along with other community benefits, that resulted. This approach could also be applied for other neighborhood parks as well.

So please take a positive, pro-health stance and create neighborhood parks our residents can walk to.

To see how Carlsbad ranks out of about 14,000 US cities in terms of percentage of residents who live within a 10-minute walk of a park, and where parks are needed most in Carlsbad, see the Trust for Public Land website: <https://parkserve.tpl.org/city/id/0611194/>.

Thank you."

Mary Anne Viney

Carlsbad Parks Update

Chris Hazeltine, Parks & Recreation Director

Kyle Lancaster, Parks Services Manager

July 24, 2018

Recommended Action

- Receive an update on the current and future Carlsbad Parks inventory

Leading to the Update

- May 8, 2018 City Council Meeting
 - Introduction of proposed FY 2018-19 CIP Budget
 - Council directed staff to hold a workshop to provide an update on the current and future parks inventory



Citywide Facilities & Improvements Plan

Growth Management Program

- Carlsbad voters approved program in 1986
 - Reduced projected population of city to ~130,000
 - Set standards that must be met for new development to be approved so as Carlsbad grows, the quality of life can be maintained

Facilities and Improvements Plan

- Council created standards by adopting the plan in 1986
- Facilities/services are specified in 11 public facility performance standards, covering items such as parks
- Staff annually monitors compliance with the plan

Facilities and Improvements Plan

- If standards are not met within a specific planning area, no new development may be approved in that area until standards are met, or satisfactory arrangements are made to guarantee the facilities and improvements

Parks Performance Standard

- Three acres per 1,000 population within the park district
- Four park districts, which correspond to city quadrants

Parks Performance Standard

- If service level is not met due to population increase within a quadrant, city is required to schedule a park for construction within five years, beginning at the time the need is identified, but no sooner than August 22, 2017

Parks Performance Standard

- “Scheduled for construction” means:
 - Park site selected and has been or is being acquired
 - Improvements for park site have been designed
 - Financing for construction of park has been set aside

Classifications of Parks

- Two classifications of parks for Growth Management:
 - Special Use Areas
 - Community Parks

Classifications of Parks

- Special Use Areas:
 - Smaller in size, with basic uses (passive or active)
 - 27 sites within city's inventory, totaling ~81 acres

Classifications of Parks

- Community Parks:
 - Larger in size, with varied amenities (passive & active)
 - 13 sites within city inventory, totaling ~254 ½ acres

Classifications of Parks

- In the late 70s/early 80s, city chose to focus on providing community parks rather than smaller neighborhood parks
 - Larger community parks, with active and passive amenities, were determined to better meet the recreational needs of residents, tourists and employees



Special Use Areas Map
Recommended Standard of
0.5 Acres per 1,000 Population

Carlsbad, California
Parks and Recreation Needs
Assessment and Action Plan



Sources: Esri, DeLorme, NAVTEQ, USGS, Intermap, iPC, NRCAN, Esri, Japan, Esri, Japan, METI, Esri, China (Hong Kong), Esri (Taiwan), MapInfo, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community



Community Parks Map
Recommended Standard of
2.5 Acres per 1,000 Population

Carlsbad, California
Parks and Recreation Needs
Assessment and Action Plan



Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, iPC, NRCAN, Esri, Japan, Esri, Japan, METI, Esri, China (Hong Kong), Esri (Taiwan), MapInfo, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Parks Performance Standard

- To date, all city quadrants are in compliance with standard

| City Quadrant | Parks Acreage Current Parks | Parks Acreage Current Need |
|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| NW | 105.2 | 90.4 |
| NE | 45.3 | 44.5 |
| SW | 70.2 | 76.8 |
| SE | 114.9 | 117.1 |
| Total | 335.6 | 328.8 |

Parks Performance Standard

- Current parks inventory exceeds the standard, except for 6.6 acres in SW quadrant, and 2.2 acres in SE quadrant
 - Two quadrants are still compliant until Aug. 21, 2022

Parks Performance Standard

- Scheduling of Veterans Memorial Park for construction will address the parks performance need in all quadrants
 - 91.5 acre Veterans Memorial Park site will equally count toward satisfying the need in all city quadrants

Veterans Memorial Park

- Calculation included in 2015 update to the General Plan
- Because of its size and central location, the park is intended to serve as a regional recreation source

Veterans Memorial Park

- To date, the city has:
 - ✓ Acquired the park site
 - ✓ Set aside \$200,000 to initiate master planning of site
 - ✓ Set aside ~\$23,000,000 for construction of site

Veterans Memorial Park



Community Facilities District No. 1

- Est. in 1991, creating special tax lien on vacant properties
- For construction of specific public facilities of citywide obligation and benefit, including Veterans Memorial Park
- Funds cannot be used for facilities other than specified

Buildout Population & Parks Acreage

- Scheduling Veterans Memorial Park for construction will result in the parks inventory for all city quadrants exceeding the projected required acreage at buildout

Buildout Population & Parks Acreage

| City Quad | Buildout Population | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Projected Need | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Current Parks | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Veterans Park | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Projected Parks |
|-----------|---------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| NW | 38,606 | 115.8 | 105.2 | 22.875 | 128.1 |
| NE | 22,488 | 67.5 | 45.3 | 22.875 | 68.2 |
| SW | 28,113 | 84.3 | 70.2 | 22.875 | 93.1 |
| SE | 42,315 | 126.9 | 114.9 | 22.875 | 137.8 |
| Total | 131,523 | 394.6 | 335.6 | 91.5 | 427.2 |

Unfunded or Partially Funded Parks

- Prior figures do not include the following park projects listed in the CIP as “unfunded” or “partially unfunded”:
 - Zone 5 Business Park Recreational Facility (9.3 acres)
 - Cannon Lake Park (6.8 acres)
 - Robertson Ranch Park (11.2 acres)

Buena Vista Reservoir Site

- Prior figures also do not include the Buena Vista Reservoir Site (3.1 acres)
 - Under design to become a neighborhood park

Buildout Population & Parks Acreage

| City Quad | Buildout Population | <u>Parks Acreage</u> | <u>Parks Acreage</u> | <u>Parks Acreage</u> | <u>Parks Acreage</u> |
|-----------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | Projected Need | Current Parks + Above Parks | Veterans Park | Projected Parks |
| NW | 38,606 | 115.8 | 127.3 | 22.875 | 150.175 |
| NE | 22,488 | 67.5 | 56.5 | 22.875 | 79.375 |
| SW | 28,113 | 84.3 | 70.2 | 22.875 | 93.075 |
| SE | 42,315 | 126.9 | 114.9 | 22.875 | 137.775 |
| Total | 131,523 | 394.6 | 368.9 | 91.5 | 460.4 |

Summary - Meeting Objectives

- Growth Management Program, particularly the Facilities and Improvements Plan, continues to meet its objectives of assuring adequate public facilities (e.g., parks) concurrent with the need created by new development



Parks & Rec. Department Master Plan

Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment

- In 2012, staff began process of developing the Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment and Comp. Action Plan

Needs Assessment Public Outreach

- During 2013, staff administered the public outreach:
 - Seven focus group meetings
 - Ten interviews
 - Two open public meetings
 - A statistically-reliable survey of Carlsbad residents

Needs Assessment Public Outreach

- During 2013, staff administered public outreach (cont.):
 - An open online survey
 - Two Senior/Parks & Recreation Commission Meetings
 - Two City Council Meetings
 - Citywide newsletter, social media, email blasts & prints

Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment

- As a result of the public input received, the draft Needs Assessment reflected what had been determined to be Carlsbad's parks and recreation values and priorities

Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment

- It identified key action items for CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development over next five years
- On Dec. 17, 2013, Council accepted the Needs Assessment

Parks & Recreation Accreditation

- In 2014, staff sought national accreditation through the Commission for Accreditation of Park & Recreation Agencies

Parks & Recreation Master Plan

- Modifications were made to the Needs Assessment and its name was changed to the Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan
- On March 24, 2015, Council accepted the Master Plan

Parks & Recreation Master Plan

- Following are the key action items for CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development in the Master Plan

Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Complete a feasibility study/business plan on the potential for an indoor, multipurpose, multigenerational community center, and an outdoor adventure activity park

Master Plan Action Items

- Status: *A study for a community center at Poinsettia Community Park and a study for an outdoor adventure activity park was completed by the project team*
 - *Council accepted the studies on Aug. 22, 2017*

Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Update master plans for future facilities to ensure amenities are consistent with the community vision as identified in the Needs Assessment

Master Plan Action Items

- Status: *The Pine Avenue, Aviara, and Poinsettia Community Parks Master Plans were updated*
 - *Council accepted the master plans on Dec. 9, 2014*

Aviara Park - Ph. II Project



Poinsettia Park – Ph. III Project



Pine Avenue Community Center



Pine Avenue Park Gardens



Master Plan Action Items

- Status: *The Leo Carrillo Ranch Master Plan – Ph. III*

Project Prioritization was updated

- *Council accepted a staff report advising of the two highest rated projects on Sept. 22, 2015*

Leo Carrillo Ranch Park Master Plan Ph. III



Leo Carrillo Ranch Park Master Plan Ph. III



Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Modify two existing tennis courts in well served areas to accommodate outdoor pickleball courts
- Status: *On Dec. 9, 2014, Council directed staff to forego modification of two tennis courts at Laguna Riviera Park*
- *Council approved Poinsettia Community Park for courts*

Master Plan Action Items



Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Design and develop the entryway to Calavera Hills Community Park
- Status: *The entryway to Calavera Hills Community Park has been preliminarily designed*
 - *Staff is currently reviewing the plans/specifications*

Master Plan Action Items



Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Complete development of one additional community garden at Calavera Hills Community Park
- Status: *One additional community garden at Calavera Hills Community Park was completed in June 2014*

Master Plan Action Items



Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Create a plan to identify an additional dog park
- Status: *In 2017, staff sought public input on relocating a dog park identified in the Poinsettia Park Master Plan*
 - *In 2018, Council directed staff to pursue the relocation*

Poinsettia Park - Dog Park Relocation



Previously Proposed Location



Possible New Location

Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Tie in all future park and facility development with the trails plan to ensure greater community connectivity within the system

Master Plan Action Items

- Status: *Staff has continuously taken into account such connectivity to the Carlsbad citywide trails system*
 - *The revised draft of the Carlsbad Trails Master Plan was presented to the Council on June 29, 2017*

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Action: Aligned with the General Plan, continue expanding to meet the growing/changing park, facility, program and special event needs of the community

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Status: *On May 20, 2014, Council approved a permit with the State of California to improve and maintain the Upper Picnic Facilities at Tamarack State Beach and the Coastal Bluff at Tamarack/Frazees State Beach*

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Status: *On Aug. 26, 2014, Council approved an updated agreement with the Carlsbad Unified School District, to maintain and utilize multipurpose field areas, tennis courts and school grounds after school hours*
 - *Kelly and Hope Elementary Schools were included*

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Status: *On Mar. 14, 2017, Council entered into an agreement which obligates the city and Lennar Homes to execute a park construction agreement for a neighborhood park at the Buena Vista Reservoir site*

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Status: *On July 17, 2018, Council received an update on the Terramar Area Coastal Improvements Project, which includes a coastal bluff top at the north end of Terramar*

Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Update the needs assessment for the next five years to ensure relevance and concurrency with existing conditions and population in Carlsbad
- Status: *\$100,000 was set aside in the Council approved FY 2018-19 Operating Budget to commence updating plan*

Summary - Addressing Action Items

- The Parks & Recreation Department has addressed, or is in process of addressing, each of the key action items for CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development included in the Needs Assessment/Master Plan

Recommended Action

- Receive an update on the current and future Carlsbad Parks inventory

Questions?



Parks Performance Standard

- Initially, city was required to schedule a park for construction within five years, beginning at the time the need was identified or before the private construction of 1,562 dwelling units per quadrant
- The requirement, however, was changed per the City Council's adoption of amendments to plans

Parks Performance Standard

- Change requested due to concerns linking timing of scheduling the construction of a park to the construction of 1,562 dwelling units per quadrant
 - General Plan anticipated future residential capacity in southwest & southeast quadrants to be less than 1,562

Request City Council Consider Park & Open Space Data Presented by Citizens on 6/12/18 & missing in Staff Report

Parks

- City & Regional need for a true South Carlsbad Coastal Park
- South Carlsbad Coastal Park achieves Community Vision of GP
- Coastal South Carlsbad Planning Area F Local Coastal Program requirement to study a “Public Park” & Citywide Coastal uses

Open Space

- Developer’s Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9 errors need correcting in Developer’s Comprehensive Zone 9 Update
- City’s responsibility to Citizens & following Growth Management Ordinance, Standards and Principles

Need a Coastal South Carlsbad Park – City data

64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens & hotel visitors w/o a Coastal Park

4-6 miles of Coast w/o Park is a City & Regional need

Community-Based Planning needed

www.pontolocal.com

4.12.2 SPECIAL USE AREAS



There is no Coastal Park to serve South Carlsbad Citizens-Visitors-Businesses. There are 10 Coastal Parks in North Carlsbad. The lack of Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad seems both unfair to South Carlsbad Citizens-Visitors-Businesses; and is unfair to North Carlsbad by forcing congestion into North Carlsbad & Encinitas/Solana Beach where there are Coastal Parks.

We can do Better!

Ponto's Carlsbad Park In-Lieu Fees & Coastal Parks & Quality of Life Results

- 947 homes (2,233 pop.) w. of I-5 & s. of Poinsettia Lane
 - City's minimum Park standard requires 6.7 acres of Park
 - Homeowners paid City taxes & park-in-lieu-fees to buy & build 6.7 acres of City Park, but No Park in area.
 - Taxes/fees didn't add Park acreage - needed Veterans
 - Nearest Park 2.3 miles across I-5. The Veteran's Park 'solution' over 5-miles away & basically inaccessible.
 - Over 90% of Community surveyed wants a Park in Ponto
 - Why no Ponto Park? Ponto fees paid for it, Community wants it, proposed Park solutions don't work. We can Do Better!
- www.pontolocals.com

Growing Coastal Park Demand

Meaningful South Carlsbad Coastal Park is vital for Carlsbad's Quality of Life & Economy

Year & Residents per Carlsbad's 4-mile Coastal Park Gap (SANDAG):

- 1985 = 116,000 - when Veterans Park coastline 'solution'
- 1995 = 140,000 + 21% - Planning Area F requirement
- 2015 = 176,000 + 52% - General Plan Update
- 2035 = 212,000 + 83% - end of 20-yr life General Plan – what then?

Visitors per Carlsbad's 4-mile Coastal Park Gap (SD Tourism Authority):

2018 = 5,092 visitors per day; growing 1.6% per year, 2035 = 6,669

Ponto last chance to fix Carlsbad's 4-mile Coastal Park gap (8% of SD County coastline) with a meaningful Coastal Park. We can do better!

www.pontolocal.com

Implements Community Vision - the Foundation for the General Plan 1 of 4

- Refer to 5-page email to City Council on 8/31/17 & 3/6/18 - Share & discuss the Issues with Citizens.

Community Vision, is foundation for General Plan. Just words to be ignored or guides to action?

- “...open spaces within walking distance of people’s homes ...” - nearest park over 2 miles away & over I-5
- “... strategic acquisitions to further the city’s open space system.” - fill Coastal South Carlsbad park gap

Implements Community Vision - the Foundation for the General Plan 2 of 4

- “... network of parks and recreation facilities will be improved ... Such improvements may include the strategic addition of more parks, ... New facilities will be located to maximize use and access by all neighborhoods, tailored to the needs of local populations ...” - provide half of Carlsbad its only Coastal Park
- “... protecting and enhancing access to the beach and the quality of the beach experience is a top community priority.” - South Carlsbad has no Coastal Park, congests North Carlsbad

Implements Community Vision - the Foundation for the General Plan 3 of 4

- “ ... Access to the beach ... will be improved through new compatible and supportive uses on or in close proximity to the beach, which may include ... a park” -
Park supports residents and visitor industry
- “... Tourism is an important component of the city’s economy ... it emphasizes ... resources that make the city attractive to ... residents - the ocean and beach” -
Park supports residents and visitor industry
- “Easy and convenient pedestrian connections will be available from every neighborhood to help children get safely to ... parks.” - Veterans Park 5-miles away from need
www.pontolocal.com

Implements Community Vision - the Foundation for the General Plan 4 of 4

From General Plan Land Use Element:

- “...the community expressed an overwhelming preference for an active waterfront ... Access to the beach will be enhanced through ... open space, parking, and amenities ...” - Need a South Carlsbad Coastal Park
- “... new growth accommodated west of Interstate 5, to enable residents and visitors to enjoy more opportunities for ... recreating along the coastline. Develop ... recreational opportunities along the coastal corridor.” - A meaningful Coastal South Carlsbad Park provides the most opportunities

Required by City & State land use regulations for Planning Area F - City's Local Coastal Program 1 of 3

page 101 of Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program – adopted July 16, 1996 MP 175(G)/LCP

Carlsbad Public Records Request PRR-2017-260 confirmed Planning Area F LCP requirements not complied with & flawed PBVVP & General Plan Update. We can do better!

Coastal Commission has told City to address prior to changing Citywide LCP or Planning Area F land use

www.pontolocal.com

City & State land use regulations for Planning Area F – Local Coastal Program page 101 2 of 3

“Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an “unplanned” area, ... As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.”

Never done: Carlsbad PRR-2017-260 confirmed. Citizens not knowing this flawed the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan, 2015 General Plan Update, and Carlsbad Park Planning Processes

City & State land use regulations for Planning Area F – Local Coastal Program page 101 3 of 3

California Coastal Commission told the City that:

“ ... the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City’s Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City’s land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area.”

Lets do better and fully inform & engage Citizens in this
www.pontolocals.com

Ponto's (LFMP-Zone 9) Growth Management Open Space requirement

- 6/11/18 Final Staff Opinion Letter, Prior Public Records Requests, & City data confirmed Developers' LFMP-9 did not provide required Open Space per Growth Management Standard: 30-acres short! Lets do better!
- Inconsistent & incomplete information in 6/11/18 Final Staff Opinion Letter & conflicts with Growth Management Ordinance
- Need to have honest Citywide discussion on this issue!
- Is Staff's Final Opinion the City Council's direction?
- You can do better

Thank you

We can do better. Please fund & support a open & honest Community-based Planning Process for Parks and Open Space in Coastal South Carlsbad

Please do the right thing and Develop Ponto Right

Carlsbad Parks Update

Chris Hazeltine, Parks & Recreation Director

Kyle Lancaster, Parks Services Manager

July 24, 2018

Recommended Action

- Receive an update on the current and future Carlsbad Parks inventory

Leading to the Update

- May 8, 2018 City Council Meeting
 - Introduction of proposed FY 2018-19 CIP Budget
 - Council directed staff to hold a workshop to provide an update on the current and future parks inventory



Citywide Facilities & Improvements Plan

Growth Management Program

- Carlsbad voters approved program in 1986
 - Reduced projected population of city to ~130,000
 - Set standards that must be met for new development to be approved so as Carlsbad grows, the quality of life can be maintained

Facilities and Improvements Plan

- Council created standards by adopting the plan in 1986
- Facilities/services are specified in 11 public facility performance standards, covering items such as parks
- Staff annually monitors compliance with the plan

Facilities and Improvements Plan

- If standards are not met within a specific planning area, no new development may be approved in that area until standards are met, or satisfactory arrangements are made to guarantee the facilities and improvements

Parks Performance Standard

- Three acres per 1,000 population within the park district
- Four park districts, which correspond to city quadrants

Parks Performance Standard

- If service level is not met due to population increase within a quadrant, city is required to schedule a park for construction within five years, beginning at the time the need is identified, but no sooner than August 22, 2017

Parks Performance Standard

- “Scheduled for construction” means:
 - Park site selected and has been or is being acquired
 - Improvements for park site have been designed
 - Financing for construction of park has been set aside

Classifications of Parks

- Two classifications of parks for Growth Management:
 - Special Use Areas
 - Community Parks

Classifications of Parks

- Special Use Areas:
 - Smaller in size, with basic uses (passive or active)
 - 27 sites within city's inventory, totaling ~81 acres

Classifications of Parks

- Community Parks:
 - Larger in size, with varied amenities (passive & active)
 - 13 sites within city inventory, totaling ~254 ½ acres


Classifications of Parks

- In the late 70s/early 80s, city chose to focus on providing community parks rather than smaller neighborhood parks
 - Larger community parks, with active and passive amenities, were determined to better meet the recreational needs of residents, tourists and employees



Special Use Areas Map
Recommended Standard of
0.5 Acres per 1,000 Population

Carlsbad, California
Parks and Recreation Needs
Assessment and Action Plan




Sources: Esri, DeLorme, NAVTEQ, USGS, Intermap, iPC, NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), TomTom, 2012



Community Parks Map
Recommended Standard of
2.5 Acres per 1,000 Population

Carlsbad, California
Parks and Recreation Needs
Assessment and Action Plan



Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, increment P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Parks Performance Standard

- To date, all city quadrants are in compliance with standard

| City Quadrant | Parks Acreage Current Parks | Parks Acreage Current Need |
|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| NW | 105.2 | 90.4 |
| NE | 45.3 | 44.5 |
| SW | 70.2 | 76.8 |
| SE | 114.9 | 117.1 |
| Total | 335.6 | 328.8 |

Parks Performance Standard

- Current parks inventory exceeds the standard, except for 6.6 acres in SW quadrant, and 2.2 acres in SE quadrant
 - Two quadrants are still compliant until Aug. 21, 2022

Parks Performance Standard

- Scheduling of Veterans Memorial Park for construction will address the parks performance need in all quadrants
 - 91.5 acre Veterans Memorial Park site will equally count toward satisfying the need in all city quadrants

Veterans Memorial Park

- Calculation included in 2015 update to the General Plan
- Because of its size and central location, the park is intended to serve as a regional recreation source

Veterans Memorial Park

- To date, the city has:
 - ✓ Acquired the park site
 - ✓ Set aside \$200,000 to initiate master planning of site
 - ✓ Set aside ~\$23,000,000 for construction of site

Veterans Memorial Park



Community Facilities District No. 1

- Est. in 1991, creating special tax lien on vacant properties
- For construction of specific public facilities of citywide obligation and benefit, including Veterans Memorial Park
- Funds cannot be used for facilities other than specified

Buildout Population & Parks Acreage

- Scheduling Veterans Memorial Park for construction will result in the parks inventory for all city quadrants exceeding the projected required acreage at buildout

Buildout Population & Parks Acreage

| City Quad | Buildout Population | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Projected Need | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Current Parks | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Veterans Park | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Projected Parks |
|-----------|---------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| NW | 38,606 | 115.8 | 105.2 | 22.875 | 128.1 |
| NE | 22,488 | 67.5 | 45.3 | 22.875 | 68.2 |
| SW | 28,113 | 84.3 | 70.2 | 22.875 | 93.1 |
| SE | 42,315 | 126.9 | 114.9 | 22.875 | 137.8 |
| Total | 131,523 | 394.6 | 335.6 | 91.5 | 427.2 |

Unfunded or Partially Funded Parks

- Prior figures do not include the following park projects listed in the CIP as “unfunded” or “partially unfunded”:
 - Zone 5 Business Park Recreational Facility (9.3 acres)
 - Cannon Lake Park (6.8 acres)
 - Robertson Ranch Park (11.2 acres)

Buena Vista Reservoir Site

- Prior figures also do not include the Buena Vista Reservoir Site (3.1 acres)
 - Under design to become a neighborhood park

Buildout Population & Parks Acreage

| City Quad | Buildout Population | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Projected Need | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Current Parks + Above Parks | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Veterans Park | <u>Parks Acreage</u> Projected Parks |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| NW | 38,606 | 115.8 | 127.3 | 22.875 | 150.175 |
| NE | 22,488 | 67.5 | 56.5 | 22.875 | 79.375 |
| SW | 28,113 | 84.3 | 70.2 | 22.875 | 93.075 |
| SE | 42,315 | 126.9 | 114.9 | 22.875 | 137.775 |
| Total | 131,523 | 394.6 | 368.9 | 91.5 | 460.4 |

Summary - Meeting Objectives

- Growth Management Program, particularly the Facilities and Improvements Plan, continues to meet its objectives of assuring adequate public facilities (e.g., parks) concurrent with the need created by new development



Parks & Rec. Department Master Plan

Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment

- In 2012, staff began process of developing the Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment and Comp. Action Plan

Needs Assessment Public Outreach

- During 2013, staff administered the public outreach:
 - Seven focus group meetings
 - Ten interviews
 - Two open public meetings
 - A statistically-reliable survey of Carlsbad residents

Needs Assessment Public Outreach

- During 2013, staff administered public outreach (cont.):
 - An open online survey
 - Two Senior/Parks & Recreation Commission Meetings
 - Two City Council Meetings
 - Citywide newsletter, social media, email blasts & prints

Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment

- As a result of the public input received, the draft Needs Assessment reflected what had been determined to be Carlsbad's parks and recreation values and priorities

Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment

- It identified key action items for CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development over next five years
- On Dec. 17, 2013, Council accepted the Needs Assessment

Parks & Recreation Accreditation

- In 2014, staff sought national accreditation through the Commission for Accreditation of Park & Recreation Agencies

Parks & Recreation Master Plan

- Modifications were made to the Needs Assessment and its name was changed to the Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan
- On March 24, 2015, Council accepted the Master Plan

Parks & Recreation Master Plan

- Following are the key action items for CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development in the Master Plan

Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Complete a feasibility study/business plan on the potential for an indoor, multipurpose, multigenerational community center, and an outdoor adventure activity park

Master Plan Action Items

- Status: *A study for a community center at Poinsettia Community Park and a study for an outdoor adventure activity park was completed by the project team*
 - *Council accepted the studies on Aug. 22, 2017*

Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Update master plans for future facilities to ensure amenities are consistent with the community vision as identified in the Needs Assessment

Master Plan Action Items

- Status: *The Pine Avenue, Aviara, and Poinsettia Community Parks Master Plans were updated*
 - *Council accepted the master plans on Dec. 9, 2014*

Aviara Park - Ph. II Project



Poinsettia Park – Ph. III Project



Pine Avenue Community Center




Pine Avenue Park Gardens



Master Plan Action Items

- Status: *The Leo Carrillo Ranch Master Plan – Ph. III*
Project Prioritization was updated
 - *Council accepted a staff report advising of the two highest rated projects on Sept. 22, 2015*

Leo Carrillo Ranch Park Master Plan Ph. III



Leo Carrillo Ranch Park Master Plan Ph. III



Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Modify two existing tennis courts in well served areas to accommodate outdoor pickleball courts
- Status: *On Dec. 9, 2014, Council directed staff to forego modification of two tennis courts at Laguna Riviera Park*
- *Council approved Poinsettia Community Park for courts*

Master Plan Action Items



Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Design and develop the entryway to Calavera Hills Community Park
- Status: *The entryway to Calavera Hills Community Park has been preliminarily designed*
 - *Staff is currently reviewing the plans/specifications*

Master Plan Action Items



Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Complete development of one additional community garden at Calavera Hills Community Park
- Status: *One additional community garden at Calavera Hills Community Park was completed in June 2014*

Master Plan Action Items



Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Create a plan to identify an additional dog park
- Status: *In 2017, staff sought public input on relocating a dog park identified in the Poinsettia Park Master Plan*
 - *In 2018, Council directed staff to pursue the relocation*

Poinsettia Park - Dog Park Relocation



Previously Proposed Location



Possible New Location

Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Tie in all future park and facility development with the trails plan to ensure greater community connectivity within the system

Master Plan Action Items

- Status: *Staff has continuously taken into account such connectivity to the Carlsbad citywide trails system*
 - *The revised draft of the Carlsbad Trails Master Plan was presented to the Council on June 29, 2017*

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Action: Aligned with the General Plan, continue expanding to meet the growing/changing park, facility, program and special event needs of the community

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Status: *On May 20, 2014, Council approved a permit with the State of California to improve and maintain the Upper Picnic Facilities at Tamarack State Beach and the Coastal Bluff at Tamarack/Frazee State Beach*

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Status: *On Aug. 26, 2014, Council approved an updated agreement with the Carlsbad Unified School District, to maintain and utilize multipurpose field areas, tennis courts and school grounds after school hours*
 - *Kelly and Hope Elementary Schools were included*

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Status: *On Mar. 14, 2017, Council entered into an agreement which obligates the city and Lennar Homes to execute a park construction agreement for a neighborhood park at the Buena Vista Reservoir site*

Opportunistic Master Plan Items

- Status: *On July 17, 2018, Council received an update on the Terramar Area Coastal Improvements Project, which includes a coastal bluff top at the north end of Terramar*

Master Plan Action Items

- Action: Update the needs assessment for the next five years to ensure relevance and concurrency with existing conditions and population in Carlsbad
- Status: *\$100,000 was set aside in the Council approved FY 2018-19 Operating Budget to commence updating plan*

Summary - Addressing Action Items

- The Parks & Recreation Department has addressed, or is in process of addressing, each of the key action items for CIP planning, and park, facility and amenity development included in the Needs Assessment/Master Plan

Recommended Action

- Receive an update on the current and future Carlsbad Parks inventory

Questions?





Special Use/Community Parks Map
 Recommended Standard of
 0.5/2.5 Acres per 1,000 Population

Carlsbad, California
 Parks and Recreation Needs
 Assessment and Action Plan



Parks Performance Standard

- Initially, city was required to schedule a park for construction within five years, beginning at the time the need was identified or before the private construction of 1,562 dwelling units per quadrant
- The requirement, however, was changed per the City Council's adoption of amendments to plans

Parks Performance Standard

- Change requested due to concerns linking timing of scheduling the construction of a park to the construction of 1,562 dwelling units per quadrant
 - General Plan anticipated future residential capacity in southwest & southeast quadrants to be less than 1,562

Mick Calarco

Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations
Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - Public Comments - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations.pdf
Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 10:18 AM
To: Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Cc: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; David De Cordova <David.deCordova@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Carrie Boyle <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; Moran, Gina@Parks <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; Smith, Darren@Parks <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations
Importance: High

Dear Planning Commission:

We are not 100% sure if you have received and read these emails and the attached data file with 4 key Low-Cost Visitor Accommodation issues and supporting data sets. The issues and data first sent to the City in Nov 2019 do not seem to be properly addressed in the Dec 2nd staff report to the planning Commission.

As fellow Carlsbad citizens we hope you fully consider this data and issues presented.

Thanks, and aloha aina,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2020 12:59 PM
To: 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Planning'; 'Scott Chadwick'; 'Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mike Pacheco'; 'david.decordova@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Scott Donnell'; 'Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal'; 'cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Lisa Urbach'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'; 'Bret Schanzenbach'; 'Kathleen@carlsbad.org'; 'planning@carlsbadca.gov'; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD'; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD'
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues resent Public Input - FW: LCPA public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations
Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD:

Carlsbad Citizens first became aware (due to extensive Public Records research) of the Carlsbad's failure (current and starting before 2010) to comply with the still existing Certified Local Coastal Program Land Use and Zoning Regulations (LCP) for Ponto Planning Area F (to specifically consider and document the need for a Ponto "Public Park" prior to changing the NRR land use on Planning Area F, and also developers' Growth Management Open Space Standard (GMP) non-compliance at Ponto in 2017. Since 2017 with this awareness Carlsbad and surrounding Citizens and Visitors have repeatedly documented the need for a Ponto Park and asked the Carlsbad City Council and Staff to provide for it on Planning Area F as the exiting LCP provides for. Since 2017 over 2,800 emails/petitions have been sent to the City and CA Coastal Commission (CCC), over 200 pages of official written (emailed) data and public comments, along with numerous presentations to prior City Council meetings on the LCP and GMP.

In Dec 2, 2020 Carlsbad began the Planning Commission Public Hearing on the Staff proposed Draft Local Coastal Program-Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) to propose to the CA Coastal Commission a change to Planning Area F's existing NRR land use and zoning. The flood of over 450 emailed public input for that specific meeting overwhelmed the City email server. As part of that process the City said in the Dec 2 email below it was going to post on its website all the Citizen/public input received on the DLCP-LUPA. On Dec 3 People for Ponto asked the Carlsbad City Council, City Clerk and City DLCP-LUPA Staff - would that posting would include all the LCP communications since 2017 when Citizens first became aware started Public Input to the City and CCC on the Ponto LCP issues?

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 11:13 AM
To: 'Planning'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Cc: 'Jennifer Jesser'; 'Don Neu'; 'City Clerk'; 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Erin Prahler'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov)
Subject: RE: 121 undeliverable Protect Ponto petitions

To City of Carlsbad and Carlsbad Planning:

We assume when you say 'records department' you mean City Clerk?

We also assume you mean 'all comments submitted' includes written comments and attachments; and Ponto related communications, presentations, public testimony and Public Records Requests to the City since 2017 - when Citizens first became aware of Existing Ponto Planning Area F LCP regulations and received CCC direction to the City on those Regulations? Can you please confirm this as this is all part of the Citizen comments and data that is part of the public record regarding the subject matter? The City is [using] 2015 input to justify current City Staff proposals, so the City should acknowledge and include People for Ponto Citizen input since 2017 on the same subject matter.

Thanks,
People for Ponto

From: Planning [<mailto:Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 6:29 PM
To: info@peopleforponto.com
Cc: Jennifer Jesser; Don Neu
Subject: RE: 121 undeliverable Protect Ponto petitions

Hello,

At the conclusion of the meeting all comments will be submitted to the records department. The records department will make the full record available on the city's website. At that time, I would suggest reviewing the record in its entirety to compare to what you submitted. Thank you.

It has been almost 3-weeks without a City response to the Dec 3 email, so People for Ponto will start re-emailing to the City and CCC public input on Ponto LCP and DLCP-LUPA issues since 2017 as 'resent official Public Input' to the City Council and CCC for the upcoming City Council DLCP-LUPA Public Hearing and other City meetings dealing with land use at Ponto. This '2017-present Public Input' should be posted on the City's website as noted in the City's Dec 2 email. The 2017-present Public Input is critical because there are now different City Council and CCC members since 2017. The 2017-present public input is critical to assure a proper Public Participation process consistent with Carlsbad and CA Coastal Act principles and assure the new City Council and the current CA Coastal Commission has the information and understands the extensive amount of multi-year public input expressing concerns, needs and desires for Ponto.

Following and attached is one of those many inputs.

Sincerely,
People for Ponto

PS: the following email/attachment has important LCPA Data and Public Comments – Low-cost Visitor Accommodations need/supply in Carlsbad

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2019 7:43 PM
To: 'Jennifer Jesser'
Cc: 'Melanie Saucier'; 'Celia Brewer'; 'Council Internet Email'; 'Cort Hitchens'; 'Erin Prahler'; 'Gabriel Buhr'; 'Mike Sebahar'; 'Harry Peacock'; 'John Gama'; 'John Gama'; 'Chas Wick'; 'Stacy King'; 'Don Neu'; 'Nika Richardson'; 'WILLIAM VAN CLEVE'; 'Jim Nardi'; 'Lisa Urbach'; Fred Sandquist (sandquist2@earthlink.net); David Hill (dashill4551@gmail.com); Laura Walsh (lauraw@surfridersd.org); 'David Hill'
Subject: LCPA public Comment - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations

Jennifer:

Attached please find Public Comments on the proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment (DLCPA) to the Land Use Plan regarding Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations.

As provided in other Public Comments and expressed by several citizens at the 11-20-19 Planning Commission meeting, I along with others kindly request:

1. a publicly accessible "Redline" version of the Existing 2016 Local Coastal Program (LCP) showing the City's proposed Draft disposition of the current Existing LCP Land Use Plan, policies and data. Without a "Redline" trying to understand the proposed Draft changes is very difficult,
2. true Citizen-based public Workshops on the Coastal Act goals-policies and LCP issues focused on the limited amount of key vacant (and soon to be vacant) Coastal lands in Carlsbad – such as Ponto, and
3. A 6-month extension of time review and provide informed public comments on the Redline LCP and DLCPA, and to provide time to conduct the aforementioned Workshops.

We are still working to try to review the LCP and DLCPA documents and provide public comments on the Coastal Recreation

Thank you for including and responding to these DLCPA Public Comments and questions.
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Low Cost Visitor Accommodations:

1. P. 3-3 cites CA Coast Act (CCA) Policies. But the City's proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) Land Use Plan (LUP) in the Ponto Area, particularly for Planning Area F, appears inconsistent with these CCA policies:
 - a. Section 30213 – protect, encourage and provide Lower-Cost Visitor & Recreation Facilities.
 - b. Section 30221 – Visitor serving & Recreation uses have priority over Residential & General Commercial uses.
 - c. Section 30223 – Upland areas reserved to support coastal Recreation uses
 - d. Section 30252(6) – correlate development with Local Park acquisition & on-site recreation

2. Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's LUP and LCP Samis Master Plan for Ponto. In the 1996 this LUP was changed to the now current LCP and LUP designation of "Non-Residential Reserve" with a specific LCP requirement to reconsider a high-priority recreation or visitor serving Coastal land use while other Ponto land uses were changed to low-priority residential uses (see Poinsettia Shores Master Plan/LCP). It seems appropriated that the LUP should re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park" in the existing LCP) to provide high-priority coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses: in part for the following reasons:
 - a. Planning Area F's existing LCP requirement requires this consideration, but the City has never disclosed this requirement to Citizens nor follow this requirement during the Cities two prior 'planning efforts' in 2010 and 2015 as documented by official Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, 262.
 - b. Ponto developers (both Samis and Kaisza) were both allowed to overdevelop Ponto, by not providing the minimum Open Space required by Carlsbad's and Citizen approved Growth Management Open Space Standard. Over 30-acres of land that should have been dedicated to Growth Management Open Space (a high-priority land use) was instead allowed to be developed with low-priority residential development. If the City's Growth Management Open Space Standard was properly applied at Ponto there would be 30-acres more open space at Ponto then there is now. This is a significant impact to CCA policies that can be corrected by changes in the Ponto LUP to properly implement City Open Space Standards and CCA policies.
 - c. The LCPA acknowledges that past (2005-17) and near-term (2019-23) growth in Carlsbad visitor demand for coastal recreation and accommodations, and indicate high past hotel occupancy rates that implies current hotel supply is just meeting current demand. Although the LCPA does not discuss the high occupancy rates at the Low-Cost campground facilities, It is assumed the campground occupancy rate and demand is higher than that of hotels. This should be defined. Based on current and near term demand for visitor accommodations the LCPA states on page 3-12 "... the City should identify and designate land where new hotels and other visitor-serving uses can be developed." It is clear where he 'City should identify and designate [this] land'? What new land(s) should be so identified and designated? However, the LCPA does not disclose longer-term visitor accommodation needs beyond 2023, nor provide a long-term plan for meeting this long-term need. The LCPA should publicly disclose, analyze and provide for the longer-term (beyond present and to beyond 2023) needs for visitor Coastal accommodations, particularly Low-Cost Accommodations and Recreation needs because the LCPA's LUP is a long-term plan for Carlsbad's buildout estimated to extend beyond 2035. Also, given the fact that there are very few vacant Coastal Sites (like Ponto) that are still available to address these long-term high priority Coastal land uses – recreation and visitor serving – reserving these vacant lands for high priority coastal land uses is consistent with the CCA Policies. Following are some longer-term projections of resident demand for Coastal park and recreation needs. It seems logical that long-term visitor will increase at a similar rate as the general population increase

rate, unless our coast becomes too overcrowded and unattractive vis-à-vis other visitor destinations. A long-term visitor demand (to go with the below long-term resident demand long-term Sea Level Rise impacts) for Coastal recreation resources should be a part of the proposed LCPA and part of the long-term LUP to provide resources for those long-term needs and to mitigate for those long-term Sea Level Rise impacts.



Increasing demand for Coastal recreational land

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County

| | | |
|------|------------|------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 | |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 | |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 | |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 | |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 | = average 100,000 visitors per day |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 | or 2.83% of Population per day |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 | or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day |

Typically around 1.6% annual increase in visitors

San Diego Tourism Authority, San Diego Travel Forecast, December 2017

- d. City in the LCPA inaccurately analyzes and misrepresents how much Visitor Serving Accommodations, particularly Low-Cost Accommodations, Carlsbad currently provides on a relative or comparative basis. The LCPA's inaccurate and simplistic analysis does not adjust for the different sizes of the Coastal Zone in the 3 cities (Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas) used in the analysis. Carlsbad's Coastal Zone is significantly larger than both the other cities, so it has more land and accommodations, just like San Diego's Coastal Zone is larger than Carlsbad's and San Diego is larger than its smaller neighbors Del Mar and National City. A simplistic how many accommodations are in your adjacent cities is an inappropriate analytical method for Carlsbad-Oceanside-Encinitas; just as it is inappropriate to compare the number of San Diego's hotels with the number hotels in San Diego's smaller neighbors Del Mar and National City. The accurate method to do a comparative analysis is based on a common denominator, such as the amount of accommodations per 1,000 acres of Coastal Zone land along with comparing each city's relative percentages. This is a more accurate and appropriate analysis that the LCPA should provide, and not that provided on page 3-13. The LCPA analysis also does not fully discuss and compare "Low-Cost" accommodations that are part of the CCA policies; nor provide a mitigation approach for "Low-Cost" accommodations lost, just 'Economy hotel rooms'. Below is data from the LCPA and other LCPs that shows the proper and more accurate comparison of existing Visitor Serving Accommodations in Carlsbad-Oceanside-Encinitas and includes Low-Cost Accommodation numbers/comparisons that are totally missing in the LCPA analysis. As the data shows, Carlsbad does not perform as well in Visitor Accommodations, and most particularly in "Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations", as the LCPA states and proposes in the LUP relative to Oceanside and Encinitas. An honest analysis like below should be provided in the LCPA LUP, particularly given the very limited amount of vacant Coastal land left to provide for high-priority Coastal Uses. Ponto is one of the last remaining vacant Coastal areas.


Carlsbad's proposed 2019 LCPA uses comparative 3-city data to address how Carlsbad's 2019 LCPA addresses Visitor Serving Accommodation needs. "Low-Cost" Accommodations are an important CA Coastal Act issue

| <u>Visitor Serving Accommodations (VSA) data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | | <u>Data source</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Coastal Acres (i.e. in Coastal Zone) | 9,216 | 1,460 | 7,845 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019 & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| VSA rooms: total | 3,211 | 975 | 634 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, pp 3-12 - 15 |
| VSA rooms: Economy | 589 | 346 | 346 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, pp 3-12 - 15 |
| VSA rooms: Low-Cost (campsites) | 220 | 272 | 171 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, State Parks, Oceanside & Paradise-by-the-sea data Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019 does not evaluate other City's Low-Cost Accommodations |
| <u>Data analysis</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>3-city Average</u> | <u>Key Findings</u> |
| VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 348 | 668 | 81 | 366 | Carlsbad provides overall Visitor Accommodations at slightly below the 3-city average |
| % of VSA rooms that are Economy | 18% | 35% | 55% | 36% | Carlsbad provides a percentage of Economy Accommodations about 50% below the 3-city average |
| Economy VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 64 | 237 | 44 | 115 | Carlsbad provides Economy Accommodations about 50% below the 3-city average |
| % VSA rooms that are Low-Cost | 7% | 28% | 27% | 21% | Carlsbad provides a percentage of Low-Cost Accommodations about 66% below the 3-city average Carlsbad LCPA also does not provide protection for loss of "Low-Cost" campground rooms, only "Economy hotel rooms" |
| Low-Cost VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 24 | 186 | 22 | 77 | Carlsbad provides Low-Cost Accommodations about 70% below the 3-city average |

- e. The LCPA is not providing for any new "Low Cost Visitor Accommodation" land uses in the proposed LUP for current/long-range needs, even though page 3-12 points out the current demand for accommodations, and the current Existing LCP has polices to increase "Low Cost Visitor Accommodation" land uses. We

understand that “Low-cost Visitor Accommodation” occupancy rates at CA State Campground at near 90%. This occupancy rate is much higher [signifying higher demand] than the occupancy rates of both the hotels, and “Economy Visitor Accommodations” which the LCPA seeks to protect. The Proposed LCPA LUP should provide historic and current “Low-cost Visitor Accommodation” occupancy rate data at CA State Campground and compare to occupancy demand for other accommodations to determine the highest occupancy demands and therefore needs. Why is the Proposed LCPA LUP not protecting AND EXPANDING (for future growth and visitor demand) the supply of this higher demand for “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” at the State Campground, particularly given the Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies on this issue, long history of this issue documented in the Current Existing Carlsbad LCP Mello II Segment, and the fact that “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” are a Statewide ‘high-Coastal-priority’ land use in CA Coastal Act Goals and Policies? Why is the proposed LUP not recognizing and incorporating these issues? The Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies [see Existing Carlsbad LCP Mello II Segment polies 2.3, 4.1, 6.1, 6.4, 6.5, 6.9, 6.10, 7.5, and 7.15 for example] are not referenced and discussed in the Proposed LUP nor is a comprehensive long-term analysis of the impact of the proposed LUP’s elimination of theses Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies vis-à-vis the CA Coastal Act Goals and Policies? How and why is the City proposing changes to these Existing Carlsbad LCP policies in the Mellow II Segment, particularly given the improved knowledge about Sea Level Rise, and Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff erosion impacts on the State Campground’s “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” - High-Coastal-Priority land use under the CA Coastal Act?

- f. At Ponto there is no low-cost/no-cost Recreational use as shown by the City of Carlsbad’s adopted Parks Master Plan (pp 87-89) that show the City’s adopted Park Service Areas in the following image. The image’s blue dots are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s adopted service areas:



Per the current Existing LCP requirements for Planning Area F at Ponto an “(i.e. Public Park)” must be considered. How is the Proposed LCPA LUP not reserving Upland Areas at Ponto for recreational uses given

Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff erosion impacts as shown in Proposed LCPA LUP Attachment B, and Exhibits B6 and B7? There is very limited amount of vacant Upland Coastal land at Ponto and South Coastal Carlsbad to accommodate low-cost/no-cost Recreational use "(i.e. Public Park)", so why is this last remaining vacant Coastal land at Ponto not being reserved for "high-Coastal Priority Land Uses"? Why is the Proposed LCPA LUP proposing this last remaining vacant Coastal land at Ponto be converted from "Non-residential Reserve" to 'low-coastal-priority residential and general commercial land uses'?

3. The proposed LCPA approach to protect existing 'economy hotels' but not 'Low-cost Visitor Accommodations' appears inappropriate. Existing hotel owners providing 'Economy' rooms are penalized while all other more expensive 'non-economy hotel' owners are not required to mitigate for their not providing more affordable accommodations. It seems like a fairer and rational approach is to use the same framework as the City's inclusionary affordable housing requirements and have the requirement and burden of providing affordable accommodations required by all visitor accommodation providers, including short-term rentals of residential homes. Use of any per accommodation "in-lieu fee" should be SUFFICIENT TO FULLY MITIGATE for not providing a required affordable accommodation by being sufficient to fully fund a new 'affordable accommodation' on a one-for one basis. City Transit Occupancy Tax revenues could also potentially be used to provide a catch-up method for existing "non-low-cost and/or non-economy accommodation providers" to address what would nominally be their inclusionary contribution. It seems like the LCPA approach needs significant rethinking to provide a rational program to include reasonable long-term and sustainable affordability in visitor accommodation's, particularly give the Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff Erosion impacts on Carlsbad's Only "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations" and the State Campground and beaches and Carlsbad's Coastal access roadways.
4. The Proposed LCPA LUP does not provide a means for citizens to understand the proposed changes to the current Existing LCP goals and policies. There are numerous current Existing LCP goals and policies regarding "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations". These all should be listed in the Proposed LCPA LUP along with a description on how and why these current Existing LCP Goals and policies are being modified or removed in the Proposed LCPA LUP.

Subject: Protect Ponto *** Please read into general public comment January 13, 2021****

From: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2021 4:17 PM
To: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: Tim Selke <TIm.Selke@carlsbadca.gov>; Charlene Buckalew <Charlene.Buckalew@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: FW: Protect Ponto *** Please read into general public comment January 13, 2021****

Mike-
Please ensure this message is forwarded to the PRC.
Thanks.
-Kyle

From: T. Owen Rassman <owen@rassman.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2021 1:21 PM
To: Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; planning@carlsbadca.gov; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Jennifer Jesser <Jennifer.Jesser@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; David De Cordova <David.deCordova@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov; carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Bret@carlsbad.org; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov; Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov; People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>
Subject: Protect Ponto *** Please read into general public comment January 13, 2021****

Dear Planning Commission, Mayor Matt Hall, City Council, and CA Coastal Commission

I was inspired to hear the conversation at last week's meeting around the meaning of "should" vs "could" relating to the phrase "The City *SHOULD* add more hotels" in the Draft LCP and I applaud the Commissioners remarks that just because we 'could' do something, doesn't mean that we 'should' do it.

Similar sounding words with extremely different meaning and impact on the future of Carlsbad.

Just like with Planning Area F/ Ponto – we 'could' keep the wrongfully done land use change in place as staff suggested but that absolutely does not mean we 'should'. There have been admitted planning mistakes done at Ponto when The City changed the land use away from "nonresidential reserve" without going through the proper channels and Coastal Commission- not correcting those now is absurd. The way I grew up was when you make a mistake, you fix it. You don't keep forging ahead on the wrong path just because you took a wrong turn. You correct and do what's right.

The people of Carlsbad ask you to act to **Protect Ponto**. I ask you to **Develop Ponto Right** and remove land change proposed at Planning Area F from the DLCP.

I request that my comments be put on record in the official public records for ALL things Planning Area F, including the official public records for Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, and Parks Master Plan Update; and the CA Coastal Commission's consideration of Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.

Thank you

T. Rassman
Carlsbad, CA

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Subject: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues
Attachments: image001.emz; image008.emz; image010.emz; image012.emz; image027.emz; image029.emz; image033.emz; People for Ponto Support Letter - Cape Rey.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 1:07 PM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Carrie Boyle' <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>

Subject: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues

Dear City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, & Beach Preservation Commission; CA Coastal Commission and State Parks:

Please consider this email and attached letter as input into the DLCP-LUPA and other Ponto issues.

Ponto Coastal Park is an investment not only for Carlsbad citizens and their children, but also benefits Carlsbad visitors and the businesses that serve those visitors. The quantity, quality and equitable distribution of Carlsbad's Coastal Recreation Parks are important investments in our social and economic sustainability, and Ponto Park is the most cost-effective investment toward that end.

If the City Council acquires it, Ponto Park, will be a great investment and opportunity to bring citizens, business and the City together to a create something truly special at Ponto. People for Ponto has had some great conversations with our Carlsbad visitor industry on the many wonderful opportunities a Ponto Park investment creates.

We hope you see and invest in those opportunities. People for Ponto has identified how the City can do that and do so in a very cost effective way.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
People for Ponto

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



CAPE REY™
CARLSBAD BEACH
A HILTON RESORT & SPA

Dear People for Ponto,

In regards to Ponto Planning Area F, Cape Rey Carlsbad Beach, a Hilton Resort and Spa would be in favor of the idea of implementing a Coastal Park in the referenced area notwithstanding any objections from the City of Carlsbad, State of CA, and CA Coastal Commission. The hotel is supportive of preserving any vacant coastal land for visitor serving purposes that will beautify and enhance the surrounding area and create more attraction for South Carlsbad. We welcome the voice of the citizens of Carlsbad to participate in the development of Ponto and look forward to collaborating on the future of the area.

Sincerely,

Bill Canepa

Mick Calarco

Subject: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues - PA F is for sale
Attachments: 2021-1-22 - Ponto Park aquisition Memo.pdf

From: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 4:55 PM
To: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: Charlene Buckalew <Charlene.Buckalew@carlsbadca.gov>; Adriana Alvarez <Adriana.Alvarez@carlsbadca.gov>; Kasia Trojanowska <Kasia.Trojanowska@carlsbadca.gov>; Tim Selke <Tim.Selke@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: FW: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues - PA F is for sale

Mike/Michael-
Please ensure this message is forwarded to the PRC/BPC.
Thanks.
-Kyle

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 2:05 PM
To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahl@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Carrie Boyle' <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>
Cc: Peter Lewi <peter.lewi@masterpiecesd.com>
Subject: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues - PA F is for sale

Dear City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, & Beach Preservation Commission; CA Coastal Commission and State Parks:

Please consider this email and attached letter as input into the DLCP-LUPA and other Ponto issues.

In February 2019, Shopoff recorded the Quit Claim of their interest in Ponto Planning Area F and abandoned their Carlsbad Planning Applications to change the LCPA and Master Plan Amendment and then development permit applications. Although the past 2-years have seen no applicant activity, the City is keeping the application active and now City Staff is processing the LCPA and Master Plan Amendment for Planning Area F.

Since 2019 Ponto Beachfront Park, Inc. 501c3 (PBP 501c3) has been working with the property owner's representative to see if we could get definition of sale price and terms so PBP 501c3 could start donor fundraising to help purchase Planning Area F for much needed public park. The attached file summarizes the status of that effort to date. Planning Area F is still for sale, if the City is interested in talking with the landowner.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

MEMORANDUM REGARDING PONTO BEACH PROPERTY

This is to provide a summary of my discussions with the real estate broker who has the listing of a parcel of land adjacent to Ponto Beach comprised of 11.04 acres (APN 216-140-43-00) (“Property”) which includes 6.5 acres which would be ideal for the much-needed public park in the Southwest quadrant of Carlsbad. My discussions have been with Jeff Adkison who is the Managing Director of Jones, Lang La Salle, Americas (“JLL”) in Los Angeles as the property owner’s agent in selling the property. LSF5 CARLSBAD HOLDINGS, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, is the owner of the Property.

I am both a real estate attorney and a real estate broker and have been acting on a voluntary basis for Ponto Beachfront Park, Inc. a 501c3 company whose mission is to work to promote the development of the park. I live in the San Pacifico community within two blocks of the Property.

For reasons unknown to me, JLL does not have the Property on either LoopNet or CoStar which are the leading platforms for listing commercial property or vacant land. Having said that the Property is clearly for sale and is not under contract at this time. I am told that the current owner is highly motivated to complete a sale of the Property as soon as possible.

We have been diligently pursuing the potential acquisition of the Property for more than a year and I have had many conversations with the listing broker and have submitted two written proposals which although not formal offers indicate our desire to facilitate a purchase of the Property. They have been reluctant to respond to us in writing without a formal offer but have through their broker continued to engage in discussions.

I would be happy to discuss this matter further and provide assistance in securing the Property for the purpose of developing Ponto Park.

Peter Lewi
Attorney at Law
858-525-3256
peter.lewi@masterpiecesd.com

Mick Calarco

Subject: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues - Park Hyatt Ponto Park support letter
Attachments: People for Ponto Coastal Park - Park Hyatt.pdf

From: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 7:14 PM
To: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: Kasia Trojanowska <Kasia.Trojanowska@carlsbadca.gov>; Tim Selke <Tim.Selke@carlsbadca.gov>; Charlene Buckalew <Charlene.Buckalew@carlsbadca.gov>; Adriana Alvarez <Adriana.Alvarez@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: FW: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues - Park Hyatt Ponto Park support letter

Mike/Michael-
Please ensure this message is forwarded to the PRC/BPC.
Thanks.
-Kyle

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 6:13 PM
To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Carrie Boyle' <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>
Subject: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues - Park Hyatt Ponto Park support letter

Dear City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, & Beach Preservation Commission; CA Coastal Commission and State Parks:

Please consider this email and attached letter as input into the DLCP-LUPA and other Ponto issues.

Ponto Coastal Park is an investment not only for Carlsbad citizens and their children, but also benefits Carlsbad visitors and the businesses that serve those visitors. The quantity, quality and equitable distribution of Carlsbad's Coastal Recreation Parks are important investments in our social and economic sustainability, and Ponto Park is the most cost-effective investment toward that end.

If the City Council acquires it, Ponto Park, will be a great investment and opportunity to bring citizens, business and the City together to create something truly special at Ponto. People for Ponto has had some great conversations with our Carlsbad visitor industry on the many wonderful opportunities a Ponto Park investment creates.

We know if Carlsbad's City Council invests in Ponto Park and so invests in its South Carlsbad citizens and businesses, we together can create a special World-Class Coastal Park.

We hope you see and invest in those opportunities. People for Ponto has identified how the City can do that and do so in a very cost effective way.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
People for Ponto

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

PARK HYATT AVIARA®

RESORT, GOLF CLUB & SPA
NORTH SAN DIEGO

7100 Aviara Resort Drive
Carlsbad, California 92011 USA

TELEPHONE + 1 760 448 1234
FACSIMILE + 1 760 603 6822
parkhyattaviara.com

January 13, 2021

Mayor Matt Hall & Councilmembers
City of Carlsbad
1635 Faraday Avenue
Carlsbad, CA 92008

RE: *People for Ponto Coastal Park*

Dear Mayor Hall & City Councilmembers,

On behalf of Park Hyatt Aviara Resort, Golf Club & Spa, we are proud to be a part of such a special coastal community as the City of Carlsbad, our South Carlsbad community and to work closely with the Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation & many other community partners in continuing to protect the natural areas of Carlsbad.

We feel that to create special open spaces for residents and visitors alike to enjoy the beauty of our city is extremely important. We agree that the Ponto Coastal Park would be a special and unique amenity offered in our fine city. We feel that should the City Council, California Coastal Commission and, most important, the Residents of Carlsbad, support a coastal recreation park at Ponto Beach, it would be a defining beacon for the City.

Respectfully,



Geoff Gray
General Manager
Park Hyatt Aviara Resort, Golf Club & Spa

cc: People for Ponto
California Coastal Commission

Mick Calarco

Subject: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on inconsistencies apparent in the 1-26-21 Staff Report on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues

Attachments: Comments of 1-26-20 #12 Staff Report.pdf

Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 8:10 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Carrie Boyle' <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: 1/26/21 City Council meeting - Public input on inconsistencies apparent in the 1-26-21 Staff Report on Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues

Importance: High

Dear City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, & Beach Preservation Commission; CA Coastal Commission and State Parks:

After review of the recently released staff report, please consider this email and attached 7-pages of Staff Report Review Comments as public input for the 1/26/21 item#12 Ponto agenda item, and also for the Carlsbad proposed Draft Local Coastal Program-Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA). The Review Comments list concerns on inconsistencies apparent in the 1/26/21 Staff Report on the DLCP-LUPA and related Ponto issues.

The staff report seems to have several critical inconsistencies with other City documents and past CA Coastal Commission (CCC) actions/direction. These inconsistencies seem to suggest inaccurate limitations on City Council discretion to key Ponto issues. These inconsistencies are significant, and seem to require further analysis by the City Council. The inconsistencies also involve the CCC and documented CCC actions at Ponto and in Carlsbad's entire Coastal Zone. It seems prudent for the City Council should get clear documented direction from the CCC on the CCC related inconsistencies apparent in the staff report. In addition some of the issues raised in the staff report relate to current litigation. As noted below apparent staff report's inconsistencies noted below are significant and it appears they should be fully researched by the City Council, and verified by the CCC.

As 34-year Carlsbad citizen I love Carlsbad. As a prior Carlsbad city planner, I helped plan some great futures and great development projects for our city and citizens. As such I know, as do many other Carlsbad citizens, how important Ponto and a much needed and requested Ponto Park is to our citizens, city, and future Carlsbad (and California) generations. The Review Comments are intended to help the City Council, City and CCC in understanding and addressing the Ponto Park and Ponto issues.

Sincerely,

Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The staff report seems to have several critical inconsistencies with other City documents and past CA Coastal Commission (CCC) actions/direction. These inconsistencies seem to suggest inaccurate limitations on City Council discretion to key Ponto issues. These inconsistencies are significant, and seem to require further analysis by the City Council. The inconsistencies also involve the CCC and documented CCC actions at Ponto and in Carlsbad’s entire Coastal Zone. It seems prudent for the he City Council should get clear documented direction from the CCC on the CCC related inconsistencies apparent in the staff report. In addition some of the issues raised in the staff report relate to current litigation. As noted below apparent staff report’s inconsistencies noted below are significant and it appears they should be fully researched by the City Council, and verified by the CCC.

Staff Report

Page statement/review comment

5 Staff report statement: “Nowhere in the policy does it require that the entire site be considered a public park; in fact, the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan conceptualizes a small “wetland interpretative park” located within an area planned for a mixed-use center that includes three-story developments that provide shops, eating and services, while also providing housing opportunities.”

“It is important to note that the city’s current Local Coastal Plan includes Carlsbad Municipal Code Section 21.090, which implements the city’s Growth Management Plan.”

Review comments: There is difference in interrupting the policy. Nowhere in the policy does it say the entire site cannot be required to be considered for a public park. The City Council has discretion on this issues, as does the CCC.

Staff’s limiting interruption does not seem logical and supported by the simple reading of the words and intent the policy. Staff’s limiting interruption also seems contrary to the exact specific CCC findings in denying the City’s application in 2010 to have that Ponto Vision Plan ‘certified’ by the CCC. A 5-page data file submitted to the Council on Dec 2, 2020 lists the exact language of the 2010 CCC’s denial of the Ponto Vision. It should be reviewed by the City Council.

Ultimately it will be the CCC that determines what the LCP policy means. In 2017 the CCC sent direction to the City specifically on this issue. This CCC direction seems to conflict with Staff’s interruption.

In reviewing the CCC’s 2010 denial of the Ponto Vision Plan citizens meet with CCC staff in 2017 to see if the City ever complied with the Planning Area F LCP policy during the 2015 General Plan Update and land use map change. We meet with CCC staff because we had never before heard from the City about this LCP policy and requirements both during the City’s Ponto Vision Plan planning activities, and also during the General Plan Update planning activities in 2015. Citizens only became aware of the LCP policy in 2017.

As citizens we know the past Public Participation outcomes for both the Ponto Vision Plan and General Plan Update would have been different if Carlsbad citizens were actually informed about the LCP policy. This is why there is so much citizen input now. If citizens knew about the LCP policy during the Ponto Vision Plan and General Plan Update processes the outcomes of those processes would be different. Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 2017-

262, R000930-072419, R001280-021720, and R001281-02170 confirmed there was no public disclosure and public discussion to “consider and document the need” per the policy. This is again specifically documented in the CCC’s 2010 denial of the Ponto Vision Plan that is the exact basis for the General Plan Update. This is why citizens think there were ‘Ponto planning mistakes’, based on a flawed public disclosure and participation planning process.

The CCC provided the following statement on 8/16/17: “The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. **The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City’s Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City’s land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area.**”

The City Council received these directions from City Staff at 1/28/20 Council meeting. CCC direction is: “**The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.** This is an issue that the San Pacifico HOA community group is raising in regards to the Shopoff/Ponto development proposal, and this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. **If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.**”

Staff report statement: “During a Planning Commission meeting in 2019, staff acknowledged that Policy A.10 of the Local Coastal Plan did not get updated when the General Plan and Local Coastal Plan Land Use Map designations were updated in 2015 with the residential and commercial designation, which has led to public confusion. While this may have been an oversight, it is not a “planning mistake” as several correspondences have stated, nor does it nullify the 2015 General Plan and Local Coastal Plan land use plan changes that the City Council and Coastal Commission approved. As discussed in more detail in the section below, an analysis has been completed and staff has found that the city is not deficient in meetings its open space or park obligations under the city’s Growth Management Plan.”

Review comments: The statement is inconsistent with the facts that the land use map update was just that ONLY a land use map update that was CONTINGENT on future evaluation of the a complete LCP-LUPA by the CCC. As the CCC stated in 2016 and 2017 the land use map could change as a result of the DLCP-LUPA process now underway. The City and CCC, or the CCC can change or decertify the Coastal Land Use Map.

The City never submitted the City’s Growth Management Plan (GMP) for CCC certification as an LCP component in addressing CA Coastal Act Policies. As such the City cannot use the GMP for LCP purposes. If the City is now proposing that the GMP be incorporated in the LCP in addressing the Ponto issues it needs to now submit the GMP as part of the DLCP-LUPA. The CCC

can only evaluate what the City submits as a proposed LCP, if the City is not submitting the GMP as part of the LCP, then the GMP is irrelevant to the LCP. The CCC uses the CA Coastal Act to measure and test the adequacy of the of the city’s proposed DLCP-LUPA application.

The City never submitted the GMP Citywide Facilities Improvement Plan (CFIP) nor all the Local Facilities Management Plan (LFMP) in the Coastal Zone for LCP Certification by the CCC. The Existing LCP, to our knowledge, has no mention of the City’s GMP being certified by the CCC. A specific citation of the City’s entire GMP being a CCC Certified component of the existing LCP is needed to justify the discussion on pages 5-6. The LCP for Ponto has no mention of the GMP complying with the Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) requirement. Again as noted in the CCC’s 2010 denial of the Ponto Vision Plan, the GMP was never referenced by the City as its LCP nor was the GMP used by the CCC in evaluating and rejecting the Ponto Vision Plan. There are inconsistencies in the 2021 Staff report’s statements relative to over 30-years of the City GMP practice relative to the LCP and required CCC review of LCP changes.

Also, in reading the Existing “the City Carlsbad Local Coastal Program 2019” at <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=24088> there is no adoption/Certification citation indicating 21.090 or the CFIP and LFMPs in the Coastal Zone are in the existing Certified LCP, and the text of Carlsbad’s Existing LCP excludes 21.090.

6 Staff report statement: regarding the Performance Standard for Open Space paragraph.

Review comments: The references to LFMP Zone 9 exemption from the GMP Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation. As such the references in the staff report may or may not be proven to be accurate.

The following, like the staff reports statements will be ultimately be addressed in the current litigation. However, I was a Carlsbad City Planner during that time and offer some thoughts simply for Council consideration. I seem to recall: the Open Space the City Staff cites were already dedicated Open Space prior to the GMP. The lagoon waters and lagoon bluffs were pre-zoned Open Space prior to being annexed into the City of Carlsbad. The GMP should have recognized these Constrained and unbuildable open space lands and water as part of the 25% of the City that was already unbuildable Open Space before the City started the GMP. The GMP Open Space Standard was to require an additional 15% of Unconstrained (developable land) as Open Space. That is what the GMP Open Space Standard is. The LFMP Zone 9 exemption of this 15% Unconstrained (developable) GMP Open Space Standard references a specific project the BLEP. I think the BLEP had a lot of GMP-compliant Open Space that met the Open Space Standard in its educational campus and sports fields. This could be reviewed. As mentioned the Constrained lagoon water and bluffs were already dedicated Constrained Open Space and maybe Pre-BLEP. The BLEP was never built, and its GMP-compliant Unconstrained GMP Open Space was also never built. The BLEB land uses were replaced by the PSMP land uses, and the BLEP’s GMP-compliant Open Space was removed. This seems why the City’s GIS mapping system records a 30-acre deficit of GMP compliant/Standard Open Space in LFMP Zone 9. Anyways, as noted the issue of if LFMP Zone 9 was/is now being falsely exempted from the GMP Open Space Standard is subject to and will be determined in litigation.

In reference to the staff reports statement on page 5, CMC 21.090 also has specific requirements for non-compliance with GMP Standards. If 21.090 is CCC Certified as an LCP, the

CCC may have concerns about the City non-compliance with 21.090 in LFMP Zone 9, particularly for Unconstrained Open Space that can provide high-priority Coastal Recreation. From a practical matter the City GIS clearly documents that LFMP Zone 9 does not provide 15% Unconstrained Open Space to meet the GMP Standard. There should be about 30 more acres of Unconstrained Open Space in LFMP Zone 9 to meet that Standard. There is no provision in 21.090 that allows a GMP Standard to be met with a land that is not compliant with that Standard. 21.090 and development of Ponto Planning Area Requires a formal LFMP Zone Amendment, and such an application is on file with the City. The LFMP Zone Amendment is required to address GMP Standards from a new land use in the proposed land use change and increased impacts in Ponto Area F from 'Non-residential Reserve' to the proposed R-23/General Commercial. 21.090 requires GMP Standards to be met. The staff report indicates the CCC will also need to review and Certify the LFMP Zone 9 Amendment if 21.090 is a CCC Certified part of Carlsbad's existing LCP.

As mentioned the issue is subject to litigation and subsequent court decision.

- 7 Staff report statement: regarding the Performance Standard for Parks paragraph. "Does the City Council want to exceed the Growth Management Plan's park standards for the Northwest Quadrant and LFMZ9 to purchase this site as a public park?"

Review comments: The references to Parks compliance with the GMP Standard I understand is also subject to current litigation.

As noted earlier, the question of if the City's entire GMP and its Park issues are already a CCC Certified LCP land use plan need to be formally confirmed, or refuted, by the CCC.

The City Council has the authority to make city park investments above the modest 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum standard. The City Council did this in the Poinsettia 61 project that increased Parkland in the NW quadrant for increased development in the SW quadrant, even though the NW already had parkland over and above the minimum standard.

A variety of viable funding options for City purchase Planning Area F are possible. These options also may provide opportunities to bring to the City outside funds that would reduce City costs. If City Council desires we can sit down with City Council and Staff to discuss the options and opportunities.

- 8 Staff report statement: regarding the 'Potential public vote requirement. No explanation as to why CMC 1.24 (1982) was never updated to the voter approved amendments to CMC 1.24 in 2002 Proposition C.

The staff report says: , " ... to purchase the properties for **natural** open space and trails connectivity purposes. **It does not appear acquisition of Ponto would qualify under Proposition C because it is being discussed for development as a park and not as natural open space.** The property **likely does not qualify as natural open space** due to its prior use as farmland and disturbance of the site, as confirmed in a 2017 report."

Review comments: The statements regarding CMC 1.24 (1982) do not acknowledge that the City failed to amend CMC 1.24 in 2002 to incorporate the 2002 voter approved responses to CMC

1.24. It is unclear why the CMC 1.24 was never amended to comply with the voter approved revisions to CMC 1.24.

The reference to “**natural**” open space being a requirement of Proposition C is not true. In a reading of the “City Attorneys Impartial Analysis” and the City Council’s “Argument in Favor” of 2002 Proposition C, there is no mention of “**natural**” open space as the only “Open Space” that can be funded by Proposition C.

The words of Proposition C clearly state in the City Attorneys Impartial Analysis says “Trails, linkages and **open space**”, and the City Council’s Argument in Favor of Proposition C state that “Trails and Open Space – Carlsbad residents have repeatedly said that creating trails and **preserving open space** is their top priority. A YES vote will provide funding for both linkages **and open space acquisition projects.**” There is no ‘natural open space’ limitation in Proposition C (see attached copy of 2002 Proposition C downloaded from City of Carlsbad website).

The staff report inaccuracy regarding ‘Natural’ are also refuted on the Carlsbad City website: <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/services/depts/parks/open/openspace/questions.asp>. The City’s website verbatim states:

“What is open space?”

The City of Carlsbad’s General Plan defines open space as “**any area of land or water which, for whatever reason, is not developed for urbanized uses and which therefore enhances residents' quality of life.**” The open space, conservation and recreation element of the General Plan lists four categories of open space: open space for preservation of natural resources, open space for managed production of resources, **open space for outdoor recreation**, and open space for aesthetic, cultural and educational purposes. Vacant lands designated for future growth are generally not considered open space.

What was Proposition C?

In Carlsbad, the City Council cannot authorize the spending of more than \$1 million of general fund money for property acquisition or improvements without prior approval from voters. **In 2002, voters passed Proposition C, which allowed the City Council to exceed the \$1 million amount on four projects:** the City of Carlsbad Safety Training Center, a new swimming pool complex (Alga Norte Community Park), an extension of Cannon Road, **and acquisition of open space and trails.** Proposition C did not direct the City Council to spend a specific amount of money on open space and trails by a certain time. Instead, it provided voter authorization to spend more than the \$1 million limit if one or more properties became available and the city felt it was in the taxpayers’ best interest to purchase it for open space/trails purposes.

What is the city’s approach to identifying land that could be purchased by the city as open space?

One chief factor considered is whether a potential property for open space will add to our quality of life at a reasonable cost. In 2005, after passage of Proposition C, the City Council appointed the Open Space and Trails Ad Hoc Citizens Committee to establish and rank a list of potential acquisitions. Some of the property on that list has been acquired. The Ad Hoc Committee is no longer active, **but the city regularly reviews available land – land identified by the committee and other land – to determine whether it’s in the taxpayers’ best interests to purchase as open space. When appropriate, the city approaches land owners to discuss**

interest in selling. The city also relies on partnerships to acquire open space. For example, developers in Carlsbad are required to set aside open space as part of their developments and to pay for the upkeep of that open space. In this way city residents get the benefit of the open space without the expense. Sometimes the city teams with a private foundation or other public agency to pool resources to preserve open space. And in some instances another public agency, such as the California Department of Fish & Game, owns and maintains the open space.”

The City & North County Advocates (NCA) signed a Lawsuit Settlement Agreement regarding the 2015 General Plan Update. This Agreement requires the City to meet and collaborate with NCA as the successor entity to the Ad Hoc Committee every 6-months regarding Open Space acquisitions under Proposition C. This requirement is in Agreement’s Section 4.3.15 (pages 12-14). In following this Agreement, in 2020 NCA recommended to the City Staff that the Planning Area F Ponto Park should be acquired via Proposition C’s exemption for acquisition of Open Space. The site is also adjacent to and includes some natural habitat.

The City’s website says: **“When appropriate, the city approaches land owners to discuss interest in selling.”** People for Ponto has communicated since 2019 that there is a willing seller, as the landowner has been trying – and is still trying- to sell the land.

Staff report statement: regarding the ‘Area identified for needed housing’,

Review comments: The City has already done this in the Draft Housing Element by providing other sites for rezoning. The City has a General Plan Amendment in the works for West Oaks in the SW Quadrant that would convert Industrial land to Residential land use. This change will also increase Park demand for the SW Quadrant where Ponto Planning Area F is located. The West Oaks GPA exemplifies the importance of providing a Coastal Park for the SW Quadrant and other Draft Housing Element planned residential increases in South Carlsbad. The people in these new homes need a Coastal Park to go to. Ponto Planning Area F is he last viable opportunity to provide that. Housing can be located in many places in the City, there are only a few locations to provide a Coastal Park so inland residents and the children can access Coastal Recreation. It is a matter of priority.

Regarding SB 166, the language actually says: “ (b) (1) No city, county, or city and county shall, by administrative, quasi-judicial, legislative, or other action, reduce, or require or permit the reduction of, the residential density for any parcel to, or allow development of any parcel at, a lower residential density, as defined in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (g), **unless the city, county, or city and county makes written findings supported by substantial evidence of both of the following:**

(A) The reduction is consistent with the adopted general plan, including the housing element.

(B) The remaining sites identified in the housing element are adequate to meet the requirements of Section 65583.2 and to accommodate the jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need pursuant to Section 65584. The finding shall include a quantification of the remaining unmet need for the jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need at each income level and the remaining capacity of sites identified in the housing element to accommodate that need by income level.”

As documented to the City in a 20-page data set emailed on Nov 30, 2020, it is questionable if Ponto Planning Area F is in fact actually adopted in the General Plan, as the City’s LCP Land Use

Plan Amendment is in process, and yet to be considered by the City Council. As page 2-26 of Carlsbad’s 2015 General Plan Land Use Element clearly states: **“The city’s LCP Land Use Plan will be updated consistent with this General Plan. However, to take effect, the LCP must be certified by the Coastal Commission as well as adopted by the city. Until such time that this occurs, the existing (as of 2013) LCP must be adhered to.”** The CCC has yet to certify the City’s Land Use Plan, and in fact the City Council has yet to even adopt a proposed DLCP-LUPA to submit to the CCC. The land use map, was just that a map. It was not a Land Use Plan. The CCC in its aforementioned 2017 direction to the City clearly indicates that the CCC in considering (likely in 2021 or 22) the DLCP-LUPA the CCC may require the City’s General Plan land use map to change at Ponto to provide for high-priority Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) or Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land uses.

Regardless, as noted by some council members and the Planning Commission the City Council could adopt a General Plan Amendment as required by SB166 (A). The Nov 30, 2020 20-page data set also shows the City has more than enough housing sites identified in its Draft Housing Element to meet its regional housing need required for the 2nd SB166 (B) finding in above to allow Planning Area F to be Ponto Park.

9 Staff report statement: regarding the ‘Current permit application to develop site’.

Review comments: The staff report does not disclose that the application also includes a LCPA. Carlsbad tax-payer dollars are being used to pay for City Staff to process for the developer both the LCPA and basic zoning of the Master Plan Amendment. The use of tax-payer dollars for this purpose is subject to the City Council consideration, but maybe conflict with the California Constitution prohibition of the ‘gift of public funds’.

Mick Calarco

Subject: Jan26th Agenda item 12 - Protect Ponto

From: T. Owen Rassman <owen@rassman.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 9:41 AM

To: Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Jennifer Jesser <Jennifer.Jesser@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; David De Cordova <David.deCordova@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov; carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Bret@carlsbad.org; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov; Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov; People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: Jan26th Agenda item 12 - Protect Ponto

Dear Mayor, City Council, Planning Commission and CA Coastal Commission

I request that the City Council direct staff to research and provide options to acquire Planning Area F for Ponto Park. And that The City Council directs staff to consult with People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens organization on the data and resources they have collected that can assist the Staff and the Council with these options.

I have lived in Southern CA for 30 years and in Carlsbad for the last 4. This is an amazing city, but I know it can be so much more, we have an obligation to our children & all those that come to enjoy the coast line to make it more.

The land at Ponto (Planning area F) is a prime location to do **something amazing** with, something that matters and inspires joy. I am aware that the land is for sale and DO NOT wish to see a developer turn it into a condo complex when it could be the **jewel of our City**. I know the State of CA says we have to have a certain number of new houses, but they don't say they have to be crammed into one of the last remaining open pieces of coastal land. Build housing complexes closer to where offices and businesses are, build them inland and **Protect Ponto!**

I know the People for Ponto organization has identified multiple paths to success that would be a win / win for everyone -- City Staff should work with them, learn from them and Ponto Park a reality.

I ask you to **Develop Ponto Right** and work with the experts that have the knowledge to do what the community wants - keep the open space, build Ponto Park!

I request that my comments be put on record in the official public records for **ALL** things Planning Area F, including the

official public records the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, and Parks Master Plan Update; and the CA Coastal Commission's consideration of Carlsbad's draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.

Thank you

T. Owen Rassman

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Mick Calarco

Subject: 1-26-21 Agenda Item 12 Protect Ponto

From: jodi marie jones <jodimariejones@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 12:21 PM

To: Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Jennifer Jesser <Jennifer.Jesser@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; David De Cordova <David.deCordova@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov; carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Bret@carlsbad.org; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov; Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov; People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: 1-26-21 Agenda Item 12 Protect Ponto

Dear Mayor, City Council, Planning Commission and CA Coastal Commission

I request that the City Council direct staff to research and provide options to acquire Planning Area F for Ponto Park. And that The City Council directs staff to consult with People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens organization on the data and resources they have collected that can assist the Staff and the Council with these options

The People have been asking to keep Ponto's Open Space and build Ponto Park for an extremely long time but it seems to fall on deaf ears or only be met with resistance. Staff's presentation to the Planning Commission in Dec 2019 and the Staff report for this agenda item have inaccurate information in them but it doesn't seem like there is much interest in recognizing the truth. I hope today's meeting will change that.

Truth is the land use change should not have been changed the way it was, so we shouldn't "just continue on with it".

Truth is Planning Area F is not the answer the State's housing demands.

Truth is Ponto Park is not only being asked for by the people that live in the area – it is for ALL of Carlsbad and ALL of the visitors that come from near and far.

Truth is it would be relatively easy to **Develop Ponto Right** – you just have to listen and want to make it happen.

So I repeat -

I request that the City Council direct staff to research and provide options to acquire Planning Area F for Ponto Park. And that The City Council directs staff to consult with People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens organization on the data and resources they have collected that can assist the Staff and the Council with these options.

I request that my comments be put on record in the official public records for **ALL** things Planning Area F, including the official public records the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, and Parks Master Plan Update; and the CA Coastal Commission's consideration of Carlsbad's draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.

Thank you

Jodi M. Jones

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues Public Input - Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad's DLCP-LUPA's projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto
Attachments: Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA planned lost of OS at Ponto.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 7:55 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues Public Input - Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad's DLCP-LUPA's projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto

Dear City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, & Beach Preservation Commission; CA Coastal Commission and State Parks:

Please include this email and attached file 'Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad's DLCP-LUPA's projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto' as public input into Carlsbad's proposed Draft LCP-Land Use Plan Amendment, and all City and CA Coastal Commission and CA Housing & Community Development proposed actions regarding Ponto.

The attachment summarizes some of the existing Coastal Open Space shortfall and distribution issues; and the projected and planned future forever loss of existing Coastal Open Space land and CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Land Uses at Ponto due to Sea Level Rise. The planned loss of Coastal Open Space is at the same time when City and Statewide demand for those reduced 'high-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses will increase from future growth of both resident population and visitors. There is limited vacant Coastal land suitable for these 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses, and Ponto is one of the last in the Carlsbad and the San Diego County coastline. Ponto Planning Area F has specific CA State Coastal Act and existing Local Coastal Program (Land Use Plan Policies and Zoning/implementation plan regulations) that require City and CA Coastal Commission consideration of these important CA Coastal Open Space Land Use issues before changing the existing 'Non-Residential Reserve' Coastal Land Use Policy designation and Zoning on Planning Area F.

As 34-year Carlsbad citizen I love Carlsbad. As such I know, as do many other Carlsbad citizens and businesses, how important Ponto is to our citizens, city, and future Carlsbad (and California) generations and our social and economic sustainability. The attached is intended to help the City Council, City and CCC in understanding and addressing some of the basic existing and future 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Use supply/demand issues at Ponto.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad's DLCP-LUPA's projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto

Introduction:

Carlsbad first documented Sea Level Rise (SLR) and associated increases in coastal erosion in a December 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment (2017 SLR Assessment). Prior planning activities (2010 Ponto Vision Plan – rejected by CA Coastal Commission, and 2015 General Plan Update) did not consider SLR and how SLR would impact Coastal Open Space Land Use & CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto. The 2017 SLR Assessment shows Open Space land and Open Space Land Uses are almost exclusively impacted by SLR at Ponto & South Coastal Carlsbad. The 2017 SLF Assessment also shows significant LOSS of Open Space land acreage and Land Uses. Most all impacted Open Space Land Uses are CA Coastal Act "High-Priority Coastal Land Uses" – Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations. Existing Ponto Open Space Land Uses are already very congested (non-existent/narrow beach) and very high, almost exclusionary, occupancy rates (Campground) due to existing population/visitor demands. Future population/visitor increases will make this demand situation worst. The significant permanent LOSS of existing Coastal Open Space land and Coastal Open Space Land Use (and land) due to SLR reduces existing supply and compounds Open Space congestion elsewhere. Prior Ponto planning did not consider, nor plan, for significant SLR and current/future "High-Priority" Coastal Open Space Land Use demands.


Open Space and City Park demand at Ponto:

Open Space at Ponto is primarily 'Constrained' as defined by the City's Growth Management Program (GMP), and cannot be counted in meeting the City's minimal 15% 'Unconstrained' GMP Open Space Standard. Per the GMP Open Space Standard, the developers of Ponto should have provided in their developments at least 30-acres of additional 'Unconstrained' GMP Open Space at Ponto. City GIS mapping data confirm 30-acres of GMP Standard Open Space is missing at Ponto (Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9).

The City of Carlsbad GIS Map on page 2 shows locations of Open Spaces at Ponto. This map and its corresponding tax parcel-based data file document Ponto's non-compliance with the GMP Open Space Standard. A summary of that City GIS data file is also on page 2. The City said Ponto's non-compliance with the GMP Open Space Standard was 'justified' by the City 'exempting' compliance with the Standard. The City 'justified' this 'exemption' for reasons that do not appear correct based on the City's GIS map and data on page 2, and by a review of 1986 aerial photography that shows most of Ponto as vacant land. The City in the Citywide Facilities Improvement Plan (CFIP) said 1) Ponto was already developed in 1986, or 2) Ponto in 1986 already provided 15% of the 'Unconstrained' land as GMP Standard Open Space. Both these 'justifications' for Ponto 'exemption' in the CFIP were not correct. The legality of the City 'exempting' Ponto developers from the GMP Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation.

The City proposes to continue to exempt future Ponto developers from providing the missing 30-acres of minimally required GMP Open Space, even though a change in Ponto Planning Area F land use from the current 'Non-Residential Reserve' Land Use requires comprehensive Amendment of the Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9 to account for a land use change. City exemption is subject of litigation.

Ponto (west of I-5 and South of Poinsettia Lane) currently has 1,025 homes that per Carlsbad's minimal Park Standard demand an 8-acre City Park. There is no City Park at Ponto. Coastal Southwest Carlsbad has an over 6.5 acre Park deficit that is being met 6-miles away in NW Carlsbad. Ponto is in the middle of 6-miles of Coastline without a City Coastal Park west of the rail corridor.



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.
- City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara had the same lagoon waters.
- City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?
- Why Ponto developers were never required to comply with the 15% Standard Open Space is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the 15% Growth Management Standard Open Space at Ponto

472 Acres
(197 Acres)
 275 Acres
X 15%
 41 Acres
(11 Acres)
30 Acres

Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 Constrained land excluded from GMP Open Space
 Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required
 GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data
Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

Sea Level Rise impacts on Open Space and Open Space Land Use Planning at Ponto:

The City's 2015 General Plan Update did not factor in the impacts of Sea Level Rise (SLR) on Ponto's Open Space land. In December 2017 the City conducted the first Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=33958>. The 2017 SLR Assessment is an initial baseline analysis, but it shows significant SLR impacts on Ponto Open Space. More follow-up analysis is being conducted to incorporate newer knowledge on SLR projections and coastal land erosion accelerated by SLR. Follow-up analysis may likely show SLR impacts occurring sooner and more extreme.

Troublingly the 2017 SLR Assessment shows SLR actually significantly reducing or eliminating Open Space land at Ponto. SLR is projected to only impact and eliminate Open Space lands and Open Space Land Use at Ponto. The loss of Ponto Open Space land and Land Use being at the State Campground, Beaches, and Batiquitos Lagoon shoreline. The losses of these Open Space lands and land uses would progress over time, and be a permanent loss. The 2017 SLR Assessment provides two time frames near-term 2050 that match with the Carlsbad General Plan, and the longer-term 'the next General Plan Update' time frame of 2100. One can think of these timeframes as the lifetimes of our children and their children (2050), and the lifetimes of our Grandchildren and their children (2100). SLR impact on Coastal Land Use and Coastal Land Use planning is a perpetual (permanent) impact that carries over from one Local Coastal Program (LCP) and City General Plan (GP) to the next Updated LCP and GP.

Following are excerpts from the 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment:

[Italicized text within brackets] is added data based on review of aerial photo maps in the Assessment.

Planning Zone 3 consists of the Southern Shoreline Planning Area and the Batiquitos Lagoon. Assets within this zone are vulnerable to inundation, coastal flooding and bluff erosion in both planning horizons (2050 and 2100). A summary of the vulnerability assessment rating is provided in Table 5. A discussion of the vulnerability and risk assessment is also provided for each asset category.

5.3.1. Beaches

Approximately 14 acres of beach area is projected to be impacted by inundation/erosion in 2050. ... Beaches in this planning area are backed by unarmored coastal bluffs. Sand derived from the natural erosion of the bluff as sea levels rise may be adequate to sustain beach widths, thus, beaches in this reach were assumed to have a moderate adaptive capacity. The overall vulnerability rating for beaches is moderate for 2050.

Vulnerability is rated moderate for the 2100 horizon due to the significant amount of erosion expected as the beaches are squeezed between rising sea levels and bluffs. Assuming the bluffs are unarmored in the future, sand derived from bluff erosion may sustain some level of beaches in this planning area. A complete loss of beaches poses a high risk to the city as the natural barrier from storm waves is lost as well as a reduction in beach access, recreation and the economic benefits the beaches provide.

5.3.3. State Parks

A majority of the South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds (separated into four parcels) were determined to be exposed to bluff erosion by the 2050 sea level rise scenario (moderate exposure). This resource is considered to have a high sensitivity since bluff erosion could significantly impair usage of the facilities. Though economic impacts to the physical structures within South Carlsbad State Beach would be relatively low, the loss of this park would be significant since adequate space for the park to move inland is not available (low adaptive capacity). State

parcs was assigned a high vulnerability in the 2050 planning horizon. State park facilities are recognized as important assets to the city in terms of economic and recreation value as well as providing low-cost visitor serving amenities. This vulnerability poses a high risk to coastal access, recreation, and tourism opportunities in this planning area.

In 2100, bluff erosion of South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds become more severe and the South Ponto State Beach day-use area becomes exposed to coastal flooding during extreme events. The sensitivity of the South Ponto day-use area is low because impacts to usage will be temporary and no major damage to facilities would be anticipated. Vulnerability and risk to State Parks remains high by 2100 due to the impacts to South Carlsbad State Beach in combination with flooding impacts to South Ponto.

Table 5: Planning Zone 3 Vulnerability Assessment Summary [condensed & notated]:

| <u>Asset Category</u> | <u>Horizon [time]</u> | <u>Hazard Type</u> | <u>Impacted Assets</u> | <u>Vulnerability Rating</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Beaches | 2050 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 14 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 54 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| Public Access | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 6 access points 4,791 feet of trails | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 10 access points 14,049 feet of trails | Moderate |
| State Parks [Campground - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations] | 2050 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [<18 Acres] | High |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [>18 Acres] [loss of over 50% of the campground & its Low-cost Visitor Accommodations , See Figure 5.] | High |
| Transportation (Road, Bike, Pedestrian) | 2050 | Bluff Erosion | 1,383 linear feet | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 11,280 linear feet | High |
| Environmentally Sensitive Lands | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 572 acres | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 606 acres | High |




Figure 7: Southern Shoreline Planning Area – Year 2050






Figure 5: CoSMoS Bluff Erosion Projections by 2100
(CoSMoS-COAST 2015)

[Figure 5 show the loss of over 50% of the campground and campground sites with a minimal .2 meter Sea Level Rise (SLR), and potentially the entire campground (due to loss of access road) in 2 meter SLF.]

Directions to analyze and correct current and future LOSS of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto

On July 3, 2017 the CA Coastal Commission provided direction to Carlsbad stating:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto ... area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad. ... this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”

Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests (PRR 2017-260, et. al.) confirmed the Existing LCP and its Ponto specific existing LUP polices and Zoning regulations were never followed in the City’s prior Ponto planning activities (i.e. 2010 Ponto Vision Plan & 2015 General Plan Update). The projected SLR loss of recreation (beach) and low-cost visitor accommodations (campground) at Ponto should factor in this Existing LCP required analysis, and a LCP-LUP for Ponto and Ponto Planning Area F.

In a February 11, 2020 City Council Staff Report City Staff stated:

“On March 14, 2017, the City Council approved the General Plan Lawsuit Settlement Agreement (Agreement) between City of Carlsbad and North County Advocates (NCA). Section 4.3.15 of the Agreement requires the city to continue to consider and evaluate properties for potential acquisition of open space and use good faith efforts to acquire those properties.”

In 2020 NCA recommended the City acquire Ponto Planning Area F as Open Space. The status of City processing that recommendation is unclear. However the Lawsuit Settlement Agreement and NCA's recommendation to the City should also be considered in the required Existing LCP analysis.

Summary:

Tragically Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) is actually planning to both SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE Coastal Open Space acreage, and to eliminate 'High-Priority Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto due to SLR.

The Existing LCP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F to analyze the deficit of Coastal Open Space Land Use should factor in the currently planned LOSS of both Coastal Open Space acreage and Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto due to SLR. As a long-range Coastal Land Use Plan this required LCP analysis needs to also consider the concurrent future increases in both population and visitor demand for those LOST Coastal Open Space acres and Coastal Open Space Land Uses.

It is very troubling that demand for these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses is increasing at the same time the current (near/at capacity) supply of these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses is significantly decreasing due to SLR. Instead of planning for long-term sustainability of these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses for future generations there appears to be a plan to use SLR and inappropriate (lower-priority residential) Coastal Land Use planning to forever remove those CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses from Ponto. CA Coastal Act Policies to address these issues should be thoroughly considered.

2021-2 proposed Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) will likely result in City and CA Coastal Commission making updates to the 2015 General Plan, based on the existing Ponto Planning Area F LCP – LUP Policy requirements, Ponto Open Space issues, high-priority Coastal Land Use needs, and SLR issues not addressed in the 2015 General Plan.

Mick Calarco

Subject: Our Home Our Future citizen input - Why a park is needed within walking distance to multifamily housing & why a meaningful Coastal Park is needed for Ponto/South Carlsbad - public input to DLCPA, Housing and Park planning

Attachments: IMG_20210709_085653863_HDR.jpg; IMG_20210710_124544688.jpg

Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 8:20 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'McDonell, Glenn' <Glenn.McDonell@asm.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>

Subject: Our Home Our Future citizen input - Why a park is needed within walking distance to multifamily housing & why a meaningful Coastal Park is needed for Ponto/South Carlsbad - public input to DLCPA, Housing and Park planning

Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Housing Commission, Planning Commission, and Park Commission; and CA Coastal Commission and HCD:

The following is citizen feedback on Carlsbad's 9-13-21 email to 'Give input on locations for future housing'. It is also for consideration in Carlsbad's Draft LCP and Parks Master Plan Amendment Processes.

At the very heart of these comments is: There is finite vacant land in Carlsbad and an even smaller figment of Vacant Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This small amount of is getting smaller due to documented coastal erosion and sea level rise. Over 32 acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space Lance Use will be lost at Ponto/South Carlsbad. This very small finite vacant Coastal land is all we have to provide for the "infinite" demands for high-priority Coastal Recreation and Low-cost access to the Coast land uses from this "infinite" amount of future generations of Carlsbad and inland cities residents; and of outside Visitors to Carlsbad's Coast. How Carlsbad, and the CA Coastal Commission and HCD, uses those precious finite fragments of vacant Coastal Land is the vital question. Since 2017 Carlsbad citizens have been asking the Council for a true, honest, open and comprehensive consideration of these issues at Ponto. Over 4,500 emails have been sent to the Council, many City Budget Workshop requests, Hours of public testimony, and hundreds of pages of documents facts gained via official Carlsbad Public Records Requests.

The proposed land use changes to high density R-23 for the 8 properties of Site 18, seem to be being operating in a 'incomplete policy silo' that only looks at affordable housing and is not considering needed City Park and wider Coastal Land Use issues at Ponto. This 'policy silo process' seems to be counter to the wise consideration and use of the last remaining vacant and redevelopable Coastal land – particularly at Ponto/South Carlsbad.

Having managed creation of a Coastal City General Plan and several Housing Elements I understand and sympathize with the challenges City Staff and Council face in trying to provide for unlimited high-density residential development growth,

but we need to look at preserving vacant land to provide needed City Parks to balance these high-density developments and provide needed Parks for these homes that have no/little yards. But it seems, as citizens have asked since 2017, there is better way to address those challenges.

The 9/13/21 City email states:

- “The city needs to identify locations for about 2,600 new homes to fulfill the state’s requirement that all cities in the region provide enough housing to meet anticipated needs. Most of these homes **need to be affordable for people with moderate to low incomes, according to state formulas for household income levels.**”

Input: Per pages 33-34 of 3/23/21 2020 Housing Element Annual Progress Report to the Carlsbad City Council stated that:

“Prices of Affordable Housing – Generally, the federal and state rule is that housing is affordable to a given family if the family pays no more than 30% of its monthly income for housing expenses that include the rent or mortgage payment, property taxes, insurance, utilities, and the like.”

The staff report then documents that a home in Carlsbad to be affordable to Low and Moderate Incomes, requires the following home sale or rental prices:

“Table 3: CY 2020 qualifying rent and utility expenses by number of bedrooms

| <u>Income Group</u> | <u>Number of bedrooms</u> | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | <u>1 bedroom</u> | <u>2 bedrooms</u> | <u>3 bedrooms</u> | <u>4 bedrooms</u> |
| Very Low | \$1,155 | \$1,444 | \$1,675 | \$1,906 |
| Low | \$1,849 | \$2,310 | \$2,680 | \$3,050 |
| Moderate | \$2,225 | \$2,781 | \$3,226 | \$3,671 |
| Above Moderate | > \$2,225 | > \$ 2,781 | > \$ 3,226 | > \$ 3,671 |

Source: "Household Income Limits 2020", City of Carlsbad (effective April 30, 2020)”

And the “for Sale Prices that are Affordable” for each income group:

| <u>Area Median Income</u> | <u>2020 Annual Income</u> | <u>Affordable Purchase Price</u> |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Very Low (30% to 50%) | \$34,651 to \$57,750 | \$82,001 to \$186,000 |
| Low (50% to 80%) | \$57,751 to \$92,400 | \$186,001 to \$342,000 |
| Moderate (80% to 120%) | \$92,401 to \$111,250 | \$342,001 to \$510,000 |
| Above Moderate | \$111,251 or above | \$510,001 and above” |

However, Carlsbad developers seeking to justify increase residential density site in the name of ‘Affordability’ to Low or Moderate incomes are not providing homes that meet these affordable rents or purchase prices. Carlsbad’s land use regulations that promote larger unit sizes and building height and bulk work in the opposite direction and instead promote Above Moderate housing as clearly evidenced in Carlsbad’s Village where housing developed at 28-35 dwelling units per acre (that should be affordable to Low Incomes – i.e. 1-4 bedroom rent at \$1,849 - \$3,050, and at sales or purchase prices from \$186,001 to \$342,000) are instead being sold for \$1.8 to \$3 million as seen in the following:

RECENT SALES

| | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2687 State Street |  | 2683 State Street |  |
| | 2 Bed 2.5 Bath 2,022 Sq. Ft. SOLD \$1,846,500 | | 3 Bed + Bonus Room 2 Bath 2,143 Sq. Ft. SOLD \$1,800,000 |
| 2677 State Street, 301 |  | 2677 State Street, 302 |  |
| | 2 Bed + Office Space 2.5 Bath 2,150 Sq. Ft. SOLD \$2,250,000 | | 3 Bed 3.5 Bath 2,717 Sq. Ft. SOLD \$3,000,000 |

This data is not a criticism of expensive housing or developers seeking to maximize their profits.

It simply shows that Carlsbad's land use regulations and 'Affordability quid-pro-quo for increasing land use density' are not functioning as intended to promote Affordability. Carlsbad's land use approach is simply increasing developer profit that serves to drive up land costs (land is a residual cost in land use development pro formas) and thus works to instead reduce Affordability. Simply changing land use to increase dwelling unit density to R23 or R-28-35 to provide "Affordable Housing is not really true.

It is suggested that with a change in land use to increase density should be a commitment recorded on the land to actually provide the number of Affordable units being cited as the rationale for increasing the density. This is an honest and accurate 'Affordable quid pro quo'. This commitment, along with land use regulation reform, will help reduce speculative land costs that discourage Affordability.

Citizens are being inaccurately told that density increases are needed to provide Affordability yet developers do not create, nor are not required to create, those Affordable units.

Unaccountable density increases do however create more speculative developer profits, and increase land costs. Density increases also increases the need for City Parks (high density by its nature depends on City Parks and Open Space for livability) along with other City services and infrastructure. Yet unaccountable density increases not does not provide actual Affordable housing. So at the next City Housing Element even more Affordable Housing will be required since the prior unaccountable density increases did not create it. During this unaccountable process vacant land disappears. That vacant land is vitally needed to provide City Parks to balance and provide useable park space for residents in high density apartments/condos.

The City Staff's documents that one of the Site 18 land owners/developers are requesting an increase in land use density to R-23 that is to provide housing Affordable to Moderate Incomes. Yet there is no developer

commitment or City requirement to create the numbers of Moderate Income housing identified in City Staff's Site 18 documentation.

There is no accessible City Park in the area to provide the needed City Park and open space needed for higher density development – the 'Veterans Park solution is 6-miles away and is effectively unusable for citizens at Ponto.

- "We'd like your input on 18 proposed locations for future housing chosen based on public input gathered last year."

Input: Site 18, was not a site 'chosen based on public input gathered last year', but was just recently chosen by a speculative developers of Site 18. As staff documents: "Staff has received a letter from one property owner expressing support for higher density." Site 18 consists of 8 properties, so it is unclear if all 8 properties are requesting higher density. Site 18 is being proposed as a "Moderate Income housing site" (i.e. a site that will provide 90 dwelling units [DU] affordable to Moderate Incomes as noted in the City Staff's analysis:

"Potential Housing: Site 18

Site Description: Vacant

Property Name: North Ponto Parcels

Site Group Acres: 5.9

Potential units site can accommodate (all parcels): 90

Income Category: Moderate (based on proposed minimum density)"

There is no copy of the 'letter' showing an accountable Affordable rational or developer commitment, or a requirement by the City that Site 18 will be developed and rented or sold to provide the 90 dwellings Affordable to Moderate Income as noted above. If the Site 18 developers would commit to recording providing that affordability it would be a responsible and accountable Affordability quid pro quo for consideration.

- The City Staff report also does not discuss the various land uses changes to increase density in a properly holistic or fully comprehensive planning way. All sites should be compared on all the key metrics for suitability. For high density housing, the most fundamental metric is walkability to a meaningful City Park for outdoor recreation and breathing room. This is fundamental in that high density housing, by definition has little/no park and recreational open space - high density means many people living on a small area of land. High density without significant large and usable City Parks within walking distance simply creates dense urban environments that over time will not sustain quality of life.

In addition for Site 18 and other at the Coast locations there are other land use demands of large inland populations or families and visitors come to the Coast and increase even more demands for City Parks. A comprehensibly considered Coastal Land Use Plan needs to assure vacant and redevelopable lands along the Coast provide sufficient Park land acreage for local Park needs (i.e. high density development requires

more Park acreage), but also to provide extra Park acreage to address the Park needs of hundreds of thousands of inland residents and visitors to the Coast. Densifying the Coast with high density residential development runs counter to this need for Coastal Parks.

The following email and attached images were submitted on 9/8/21 that illustrate the City Parks needs generated by R-23 higher density and why it is important to provide meaningful City Parks within walking distance to higher density development.

Thank you for your consideration. You say it is Our Home Our Future. We hope you do the right thing for present and future generations of Carlsbad and CA citizens and visitors. Please do not let short-term and short sighted silo thinking lead to a bad decisions on the use of the last bit of vacant coastal land.

Respectfully,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 11:55 AM
To: 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'scott.donnell@carlsbadca.gov'
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'; Mehmood, Sohab@HCD (Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov); McDougall, Paul@HCD (Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov); 'McDonell, Glenn'; Moran, Gina@Parks (Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov); Smith, Darren@Parks (Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov); Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov)
Subject: Why a park is needed within walking distance to multifamily housing & why a meaningful Coastal Park is needed for Ponto/South Carlsbad - public input to DLCPA, Housing and Park planning

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Commission and Housing Commission; and CA Coastal Commission:

I request this email and attachments be provided as official public input to the Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, Housing Element land use changes, Parks Master Plan Amendment, and land use activities at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad.

For many years Carlsbad and People for Ponto Citizens have been trying to communicate the need for a meaningful Coastal Park for South Carlsbad. There is NO City Coastal Park west of I-5/rail corridor in South Carlsbad (yet there are 10 such City Parks totaling over 35 acres in North Carlsbad). The Citizens and visitors to South Carlsbad have No Coastal Park, and Ponto is the last vacant unplanned Coastal land left to provide this needed Coastal Park.

The attached images of high-density housing (R-23) in Carlsbad clearly illustrate why City Parks are needed within walking distance to multifamily housing. It also illustrates why meaningful Coastal Parks are needed to provide Coastal Recreation for a unlimited growing population that will primarily be housed by high-density housing that minimizes outdoor recreation space.

High-density housing, by definition, provides minimal outdoor recreation space per dwelling unit. So City Parks are the only meaningful sized areas where high-density housing occupants (particularly Children) can have room to play. This is particularly critical in regards to Coastal Parks, as Coastal Parks absorb the Coastal Park demands/needs from significant large inland and visitor populations. This critical need is made all the more serious given sea level rise and coastal erosion impacts to Coastal Open Space.

The State of California is advancing dense high-density housing to promote affordability, yet most of the benefits of simply increasing density tend to result in increasing developer profit margins and thus increase residual land costs as Carlsbad has seen in Carlsbad Village. The State of California Housing Law currently does not address the logical and concurrent need to both increase City Park acreage and equitably distribute that City Park acreage within walking distance to housing – particularly high-density housing.

Having a City Park within a 10-minute walk from high-density housing is vital for the long-term viability, livability, and quality of life for high-density housing and the citizens and families that live in this housing. Hopefully the City of Carlsbad can advance the concurrent increase in City Park acreage and 10-minute walk accessibility in its Coastal land use, land use, housing, and parks plans.

As a former city, coastal and urban planner having worked in high-density situations I have several planning policy ideas that maybe helpful if the City Council would like to discuss them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lance Schulte

From: City of Carlsbad [<mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com>] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad
Sent: Thursday, September 2, 2021 4:39 PM
To: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: Give input on locations for future housing



Give input on locations for future housing

The City of Carlsbad is seeking input on where new housing units could be built in Carlsbad to satisfy a state requirement that cities accommodate their fair share of the region’s housing needs, including homes for people of all income levels and stages of life. Eighteen proposed locations were chosen based on public input gathered last year, input from a citizens advisory committee and direction from the City Council.

Of the 3,900 new housing units that make up Carlsbad’s fair share, about 2,100 need to be affordable for people with very low to moderate incomes. The city had already identified vacant residential locations and planned housing

projects to help meet the state's housing requirement, but it wasn't enough to meet the need for 3,900 units.

[Review sites on an online map.](#)

Community members have three ways to provide feedback:

Survey

An [online survey](#) will be available through Oct. 1.

Virtual public workshops (held via Zoom)

Wednesday, Sept. 15, 5:30 to 7 p.m. | [Register here](#)

Wednesday, Sept. 22, 5:30 to 7 p.m. | [Register here](#)

City staff will provide an overview of the city's housing plan update process and how the potential housing sites were selected. Participants will then break into smaller groups to ask questions and provide input on the potential locations.

*Persons with a disability may request meeting materials in appropriate alternative formats as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Reasonable accommodations and auxiliary aids will be provided to effectively allow participation in the meeting(s). Please contact Sue Armstrong at 760-434-5352 (voice), 711 (free relay service for TTY users) or sue.armstrong@carlsbadca.gov at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to discuss accessibility needs.

Comments via mail or email by Oct. 22

Scott Donnell, Senior Planner, Community Development

1635 Faraday Ave., Carlsbad, CA 92008

scott.donnell@carlsbadca.gov

The city is seeking input on proposed sites that would need to be rezoned, either to allow housing where it's not allowed today or increase the number of units allowed on sites already zoned for housing. Owners and people living within 600 feet of all the potentially affected properties have been notified by mail of the potential rezoning.

The city would not build housing on these sites. Instead, the city's obligation is to identify space for housing and create policies that would facilitate new housing to be built based on different income levels and stages of life.

Next steps

City staff will update the map of proposed sites based on community input and then share it with the City Council in early 2022 for approval to move forward with the environmental review of those sites.

- Sept. 2 - Oct. 22, 2021: Public input on potential sites for future housing
- Early 2022: City Council public meeting to receive input and consider endorsing final map(s) for environmental review
- Spring 2022 - Winter 2022/2023: Environmental review of housing sites and public input on environmental analysis document

Background

The City of Carlsbad has updated its housing plan, something required by state law to ensure the city is meeting the housing needs of all members of the community. The new plan includes policies designed to encourage the number and types of housing the state requires. It also identifies locations where new housing could be built. In all, the City of Carlsbad needs to show how about 3,900 housing units could be built over the next eight years to meet state requirements.

Learn more

- [Map of potential housing sites](#)
- [Approved housing plan](#) (policies and strategies)
- [Housing plan update website](#)
- Scott Donnell, senior planner, scott.donnell@carlsbadca.gov, 760-602-4618



Visit the Website



City of Carlsbad | 1200 Carlsbad Village Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

[Unsubscribe info@peopleforponto.com](mailto:info@peopleforponto.com)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by planning@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*





Mick Calarco

Subject: 10-12-21 Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment - 3 choices and supporting data
Attachments: Council's 3 LCP choices for Ponto Planning Area F - 2021-10-12b.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, October 8, 2021 3:12 PM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; Assemblymember.BoernerHorvath@assembly.ca.gov; 'Chin, Janet' <Janet.Chin@asm.ca.gov>; 'McDonell, Glenn' <Glenn.McDonell@asm.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: 10-12-21 Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment - 3 choices and supporting data

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions; CA Coastal Commission and HCD; and Assembly member Boerner-Horvath:

Please include this email as official public input in the City Council and CCC consideration of the City of Carlsbad's proposed Draft LCP Amendment. As noted in your staff report you have a few choices. The Staff report however should have clearly communicated to Citizens and you the 2017 direction the CA Coastal Staff provided the City regarding Ponto Planning Area F. Below is a recommendation for the wise, fair, legal and overwhelming Citizen requested choice.

As individual citizen representatives you are accountable for your choices. As summarized below you have been provided by the citizens you are elected to represent thousands of petitions, pages and hours of public testimony supporting by documented data from over 50 official City public records requests.

We hope you listen and do the right thing to Develop Ponto Right.

From a historical context, you should see the images below from the prior Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park (Samis) LCP. Land Use for Ponto Planning Area F was Travel Services & General Commercial, and there was an adjacent "12.8-acre Coastal Recreation Land Use" that was eliminated. Both these prior LCP land uses would have provided the much needed Coastal Recreation and Open Space Land use that is currently missing in South Carlsbad/Ponto.

Please also note that South Carlsbad/Ponto is in the center of a 6-mile stretch of coastline without a Coastal Park west of the I-5/Rail corridor. Ponto Planning Area F is the last significant vacant unplanned Coastal land.

Below are your 3 choices and data supporting those choices. We hope you honestly consider these in representing Carlsbad Citizens, and in concern for CA citizens and visitors to our coast.

Respectfully,
Lance Schulte

Each Councilperson's 3 LCP choices for Ponto Planning Area F

There is a lot of data and citizen desire/input regarding Ponto Planning Area F Coastal Land Use. However there are only 3 choices each councilmember (individually and collectively) will have in representing citizens' desires. As Citizen Representatives each councilmember is responsible and accountable for considering the data and desires Citizens have provided. Based on attendance at all relevant City meetings on Ponto, multiple community meetings and communications over the years the order of what the citizens are requesting of their Council and what the data supports are:

1st Choice: Change Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Map and Master Plan Zoning to provide for the two "High-priority Coastal Land Uses" identified in in the Existing LCP – Coastal Recreation and/or Low-cost Visitor Accommodations. Both these two Land Uses are designated Open Space in Carlsbad's General Plan.

LCP public input with documented supporting data supporting this 1st priority choice:

- 29 page Coastal Recreation land use data file
- 7 page Low-Cost Visitor Accommodation land use data file
- 5 page Planning Area F Existing LCP LUP & CCC direction data file
- 7 page Sea Level Rise & Carlsbad's LCP projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto data file
- 19 page Public Comments on July 13, 2021 Item #14 staff report to the City Council data
- 7 page 2021 July 13 Council meeting: missing Staff Report topics data file
- 3 page General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits Analysis of Ponto Park and Promenade
- 5,000+ written/emailed petitions to the Council & CA Coastal Commission requesting this choice
- Letters from Carlsbad visitor industry, Surfrider Foundation, and Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation
- Open Space recommendations from North County Advocates per City's lawsuit settlement
- City Council and CA Housing & Community Development removing Planning Area F from the housing site inventory in the Certified 2021-29 Housing Element
- City Council initiating Citizen input on a rethinking of how to land use plan Carlsbad's little remaining vacant lands given State mandates for unlimited population growth in Carlsbad and addressing Sea Level Rise impacts. Citizen input has yet to begin on Growth Management 2.0 needs, PCH Relocation feasibility/desirability, funding solutions to Sea Level Rise impacts to Coastal Recreation & Low-cost Visitor Accommodations, and more citizen input on Parks Master Plan Update.
- Documentation the City has not followed current LCP Land Use Plan Policies regarding both Coastal Parks and Low-Cost Campground expansion
- The 2016 & 2017 CA Coastal Commission Communications to the City regarding Planning Area F
- Current litigation against the City regarding non-compliance with Park and Open Space Standards maybe could be addressed in some ways with this choice

2nd Choice: Do nothing to change Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Master Plan Zoning. This do nothing choice retains all land use options while the City works to define and decide on its very important Growth Management 2.0, PCH Relocation, funded solutions to Sea Level Rise impacts to both Coastal Recreation & Low-cost Visitor Accommodations projects, and more Citizen input on Parks Master Plan Update. These 4 projects will define how the City will forever use its last few remaining vacant parcels of land – particularly Coastal Land. Doing nothing to change the Ponto Planning Area F LCP, makes sense in keeping all options open while the Citizens and the City work on these 4 projects.

LCP public input with documented supporting data supporting this 2nd priority choice:

- All the supporting data in the above 1st choice seems also relevant for this 2nd choice.

3rd Choice: Change Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Master Plan Zoning as requested by the speculative land developer in their 2016 development applications to change the LCP and Master Plan. City staff has chosen to basically represent the developer’s requested changes to you as staff’s recommendations to you. This choice would eliminate “High-priority Coastal Land Uses”, and instead provide lower-priority residential land use that is already the predominate land use in Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone. This choice eliminates the last meaningful and cost effective land use option for the City to address critical future South Carlsbad Coastal Land Use needs. This choice may prove very costly. This choice is basically the antithesis of Choices 1 and 2.

LCP public input with documented supporting data supporting this 3rd priority choice:

- There appears little to no documented data supporting this choice:
 - The site is not required for housing. City Council and CA Housing & Community Development have removed Planning Area F from the housing site inventory in the Certified 2021-29 Housing Element
 - Documented data listed in Choice 1 above also does not support Choice 3.
 - Carlsbad’s Ponto Vision Plan’s Land Use Plan is the foundation and basis for Carlsbad’s General Plan at Ponto. This land use plan was specifically denied by the CA Coastal Commission, due to Planning Area F land use issues. Official City of Carlsbad public records requests failed to provide documents that the City of Carlsbad lawfully informed, discussed, considered and documented with Citizens Planning Area F’s existing LCP Land Use Policy requirements before proposing to change Planning Area F’s “Non-residential Reserve” Coastal Land Use.
 - There is no discernable and documented Citizen support for choice 3. The 5,000+ written/emailed petitions to the Council & CA Coastal Commission in fact have been opposed to choice 3.
- There is data in the form of opinions from the speculative developer’s attorney. The developer’s attorney is paid to support choice 3 - the developer’s proposed land use and zoning change. However that attorney appears to be misrepresenting facts to the Council and City such as:
 - Falsely denying developer discussions with the citizen created 501c3 corporation on purchasing Planning Area F. The Coast News reported on this 6-months ago.
 - Inaccurately communicating another sale to a developer when none occurred
 - Inaccurately saying they are actively processing their proposed 2016 LCP and Zoning change and development applications and EIR when they had in fact stopped all processing in February 2019. They did however in April 2021 file a SB330 pre-application, but since then appear have not implemented that pre-application. The pre-application expires in Oct 2021.


- Inaccurately communicating to the Council a threat of lawsuit against the City over both City and CA Housing & Community Development adoption of the 2021-2029 Housing Element that removed Planning Area F as a needed housing site. No lawsuit is known to be had been filed.
- Incomplete and inaccurate references to SB330, specifically regarding the City Council's and CA Coastal Commission's clear legal authority under SB 330 and other State laws to change land use and zoning, particularly land use changes in furtherance of CA Coastal Act Policies. The CA Coastal Act and the Act's Policies will be used to determine Planning Area F's appropriate land use in the LCP.
- The lack of clarity on whom the attorney represents - 'LSF5 Carlsbad Holdings LLC' and/or 'Shopoff' the prior proposed developer of Planning Area F. Shopoff quitclaimed interest in Planning Area F over 2.5 years ago on 2/11/2019. The Attorney was Shopoff's attorney, and Shopoff still shows Planning Area F on their website as their "Land" project. It is understood that Shopoff et. al. has been a notable financial contributor to Carlsbad political campaigns.
- The lack of clarity as to who are the members of 'LSF5 Carlsbad Holdings LLC'? The LLC is registered in Delaware and Bermuda for apparent secrecy and tax purposes. Do those LLC members have any undisclosed relationships of concern within the City of Carlsbad?

Legal status: All 3 choices are allowed under CA State Law. All 3 choices do not prohibit the speculative developer from pursuing their 2016 applications to request from both the City and CCC the speculative developer's proposed LCP and Zoning change. All 3 choices provide the speculative developer with a reasonable economic use of the property consistent with the US Constitution and State Law, and there would be no 'taking of the property' when that is the case.

The speculative developer purchased the property in 2007 with a "Non-residential Reserve" land use as shown in the Existing LCP Land Use Policy. The speculative developer did not purchase land with R-23 land use. Speculative developers are not guaranteed City or CCC approval of their profit motivated proposed speculative land use changes under the law.

Carlsbad has many privately owned, operated and profitable land uses that are consistent with the CA Coastal Act's High-Priority Coastal Land Uses. Many are in the San Diego region and Coastal Zone.

In fact the prior Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP for this area included a 12.8-acre privately owned and managed "Recreation Commercial" area of Coastal Recreation land use. This data was provided to the Council in the '19 page Public Comments on July 13, 2021 Item #14 staff report to the City Council data' listed In Choice 1. As noted then and shown in the 2 images below the privately owned Coastal Recreation land use was also the significant part of the developer's compliance with the City's required Growth Management Program "Unconstrained" Open Space Standard at Ponto:



GENERAL PLAN BATIQUITOS LAGOON EDUCATIONAL PARK

SAMMIS PROPERTIES

PLANNING AREA I: HEALTH/RECREATION CENTER (12.8 ACRES)

Description: The recreation center could provide a wide variety of sports-and-health-related activities. Included within the Planning Area are a gymnasium, pool, sports fields, tennis courts, nutrition/sports injury clinic, health center, day care center and student union/book store. The gymnasium will serve as a training facility for members of the U.S. Olympic Team during normal business hours and be open to the public during the evening and on weekends.

Use Allocation:

Maximum of Seven tennis courts
Maximum of 60,000 s.f. gymnasium
Maximum of 10,000 s.f. day care center
Maximum of 600 s.f. tennis building
Swimming pool and sports fields
Maximum of 29,200 s.f. health club/sports injury clinic/nutrition center
Maximum of 22,000 s.f. student oriented commercial

Permitted Uses: The following uses are allowed within the Recreation Center Planning Area: Indoor and outdoor participant and spectator sports which may include pools, tennis courts, racquetball courts, a gymnasium, locker rooms and sports fields. Also permitted are a health club/sports injury clinic/nutrition center, student union/book store and any other related uses as determined to be consistent by the Land Use Manager.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Each Councilperson's 3 LCP choices for Ponto Planning Area F

There is a lot of data and citizen desire/input regarding Ponto Planning Area F Coastal Land Use. However there are only 3 choices each councilmember (individually and collectively) will have in representing citizens' desires. As Citizen Representatives each councilmember is responsible and accountable for considering the data and desires Citizens have provided. Based on attendance at all relevant City meetings on Ponto, multiple community meetings and communications over the years the order of what the citizens are requesting of their Council and what the data supports are:

1st Choice: Change Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Map and Master Plan Zoning to provide for the two "High-priority Coastal Land Uses" identified in in the Existing LCP – Coastal Recreation and/or Low-cost Visitor Accommodations. Both these two Land Uses are designated Open Space in Carlsbad's General Plan.

LCP public input with documented supporting data supporting this 1st priority choice:

- 29 page Coastal Recreation land use data file
- 7 page Low-Cost Visitor Accommodation land use data file
- 5 page Planning Area F Existing LCP LUP & CCC direction data file
- 7 page Sea Level Rise & Carlsbad's LCP projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto data file
- 19 page Public Comments on July 13, 2021 Item #14 staff report to the City Council data
- 7 page 2021 July 13 Council meeting: missing Staff Report topics data file
- 3 page General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits Analysis of Ponto Park and Promenade
- 5,000+ written/emailed petitions to the Council & CA Coastal Commission requesting this choice
- Letters from Carlsbad visitor industry, Surfrider Foundation, and Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation
- Open Space recommendations from North County Advocates per City's lawsuit settlement
- City Council and CA Housing & Community Development removing Planning Area F from the housing site inventory in the Certified 2021-29 Housing Element
- City Council initiating Citizen input on a rethinking of how to land use plan Carlsbad's little remaining vacant lands given State mandates for unlimited population growth in Carlsbad and addressing Sea Level Rise impacts. Citizen input has yet to begin on Growth Management 2.0 needs, PCH Relocation feasibility/desirability, funding solutions to Sea Level Rise impacts to Coastal Recreation & Low-cost Visitor Accommodations, and more citizen input on Parks Master Plan Update.
- Documentation the City has not followed current LCP Land Use Plan Policies regarding both Coastal Parks and Low-Cost Campground expansion
- The 2016 & 2017 CA Coastal Commission Communications to the City regarding Planning Area F
- Current litigation against the City regarding non-compliance with Park and Open Space Standards maybe could be addressed in some ways with this choice

2nd Choice: Do nothing to change Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Master Plan Zoning. This do nothing choice retains all land use options while the City works to define and decide on its very important Growth Management 2.0, PCH Relocation, funded solutions to Sea Level Rise impacts to both Coastal Recreation & Low-cost Visitor Accommodations projects, and more Citizen input on Parks Master Plan Update. These 4 projects will define how the City will forever use its last few remaining vacant parcels of land – particularly Coastal Land. Doing nothing to change the Ponto Planning Area F LCP, makes sense in keeping all options open while the Citizens and the City work on these 4 projects.

LCP public input with documented supporting data supporting this 2nd priority choice:

- All the supporting data in the above 1st choice seems also relevant for this 2nd choice.

3rd Choice: Change Ponto Planning Area F LCP Land Use Policy and Master Plan Zoning as requested by the speculative land developer in their 2016 development applications to change the LCP and Master Plan. City staff has chosen to basically represent the developer's requested changes to you as staff's recommendations to you. This choice would eliminate "High-priority Coastal Land Uses", and instead provide lower-priority residential land use that is already the predominate land use in Carlsbad's Coastal Zone. This choice eliminates the last meaningful and cost effective land use option for the City to address critical future South Carlsbad Coastal Land Use needs. This choice may prove very costly. This choice is basically the antithesis of Choices 1 and 2.

LCP public input with documented supporting data supporting this 3rd priority choice:

- There appears little to no documented data supporting this choice:
 - The site is not required for housing. City Council and CA Housing & Community Development have removed Planning Area F from the housing site inventory in the Certified 2021-29 Housing Element
 - Documented data listed in Choice 1 above also does not support Choice 3.
 - Carlsbad's Ponto Vision Plan's Land Use Plan is the foundation and basis for Carlsbad's General Plan at Ponto. This land use plan was specifically denied by the CA Coastal Commission, due to Planning Area F land use issues. Official City of Carlsbad public records requests failed to provide documents that the City of Carlsbad lawfully informed, discussed, considered and documented with Citizens Planning Area F's existing LCP Land Use Policy requirements before proposing to change Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" Coastal Land Use.
 - There is no discernable and documented Citizen support for choice 3. The 5,000+ written/emailed petitions to the Council & CA Coastal Commission in fact have been opposed to choice 3.
- There is data in the form of opinions from the speculative developer's attorney. The developer's attorney is paid to support choice 3 - the developer's proposed land use and zoning change. However that attorney appears to be misrepresenting facts to the Council and City such as:


- Falsely denying developer discussions with the citizen created 501c3 corporation on purchasing Planning Area F. The Coast News reported on this 6-months ago.
- Inaccurately communicating another sale to a developer when none occurred
- Inaccurately saying they are actively processing their proposed 2016 LCP and Zoning change and development applications and EIR when they had in fact stopped all processing in February 2019. They did however in April 2021 file a SB330 pre-application, but since then appear have not implemented that pre-application. The pre-application expires in Oct 2021.
- Inaccurately communicating to the Council a threat of lawsuit against the City over both City and CA Housing & Community Development adoption of the 2021-2029 Housing Element that removed Planning Area F as a needed housing site. No lawsuit is known to be had been filed.
- Incomplete and inaccurate references to SB330, specifically regarding the City Council's and CA Coastal Commission's clear legal authority under SB 330 and other State laws to change land use and zoning, particularly land use changes in furtherance of CA Coastal Act Policies. The CA Coastal Act and the Act's Policies will be used to determine Planning Area F's appropriate land use in the LCP.
- The lack of clarity on whom the attorney represents - 'LSF5 Carlsbad Holdings LLC' and/or 'Shopoff' the prior proposed developer of Planning Area F. Shopoff quitclaimed interest in Planning Area F over 2.5 years ago on 2/11/2019. The Attorney was Shopoff's attorney, and Shopoff still shows Planning Area F on their website as their "Land" project. It is understood that Shopoff et. al. has been a notable financial contributor to Carlsbad political campaigns.
- The lack of clarity as to who are the members of 'LSF5 Carlsbad Holdings LLC'? The LLC is registered in Delaware and Bermuda for apparent secrecy and tax purposes. Do those LLC members have any undisclosed relationships of concern within the City of Carlsbad?

Legal status: All 3 choices are allowed under CA State Law. All 3 choices do not prohibit the speculative developer from pursuing their 2016 applications to request from both the City and CCC the speculative developer's proposed LCP and Zoning change. All 3 choices provide the speculative developer with a reasonable economic use of the property consistent with the US Constitution and State Law, and there would be no 'taking of the property' when that is the case.

The speculative developer purchased the property in 2007 with a "Non-residential Reserve" land use as shown in the Existing LCP Land Use Policy. The speculative developer did not purchase land with R-23 land use. Speculative developers are not guaranteed City or CCC approval of their profit motivated proposed speculative land use changes under the law.

Carlsbad has many privately owned, operated and profitable land uses that are consistent with the CA Coastal Act's High-Priority Coastal Land Uses. Many are in the San Diego region and Coastal Zone.

In fact the prior Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP for this area included a 12.8-acre privately owned and managed "Recreation Commercial" area of Coastal Recreation land use. This data was provided to the Council in the '19 page Public Comments on July 13, 2021 Item #14 staff report to the City Council data' listed In Choice 1. As noted then and shown in the 2 images below the privately owned Coastal Recreation land use was also the significant part of the developer's compliance with the City's required Growth Management Program "Unconstrained" Open Space Standard at Ponto:



GENERAL PLAN BATIQUITOS LAGOON EDUCATIONAL PARK

SAMMIS PROPERTIES

PLANNING AREA I: HEALTH/RECREATION CENTER (12.8 ACRES)

Description: The recreation center could provide a wide variety of sports-and-health-related activities. Included within the Planning Area are a gymnasium, pool, sports fields, tennis courts, nutrition/sports injury clinic, health center, day care center and student union/book store. The gymnasium will serve as a training facility for members of the U.S. Olympic Team during normal business hours and be open to the public during the evening and on weekends.

Use Allocation:

Maximum of Seven tennis courts
Maximum of 60,000 s.f. gymnasium
Maximum of 10,000 s.f. day care center
Maximum of 600 s.f. tennis building
Swimming pool and sports fields
Maximum of 29,200 s.f. health club/sports injury clinic/nutrition center
Maximum of 22,000 s.f. student oriented commercial

Permitted Uses: The following uses are allowed within the Recreation Center Planning Area: Indoor and outdoor participant and spectator sports which may include pools, tennis courts, racquetball courts, a gymnasium, locker rooms and sports fields. Also permitted are a health club/sports injury clinic/nutrition center, student union/book store and any other related uses as determined to be consistent by the Land Use Manager.

Mick Calarco

Subject: Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment and 10/12/21 Council meeting on City proposed changes to 3 Existing Mellow II LCP Land Use policies regarding high-priority Coastal Land Uses

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 12:31 PM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; Assemblymember.BoernerHorvath@assembly.ca.gov; 'Chin, Janet' <Janet.Chin@asm.ca.gov>; McDonell, Glenn <Glenn.McDonell@asm.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment and 10/12/21 Council meeting on City proposed changes to 3 Existing Mellow II LCP Land Use policies regarding high-priority Coastal Land Uses

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions; CA Coastal Commission and HCD; and Assembly member Boerner-Horvath:

Before the City Council considers voting on Staff's recommendation to request that the CCC delete these long adopted LCP Land Use Policies (LCP LUP) 6-2, 6-4, and 6-10 for the Mello II LCP Segment of Carlsbad's LCP it seems important to gather some facts. The below Carlsbad Public Records request was filed to determine how the City and its Planning and Parks Commissions and City Council has communicated and considered these 3 LCP LUPs with Citizens during the City's past and current Coastal Park and Land Use planning activities.

These 3 LCP LUP are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. Being a 34+ year Carlsbad citizen, I don't recall any City communication, call for public input, or explicit planning agenda item on these 3 LCP LUPs when various land use and Park planning decisions were made in the areas mentioned in the 3 LCP LUPs. There appears little to no discussion of past implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP. Given City staff and consultants have been working on LCP review and recommended revisions/deletions for several years this seemed odd.

Thus the 9/21/21 public records request is to gather documented facts so Carlsbad, and CCC decision makers are aware of and have data on these 3 LCP LUPs before being asked to delete/change them. On 9/30/21 Staff requested a 14-day extension to provide the data, but unfortunately this will be after the City Council is asked to vote of deletion of these 3 LCP LUPs on Oct 12th. This is the reason the information on the request below is being provided to the City Council and Planning and Parks Commissions, and CCC for the Council's Oct 12th meeting, consideration and direction.

People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have gathered and provided extensive documented facts and public input on the LCP. Documented facts on how Carlsbad compares with other Cities, and has communicated/considered the LCP and CA

Coastal Act regarding both Coastal Recreation (specific 29-page data file plus other data) and Camping/Lower-cost Visitor Serving Recreation uses (specific 7-page data file plus other data) has been provided to you. Over 5,000 petition requests from citizens and visitors to properly address these issues have also be provided to you.

Thank you for your consideration of this additional 3 LCP LUP information in your LCP, and Coastal Parks, planning processes.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

Re: Public Records Request Received September 21, 2021, Request # R002393-092121

Dear Lance Schulte,

The City of Carlsbad is in receipt of your public records request received on September 21, 2021 regarding:

“Carlsbad’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980’s. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad’s 2016 compiled LCP and are:

“POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.

POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.

POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations”

The public record request is to see documents of:

- a. City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- b. Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

On 7/13/21 the Council will consider information about options for the City to acquire/preserve Coastal Park and Open Space land use at Ponto and South Coastal Carlsbad. This email and attached files provide data on these issues that should be considered.

Most development in Coastal (and inland) Carlsbad is housing (27% in 2012 and more now). Because of 3 large lagoons and federal/State Endangered Species laws 37% of Carlsbad is protected/undevelopable water/land habitat. In 2012 only 9% was vacant land (this is less than 9% now). There are 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens (62% of the City population) that do not have a Coastal Park. Ponto is also in the center of a 6-mile stretch of coastline without a Coastal Park and additional Coastal Park demand is created by other North County and California citizens and visitors. Ponto Planning Area F is the last meaningful sized and dimensioned vacant unplanned (and not fully Certified by the CA Coastal Commission) Coastal land west of I-5 that can practically provide any meaningful Coastal Open Space Land Uses - Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) or replace a campground that provides low-cost visitor accommodations.

Planning Area F also has a specific Coastal Land Use Policy regulation that requires the consideration of the need for these Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Planning Area F and within the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan/LCP area. The CA Coastal Commission in its 2017 communications to the City/Citizens outlines this. Ponto Planning Area F is the only meaningful sized and dimensioned vacant and unplanned Coastal land within the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan/LCP area. The Coastal Open Space Land Uses in the Planning Area F Coastal Land Use Policy are “High-priority Coastal land uses” under the CA Coastal Act.

The City’s 2017 Sea Level Rise Study determined 30+ acres of this type of Coastal Open Space Land Use will be lost at Ponto due to sea level rise and coastal bluff erosion within the year 2050 planning horizon of Carlsbad’s Local Coastal Program and General Plan. This 30+ acre loss of Coastal land will not magically stop at the year 2050 planning horizon, but will continue and increase the loss of “High-priority Coastal land uses” at Ponto for who knows how many Local Coastal Program and General Plan planning horizons.

The CA Coastal Act has several decades long State Law policies that address the issues at Ponto:

- Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast. ... “
- Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.”;
- Section 30213 “... Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...”;
- Section 30221 – Visitor serving & Recreation uses have priority over Residential & General Commercial uses.
- Section 30222 “The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- Section 30223 “Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible” ,

- Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

However, recent temporary emergency State housing laws such as SB 330 may have ‘muddied the water’ for Carlsbad Staff as to how to follow the CA Coastal Act, and create a sustainable Coastal Land Use Plan that serves the needs of Carlsbad and California Citizens. SB 330 does not prevent the CA Coastal Commission and/or City of Carlsbad from changing a Local Coastal Program, General Plan land use designation or Zoning designation on a property. Following are verbatim excerpts from SB 330 that most clearly speak to those facts:

- “65589.5. (a) (1) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following: ... (e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to relieve the local agency from complying with ... the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code).”
- “66300. (a) As used in this section: (2) Nothing in this section supersedes, limits, or otherwise modifies the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code). For a housing development project proposed within the coastal zone, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an affected county or an affected city from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition necessary to implement or amend a certified local coastal program consistent with the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code).
- (1) This section does not prohibit an affected county or an affected city from changing a land use designation or zoning ordinance to a less intensive use if the city or county concurrently changes the development standards, policies, and conditions applicable to other parcels within the jurisdiction to ensure that there is no net loss in residential capacity.

It is unclear if SB 330’s temporary emergency requirement to promote affordable housing of “no net loss in residential capacity” applies to 1) the required 26 housing units that must be affordable to “Low-income”, or 2) these 26 Low-income units and the around 110-156 non-affordable market rate units, or 3) 130 or so housing units that need to be ‘affordable to Moderate Incomes’? As a practical matter, only the minimum required 26 units affordable to “Low-incomes” are being proposed. The site will not be affordable to “Moderate-Incomes”. This issue of what is more important to the State’s Coastal Land Use Resources 26 ‘low-income units’ and the forever loss of needed Coastal Open Space Land Use; or addressing the loss Coastal Open Space Land Use with the only meaningful size vacant and Coastal unplanned land at Ponto.

Attached, People for Ponto citizens compiled some General Comparative Cost/Benefit analysis from City data, and also other critical and relevant data that should be considered. Ponto Coastal Land Use issues are not just a local city issue but are a ‘poster child’ for larger Statewide Coastal Resource and Coastal Land Use planning policy.

The CA Coastal Act and recent temporary emergency housing laws create some very fundamental questions for the CA State Legislature, Governor, CA Coastal Commission & HCD; and the City in trying to address State Law are:

1. Should the CA Legislature amend the CA Coastal Act to provide a “no net loss capacity” requirement for the State’s high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Uses and Coastal Recreation? California knows it is losing high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Uses and Coastal Recreation due to Sea Level Rise and accelerated coastal erosion, and this will be a long-term and permanent loss. Should a “no net loss of high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Uses” law be added to the CA Coastal Act by the CA Legislature like it temporarily created for housing land uses? CA and Carlsbad know we will lose 30+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto. This fact and fundamental question is not being addresses in a comprehensive way. People for Ponto Citizens have raised this issue since 2017 and we still have not had the comprehensive and inclusive approach needed and requested.

2. If the CA Coastal Commission changes residential land use in an un-Certified Coastal parcel, or does so via an LCP Amendment, is the City required to provide “no net residential loss”? Or is the CA Coastal Commission required to provide “no net residential loss”? Or it seems the law is written imply that there no requirement to provide “no net residential loss”?
3. What happens when a City (or CA Coastal Commission) needs to change residential land use to address other land use needs but runs out of parcels to provide “no net residential loss”? Are they prohibited from doing that? Is a temporary housing the tail that wagging the forever Coastal land use need dog?

Coastal Land next to and near the Coast is finite, very limited and is needed to serve large inland and visitor populations. Most Coastal land is developed with housing. Much past housing development has walled off the coast, and there are only a handful of vacant lands are left to provide Coastal Parks for large inland and visitor populations. These few remaining vacant lands are not equitably distributed along the coast.

Vacant Coastal land like Ponto is a rare, finite and a precious Coastal Open Space land resource. There is a 6-mile length of coastline centered around Ponto without a Coastal Park. If Ponto is developed for more residential it will be lost forever. If it is Developed Right as a much needed Coastal Park it will be preserved forever.

We all – Citizens, Council, State Legislature, Coastal Commission and HCD – are in an important once in a lifetime/career discussion that has forever consequences and that will impact future generations and their children and children’s children in profound ways.

We hope the message truly reaches you; and you do the right thing for the future and future generations.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
A People for Ponto Citizen

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 7:55 AM
To: 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Planning'; 'Scott Chadwick'; 'Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mike Pacheco'; 'Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal'; 'Carrie Boyle'; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'; 'Bret Schanzenbach'; 'Kathleen@carlsbad.org'; 'planning@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mike Grim'; 'Laura Walsh'; 'Kristin Brinner'; 'Jim Jaffee'; 'Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mark Rudyk'; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD'; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA & Ponto issues Public Input - Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad’s DLCP-LUPA’s projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto

Dear City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, & Beach Preservation Commission; CA Coastal Commission and State Parks:

Please include this email and attached file ‘Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad’s DLCP-LUPA’s projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto’ as public input into Carlsbad’s proposed Draft LCP-Land Use Plan Amendment, and all City and CA Coastal Commission and CA Housing & Community Development proposed actions regarding Ponto.

The attachment summarizes some of the existing Coastal Open Space shortfall and distribution issues; and the projected and planned future forever loss of existing Coastal Open Space land and CA Coastal Act ‘High-Priority’ Coastal Land Uses at Ponto due to Sea Level Rise. The planned loss of Coastal Open Space is at the same time when City and Statewide demand for those reduced ‘high-Priority’ Coastal Open Space Land Uses will increase from future growth of both resident population and visitors. There is limited vacant Coastal land suitable for these ‘High-Priority’ Coastal Open Space Land Uses, and Ponto is one of the last in the Carlsbad and the San Diego County coastline. Ponto Planning Area F

has specific CA State Coastal Act and existing Local Coastal Program (Land Use Plan Policies and Zoning/implementation plan regulations) that require City and CA Coastal Commission consideration of these important CA Coastal Open Space Land Use issues before changing the existing 'Non-Residential Reserve' Coastal Land Use Policy designation and Zoning on Planning Area F.

As 34-year Carlsbad citizen I love Carlsbad. As such I know, as do many other Carlsbad citizens and businesses, how important Ponto is to our citizens, city, and future Carlsbad (and California) generations and our social and economic sustainability. The attached is intended to help the City Council, City and CCC in understanding and addressing some of the basic existing and future 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Use supply/demand issues at Ponto.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Mick Calarco

Subject: Support for the Proposal for Open Park Space at Ponto Vote October 12, 2021

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 11:42 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; Assemblymember.BoernerHorvath@assembly.ca.gov; 'Chin, Janet' <Janet.Chin@asm.ca.gov>; 'McDonell, Glenn' <Glenn.McDonell@asm.ca.gov>

Subject: FW: Support for the Proposal for Open Park Space at Ponto Vote October 12, 2021

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions; CA Coastal Commission and HCD; and Assembly member Boerner-Horvath:

Please include this email as official public input in the City Council and CCC consideration of the City of Carlsbad's proposed Draft LCP Amendment.

From: DAVID ZERFING [<mailto:ibanddz@comcast.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 8:24 AM

To: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Support for the Proposal for Open Park Space at Ponto Vote October 12, 2021

My family and I have been residents of Coastal Carlsbad for over twenty years. The need to preserve open space, especially near the ocean and lagoons, is very important to us. Everyone we know including friends, business contacts, people who enjoy outside activities and everyone with any concern for the environment feels the same.

We strongly oppose the possibility of developing the "Ponto Project" as housing and/or commercial space. Instead, the proposal for the land to be used as a public park is responsible, reasonable and a benefit all persons could enjoy.

Carlsbad has and continues to experience high and medium density residential and commercial development. Ponto's unique location, and the need to preserve it for the present and the future supports the recommendation above.

Laure Blackburn
7384 Escallonia Court
Carlsbad, CA 92011

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mick Calarco

Subject: Save Ponto

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 11:49 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; Assemblymember.BoernerHorvath@assembly.ca.gov; 'Chin, Janet' <Janet.Chin@asm.ca.gov>; 'McDonell, Glenn' <Glenn.McDonell@asm.ca.gov>; McDonell, Glenn <Glenn.McDonell@asm.ca.gov>

Subject: FW: Save Ponto

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions; CA Coastal Commission and HCD; and Assembly member Boerner-Horvath:

Please include this email as official public input in the City Council and CCC consideration of the City of Carlsbad's proposed Draft LCP Amendment.

From: Michael Johnson [<mailto:mjcarlsbad@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:02 AM

To: Peopleforponto Info

Subject: Save Ponto

As a resident / homeowner for 32 years, I am concerned about losing the last open coastal space in southern cal.

Please don't turn this area into HB with hotels and condos everywhere.

Please reconsider and turn this area into a city park if anything.

Thank you,
Michael Johnson
841 Mistletoe Lane
Carlsbad
92011

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mick Calarco

Subject: 10/12/21 Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment regarding high-priority Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations Coastal Land Uses

Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - Public Comments - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations - updated 2021-10-12.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 1:25 PM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; Assemblymember.BoernerHorvath@assembly.ca.gov; 'Chin, Janet' <Janet.Chin@asm.ca.gov>; 'McDonell, Glenn' <Glenn.McDonell@asm.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: RE: 10/12/21 Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment regarding high-priority Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations Coastal Land Uses

Sorry I forgot to send the attachment.

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 12:54 PM

To: 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Planning'; 'Scott Chadwick'; 'Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mike Pacheco'; 'Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal'; 'Carrie Boyle'; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'; 'Bret Schanzenbach'; 'Kathleen@carlsbad.org'; 'planning@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mike Grim'; 'Laura Walsh'; 'Kristin Brinner'; 'Jim Jaffee'; 'Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mark Rudyk'; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD'; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD'; 'Homer, Sean@Parks'; 'Assemblymember.BoernerHorvath@assembly.ca.gov'; 'Chin, Janet'; 'McDonell, Glenn'

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: 10/12/21 Citizen input to Carlsbad Council & CCC on Carlsbad Draft LCP Amendment regarding high-priority Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations Coastal Land Uses

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions; CA Coastal Commission and HCD; and Assembly member Boerner-Horvath:

Please include the attached data file as official public input regarding Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations at Ponto/South Carlsbad and Citywide in the City Council and CCC consideration of the City of Carlsbad's proposed Draft LCP Amendment.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Low Cost Visitor Accommodations:

1. On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:
 - a. For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
 - b. For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
 - c. For Policy 6-10 documents were provided that stated that 3 hotels – Flower Fields Westin, Legoland Hotel, and Timeshare Expansion were all considered Low Cost Accommodations by the Developer's Report to City. Table 3-1 below from the Draft Proposed LCP Amendment however shows these Accommodations are NOT Low-Cost Accommodations but "Upper Upscale", "Luxury", and "Upscale". Is this right? Has Policy 6-10 seems to have been circumvented in the City's Coastal Development Permit process. The Draft LCP Amendment should address an accountable approach to compliance with Policy 6-10.

Table 3-1, Carlsbad Coastal Zone Hotel Inventory

| Property | Smith Travel Research Cost Scale | Rooms |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| Days Inn Carlsbad | Economy | 45 |
| Scandia Motel | Economy | 20 |
| Motel 6 Carlsbad East | Economy | 140 |
| Motel 6 Carlsbad South | Economy | 162 |
| Ramada Carlsbad | Midscale | 121 |
| La Quinta Inns & Suites Carlsbad Legoland Area | Midscale | 110 |
| Best Western Plus Beach View Lodge | Upper Midscale | 41 |
| Carlsbad by the Sea Resort | Upper Midscale | 145 |
| Holiday Inn Express & Suites Carlsbad Beach | Upper Midscale | 120 |
| Carlsbad Inn Beach Resort | Upper Upscale | 62 |
| Westin Carlsbad Resort & Spa | Upper Upscale | 208 |
| Sheraton Hotel Carlsbad Resort & Spa | Upper Upscale | 169 |
| West Inn & Suites @ Carlsbad | Upper Upscale | 86 |
| Cape Rey Carlsbad, a Hilton Resort | Upper Upscale | 215 |
| Legoland Castle Hotel | Upscale | 250 |
| Grand Pacific Palisades Resort | Upscale | 90 |
| Hyatt House San Diego Carlsbad | Upscale | 98 |
| Hilton Garden Inn Carlsbad Beach | Upscale | 161 |
| Ocean Palms Beach Resort | Upscale | 56 |
| Tamarack Beach Resort | Luxury | 23 |
| Legoland California Resort Hotel | Luxury | 250 |
| Beach Terrace Inn | Luxury | 48 |
| Four Seasons Residence Club Aviara | Luxury | 42 |
| Park Hyatt Aviara Resort | Luxury | 327 |
| Total Hotel Rooms | | 2,989 |
| South Carlsbad State Beach Campground | Lower-Cost (per the average daily rate for "Economy" hotels) | 222 |
| Total Accommodations | | 3,211 |

Source: Smith Travel Research, October 2018

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California’s, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City’s past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: “Carlsbad’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980’s. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad’s 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- “POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.

- POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
 - POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations”
2. The public record request is to see documents of:
 - a. City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
 - b. Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”
 3. P. 3-3 cites CA Coastal Act (CCA) Polices. But the City’s proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) Land Use Plan (LUP) in the Ponto Area, particularly for Planning Area F, appears inconsistent with these CCA policies:
 - a. Section 30213 – protect, encourage and provide Lower-Cost Visitor & Recreation Facilities.
 - b. Section 30221 – Visitor serving & Recreation uses have priority over Residential & General Commercial uses.
 - c. Section 30223 – Upland areas reserved to support Coastal Recreation uses
 - d. Section 30252(6) – correlate development with Local Park acquisition & on-site recreation
 4. Planning Area F used to be designated “Visitor Serving Commercial” as part of the original 1980’s LUP and LCP Samis Master Plan for Ponto. In the 1996 this LUP was changed to the now current LCP and LUP designation of “Non-Residential Reserve” with a specific LCP requirement to reconsider a high-priority recreation or visitor serving Coastal land use while other Ponto land uses were changed to low-priority residential uses (see Poinsettia Shores Master Plan/LCP). It seems appropriated that the LUP should re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space (“i.e. Public Park” in the existing LCP) to provide high-priority coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses: in part for the following reasons:
 - a. Planning Area F’s existing LCP requirement requires this consideration, but the City has never disclosed this requirement to Citizens nor followed this requirement during the Cities two prior ‘planning efforts’ in 2010 and 2015 as documented by official Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, 262.
 - b. Ponto developers (both Samis and Kaisza) were both allowed to overdevelop Ponto, by not providing the minimum Open Space required by Carlsbad’s and Citizen approved Growth Management Open Space Standard. Over 30-acres of land that should have been dedicated to Growth Management Open Space (a high-priority land use) was instead allowed to be developed with low-priority residential development. If the City’s Growth Management Open Space Standard was properly applied at Ponto there would be 30-acres more open space at Ponto then there is now. This is a significant impact to CCA policies that can be corrected by changes in the Ponto LUP to properly implement City Open Space Standards and CCA policies.

- c. The LCPA acknowledges that past (2005-17) and near-term (2019-23) growth in Carlsbad visitor demand for coastal recreation and accommodations, and indicate high past hotel occupancy rates that implies current hotel supply is just meeting current demand. Although the LCPA does not discuss the high occupancy rates at the Low-Cost Accommodation campground facilities, It is assumed the campground occupancy rate (understood to be around 80% or more) and demand is higher than that of hotels. This should be documented/defined. Based on current and near term demand for visitor accommodations the LCPA states on page 3-12 "... the City should identify and designate land where new hotels and other visitor-serving uses can be developed." It is clear where the 'City should identify and designate [this] land'? What new land(s) should be so identified and designated? However, the LCPA does not disclose longer-term visitor accommodation needs beyond 2023, nor provide a long-term plan for meeting this long-term need. The LCPA should publicly disclose, analyze and provide for the longer-term "Coastal Zone Buildout needs" (beyond present and well beyond 2023) for visitor Coastal accommodations, particularly Low-Cost Accommodations and Recreation needs because the LCPA's LUP is a long-term plan for Carlsbad's buildout estimated to extend beyond 2035. Also, given the fact that there are very few vacant Coastal sites (like Ponto) that are still available to address these long-term high priority Coastal land uses – recreation and visitor serving – reserving these vacant lands for high priority coastal land uses is consistent with many CCA Polices. Following are some longer-term projections of resident demand for Coastal park and recreation needs. It seems logical that long-term visitor demand will increase at a similar rate as the general population increase rate, unless our coast becomes too overcrowded and unattractive vis-à-vis other visitor destinations. A long-term visitor demand (to go with the below long-term resident demand long-term Sea Level Rise impacts) for Coastal recreation resources should be a part of the proposed LCPA and part of the long-term LUP to provide resources for those long-term needs and to mitigate for those long-term Sea Level Rise impacts.

Increasing demand for Coastal recreational land

San Diego County Population

| | |
|------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 people per mile of coast |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 people per mile of coast |

2010 - 2050 % Change = 42% increase in population

SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

Increasing demand for Coastal recreational land

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 or 2.83% of Population per day |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day |

Typically around 1.6% annual increase in visitors

San Diego Tourism Authority, San Diego Travel Forecast, December 2017

d. City in the LCPA inaccurately analyzes and misrepresents how much Visitor Serving Accommodations, particularly Low-Cost Accommodations, Carlsbad currently provides on a relative or comparative basis. The LCPA’s inaccurate and simplistic analysis does not adjust for the different sizes of the Coastal Zone in the 3 cities (Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas) used in the analysis. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is significantly larger than both the other cities, so it has more land and accommodations, just like San Diego’s Coastal Zone is larger than Carlsbad’s and San Diego is larger than its smaller adjacent neighbors Del Mar and National City. A simplistic how many accommodations are in your adjacent cities is an inappropriate analytical method for Carlsbad-Oceanside-Encinitas; just as it is inappropriate to compare the number of San Diego’s hotels with the number hotels in San Diego’s smaller neighbors Del Mar and National City. The accurate method to do a comparative analysis is based on a common denominator, such as the amount of accommodations per 1,000 acres of Coastal Zone land along with comparing each city’s relative percentages. This is a more accurate and appropriate analysis that the LCPA should provide, and not that provided on page 3-13. The LCPA analysis also does not fully discuss and compare “Low-Cost” accommodations that are part of the CCA policies; nor provide a mitigation approach for “Low-Cost” accommodations lost, just ‘Economy hotel rooms’. Below is data from the LCPA and other LCPs that shows the proper and more accurate comparison of existing Visitor Serving Accommodations in Carlsbad-Oceanside-Encinitas and includes Low-Cost Accommodation numbers/comparisons that are totally missing in the LCPA analysis. As the data shows, Carlsbad does not perform as well in Visitor Accommodations, and most particularly in “Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations”, as the LCPA states and proposes in the LUP relative to Oceanside and Encinitas. An honest analysis like below should be provided in the LCPA LUP, particularly given the very limited amount of vacant Coastal land left to provide for high-priority Coastal Uses. Ponto is one of the last remaining vacant Coastal areas.

Carlsbad's proposed 2019 LCPA uses comparative 3-city data to address how Carlsbad's 2019 LCPA addresses Visitor Serving Accommodation needs. “Low-Cost” Accommodations are an important CA Coastal Act issue


| <u>Visitor Serving Accommodations (VSA) data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>Data source</u> | |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Coastal Acres (i.e. in Coastal Zone) | 9,216 | 1,460 | 7,845 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019 & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs | |
| VSA rooms: total | 3,211 | 975 | 634 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, pp 3-12 - 15 | |
| VSA rooms: Economy | 589 | 346 | 346 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, pp 3-12 - 15 | |
| VSA rooms: Low-Cost (campsites) | 220 | 413 | 171 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, State Parks, Oceanside Harbor, Paradise-by-the-Sea and Oceanside RV Park data. Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019 does not evaluate other City’s Low-Cost Accommodations | |
| <u>Data analysis</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>3-city Average</u> | <u>Key Findings</u> |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------|-----|-----|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 348 | 668 | 81 | 366 | Carlsbad provides overall Visitor Accommodations at slightly below the 3-city average |
| % of VSA rooms that are Economy | 18% | 35% | 55% | 36% | Carlsbad provides a percentage of Economy Accommodations about 50% below the 3-city average |
| Economy VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 64 | 237 | 44 | 115 | Carlsbad provides Economy Accommodations about 50% below the 3-city average |
| % VSA rooms that are Low-Cost | 7% | 42% | 27% | 25% | Carlsbad provides a percentage of Low-Cost Accommodations about 72% below the 3-city average Carlsbad LCPA also does not provide protection for loss of "Low-Cost" campground rooms, only "Economy hotel rooms" |
| Low-Cost VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 24 | 283 | 22 | 110 | Carlsbad provides Low-Cost Accommodations about 78% below the 3-city average |

- e. The LCPA is not providing for any new "Low Cost Visitor Accommodation" land uses in the proposed LUP for current/long-range needs, even though page 3-12 points out the current demand for accommodations, and the current Existing LCP has polices to increase "Low Cost Visitor Accommodation" land uses. We understand that "Low-cost Visitor Accommodation" occupancy rates at CA State Campground at Carlsbad are near 90%. This occupancy rate is much higher [signifying higher demand] than the occupancy rates of both the hotels, and "Economy Visitor Accommodations" which the LCPA seeks to protect. The Proposed LCPA LUP should provide historic and current "Low-cost Visitor Accommodation" occupancy rate data at CA State Campground at Carlsbad and compare to occupancy demand for other accommodations to determine the highest occupancy demands and therefore needs. Why is the Proposed LCPA LUP not protecting AND EXPANDING (for future CA & Carlsbad population growth and visitor demand growth) the supply of this higher demand for "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations" at the State Campground? Why is the Proposed LCPA LUP protecting and expanding this high-priority Coastal Land Use particularly given the Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies on this issue, long history of this issue documented in the Current Existing Carlsbad LCP Mello II Segment, and the fact that "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations" are a Statewide 'high-Coastal-priority' land use in CA Coastal Act Goals and Policies? Why is the proposed LUP not recognizing and incorporating these issues? The Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies [see Existing Carlsbad LCP Mello II Segment polies 2.3, 4.1, 6.1, 6.4, 6.5, 6.9, 6.10, 7.5, and 7.15 for example] are not referenced and discussed in the Proposed LUP nor is a comprehensive long-term analysis of the impact of the proposed LCPA LUP's elimination of theses Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies vis-à-vis the CA Coastal Act Goals and Policies? How and why is the City proposing changes to these Existing Carlsbad LCP policies in the Mellow II Segment, particularly given the improved knowledge about Sea Level Rise, and Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff erosion

impacts on the State Campground's "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations" - High-Coastal-Priority land use under the CA Coastal Act?

- f. At Ponto there is no low-cost/no-cost Recreational use as shown by the City of Carlsbad's adopted Parks Master Plan (pp 87-89) that show the City's adopted Park Service Areas in the following image. The image's blue dots are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City's adopted service areas:



Per the current Existing LCP requirements for Planning Area F at Ponto "Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park)" must be considered. How is the Proposed LCPA LUP not reserving Upland Areas at Ponto for recreational uses given Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff erosion impacts as shown in Proposed LCPA LUP Attachment B, and Exhibits B6 and B7? There is very limited amount of vacant Upland Coastal land at Ponto and South Coastal Carlsbad to accommodate low-cost/no-cost Recreational use "(i.e. Public Park)", so why is this last remaining vacant Coastal land at Ponto not being reserved for "high-Coastal Priority Land Uses"? Why is the Proposed LCPA LUP proposing this last remaining vacant Coastal land at Ponto be converted from "Non-residential Reserve" to 'low-coastal-priority residential and general commercial land uses'?

5. The proposed LCPA approach to protect existing 'economy hotels' but not 'Low-cost Visitor Accommodations' appears inappropriate. Existing hotel owners providing 'Economy' rooms are penalized while all other more expensive 'non-economy hotel' owners are not required to mitigate for their not providing more affordable accommodations. It seems like a fairer and rational approach is to use the same framework as the City's inclusionary affordable housing requirements and have the requirement and burden of providing affordable accommodations required by all visitor accommodation providers, including short-term rentals of residential homes. Use of any per accommodation "in-lieu fee" should be SUFFICIENT TO FULLY MITIGATE for not providing a required affordable accommodation by being sufficient to fully fund a new 'affordable accommodation' on a one-for one basis. City Transit Occupancy Tax revenues could also potentially be used to provide a catch-up method for existing

“non-low-cost and/or non-economy accommodation providers” to address what would nominally be their inclusionary contribution. It seems like the LCPA approach needs significant rethinking to provide a fair and rational program to include reasonable long-term and sustainable affordability in visitor accommodation’s, particularly give the Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff Erosion impacts on Carlsbad’s Only “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” and the State Campground and beaches and Carlsbad’s Coastal access roadways.

6. The Proposed LCPA LUP does not provide a means for citizens to understand the proposed changes to the current Existing LCP goals and policies. There are numerous current Existing LCP LUP goals and policies regarding “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations”. All these should be listed in the Proposed LCPA LUP along with a description on how and why these current Existing LCP Goals and policies are being modified or removed in the Proposed LCPA LUP.
7. Carlsbad has only a Finite amount of vacant Coastal land to provide for an Infinite amount of future Carlsbad/CA residents and visitors to Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone. How these Finite Coastal Land resources are used to supply high-priority Coastal Recreation and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land uses to address the Infinite demand from future population and visitor growth will be critical in determining the desirability and sustainability of our Carlsbad and CA Coastal Resources. Expanding Coastal Open Space Land use to accommodate the growing population/visitor demand for Coastal Open Space is a critical City and CA policy issue.
8. Carlsbad’s 2015 General Plan Update (2015 GPU) could not consider data in the December 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment (2017 SLRVA). The Citizens of Carlsbad, City of Carlsbad and the CA Coastal Commission did not have the ability to know about and consider the projected significant loss of ‘high-priority’ Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. The projected loss of these Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto – beach and State Campground – will within the ‘lifetime of Carlsbad’s LCP and General Plan’, basically eliminate all of Carlsbad’s existing and planned Low-cost Visitor Accommodations and the only public Coastal Recreation land in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Please see the attached Public Comments data file for Carlsbad’s Proposed Draft LCPA-LUPA and all things Ponto regarding Sea Level Rise titled: “Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad’s DLCP-LUPA’s projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto” that summarizes the projected/planned loss of almost all the high-priority Coastal Open Space at Ponto due to sea level rise. This data should be considered with both the public comments on Low-cost Visitor Accommodations and Coastal Recreation in submitted earlier.
9. A Coastal Park provides the lowest-cost (i.e. no-cost) visitor access to the Coast. Although Coastal Parks do not provide over-night sleeping access, they do provide no-cost Coastal Recreation day-use.

Mick Calarco

Subject: Support for the Proposal for Open Park Space at Ponto Vote October 12, 2021

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 11:42 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; 'Bret Schanzenbach' <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mike Grim <Mike.Grim@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'Kristin Brinner' <kristin@surfridersd.org>; 'Jim Jaffee' <jimjaffee@gmail.com>; Michael Tully <Michael.Tully@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mark Rudyk' <markr@visitcarlsbad.com>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; Assemblymember.BoernerHorvath@assembly.ca.gov; 'Chin, Janet' <Janet.Chin@asm.ca.gov>; 'McDonell, Glenn' <Glenn.McDonell@asm.ca.gov>

Subject: FW: Support for the Proposal for Open Park Space at Ponto Vote October 12, 2021

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions; CA Coastal Commission and HCD; and Assembly member Boerner-Horvath:

Please include this email as official public input in the City Council and CCC consideration of the City of Carlsbad's proposed Draft LCP Amendment.

From: DAVID ZERFING [<mailto:lbanddz@comcast.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 8:24 AM

To: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Support for the Proposal for Open Park Space at Ponto Vote October 12, 2021

My family and I have been residents of Coastal Carlsbad for over twenty years. The need to preserve open space, especially near the ocean and lagoons, is very important to us. Everyone we know including friends, business contacts, people who enjoy outside activities and everyone with any concern for the environment feels the same.

We strongly oppose the possibility of developing the "Ponto Project" as housing and/or commercial space. Instead, the proposal for the land to be used as a public park is responsible, reasonable and a benefit all persons could enjoy.

Carlsbad has and continues to experience high and medium density residential and commercial development. Ponto's unique location, and the need to preserve it for the present and the future supports the recommendation above.

Laure Blackburn
7384 Escallonia Court
Carlsbad, CA 92011

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mick Calarco

Subject: comments of - Discover easy, convenient alternative transportation options in Carlsbad
Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2021-Oct Updated Public Comments - Coastal Recreation.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 1:25 PM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>;
Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal
<carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: comments of - Discover easy, convenient alternative transportation options in Carlsbad

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Parks, Traffic and Planning Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission:

Please consider this information in your Parks-Land Use-Mobility-Coastal planning efforts.

People for Ponto Citizens have called out the locational inequity in City Park facilities in Coastal South Carlsbad/Ponto. Please see the attached 30-page Coastal Recreation comments on Carlsbad Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment and Parks Master Plan Update.

The Council has said Veterans Park 4-6 miles away and not very accessible other than by car, is providing citizens the Park solution for South Carlsbad's and Ponto's Park Deficit. This is the most pronounced example of how there is limited mobility options for many elderly, children, and busy adults (with little time to drive after a work) to access their 'local' Park. Using the 'you must drive to' Veterans Park as the 'local park' solution to neighborhood and distant Quadrant Park Demand is something this Workshop seems should try to address and connect with Park planning activities. Also the loss of City Parkland acreage for actual park use because large vehicle parking lots (a mobility land use) need to be provided.

The City Council has created an unequal distribution of Parks (and particularly Coastal Parks) in its City Land Use/Parks/Circulation policies that do not require Developers/City to provide Parks be within a 10-minute walk from neighborhoods (like other Cities require). Council policy also only requires developers/City provide the bare minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population v. the 60% higher 5 acre/1,000 population other cities require. More acreage will also increase park access. Walkable access to City Parks will become more vital for Quality of Life as CA cities increase residential densities and Park demand. It is suggested that these issues and in particular the lack of mobility options between South Carlsbad Park Demand and its 'local park' Supply at Veterans' Park should be factored into the Workshop and other City planning efforts. People for Ponto Citizens have mentioned this for years - please consider the attached 30-page Coastal Recreation data.

Thank you.

Thank you again,
Lance Schulte

PS: it seems odd to have to register and fill out all sorts of personal information to simply attend an open workshop. This is not required for in-person workshops.

From: City of Carlsbad [<mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com>] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 10:31 AM
To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Discover easy, convenient alternative transportation options in Carlsbad

Discover easy, convenient alternative transportation options in Carlsbad

Join us for a Move Carlsbad workshop

MOVECarlsbad

Easy, affordable and sustainable ways to get around the city



Join us for an interactive, virtual Move Carlsbad workshop series to explore easy, affordable and sustainable ways to get around Carlsbad. The City of Carlsbad and Circulate San Diego will host four, one-hour workshops via Zoom to demystify public transit and answer questions about Carlsbad's transportation options. This Move Carlsbad workshop series is part of the city's [Age-Friendly Carlsbad](#) initiative which seeks to enhance the quality of life in the community for people of all ages and abilities.

RSVP here to attend the workshops below via Zoom:
<http://www.carlsbadca.gov/workshops>

Public Transit 101

Date: Oct. 19, 10 a.m.

Description: Learn more about public transportation options available in Carlsbad and tips to improve your transit experience.

Walking and Biking 101

Date: Oct. 26, 10 a.m.

Description: Learn the best routes, safety tips and more.

Getting around Carlsbad: What's Next?

Date: Nov. 2, 10 a.m.

Description: Learn about transportation and mobility news.

Learn more and RSVP to attend

- RSVP here to receive your Zoom link to attend all four workshops: www.carlsbadca.gov/workshops
- Visit www.carlsbadca.gov/workshops, call 760-602-4650, or stop by the Carlsbad Senior Center at 799 Pine Ave. for more information.



Carlsbad Senior Center
799 Pine Ave.
Carlsbad, CA 92008
760-602-4650
parksandrec@carlsbadca.gov

Visit our Website



[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by parksandrec@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on Oct 12th 2021:

On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:

- For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
- For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
- For Policy 6-10 concerns providing Low Cost Visitor Accommodations. Public Parks are the lowest cost (free) Visitor accommodating land use there is.

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City's past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: "Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980's. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad's 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- "POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.
- POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
- POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations"

The public record request is to see documents of:

- City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on January 2021:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 5-30 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| <u>Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage</u> | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland |

Anticipated Future Park development projects

| <u>Park - quadrant</u> | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:**
 - 4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,
 - 6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and
 - 2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant

Shortfall (excess) in
Current Quadrant
Park standard by

| | population | | Future Park | | existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants |
|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | acres | need | acres | % | |
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the demand for that Park.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning; is highly detrimental to the City, City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and City Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

2. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

3. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
- Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

4. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ...”; 2). This data be used in the City’s analysis and the public’s review and discussion about the City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount “maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone” and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to “assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”. Most of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

5. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City’s proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

6. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is an obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail



Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.

- Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

8. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can


only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

9. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.


10. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.

- Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
- Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
- Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
- Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the

Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



11. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that

15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

12. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:

- Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
- In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
- In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.

- Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
- In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
- In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without First disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
- In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to ether:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of "Non-Residential Reserve" until such time as the City's past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park") to provide both "High-Priory" coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

13. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words "shall") these "low

priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City “may” or ‘may not’ choose (per the proposed “may” LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City’s (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy ‘shell game’. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two “may” criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only “low-priority” residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by “shall” policy) winners, and “high-priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal ‘long-shot’ (“may” policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the

documented “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently

dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

14. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

15. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is

illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

Subject: FW: Jan26th Agenda item 12 - Protect Ponto

From: T. Owen Rassman <owen@rassman.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 9:41 AM

To: Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Jennifer Jesser <Jennifer.Jesser@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; David De Cordova <David.deCordova@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov; carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Bret@carlsbad.org; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov; Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov; People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: Jan26th Agenda item 12 - Protect Ponto

Dear Mayor, City Council, Planning Commission and CA Coastal Commission

I request that the City Council direct staff to research and provide options to acquire Planning Area F for Ponto Park. And that The City Council directs staff to consult with People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens organization on the data and resources they have collected that can assist the Staff and the Council with these options.

I have lived in Southern CA for 30 years and in Carlsbad for the last 4. This is an amazing city, but I know it can be so much more, we have an obligation to our children & all those that come to enjoy the coast line to make it more.

The land at Ponto (Planning area F) is a prime location to do **something amazing** with, something that matters and inspires joy. I am aware that the land is for sale and DO NOT wish to see a developer turn it into a condo complex when it could be the **jewel of our City**. I know the State of CA says we have to have a certain number of new houses, but they don't say they have to be crammed into one of the last remaining open pieces of coastal land. Build housing complexes closer to where offices and businesses are, build them inland and **Protect Ponto!**

I know the People for Ponto organization has identified multiple paths to success that would be a win / win for everyone -- City Staff should work with them, learn from them and Ponto Park a reality.

I ask you to **Develop Ponto Right** and work with the experts that have the knowledge to do what the community wants - keep the open space, build Ponto Park!

I request that my comments be put on record in the official public records for **ALL** things Planning Area F, including the

official public records the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, and Parks Master Plan Update; and the CA Coastal Commission's consideration of Carlsbad's draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.

Thank you

T. Owen Rassman

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

To: Kyle Lancaster; Mike Pacheco
Cc: Charlene Buckalew; Bonnie Elliott; Tim Selke
Subject: RE: 1-26-21 Agenda Item 12 Protect Ponto

From: jodi marie jones <jodimariejones@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 12:21 PM

To: Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Jennifer Jesser <Jennifer.Jesser@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; David De Cordova <David.deCordova@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov; carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Bret@carlsbad.org; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov; Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov; People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: 1-26-21 Agenda Item 12 Protect Ponto

Dear Mayor, City Council, Planning Commission and CA Coastal Commission

I request that the City Council direct staff to research and provide options to acquire Planning Area F for Ponto Park. And that The City Council directs staff to consult with People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens organization on the data and resources they have collected that can assist the Staff and the Council with these options

The People have been asking to keep Ponto's Open Space and build Ponto Park for an extremely long time but it seems to fall on deaf ears or only be met with resistance. Staff's presentation to the Planning Commission in Dec 2019 and the Staff report for this agenda item have inaccurate information in them but it doesn't seem like there is much interest in recognizing the truth. I hope today's meeting will change that.

Truth is the land use change should not have been changed the way it was, so we shouldn't "just continue on with it".

Truth is Planning Area F is not the answer the State's housing demands.

Truth is Ponto Park is not only being asked for by the people that live in the area – it is for ALL of Carlsbad and ALL of the visitors that come from near and far.

Truth is it would be relatively easy to **Develop Ponto Right** – you just have to listen and want to make it happen.

So I repeat -

I request that the City Council direct staff to research and provide options to acquire Planning Area F for Ponto Park. And that The City Council directs staff to consult with People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens organization on the data and resources they have collected that can assist the Staff and the Council with these options.

I request that my comments be put on record in the official public records for **ALL** things Planning Area F, including the official public records the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, and Parks Master Plan Update; and the CA Coastal Commission's consideration of Carlsbad's draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.

Thank you

Jodi M. Jones

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>

Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 5:46 PM

To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>; Neelay Bhatt <neelay.bhatt@prosconsulting.com>

Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Shirley J Cole

E-mail SHIRLEY.COLE@SBCGLOBAL.NET

Comments

Policies using parks and recreation sites should be of benefit to most Carlsbad residents. To limit the use of tennis courts to only those persons playing tennis when many other sports/activities can benefit is not being inclusive. This should change similar to how baseball fields accommodate kickball, soccer and softball. Many of our fields are under utilized. Simple changes can be made (as they have in most California cities) to allow for the growth of pickleball. Carlsbad is expected to have the highest growth in senior category in the next 10 years. Many seniors would lead healthier lives if they were encouraged to play a cardio sport. Do not make it so difficult to change tennis courts to allow for tennis or pickleball. Just paint some additional lines!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Pickleball Courts
Attachments: IMG-1852.MOV; Re: Pickleball Courts

From: Douglas Gore <douglasgore4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 2:09 PM
To: Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Keith Blackburn <Keith.Blackburn@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; barbara.kennedy@carlsbadca.gov; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; raviolli.medina@carlsbadca.gov; Tammy Cloud-McMinn <Tammy.McMinn@carlsbadca.gov>; Sheila Cobian <Sheila.Cobian@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Pickleball Courts

Hi:

On any day, if you look at the existing tennis courts, there are at least **2-3 tennis courts that are empty** and most of the time, only two people are on the tennis court at any given time; **see attached video. We really need more pickleball courts.**

If you watch the live video feed from Poinsettia Pickleball Park, you will see children as young as 7 years old and people 88 years old playing this growing game. In fact, more and more families and younger children are coming to the park to play. This facility is already beyond capacity, people are waiting 30-45 minutes to play one game. People plan their vacation to come to our park to play. People drive from other counties like Orange County, Temecula, Fallbrook and South San Diego to play at our facility. People spend money in Carlsbad when they travel to the park; go to restaurants, buy gas and food, etc..

The time to retrofit 1 tennis court compared to finding land, permits, and building pickleball courts from scratch will be much cheaper and faster; very large cost savings to the city to convert 1 or 2 tennis courts. Drawing below, three (3) pickleball courts will fit very nicely into one (1) of the existing tennis courts without any new changes to the existing perimeter fencing. Remove the tennis net/posts, install pickleball nets/posts, add two low fences between the courts, and repaint the tennis courts into three pickleball courts. The current pickleball courts have a width of 30 feet, the new pickleball courts would have a width of 33 feet and will be about 6 inches less on either end. Having more width would be really nice and having a fence that is open at only one end will keep the balls from going into the other courts. There will be plenty of room on either end for bench seating, just like the present courts; actually there is more bench seating than the existing courts.

I would suggest converting 2 tennis courts and using these 6 new pickleball courts for strong intermediate and advanced players. Use the existing 6 pickleball courts for beginners/social and strong intermediate players. This would create a fun and social atmosphere for all the players. I cannot tell you how many friends I have made playing pickleball. For the most part, 99% of the people are really nice. As with any sport or business there are always a few bad apples. LOL.



As one of the **fastest growing** recreational **sports** in North America, the game of **Pickleball** is truly a phenomenon.

The Sports & Fitness Industry Association (SFIA) is a trade organization that tracks the popularity of sports and registers the sales of products for those various sports throughout America.

In 2014 the SFIA found that there were a total of 2.815 million US players. Those numbers represented a 1.8% rate of growth from the previous year, which is what earned it the reputation of being one of the fastest-growing sports in America.


In 2018 they reported a total of 3.1 million pickleball players in the US and at last count, there were 20,933 pickleball courts to choose from throughout the 50 states, not to mention growing participation overseas.

In 2020, they reported 21.3% growth and a total of 4.2 million active players and still growing.

Cheers~
Douglas Gore

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

From: Douglas Gore <douglasgore4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 2:45 PM
To: Matthew Hall; Keith Blackburn; Scott Chadwick; barbara.kennedy@carlsbadca.gov; Mike Pacheco; raviolli.medina@carlsbadca.gov; Tammy Cloud-McMinn; Sheila Cobian
Subject: Re: Pickleball Courts



On Tue, Jun 22, 2021 at 2:08 PM Douglas Gore <douglasgore4@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi:

On any day, if you look at the existing tennis courts, there are at least **2-3 tennis courts that are empty** and most of the time, only two people are on the tennis court at any given time; **see attached video. We really need more pickleball courts.**

If you watch the live video feed from Poinsettia Pickleball Park, you will see children as young as 7 years old and people 88 years old playing this growing game. In fact, more and more families and younger children are coming to the park to play. This facility is already beyond capacity, people are waiting 30-45 minutes to play one game. People plan their vacation to come to our park to play. People drive from other counties like Orange County, Temecula, Fallbrook and South San Diego to play at our facility. People spend money in Carlsbad when they travel to the park; go to restaurants, buy gas and food, etc..

The time to retrofit 1 tennis court compared to finding land, permits, and building pickleball courts from scratch will be much cheaper and faster; very large cost savings to the city to convert 1 or 2 tennis courts. Drawing below, three (3) pickleball courts will fit very nicely into one (1) of the existing tennis courts without any new changes to the existing perimeter fencing. Remove the tennis net/posts, install pickleball nets/posts, add two low fences between the courts, and repaint the tennis courts into three pickleball courts. The current pickleball courts have a width of 30 feet, the new pickleball courts would have a width of 33 feet and will be about 6 inches less on either end. Having more width would be really nice and having a fence that is

open at only one end will keep the balls from going into the other courts. There will be plenty of room on either end for bench seating, just like the present courts; actually there is more bench seating than the existing courts.

I would suggest converting 2 tennis courts and using these 6 new pickleball courts for strong intermediate and advanced players. Use the existing 6 pickleball courts for beginners/social and strong intermediate players. This would create a fun and social atmosphere for all the players. I cannot tell you how many friends I have made playing pickleball. For the most part, 99% of the people are really nice. As with any sport or business there are always a few bad apples. LOL.

As one of the **fastest growing** recreational **sports** in North America, the game of **Pickleball** is truly a phenomenon.

The Sports & Fitness Industry Association (SFIA) is a trade organization that tracks the popularity of sports and registers the sales of products for those various sports throughout America.

In 2014 the SFIA found that there were a total of 2.815 million US players. Those numbers represented a 1.8% rate of growth from the previous year, which is what earned it the reputation of being one of the fastest-growing sports in America.

In 2018 they reported a total of 3.1 million pickleball players in the US and at last count, there were 20,933 pickleball courts to choose from throughout the 50 states, not to mention growing participation overseas.

In 2020, they reported 21.3% growth and a total of 4.2 million active players and still growing.

Cheers~
Douglas Gore

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 8:33 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name jeff adamoff
E-mail jeff.adamoff@gmail.com
Comments I was just at the PB courts at Poinsettia today and saw the notice about adding more PB courts...I agree that we need more courts, BUT PLEASE; dont take away any of those tennis courts...The top 4 courts are some of the best in the county and it would be a shame to lose them... I play both Pickleball and Tennis and while there is a need for more PB courts that empty lot next to the existing courts would be the perfect solution. I do understand that with new courts and more people comes the issue of parking. One thing for sure is that this is a fabulous park

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 6:35 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name fred gelin
E-mail fredlgelin@gmail.com
Comments Yes.... we definitely need more pickleball cts including additional competition cts.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 18, 2021 8:25 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Cheney Squier
E-mail cheneyann@sbcglobal.net
Comments We would love to enjoy more pickleball courts at poinsettia park ! Could some of the unused tennis courts be converted ? This is a big need in our community of Carlsbad :) thank you !! Cheney

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 18, 2021 8:46 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Heath squier
E-mail Hsquier@gmail.com
Comments Love the idea of adding more pickleball courts. Having to wait so long to play currently which is not ideal for anyone. Please add more!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 18, 2021 8:25 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Cheney Squier
E-mail cheneyann@sbcglobal.net
Comments We would love to enjoy more pickleball courts at poinsettia park ! Could some of the unused tennis courts be converted ? This is a big need in our community of Carlsbad :) thank you !! Cheney

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 12:03 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Steve Brendel
E-mail Brendel3@sbcglobal.net
Comments More pickleball courts please

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 12:01 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Cathy Brendel
E-mail Brendel4776@ gmail.com
Comments More pickleball courts please

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 6:47 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Alex
E-mail Alexandtroy@yahoo.com
Comments You've probably noticed how the pickleball courts at Poinsettia are heavily utilized and it's not unusual to have 20-100 players waiting to play. Hopefully this tells you there is a need for more courts! And here's a hot tip - pickleball is VERY social and because of that, it is preferable to have many courts in one place. So, for example, one venue of 24 courts is more desirable than 4 venues with 6 courts each. And a large venue tends to have fewer "issues". Please PLEASE build more courts in Carlsbad.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 7:41 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name brent haws
E-mail bhaws@san.rr.com
Comments Love what you have done with Pickleball in Carlsbad. and example for all of San Diego County.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 8:10 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Melinda
E-mail Krppi@yahoo.com
Comments We need more pickleball courts (with lights if possible)!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2021 3:12 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mark R Nims
E-mail teamnims1@gmail.com

Comments I would like to support the addition of more pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park. The existing courts have been a great addition but they are constantly full with many people waiting to play. Perhaps utilizing one existing tennis court to add 4 more courts. This would also allow for courts to be designated beginner, intermediate or advanced. Thank you.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 25, 2021 9:29 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Georgia Stroud
E-mail ogeorgia29@gmail.com

Comments I think there should be more pickle ball courts. At any time there are 24 people usually playing and 10 or more waiting. The size of those 6 courts is equal to 1 1/2 tennis courts where only 3 to 6 players would be playing. Most of the time the tennis courts are not used and people have to wait to play pickle ball. It would be nice if we had more pickle ball courts and less tennis courts. Thank you.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 7:38 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name [marcy](#)
E-mail marcy.horgan@yahoo.com
Comments [More outdoor pickleball courts!](#)

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 9:51 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Ian Frost
E-mail ianfrostis@gmail.com

Comments Hello. I highly recommend adding additional pickleball courts to Poinsettia Park. I've been observing patterns in attendance and new interest to the sport, and Poinsettia has become a popular place for social and advanced play. There are 4 dedicated social courts and 2 advanced courts. We definitely need at least two additional advanced courts to balance out attendance. I hope this is being considered. Thank you for your attention to my request.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 3:41 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Ryan Johnson
E-mail ryanmjohnsonre@gmail.com
Comments I played 3x a week there from Easter 2021 to July 2021.
It's too crowded. Need more designated rec courts AND
competitive courts as well (those games last longer).

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 9:07 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name [Pat Moran](#)
E-mail patmoran123@gmail.com
Comments [More Pickleball courts.](#)

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:58 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Bill Maloney
E-mail wgmaloney@hotmail.com
Comments Please add to the master plan the addition of pickleball courts at more parks. They footprint is small and the courses are a welcome amenity to many. Thank you

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:25 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Tom Devaney
E-mail the.devaneys@roadrunner.com
Comments We need more pickleball courts.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 5:46 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Annette Maloney
E-mail amaloney01@yahoo.com
Comments Carlsbad could use more Pickleball courts, Poinsettia is always very crowded.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 11:24 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Lynn Chang
E-mail Lynnchang@yahoo.com
Comments Pickleball courts are too crowded at Pointsettia, we need more Pickleball courts in Carlsbad!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 6:05 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Sue Nopar
E-mail Sabesmom@hotmail.com
Comments It would be great to get more pickleball courts in Carlsbad. There is often a long wait to get on a court at Poinsettia Park. Thank you!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 4:00 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mary Lou Kestler
E-mail maryloukestler@yahoo.com
Comments Need more outdoor Pickleball courts please
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 24, 2021 11:49 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: FW: Has COVID changed parks and recreation priorities?

Importance: High

Mick:

Thank you. We wanted to make sure you and the City are documenting and considering the citizen input you have received so far over the past several years regarding Ponto Park needs. Can you confirm that you are considering this citizen input in your work?

Clearly the need for wide open grassy spaces that allow social distancing and multi-function park and recreation opportunities is a key lesson from Covid along with having those wide grassy multi-use parklands within walking distance to all neighborhoods. This has been expressed repeatedly by Carlsbad's citizens regarding in the Coastal Park void (unserved area) in South Carlsbad.

Carlsbad citizens have identified several significant private sector/donor funding sources for Ponto Coastal Park. How can Carlsbad citizens have a discussion with you and the City on those opportunities?

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to confirmation that years of citizen input to the City on Ponto Park is being considered in your efforts.

Thanks again, and Happy Thanksgiving,

Lance Schulte

From: City of Carlsbad [mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad
Sent: Wednesday, November 24, 2021 9:26 AM
To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Has COVID changed parks and recreation priorities?



[View as Webpage](#)



Has COVID changed parks and recreation priorities?

The City of Carlsbad is creating an updated blueprint that will guide priorities and proposed investments in parks and recreation for the next five years. This project was interrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as the project starts back up, the city wants to know if the community's priorities have changed.

Community members are encouraged to attend one of two upcoming virtual meetings to hear the public feedback that was provided in February 2020 and let the city know if anything has changed.

Thursday, Dec. 9, 6 to 7 p.m.

[Register](#)

Saturday, Dec. 11, 10 to 11 a.m.

[Register](#)

The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015. The update will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A five-year strategic action plan

Other input opportunities

Input from the workshops will be used to create a survey questionnaire to obtain feedback from a statistically representative group of Carlsbad residents. The survey will also be available online to anyone who wants to take it; however, the results will be analyzed separately from the random sample.

A draft of the master plan will be made available for input by the end of summer 2022, with a final draft scheduled to be presented to the City Council for approval in fall of 2022.

More information

Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859



[Visit website](#)

City of Carlsbad | 1200 Carlsbad Village Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by communications@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 12:54 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mike Tindall
E-mail tindallmike@hotmail.com

Comments

I am 75 years old and I enjoy playing pickleball. It is a multi-generational sport. Usually I play with people younger than me at Poinsettia Park and enjoy the experience. We need more outside courts in Carlsbad. Sometimes the wait between games at Poinsettia Park is longer than the actual playing time. At the minimum-only to save money- check on double use of the tennis courts at Poinsettia. The City of Encinitas does it with success at Cottonwood Creek Park. Check with them or observe it in person. Many Carlsbad residents played there before the courts at Poinsettia were built. Thanks for your consideration.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: FW: Pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park

From: Douglas Gore <douglasgore4@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 2:39 PM

To: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>

Subject: Pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park

Dear Matt, Kyle and Mike,

Pickleball is the fastest growing sport in the United States. It is being played in elementary, middle, high school and by college athletes. There is talk that it might be played in the next Summer Olympics. There are 134 tennis courts in the city of Carlsbad and only 6 Pickleball courts. Making 1 tennis court a multi-use court, tennis and Pickleball will not keep people from playing tennis. I won't push my luck and ask you to use 2 tennis courts for multi-use courts LOL. In fact, the tennis courts at Poinsettia Park are very underutilized.

Believe it or not, a lot of money comes into Carlsbad. I talk to people almost everyday that drive to Carlsbad to play at Poinsettia Park. These people live in Chula Vista, La Jolla, Poway, Fallbrook, Escondido, Vista, San Marcos and Oceanside to name a few cities. They eat at our restaurants, buy gas, shop at our stores, they help support our local businesses.

The six courts at Poinsettia are some of the best courts in San Diego County! Often 20-40 people are waiting to play, which is frustrating when you look West and see 3-5 tennis courts are empty; not being used. What's funny, a lot of pickleball players are tennis players that have fallen in love with pickleball.

The Pickleball courts are being fully utilized on a daily basis. In fact, there are not enough Pickleball courts. Almost everyday people are waiting from 10-40 minutes to play 1 game because there are so many people waiting to play and not enough courts.

I would like to make a suggestion, which would be very cost effective and simple to do. No need for new construction or extensive planning permits. Take the one tennis court (Southwest Court) located next to the main parking lot and adjacent to the main park, away from residential homes and paint pickleball lines (shadow lines) on the tennis courts. Encinitas did this on two of their tennis courts, see picture below; they didn't go through an extensive, time consuming building or permitting process. Noise would not be an issue at this location because it is towards the middle of the park and next to the parking lot. Leave the tennis net in place, it will be used as a divider between the four pickleball courts; see picture below. Place portable, heavy-duty pickleball nets, like they use at Bobby Riggs on this court; see picture below. When people are not playing tennis, pickleball can be played. When people are not playing pickleball, tennis can be played.

One tennis court would allow at least 16 pickleball players to get their mental and physical exercise as compared to two or four tennis players. These four courts could be used for more advanced players. The permanent six pickleball courts can then be used for beginner to intermediate players. When and if Carlsbad builds new pickleball courts, (we all are praying and have our fingers crossed) the converted tennis court can easily be converted back to a full-time tennis court.

I REALLY hope you will consider this idea. The tennis courts are not being utilized to their full capacity. In fact, many, many, times throughout the day, the tennis courts are half empty and the pickleball courts have a lot of people waiting to play, needless to say, it is very frustrating. Tennis players are converting to pickleball, as much as they don't want to admit it.

Pickleball brings families together. Many new friendships are formed. Money comes into Carlsbad.

This would be a temporary solution. The tennis court would not be gone permanently. If money is an issue to convert, I'm sure the Pickleball community will be more than willing to help raise money to paint the lines and buy the portable nets.

Thank you!

Cheers~

Douglas Gore

Cottonwood Creek Park Tennis Courts,
Encinitas, California



Light brown lines (shadow lines) have been painted on two tennis courts to create eight Pickleball courts; the tennis net separates the four pickleball courts. Temporary pickleball nets are rolled onto the court when the tennis court is not being used. Tennis or pickleball can be played at the same location.

Sturdy and Portable Pickleball Nets
Local Company started by one of the top women
Pickleball players in the USA
C&D Pickleball Nets (760) 710-7413
Notice orange shadow lines on tennis court to
create Pickleball courts.

https://bestpickleballnets.business.site/?utm_source=gmb&utm_medium=referral

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 4:38 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Linda Shafer
E-mail Las0510@yahoo.com
Comments We and a large group of friends in the community (from elementary schoolers to seniors) enjoy the fitness and fun of pickle-ball. We would love to see the tennis courts at Laguna Riviera Park (by Kelly School) converted into temporary pickle-ball and tennis courts. It could be similar to what Escondido did at Cottonwood Park.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 4:51 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Karen Thuesen Walsh
E-mail walshfamily@roadrunner.com
Comments I would love to see pickle ball courts at stagecoach park. Have to drive all the way to poinsettia to use public pickle ball courts. Poinsettia is often very crowded and has long waits to play.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:12 PM
To: Communications; Mick Calarco; Council Internet Email; Kyle Lancaster
Cc: Boyle, Carrie@Coastal; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal; City Clerk; info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Parks Commission:

Sorry I am unable to attend the workshops. Following is my public input & data, and suggested questions the City should provide citizens in setting park land use policy and priorities:

A clear lesson from Covid is the need for flat wide open grassy parks that fully allow social distancing and multi-function park and recreation opportunities within a 10-minute walking distance to all neighborhoods. This fundamentally what city parks are intended to provide – flat wide-grassed-flat and fully useable multi-function spaces to recreate formally or informally, and being accessible by a short walk to all neighborhoods and children without having to drive a car to access.

Another clear lesson comes from new City and State parallel moves to demand unlimited population growth using higher density condo/apartment developments. These developments by definition pack more people into a smaller area thus creating an even greater need for parks. Making flat wide open grassy and fully useable parks even more important to be provided within a 10-minute walk.

Trails although nice to walk along in the outdoors force people into a 5-8 foot wide path that does not allow social distancing. A trail is not a park.

Carlsbad People for Ponto (P4P) Citizens have for years provided the City input on Parks and Recreation Priority issues from 2017 to less than 2-months ago, and to now. Since pre-Covid 2017 over about 5,000 written/verbal petitions and multiple budget processes have been provided. In an after-Covid situation, most recently in October 2021, about 700 written/verbal petitions and public testimony was provided. Carlsbad P4P Citizen input is based on documented City records. P4P Carlsbad Citizen input is/has been consistent with the above Covid observations and significant in the numbers of Citizens calling for a meaningful (i.e. usable wide, grassed multi-function) park at Ponto. The P4P Citizen input should be fully disclosed, discussed and accounted for in the Parks Master Plan.

P4P's 30-page October 15, 2021 "Coastal Recreation" data file to the City documented comparative park data that the City should fully present and discuss with Citizens as part of the Parks Master Plan. The comparative park data shows Carlsbad is below average nationally and significantly below our adjacent Cities in providing parks – and requiring Carlsbad developers provide parks for their developments. It also documents how over 112 acres, or over 33% of all existing/planned City parkland is constrained and unusable to humans to fully use as a park. Having over 33% of City Parks constrained and not fully useable a park for citizens is a significant city land use and parks master plan issue. The 30-pages of documented information and requests in the October 15, 2021 Coastal Recreation file should be a part of the park master plan process. Following are some key park data the City should present and key park priority questions on that data the City should ask citizens:

1. Carlsbad only requires developers to provide a comparatively low 3-acres of parkland per 1,000 population of Carlsbad developments. Encinitas and Oceanside require their developers to provide 5-acres per 1,000 population, which is over 60% more parkland than Carlsbad's City Council requires developers to provide.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require 60% less parkland than Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide the same 5-acres per 1,000 parkland as Encinitas and Oceanside?

2. Carlsbad does not plan for, or require developers, to provide parks within a 10-minute walk to homes. Both Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be provided within a 10-minute walk of all homes in their Cities.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require parks to be within a 10-minute walk of homes like Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide their parkland requirement (3 or 5 acres/1,000 population) be within a 10-minute walk of homes the homes the developer builds like Encinitas and Oceanside?

3. Carlsbad is BELOW the national average in BOTH providing Parkland and in providing Parkland Within a 10-minutewalk to homes (see ,Trust for Public Land Park Score).
 - a. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland?
 - b. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
 - c. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland within a 10-minute walk to homes?
 - d. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland within a 10-minute walk of homes so as to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)

4. South Carlsbad composes 62% of Carlsbad's population, yet has no large grassy usable Coastal park (like a Holiday Park) and has 0-acers of park west of I-5.
 - a. Should 62% of Carlsbad's population have at least one large grassy and fully useable park?
 - b. Should South Carlsbad developers be required to correct this park inequity?

5. North Carlsbad composes 38% of Carlsbad's population, yet has 10 Coastal parks totaling over 35-acres west of I-5.
 - a. Should the City's planned park investments be re-prioritized to correlate the location of coastal park land acreage with population demand?

6. South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build and fund many North Carlsbad park acres in both Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park.
 - a. Should the City appropriately use those South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park to fund parks in South Carlsbad where the development and park demand from that development occurred?

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to confirmation that years of P4P citizen input to the City on Park issues is being considered in your efforts.

From: City of Carlsbad [mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 10:30 AM

To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings



[View as Webpage](#)



Parks & Recreation Master Plan Meetings are this Week

Don't forget to register for one of two virtual meetings we're holding this week to talk about whether COVID has changed parks and rec priorities.

Thursday, Dec. 9, 6 to 7 p.m.

[Register](#)

Saturday, Dec. 11, 10 to 11 a.m.

[Register](#)

The City of Carlsbad is creating an updated blueprint that will guide priorities and proposed investments in parks and recreation for the next five years. This project was interrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as the project starts back up, the city wants to know if the community's priorities have changed.

Community members are encouraged to attend one of the two virtual meetings to hear the public feedback that was provided in February 2020 and let the city know if anything has changed.

The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015. The update will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A five-year strategic action plan

Other input opportunities

Input from the workshops will be used to create a survey questionnaire to obtain feedback from a statistically representative group of Carlsbad residents. The survey will also be available online to anyone who wants to take it; however, the results will be analyzed separately from the random sample.

A draft of the master plan will be made available for input by the end of summer 2022, with a final draft scheduled to be presented to the City Council for approval in fall of 2022.

More information

Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859



Visit website

City of Carlsbad | 1200 Carlsbad Village Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by communications@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Communications; Mick Calarco; Council Internet Email; Kyle Lancaster
Cc: Boyle, Carrie@Coastal; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal; City Clerk; info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings
Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2021-Oct U....pdf

in case you do not have the 30-page October 2021 Coastal Recreation file, here it is attached.

Thank you.

Happy Holidays,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:12 PM
To: 'communications@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mick Calarco'; 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle Lancaster'
Cc: Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); 'City Clerk'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Parks Commission:

Sorry I am unable to attend the workshops. Following is my public input & data, and suggested questions the City should provide citizens in setting park land use policy and priorities:

A clear lesson from Covid is the need for flat wide open grassy parks that fully allow social distancing and multi-function park and recreation opportunities within a 10-minute walking distance to all neighborhoods. This fundamentally what city parks are intended to provide – flat wide-grassed-flat and fully useable multi-function spaces to recreate formally or informally, and being accessible by a short walk to all neighborhoods and children without having to drive a car to access.

Another clear lesson comes from new City and State parallel moves to demand unlimited population growth using higher density condo/apartment developments. These developments by definition pack more people into a smaller area thus creating an even greater need for parks. Making flat wide open grassy and fully useable parks even more important to be provided within a 10-minute walk.

Trails although nice to walk along in the outdoors force people into a 5-8 foot wide path that does not allow social distancing. A trail is not a park.

Carlsbad People for Ponto (P4P) Citizens have for years provided the City input on Parks and Recreation Priority issues from 2017 to less than 2-months ago, and to now. Since pre-Covid 2017 over about 5,000 written/verbal petitions and multiple budget processes have been provided. In an after-Covid situation, most recently in October 2021, about 700 written/verbal petitions and public testimony was provided. Carlsbad P4P Citizen input is based on documented City records. P4P Carlsbad Citizen input is/has been consistent with the above Covid observations and significant in the numbers of Citizens calling for a meaningful (i.e. usable wide, grassed multi-function) park at Ponto. The P4P Citizen input should be fully disclosed, discussed and accounted for in the Parks Master Plan.

P4P's 30-page October 15, 2021 "Coastal Recreation" data file to the City documented comparative park data that the City should fully present and discuss with Citizens as part of the Parks Master Plan. The comparative park data shows Carlsbad is below average nationally and significantly below our adjacent Cities in providing parks – and requiring Carlsbad developers provide parks for their developments. It also documents how over 112 acres, or over 33% of all existing/planned City parkland is constrained and unusable to humans to fully use as a park. Having over 33% of City Parks constrained and not fully useable a park for citizens is a significant city land use and parks master plan issue. The 30-pages of documented information and requests in the October 15, 2021 Coastal Recreation file should be a part of the park master plan process. Following are some key park data the City should present and key park priority questions on that data the City should ask citizens:

1. Carlsbad only requires developers to provide a comparatively low 3-acres of parkland per 1,000 population of Carlsbad developments. Encinitas and Oceanside require their developers to provide 5-acres per 1,000 population, which is over 60% more parkland than Carlsbad's City Council requires developers to provide.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require 60% less parkland than Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide the same 5-acres per 1,000 parkland as Encinitas and Oceanside?
2. Carlsbad does not plan for, or require developers, to provide parks within a 10-minute walk to homes. Both Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be provided within a 10-minute walk of all homes in their Cities.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require parks to be within a 10-minute walk of homes like Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide their parkland requirement (3 or 5 acres/1,000 population) be within a 10-minute walk of homes the homes the developer builds like Encinitas and Oceanside?
3. Carlsbad is BELOW the national average in BOTH providing Parkland and in providing Parkland Within a 10-minutewalk to homes (see ,Trust for Public Land Park Score).
 - a. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland?
 - b. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
 - c. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland within a 10-minute walk to homes?
 - d. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland within a 10-minute walk of homes so as to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
4. South Carlsbad composes 62% of Carlsbad's population, yet has no large grassy usable Coastal park (like a Holiday Park) and has 0-acers of park west of I-5.
 - a. Should 62% of Carlsbad's population have at least one large grassy and fully useable park?
 - b. Should South Carlsbad developers be required to correct this park inequity?
5. North Carlsbad composes 38% of Carlsbad's population, yet has 10 Coastal parks totaling over 35-acres west of I-5.
 - a. Should the City's planned park investments be re-prioritized to correlate the location of coastal park land acreage with population demand?
6. South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build and fund many North Carlsbad park acres in both Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park.

- a. Should the City appropriately use those South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park to fund parks in South Carlsbad where the development and park demand from that development occurred?


Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to confirmation that years of P4P citizen input to the City on Park issues is being considered in your efforts.

From: City of Carlsbad [mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad


Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 10:30 AM

To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings



[View as Webpage](#)



Parks & Recreation Master Plan Meetings are this Week

Don't forget to register for one of two virtual meetings we're holding this week to talk about whether COVID has changed parks and rec priorities.

Thursday, Dec. 9, 6 to 7 p.m.

[Register](#)

Saturday, Dec. 11, 10 to 11 a.m.

[Register](#)

The City of Carlsbad is creating an updated blueprint that will guide priorities and proposed investments in parks and recreation for the next five years. This project was interrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as the project starts back up, the city wants to know if the community's priorities have changed.

Community members are encouraged to attend one of the two virtual meetings to hear the public feedback that was provided in February 2020 and let the city know if anything has changed.

The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015. The update will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A five-year strategic action plan

Other input opportunities

Input from the workshops will be used to create a survey questionnaire to obtain feedback from a statistically representative group of Carlsbad residents. The survey will also be available online to anyone who wants to take it; however, the results will be analyzed separately from the random sample.

A draft of the master plan will be made available for input by the end of summer 2022, with a final draft scheduled to be presented to the City Council for approval in fall of 2022.

More information

Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859



Visit website



[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net)
[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)
Sent by communications@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on Oct 12th 2021:

On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:

- For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
- For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
- For Policy 6-10 concerns providing Low Cost Visitor Accommodations. Public Parks are the lowest cost (free) Visitor accommodating land use there is.

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City's past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: "Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980's. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad's 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- "POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.
- POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
- POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations"

The public record request is to see documents of:

- City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on January 2021:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 5-30 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| <u>Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage</u> | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland |

Anticipated Future Park development projects

| <u>Park - quadrant</u> | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:**
 - 4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,
 - 6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and
 - 2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant

Shortfall (excess) in
Current Quadrant
Park standard by

| | population | | Future Park | | existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants |
|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | acres | need | acres | % | |
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the demand for that Park.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning; is highly detrimental to the City, City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and City Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

2. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

3. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
- Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

4. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ...”; 2). This data be used in the City’s analysis and the public’s review and discussion about the City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount “maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone” and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to “assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”. Most of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

5. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City’s proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open


space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

our local streets to find a significantly large open area to play in. Ponto residents have to drive their kids to get to a park increasing VMT and GHG emissions. The City's proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan 'solution' to Ponto's no-park condition, along with the City's need to add an additional 6.5 acres of new City parks in Southwest Carlsbad to comply with the Southwest Carlsbad's 2012 population demand (at a ratio of 3-acre/1,000 population) is to provide a City Park – Veterans Park – over 6-miles away from the Ponto and Southwest Carlsbad population need. This makes a bad situation worse. The City's proposed location is totally inaccessible to serve the needs of the population of children or anyone without a car, that it is intended to serve in South Carlsbad. This City proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan 'solution' seems inappropriate and inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act and common sense. During the City's Veterans Park and budget community workshops citizens expressed a desire for a Ponto Park to be the solution to our Ponto and Southwest Carlsbad Park deficits. Those citizen requests were not apparently considered as part of the City's proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan. Following is an image summarizing the magnitude of citizen needs/desires expressed at the City's Budget workshop. Note the number and size of the text citing Ponto Park and South Carlsbad that reflects the number and magnitude/intensity of citizen workshop groups' input. The failure to acknowledge this public participation and data in the Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan Park seems in conflict with CCA Sections 30006 and 30252(6):



For South Carlsbad there is a complete lack of any existing or planned City Coastal Park and park acreage west of I-5, while North Carlsbad has 9 existing and 1 planned City Coastal Parks totaling 37.8 acres of City Coastal W of I-5 North Carlsbad. Not only is this unfair to South Carlsbad, it is also unfair to North Carlsbad as it increases VMT and parking impacts in North Carlsbad because South Carlsbad is not providing the City Coastal Parks for South Carlsbad resident/visitor demands. This City Park disparity is shown on Figure 3-1 of the Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan;

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

6. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is an obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail




Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



7. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:

- Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - Source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

8. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can


only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

9. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.


10. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.

- Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
- Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
- Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
- Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the

Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



11. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that

15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

12. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:

- Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
- In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
- In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.

- Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
- In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
- In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without First disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
- In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to ether:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of "Non-Residential Reserve" until such time as the City's past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park") to provide both "High-Priory" coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

13. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words "shall") these "low

priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City “may” or ‘may not’ choose (per the proposed “may” LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City’s (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy ‘shell game’. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two “may” criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only “low-priority” residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by “shall” policy) winners, and “high-priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal ‘long-shot’ (“may” policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the

documented “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently

dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

14. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

15. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is

illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 4:51 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Karen Thuesen Walsh
E-mail walshfamily@roadrunner.com
Comments I would love to see pickle ball courts at stagecoach park.
Have to drive all the way to poinsettia to use public
pickle ball courts. Poinsettia is often very crowded and
has long waits to play.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Communications; Mick Calarco; Council Internet Email; Kyle Lancaster
Cc: Boyle, Carrie@Coastal; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal; City Clerk; info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings
Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2021-Oct U....pdf

in case you do not have the 30-page October 2021 Coastal Recreation file, here it is attached.

Thank you.

Happy Holidays,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:12 PM
To: 'communications@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mick Calarco'; 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle Lancaster'
Cc: Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); 'City Clerk'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Parks Commission:

Sorry I am unable to attend the workshops. Following is my public input & data, and suggested questions the City should provide citizens in setting park land use policy and priorities:

A clear lesson from Covid is the need for flat wide open grassy parks that fully allow social distancing and multi-function park and recreation opportunities within a 10-minute walking distance to all neighborhoods. This fundamentally what city parks are intended to provide – flat wide-grassed-flat and fully useable multi-function spaces to recreate formally or informally, and being accessible by a short walk to all neighborhoods and children without having to drive a car to access.

Another clear lesson comes from new City and State parallel moves to demand unlimited population growth using higher density condo/apartment developments. These developments by definition pack more people into a smaller area thus creating an even greater need for parks. Making flat wide open grassy and fully useable parks even more important to be provided within a 10-minute walk.

Trails although nice to walk along in the outdoors force people into a 5-8 foot wide path that does not allow social distancing. A trail is not a park.

Carlsbad People for Ponto (P4P) Citizens have for years provided the City input on Parks and Recreation Priority issues from 2017 to less than 2-months ago, and to now. Since pre-Covid 2017 over about 5,000 written/verbal petitions and multiple budget processes have been provided. In an after-Covid situation, most recently in October 2021, about 700 written/verbal petitions and public testimony was provided. Carlsbad P4P Citizen input is based on documented City records. P4P Carlsbad Citizen input is/has been consistent with the above Covid observations and significant in the numbers of Citizens calling for a meaningful (i.e. usable wide, grassed multi-function) park at Ponto. The P4P Citizen input should be fully disclosed, discussed and accounted for in the Parks Master Plan.

P4P's 30-page October 15, 2021 "Coastal Recreation" data file to the City documented comparative park data that the City should fully present and discuss with Citizens as part of the Parks Master Plan. The comparative park data shows Carlsbad is below average nationally and significantly below our adjacent Cities in providing parks – and requiring Carlsbad developers provide parks for their developments. It also documents how over 112 acres, or over 33% of all existing/planned City parkland is constrained and unusable to humans to fully use as a park. Having over 33% of City Parks constrained and not fully useable a park for citizens is a significant city land use and parks master plan issue. The 30-pages of documented information and requests in the October 15, 2021 Coastal Recreation file should be a part of the park master plan process. Following are some key park data the City should present and key park priority questions on that data the City should ask citizens:

1. Carlsbad only requires developers to provide a comparatively low 3-acres of parkland per 1,000 population of Carlsbad developments. Encinitas and Oceanside require their developers to provide 5-acres per 1,000 population, which is over 60% more parkland than Carlsbad's City Council requires developers to provide.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require 60% less parkland than Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide the same 5-acres per 1,000 parkland as Encinitas and Oceanside?
2. Carlsbad does not plan for, or require developers, to provide parks within a 10-minute walk to homes. Both Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be provided within a 10-minute walk of all homes in their Cities.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require parks to be within a 10-minute walk of homes like Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide their parkland requirement (3 or 5 acres/1,000 population) be within a 10-minute walk of homes the homes the developer builds like Encinitas and Oceanside?
3. Carlsbad is BELOW the national average in BOTH providing Parkland and in providing Parkland Within a 10-minutewalk to homes (see ,Trust for Public Land Park Score).
 - a. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland?
 - b. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
 - c. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland within a 10-minute walk to homes?
 - d. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland within a 10-minute walk of homes so as to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
4. South Carlsbad composes 62% of Carlsbad's population, yet has no large grassy usable Coastal park (like a Holiday Park) and has 0-acers of park west of I-5.
 - a. Should 62% of Carlsbad's population have at least one large grassy and fully useable park?
 - b. Should South Carlsbad developers be required to correct this park inequity?
5. North Carlsbad composes 38% of Carlsbad's population, yet has 10 Coastal parks totaling over 35-acres west of I-5.
 - a. Should the City's planned park investments be re-prioritized to correlate the location of coastal park land acreage with population demand?
6. South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build and fund many North Carlsbad park acres in both Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park.

- a. Should the City appropriately use those South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park to fund parks in South Carlsbad where the development and park demand from that development occurred?


Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to confirmation that years of P4P citizen input to the City on Park issues is being considered in your efforts.

From: City of Carlsbad [mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad


Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 10:30 AM

To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings



[View as Webpage](#)



Parks & Recreation Master Plan Meetings are this Week

Don't forget to register for one of two virtual meetings we're holding this week to talk about whether COVID has changed parks and rec priorities.

Thursday, Dec. 9, 6 to 7 p.m.

[Register](#)

Saturday, Dec. 11, 10 to 11 a.m.

[Register](#)

The City of Carlsbad is creating an updated blueprint that will guide priorities and proposed investments in parks and recreation for the next five years. This project was interrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as the project starts back up, the city wants to know if the community's priorities have changed.

Community members are encouraged to attend one of the two virtual meetings to hear the public feedback that was provided in February 2020 and let the city know if anything has changed.

The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015. The update will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A five-year strategic action plan

Other input opportunities

Input from the workshops will be used to create a survey questionnaire to obtain feedback from a statistically representative group of Carlsbad residents. The survey will also be available online to anyone who wants to take it; however, the results will be analyzed separately from the random sample.

A draft of the master plan will be made available for input by the end of summer 2022, with a final draft scheduled to be presented to the City Council for approval in fall of 2022.

More information

Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859



Visit website



[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net)
[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)
Sent by communications@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on Oct 12th 2021:

On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:

- For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
- For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
- For Policy 6-10 concerns providing Low Cost Visitor Accommodations. Public Parks are the lowest cost (free) Visitor accommodating land use there is.

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City's past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: "Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980's. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad's 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- "POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.
- POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
- POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations"

The public record request is to see documents of:

- City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on January 2021:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 5-30 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| <u>Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage</u> | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland |

Anticipated Future Park development projects

| <u>Park - quadrant</u> | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:**
 - 4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,
 - 6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and
 - 2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant

Shortfall (excess) in
Current Quadrant
Park standard by

| | population | | Future Park | | existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants |
|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | acres | need | acres | % | |
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the demand for that Park.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning; is highly detrimental to the City, City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and City Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

2. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

3. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
- Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

4. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ...”; 2). This data be used in the City’s analysis and the public’s review and discussion about the City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount “maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone” and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to “assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”. Most of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

5. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City’s proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

6. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is an obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail




Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



7. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:
- Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - Source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

8. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can


only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

9. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.


10. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.

- Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
- Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
- Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
- Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the

Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



11. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that

15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

12. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:

- Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
- In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
- In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.

- Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
- In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
- In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without First disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
- In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to ether:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of "Non-Residential Reserve" until such time as the City's past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park") to provide both "High-Priory" coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

13. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words "shall") these "low

priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City “may” or ‘may not’ choose (per the proposed “may” LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City’s (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy ‘shell game’. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two “may” criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only “low-priority” residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by “shall” policy) winners, and “high-priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal ‘long-shot’ (“may” policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the

documented “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently

dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

14. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

15. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is

illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Communications; Mick Calarco; Council Internet Email; Kyle Lancaster
Cc: Boyle, Carrie@Coastal; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal; City Clerk; info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings
Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2021-Oct U....pdf

in case you do not have the 30-page October 2021 Coastal Recreation file, here it is attached.

Thank you.

Happy Holidays,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:12 PM
To: 'communications@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mick Calarco'; 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle Lancaster'
Cc: Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); 'City Clerk'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Parks Commission:

Sorry I am unable to attend the workshops. Following is my public input & data, and suggested questions the City should provide citizens in setting park land use policy and priorities:

A clear lesson from Covid is the need for flat wide open grassy parks that fully allow social distancing and multi-function park and recreation opportunities within a 10-minute walking distance to all neighborhoods. This fundamentally what city parks are intended to provide – flat wide-grassed-flat and fully useable multi-function spaces to recreate formally or informally, and being accessible by a short walk to all neighborhoods and children without having to drive a car to access.

Another clear lesson comes from new City and State parallel moves to demand unlimited population growth using higher density condo/apartment developments. These developments by definition pack more people into a smaller area thus creating an even greater need for parks. Making flat wide open grassy and fully useable parks even more important to be provided within a 10-minute walk.

Trails although nice to walk along in the outdoors force people into a 5-8 foot wide path that does not allow social distancing. A trail is not a park.

Carlsbad People for Ponto (P4P) Citizens have for years provided the City input on Parks and Recreation Priority issues from 2017 to less than 2-months ago, and to now. Since pre-Covid 2017 over about 5,000 written/verbal petitions and multiple budget processes have been provided. In an after-Covid situation, most recently in October 2021, about 700 written/verbal petitions and public testimony was provided. Carlsbad P4P Citizen input is based on documented City records. P4P Carlsbad Citizen input is/has been consistent with the above Covid observations and significant in the numbers of Citizens calling for a meaningful (i.e. usable wide, grassed multi-function) park at Ponto. The P4P Citizen input should be fully disclosed, discussed and accounted for in the Parks Master Plan.

P4P's 30-page October 15, 2021 "Coastal Recreation" data file to the City documented comparative park data that the City should fully present and discuss with Citizens as part of the Parks Master Plan. The comparative park data shows Carlsbad is below average nationally and significantly below our adjacent Cities in providing parks – and requiring Carlsbad developers provide parks for their developments. It also documents how over 112 acres, or over 33% of all existing/planned City parkland is constrained and unusable to humans to fully use as a park. Having over 33% of City Parks constrained and not fully useable a park for citizens is a significant city land use and parks master plan issue. The 30-pages of documented information and requests in the October 15, 2021 Coastal Recreation file should be a part of the park master plan process. Following are some key park data the City should present and key park priority questions on that data the City should ask citizens:

1. Carlsbad only requires developers to provide a comparatively low 3-acres of parkland per 1,000 population of Carlsbad developments. Encinitas and Oceanside require their developers to provide 5-acres per 1,000 population, which is over 60% more parkland than Carlsbad's City Council requires developers to provide.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require 60% less parkland than Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide the same 5-acres per 1,000 parkland as Encinitas and Oceanside?
2. Carlsbad does not plan for, or require developers, to provide parks within a 10-minute walk to homes. Both Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be provided within a 10-minute walk of all homes in their Cities.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require parks to be within a 10-minute walk of homes like Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide their parkland requirement (3 or 5 acres/1,000 population) be within a 10-minute walk of homes the homes the developer builds like Encinitas and Oceanside?
3. Carlsbad is BELOW the national average in BOTH providing Parkland and in providing Parkland Within a 10-minutewalk to homes (see ,Trust for Public Land Park Score).
 - a. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland?
 - b. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
 - c. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland within a 10-minute walk to homes?
 - d. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland within a 10-minute walk of homes so as to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
4. South Carlsbad composes 62% of Carlsbad's population, yet has no large grassy usable Coastal park (like a Holiday Park) and has 0-acers of park west of I-5.
 - a. Should 62% of Carlsbad's population have at least one large grassy and fully useable park?
 - b. Should South Carlsbad developers be required to correct this park inequity?
5. North Carlsbad composes 38% of Carlsbad's population, yet has 10 Coastal parks totaling over 35-acres west of I-5.
 - a. Should the City's planned park investments be re-prioritized to correlate the location of coastal park land acreage with population demand?
6. South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build and fund many North Carlsbad park acres in both Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park.

- a. Should the City appropriately use those South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park to fund parks in South Carlsbad where the development and park demand from that development occurred?


Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to confirmation that years of P4P citizen input to the City on Park issues is being considered in your efforts.

From: City of Carlsbad [mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad

Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 10:30 AM

To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings



[View as Webpage](#)

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Meetings are this Week

Don't forget to register for one of two virtual meetings we're holding this week to talk about whether COVID has changed parks and rec priorities.

Thursday, Dec. 9, 6 to 7 p.m.

[Register](#)

Saturday, Dec. 11, 10 to 11 a.m.

[Register](#)

The City of Carlsbad is creating an updated blueprint that will guide priorities and proposed investments in parks and recreation for the next five years. This project was interrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as the project starts back up, the city wants to know if the community's priorities have changed.

Community members are encouraged to attend one of the two virtual meetings to hear the public feedback that was provided in February 2020 and let the city know if anything has changed.

The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015. The update will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A five-year strategic action plan

Other input opportunities

Input from the workshops will be used to create a survey questionnaire to obtain feedback from a statistically representative group of Carlsbad residents. The survey will also be available online to anyone who wants to take it; however, the results will be analyzed separately from the random sample.

A draft of the master plan will be made available for input by the end of summer 2022, with a final draft scheduled to be presented to the City Council for approval in fall of 2022.

More information

Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859



Visit website



[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net)
[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)
Sent by communications@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on Oct 12th 2021:

On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:

- For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
- For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
- For Policy 6-10 concerns providing Low Cost Visitor Accommodations. Public Parks are the lowest cost (free) Visitor accommodating land use there is.

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City's past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: "Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980's. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad's 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- "POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.
- POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
- POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations"

The public record request is to see documents of:

- City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on January 2021:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 5-30 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| <u>Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage</u> | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland |

Anticipated Future Park development projects

| <u>Park - quadrant</u> | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:**
 - 4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,
 - 6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and
 - 2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant

Shortfall (excess) in
Current Quadrant
Park standard by

| | population | | Future Park | | existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants |
|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | acres | need | acres | % | |
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the demand for that Park.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning; is highly detrimental to the City, City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and City Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

2. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

3. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
- Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

4. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ...”; 2). This data be used in the City’s analysis and the public’s review and discussion about the City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount “maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone” and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to “assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”. Most of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

5. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City’s proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

6. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is an obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.


How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail




Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



7. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:
- Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - Source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

8. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can


only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

9. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.


10. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.

- Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
- Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
- Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
- Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the

Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



11. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that

15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

12. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:

- Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
- In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
- In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.

- Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
- In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
- In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without First disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
- In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to ether:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of "Non-Residential Reserve" until such time as the City's past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park") to provide both "High-Priory" coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

13. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words "shall") these "low

priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City “may” or ‘may not’ choose (per the proposed “may” LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City’s (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy ‘shell game’. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two “may” criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only “low-priority” residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by “shall” policy) winners, and “high-priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal ‘long-shot’ (“may” policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the

documented “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently

dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

14. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.
15. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is

illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 4:51 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Karen Thuesen Walsh
E-mail walshfamily@roadrunner.com
Comments I would love to see pickle ball courts at stagecoach park. Have to drive all the way to poinsettia to use public pickle ball courts. Poinsettia is often very crowded and has long waits to play.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:12 PM
To: Communications; Mick Calarco; Council Internet Email; Kyle Lancaster
Cc: Boyle, Carrie@Coastal; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal; City Clerk; info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Parks Commission:

Sorry I am unable to attend the workshops. Following is my public input & data, and suggested questions the City should provide citizens in setting park land use policy and priorities:

A clear lesson from Covid is the need for flat wide open grassy parks that fully allow social distancing and multi-function park and recreation opportunities within a 10-minute walking distance to all neighborhoods. This fundamentally what city parks are intended to provide – flat wide-grassed-flat and fully useable multi-function spaces to recreate formally or informally, and being accessible by a short walk to all neighborhoods and children without having to drive a car to access.

Another clear lesson comes from new City and State parallel moves to demand unlimited population growth using higher density condo/apartment developments. These developments by definition pack more people into a smaller area thus creating an even greater need for parks. Making flat wide open grassy and fully useable parks even more important to be provided within a 10-minute walk.

Trails although nice to walk along in the outdoors force people into a 5-8 foot wide path that does not allow social distancing. A trail is not a park.

Carlsbad People for Ponto (P4P) Citizens have for years provided the City input on Parks and Recreation Priority issues from 2017 to less than 2-months ago, and to now. Since pre-Covid 2017 over about 5,000 written/verbal petitions and multiple budget processes have been provided. In an after-Covid situation, most recently in October 2021, about 700 written/verbal petitions and public testimony was provided. Carlsbad P4P Citizen input is based on documented City records. P4P Carlsbad Citizen input is/has been consistent with the above Covid observations and significant in the numbers of Citizens calling for a meaningful (i.e. usable wide, grassed multi-function) park at Ponto. The P4P Citizen input should be fully disclosed, discussed and accounted for in the Parks Master Plan.

P4P's 30-page October 15, 2021 "Coastal Recreation" data file to the City documented comparative park data that the City should fully present and discuss with Citizens as part of the Parks Master Plan. The comparative park data shows Carlsbad is below average nationally and significantly below our adjacent Cities in providing parks – and requiring Carlsbad developers provide parks for their developments. It also documents how over 112 acres, or over 33% of all existing/planned City parkland is constrained and unusable to humans to fully use as a park. Having over 33% of City Parks constrained and not fully useable a park for citizens is a significant city land use and parks master plan issue. The 30-pages of documented information and requests in the October 15, 2021 Coastal Recreation file should be a part of the park master plan process. Following are some key park data the City should present and key park priority questions on that data the City should ask citizens:

1. Carlsbad only requires developers to provide a comparatively low 3-acres of parkland per 1,000 population of Carlsbad developments. Encinitas and Oceanside require their developers to provide 5-acres per 1,000 population, which is over 60% more parkland than Carlsbad's City Council requires developers to provide.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require 60% less parkland than Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide the same 5-acres per 1,000 parkland as Encinitas and Oceanside?

2. Carlsbad does not plan for, or require developers, to provide parks within a 10-minute walk to homes. Both Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be provided within a 10-minute walk of all homes in their Cities.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require parks to be within a 10-minute walk of homes like Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide their parkland requirement (3 or 5 acres/1,000 population) be within a 10-minute walk of homes the homes the developer builds like Encinitas and Oceanside?

3. Carlsbad is BELOW the national average in BOTH providing Parkland and in providing Parkland Within a 10-minutewalk to homes (see ,Trust for Public Land Park Score).
 - a. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland?
 - b. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
 - c. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland within a 10-minute walk to homes?
 - d. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland within a 10-minute walk of homes so as to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)

4. South Carlsbad composes 62% of Carlsbad's population, yet has no large grassy usable Coastal park (like a Holiday Park) and has 0-acers of park west of I-5.
 - a. Should 62% of Carlsbad's population have at least one large grassy and fully useable park?
 - b. Should South Carlsbad developers be required to correct this park inequity?

5. North Carlsbad composes 38% of Carlsbad's population, yet has 10 Coastal parks totaling over 35-acres west of I-5.
 - a. Should the City's planned park investments be re-prioritized to correlate the location of coastal park land acreage with population demand?

6. South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build and fund many North Carlsbad park acres in both Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park.
 - a. Should the City appropriately use those South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park to fund parks in South Carlsbad where the development and park demand from that development occurred?

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to confirmation that years of P4P citizen input to the City on Park issues is being considered in your efforts.

From: City of Carlsbad [mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 10:30 AM

To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings



[View as Webpage](#)



Parks & Recreation Master Plan Meetings are this Week

Don't forget to register for one of two virtual meetings we're holding this week to talk about whether COVID has changed parks and rec priorities.

Thursday, Dec. 9, 6 to 7 p.m.

[Register](#)

Saturday, Dec. 11, 10 to 11 a.m.

[Register](#)

The City of Carlsbad is creating an updated blueprint that will guide priorities and proposed investments in parks and recreation for the next five years. This project was interrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as the project starts back up, the city wants to know if the community's priorities have changed.

Community members are encouraged to attend one of the two virtual meetings to hear the public feedback that was provided in February 2020 and let the city know if anything has changed.

The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015. The update will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A five-year strategic action plan

Other input opportunities

Input from the workshops will be used to create a survey questionnaire to obtain feedback from a statistically representative group of Carlsbad residents. The survey will also be available online to anyone who wants to take it; however, the results will be analyzed separately from the random sample.

A draft of the master plan will be made available for input by the end of summer 2022, with a final draft scheduled to be presented to the City Council for approval in fall of 2022.

More information

Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859



Visit website

City of Carlsbad | 1200 Carlsbad Village Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by communications@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Communications; Mick Calarco; Council Internet Email; Kyle Lancaster
Cc: Boyle, Carrie@Coastal; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal; City Clerk; info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings
Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2021-Oct U....pdf

in case you do not have the 30-page October 2021 Coastal Recreation file, here it is attached.

Thank you.

Happy Holidays,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:12 PM
To: 'communications@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Mick Calarco'; 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle Lancaster'
Cc: Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); 'City Clerk'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Parks Commission:

Sorry I am unable to attend the workshops. Following is my public input & data, and suggested questions the City should provide citizens in setting park land use policy and priorities:

A clear lesson from Covid is the need for flat wide open grassy parks that fully allow social distancing and multi-function park and recreation opportunities within a 10-minute walking distance to all neighborhoods. This fundamentally what city parks are intended to provide – flat wide-grassed-flat and fully useable multi-function spaces to recreate formally or informally, and being accessible by a short walk to all neighborhoods and children without having to drive a car to access.

Another clear lesson comes from new City and State parallel moves to demand unlimited population growth using higher density condo/apartment developments. These developments by definition pack more people into a smaller area thus creating an even greater need for parks. Making flat wide open grassy and fully useable parks even more important to be provided within a 10-minute walk.

Trails although nice to walk along in the outdoors force people into a 5-8 foot wide path that does not allow social distancing. A trail is not a park.

Carlsbad People for Ponto (P4P) Citizens have for years provided the City input on Parks and Recreation Priority issues from 2017 to less than 2-months ago, and to now. Since pre-Covid 2017 over about 5,000 written/verbal petitions and multiple budget processes have been provided. In an after-Covid situation, most recently in October 2021, about 700 written/verbal petitions and public testimony was provided. Carlsbad P4P Citizen input is based on documented City records. P4P Carlsbad Citizen input is/has been consistent with the above Covid observations and significant in the numbers of Citizens calling for a meaningful (i.e. usable wide, grassed multi-function) park at Ponto. The P4P Citizen input should be fully disclosed, discussed and accounted for in the Parks Master Plan.

P4P's 30-page October 15, 2021 "Coastal Recreation" data file to the City documented comparative park data that the City should fully present and discuss with Citizens as part of the Parks Master Plan. The comparative park data shows Carlsbad is below average nationally and significantly below our adjacent Cities in providing parks – and requiring Carlsbad developers provide parks for their developments. It also documents how over 112 acres, or over 33% of all existing/planned City parkland is constrained and unusable to humans to fully use as a park. Having over 33% of City Parks constrained and not fully useable a park for citizens is a significant city land use and parks master plan issue. The 30-pages of documented information and requests in the October 15, 2021 Coastal Recreation file should be a part of the park master plan process. Following are some key park data the City should present and key park priority questions on that data the City should ask citizens:

1. Carlsbad only requires developers to provide a comparatively low 3-acres of parkland per 1,000 population of Carlsbad developments. Encinitas and Oceanside require their developers to provide 5-acres per 1,000 population, which is over 60% more parkland than Carlsbad's City Council requires developers to provide.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require 60% less parkland than Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide the same 5-acres per 1,000 parkland as Encinitas and Oceanside?
2. Carlsbad does not plan for, or require developers, to provide parks within a 10-minute walk to homes. Both Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be provided within a 10-minute walk of all homes in their Cities.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require parks to be within a 10-minute walk of homes like Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide their parkland requirement (3 or 5 acres/1,000 population) be within a 10-minute walk of homes the homes the developer builds like Encinitas and Oceanside?
3. Carlsbad is BELOW the national average in BOTH providing Parkland and in providing Parkland Within a 10-minutewalk to homes (see ,Trust for Public Land Park Score).
 - a. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland?
 - b. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
 - c. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland within a 10-minute walk to homes?
 - d. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland within a 10-minute walk of homes so as to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
4. South Carlsbad composes 62% of Carlsbad's population, yet has no large grassy usable Coastal park (like a Holiday Park) and has 0-acers of park west of I-5.
 - a. Should 62% of Carlsbad's population have at least one large grassy and fully useable park?
 - b. Should South Carlsbad developers be required to correct this park inequity?
5. North Carlsbad composes 38% of Carlsbad's population, yet has 10 Coastal parks totaling over 35-acres west of I-5.
 - a. Should the City's planned park investments be re-prioritized to correlate the location of coastal park land acreage with population demand?
6. South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build and fund many North Carlsbad park acres in both Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park.

- a. Should the City appropriately use those South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park to fund parks in South Carlsbad where the development and park demand from that development occurred?


Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to confirmation that years of P4P citizen input to the City on Park issues is being considered in your efforts.

From: City of Carlsbad [mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad


Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 10:30 AM

To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings



[View as Webpage](#)



Parks & Recreation Master Plan Meetings are this Week

Don't forget to register for one of two virtual meetings we're holding this week to talk about whether COVID has changed parks and rec priorities.

Thursday, Dec. 9, 6 to 7 p.m.

[Register](#)

Saturday, Dec. 11, 10 to 11 a.m.

[Register](#)

The City of Carlsbad is creating an updated blueprint that will guide priorities and proposed investments in parks and recreation for the next five years. This project was interrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as the project starts back up, the city wants to know if the community's priorities have changed.

Community members are encouraged to attend one of the two virtual meetings to hear the public feedback that was provided in February 2020 and let the city know if anything has changed.

The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015. The update will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A five-year strategic action plan


Other input opportunities

Input from the workshops will be used to create a survey questionnaire to obtain feedback from a statistically representative group of Carlsbad residents. The survey will also be available online to anyone who wants to take it; however, the results will be analyzed separately from the random sample.

A draft of the master plan will be made available for input by the end of summer 2022, with a final draft scheduled to be presented to the City Council for approval in fall of 2022.

More information

Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859



Visit website



[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](#)
[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)
Sent by communications@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on Oct 12th 2021:

On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:

- For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
- For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
- For Policy 6-10 concerns providing Low Cost Visitor Accommodations. Public Parks are the lowest cost (free) Visitor accommodating land use there is.

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City's past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: "Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980's. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad's 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- "POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.
- POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
- POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations"

The public record request is to see documents of:

- City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on January 2021:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 5-30 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| <u>Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage</u> | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland |

Anticipated Future Park development projects

| <u>Park - quadrant</u> | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:**
 - 4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,
 - 6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and
 - 2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant

Shortfall (excess) in
Current Quadrant
Park standard by

| | population | | Future Park | | existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants |
|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | acres | need | acres | % | |
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the demand for that Park.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning; is highly detrimental to the City, City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and City Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

2. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

3. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
- Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

4. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ...”; 2). This data be used in the City’s analysis and the public’s review and discussion about the City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount “maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone” and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to “assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”. Most of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

5. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City’s proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

6. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is an obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail



Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.

- Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

8. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can


only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

9. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.


10. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.

- Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
- Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
- Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
- Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the

Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



11. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that

15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

12. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:

- Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
- In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
- In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.

- Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
- In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
- In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without First disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
- In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to either:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of "Non-Residential Reserve" until such time as the City's past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park") to provide both "High-Priority" coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

13. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words "shall") these "low

priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City “may” or ‘may not’ choose (per the proposed “may” LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City’s (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy ‘shell game’. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two “may” criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only “low-priority” residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by “shall” policy) winners, and “high-priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal ‘long-shot’ (“may” policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the

documented “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently

dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

14. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

15. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is

illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

Subject: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings - Q7
Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2021-Oct Updated Public Comments - Coastal Recreation.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, December 10, 2021 9:41 AM
To: Communications <Communications@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>
Cc: City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings - Q7

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Parks Commission, and CA Coastal Commission:

I would like to amend the Dec 8th email below to add a 7th suggested data point and question the City should provide citizens in setting park land use policy and priorities. The data for this question comes from City data as documented on page 3 of the attached Coastal Recreation public input provided in Oct, 2021 for both the City's proposed Parks Master Plan & Local Coastal Program Amendments:

7. Over 112 acres, or over 33% of all existing/planned City parkland is constrained and unusable to humans to fully use as a park. This means over 1/3 of the land within what are called City parks is functionally unusable by citizens as a park, and 1/3 of Carlsbad citizens are not being provided useable parkland per the City's minimal parkland per population standard.
 - a. Should it be a City priority to acquire 112 new acres of unconstrained and fully useable acres to replace the 112 acres of City Park land that is constrained and cannot be used as a Park?

Following is the data from page 3 of Coastal Recreation (attached):

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage | total park acres | Unusable park acres | % of park unusable | reason unusable |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal Parkland | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as |

Anticipated Future Park

development projects

Park - quadrant

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres
in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% 112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- 59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population
- Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:
 - 4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,
 - 6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and
 - 2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant

Thanks you for your consideration,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 1:12 PM

To: communications@carlsbadca.gov; 'Mick Calarco'; CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov; 'Kyle Lancaster'

Cc: Carrie Boyle; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal; 'City Clerk'; info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: RE: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Parks Commission:

Sorry I am unable to attend the workshops. Following is my public input & data, and suggested questions the City should provide citizens in setting park land use policy and priorities:

A clear lesson from Covid is the need for flat wide open grassy parks that fully allow social distancing and multi-function park and recreation opportunities within a 10-minute walking distance to all neighborhoods. This fundamentally what city parks are intended to provide – flat wide-grassed-flat and fully useable multi-function spaces to recreate formally or informally, and being accessible by a short walk to all neighborhoods and children without having to drive a car to access.

Another clear lesson comes from new City and State parallel moves to demand unlimited population growth using higher density condo/apartment developments. These developments by definition pack more people into a smaller area thus creating an even greater need for parks. Making flat wide open grassy and fully useable parks even more important to be provided within a 10-minute walk.

Trails although nice to walk along in the outdoors force people into a 5-8 foot wide path that does not allow social distancing. A trail is not a park.

Carlsbad People for Ponto (P4P) Citizens have for years provided the City input on Parks and Recreation Priority issues from 2017 to less than 2-months ago, and to now. Since pre-Covid 2017 over about 5,000 written/verbal petitions and multiple budget processes have been provided. In an after-Covid situation, most recently in October 2021, about 700 written/verbal petitions and public testimony was provided. Carlsbad P4P Citizen input is based on documented City records. P4P Carlsbad Citizen input is/has been consistent with the above Covid observations and significant in the numbers of Citizens calling for a meaningful (i.e. usable wide, grassed multi-function) park at Ponto. The P4P Citizen input should be fully disclosed, discussed and accounted for in the Parks Master Plan.

P4P's 30-page October 15, 2021 "Coastal Recreation" data file to the City documented comparative park data that the City should fully present and discuss with Citizens as part of the Parks Master Plan. The comparative park data shows Carlsbad is below average nationally and significantly below our adjacent Cities in providing parks – and requiring Carlsbad developers provide parks for their developments. It also documents how over 112 acres, or over 33% of all existing/planned City parkland is constrained and unusable to humans to fully use as a park. Having over 33% of City Parks constrained and not fully useable a park for citizens is a significant city land use and parks master plan issue. The 30-pages of documented information and requests in the October 15, 2021 Coastal Recreation file should be a part of the park master plan process. Following are some key park data the City should present and key park priority questions on that data the City should ask citizens:

1. Carlsbad only requires developers to provide a comparatively low 3-acres of parkland per 1,000 population of Carlsbad developments. Encinitas and Oceanside require their developers to provide 5-acres per 1,000 population, which is over 60% more parkland than Carlsbad's City Council requires developers to provide.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require 60% less parkland than Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide the same 5-acres per 1,000 parkland as Encinitas and Oceanside?
2. Carlsbad does not plan for, or require developers, to provide parks within a 10-minute walk to homes. Both Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be provided within a 10-minute walk of all homes in their Cities.
 - a. Should Carlsbad require parks to be within a 10-minute walk of homes like Encinitas and Oceanside?
 - b. Should Carlsbad require developers to provide their parkland requirement (3 or 5 acres/1,000 population) be within a 10-minute walk of homes the developer builds like Encinitas and Oceanside?
3. Carlsbad is BELOW the national average in BOTH providing Parkland and in providing Parkland Within a 10-minutewalk to homes (see ,Trust for Public Land Park Score).
 - a. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland?
 - b. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
 - c. Should Carlsbad be below average nationally in providing Parkland within a 10-minute walk to homes?

- d. Should Carlsbad provide Parkland within a 10-minute walk of homes so as to be in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, just average, or below average nationally? (select one)
- 4. South Carlsbad composes 62% of Carlsbad’s population, yet has no large grassy usable Coastal park (like a Holiday Park) and has 0-acers of park west of I-5.
 - a. Should 62% of Carlsbad’s population have at least one large grassy and fully useable park?
 - b. Should South Carlsbad developers be required to correct this park inequity?
- 5. North Carlsbad composes 38% of Carlsbad’s population, yet has 10 Coastal parks totaling over 35-acres west of I-5.
 - a. Should the City’s planned park investments be re-prioritized to correlate the location of coastal park land acreage with population demand?
- 6. South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build and fund many North Carlsbad park acres in both Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park.
 - a. Should the City appropriately use those South Carlsbad developer fees paid to build Veterans Park and Poinsettia 61 Park to fund parks in South Carlsbad where the development and park demand from that development occurred?

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to confirmation that years of P4P citizen input to the City on Park issues is being considered in your efforts.

From: City of Carlsbad [<mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com>] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 10:30 AM
To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Tell us about parks & rec priorities at this week's meetings

[View as Webpage](#)



Parks & Recreation Master Plan Meetings are this Week

Don't forget to register for one of two virtual meetings we're holding this week to talk about whether COVID has changed parks and rec priorities.

Thursday, Dec. 9, 6 to 7 p.m.

[Register](#)

Saturday, Dec. 11, 10 to 11 a.m.

[Register](#)

The City of Carlsbad is creating an updated blueprint that will guide priorities and proposed investments in parks and recreation for the next five years. This project was interrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as the project starts back up, the city wants to know if the community's priorities have changed.

Community members are encouraged to attend one of the two virtual meetings to hear the public feedback that was provided in February 2020 and let the city know if anything has changed.

The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015. The update will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A five-year strategic action plan

Other input opportunities

Input from the workshops will be used to create a survey questionnaire to obtain feedback from a statistically representative group of Carlsbad residents. The survey will also be available online to anyone who wants to take it; however, the results will be analyzed separately from the random sample.

A draft of the master plan will be made available for input by the end of summer 2022, with a final draft scheduled to be presented to the City Council for approval in fall of 2022.

More information

Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859



Visit website

City of Carlsbad | 1200 Carlsbad Village Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](#)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by communications@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on Oct 12th 2021:

On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:

- For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
- For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
- For Policy 6-10 concerns providing Low Cost Visitor Accommodations. Public Parks are the lowest cost (free) Visitor accommodating land use there is.

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City's past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: "Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980's. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad's 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- "POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.
- POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
- POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations"

The public record request is to see documents of:

- City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on January 2021:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 5-30 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| <u>Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage</u> | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland |

Anticipated Future Park development projects

| <u>Park - quadrant</u> | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:**
 - 4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,
 - 6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and
 - 2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant

Shortfall (excess) in
Current Quadrant
Park standard by

| | population | | Future Park | | existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants |
|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | acres | need | acres | % | |
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the demand for that Park.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning; is highly detrimental to the City, City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and City Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

2. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

3. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
- Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

4. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ...”; 2). This data be used in the City’s analysis and the public’s review and discussion about the City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount “maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone” and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to “assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”. Most of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

5. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City’s proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

6. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is an obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail




Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



7. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:

- Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - Source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

8. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can


only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

9. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.


10. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.

- Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
- Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
- Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
- Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the

Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



11. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that

15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

12. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:

- Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
- In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
- In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.

- Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
- In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
- In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without First disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
- In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to ether:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of "Non-Residential Reserve" until such time as the City's past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park") to provide both "High-Priory" coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

13. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words "shall") these "low

priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City “may” or ‘may not’ choose (per the proposed “may” LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City’s (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy ‘shell game’. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two “may” criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only “low-priority” residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by “shall” policy) winners, and “high-priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal ‘long-shot’ (“may” policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the

documented “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently

dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

14. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

15. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is

illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

Subject: More pickleball courts please!!

From: Dawn Godwin <dundy1@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 11, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Subject: More pickleball courts please!!

Please take some of the tennis courts and convert to pickle ball

Thank you for your consideration,

Dawn Goodwin

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Poinsettia Park Pickleball Courts

From: Cheney Squier <cheneyann@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Saturday, December 11, 2021 12:37 PM

To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Help <Help@CarlsbadCA.gov>

Subject: Poinsettia Park Pickleball Courts

Hello,

The purpose of this email is to express the urgent need for more pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park in Carlsbad. The current courts are lovely but consistently overcrowded and I know that some of the unused tennis courts being converted to more courts (even lined for dual purpose) would immensely be beneficial to the Community . Thank you for your attention to this matter!

Sincerely,

Cheney Squier
6978 Sweetwater St.
Carlsbad CA 92011

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Chris Paccione <cspaccione@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 11, 2021 8:07 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Master Plan

Hi Mick,

Unfortunately, I can not make the Master Plan meetings. Short and sweet-i would like to see more pickleball courts in Carlsbad. That is my vote!

Thanks!
Chris Paccione

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Subject: Comments on parks

From: Patricia Bleha <patbleha@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 11, 2021 2:59 PM
To: Communications <Communications@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Cc: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Comments on parks

Mick Calarco and Kyle Lancaster,
I totally support Lance Shulte's recent comments to you regarding park plans. It was shocking to learn that Carlsbad is below average in open space parks per population nationally and even more behind than Oceanside and Encinitas! Why don't you ask them how they do it, instead of paying for pricey consultants with our tax money????

You need to dig in your heels and get this situation addressed. You keep ignoring the needs of many residents who for DECADES have asked for more open space parks! Instead you keep talking about more improved facilities. Open space parks are far less costly than what you are pushing that benefit a very small part of the population. How many residents play pickleball, for example? Just a vocal few. Remember our population is aging. We want parks close by and do not want to jump into the car, increasing air pollution.

Forget about your cheesy proposal to make Veterans Park quality for a park for all the quadrants. Parks should be in all quadrants. Seniors and young mothers should be able to walk to parks with their children.

Patricia Bleha, Carlsbad resident and taxpayer since 1976

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 12:23 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Darlene Gillis
E-mail darlenegillis@msn.com
Comments I would like more pickleball courts added to the downtown area of Carlsbad

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Please help! Need more Pickleball courts @ Poinsettia
Attachments: IMG_8318.MOV

From: Yoga <yoga_marcie@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2021 8:31 PM
To: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Please help! Need more Pickleball courts @ Poinsettia

Hi Mike,

Thank you for hosting Saturday's meeting and for all the great work your team has done!

We need your help.

It was abundantly clear that the majority attending wanted additional Pickleball courts added or switched from tennis courts, yet we feel unheard! Oftentimes at Poinsettia Park there are TWENTY TO THIRTY people waiting to play doubles all day long. We are ALL frustrated that we have only 6 courts, and 2 of them are for tough competitors ("challenge courts"), which is only a small percentage of players. So really we have 4 courts for dozens and dozens of players. Typically the wait is 25-45 minutes between games!

It's not right that we are being sidelined. It's not right that other things are being built instead of more courts! It's not right that tennis has soooo many courts and far fewer players.

We also need shaded areas, sun shades over the bleachers.

Pickeball is the fastest growing sport in the US, more people join every day.

We are all HIGHLY FRUSTRATED over the situation. Please do something and let us know you're doing it!

Here's a video I took. This is typical!

Thank you,
Marcie Peters

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 2:48 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Marisa Tervoort
E-mail Marisanevarez@gmail.com

Comments I am requesting that the city of Carlsbad seriously consider converting the 2 tennis courts at Calavera into multi-use courts (meaning pickleball/tennis courts). I currently play at Poinsettia and the courts are packed most days. The courts at Calavera are very quiet and I would like to see the courts get more usage. Pickleball is a sport for all ages as it is not as hard on the body as tennis. I urge the City to add pickleball court lines to the existing tennis courts.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Pickleball Courts in Carlsbad

From: adentonpmc@verizon.net <adentonpmc@verizon.net>

Sent: Saturday, January 1, 2022 12:37 AM

To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: dg123dg123@yahoo.com

Subject: Pickleball Courts in Carlsbad

Mick,

As you're probably aware, Pickleball is the fastest growing sport in the U.S., especially in San Diego. There aren't enough courts in Carlsbad which results in waiting for up to an hour to play a game. The Poinsetitia Park courts are way beyond their capacity. On top of this, I live right near Pointsettia park and pay taxes to support it. As a local, I should have access to a park that is literally 5 minutes walk from my house. Instead I have to wait excessive amounts of time to play a game of Pickleball. I speak with people who come from all around southern CA to play in this park; I spoke with people today who came from Pasadena.

I suggest that we either add more courts or give preference to local residents as we pay local taxes and have to deal with all of the traffic associated with tournaments and all types of activity at the park. Maybe you should add fees for others who aren't locals which can create a revenue stream while allowing residents to get more playing time. Or, another option is to add more courts. I know that we added a dog park and have allocated much of the park, so maybe we can take over some tennis courts and convert them to Pickleball as I often see them unused.

Thanks for your help in this matter. I'd be happy to discuss this further (my number below). Thanks.

Alan Denton

805.750.1364

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Time to Dump PROS

From: Fred Peppe <outlook_612C03A0AF76B55F@outlook.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 4, 2022 7:15 AM

To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>

Subject: Time to Dump PROS

The consulting group you selected is so far out of touch with the needs of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation that it is time to get another voice to represent you.

To completely ignore the sport of pickleball makes absolutely no sense.

If you need help with this, I can put together a team to assist.

Thanks for your time in addressing this important matter.

Fred Peppe

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Pickleball Courts
Attachments: Poinsettia Pickleball courts paddle rack 2021.jpeg; Poinsettia Pickleball courts people waiting 2021.jpeg

From: Douglas Gore <douglasgore4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 10:58 AM
To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Pickleball Courts

As Carlsbad Pickleball players, we know that the City of Carlsbad “decision makers” are aware of long wait times to play at the Poinsettia Park Pickleball Courts. To review, throughout most of the day there are typically more than 20 players required to wait 30–45 minutes to play just one game. During this wait time, it is extremely frustrating and disgusting to look 50 feet to the West of the courts and see vacant tennis courts. This is a waste of not only Carlsbad Park Department assets but the personal time for those waiting to play. If tennis courts are not being used for hours and hours throughout the day, why not let families and individuals play Pickleball on these empty courts?

To mitigate this problem, a prudent and expedient low cost “**interim solution**” for both the city and the pickleball players is to **temporarily** convert two (2) of the southwest Poinsettia Park tennis courts into eight (8) dedicated pickleball courts or two (2) multi-purpose pickleball/tennis courts. This can be accomplished by merely adding pickleball court lines to the existing tennis court lines and leaving tennis nets and posts in place as is. Noise is **NOT** an issue because there are no homes near these 2 tennis courts – just a large parking lot and mature trees. In fact, these courts are more than three (3) football fields away from the closest homes. Therefore, there is no need to install expensive acoustic wind screens. **Every Poinsettia Park pickleball player that we have spoken with is 100% supportive of this solution.**

The city can easily and inexpensively convert the affected courts to permanent courts for either sport once this gross imbalance of Park Department assets has been permanently resolved. This is an affordable way to increase the utilization of park assets, improve service to the growing pickleball population in Carlsbad and

enhance the image of the City and Parks and Recreation Department. It will also be a strong indication that Parks and Rec is a dynamic organization, not a static group, that cannot react to this growing ongoing problem because of bureaucracy.

I would be interested in hearing your response to this issue that does not require years of planning, asset allocation, building and unnecessary delays.

Douglas Gore, Carlsbad Pickleball Support Group, 760-717-2286

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

COURTS

END OF LINE → FIRST ON

FROM WHERE THE CLIP IS

MOVE CLIP, NOT PADDLES

SOCIAL COURTS 1, 2, 3 & 4
RULE 7
"OVER EIGHT PLAYERS WAITING, PLAY SHALL BE FOUR ON - FOUR OFF."

Paddle Rotation for Rule 7:

If over eight players are waiting to play on Courts 1, 2, 3 or 4, players should place their paddle in the first empty slot from right.

When a game finishes and a court becomes open, players whose paddles are above the NEXTuP clip, remove their paddle and slide the NEXTuP clip to below the group of paddles to the left. **NO PADDLES**

Players returning from a complete game should place their paddle in the open slots from right to left.

When the NEXTuP clip reaches the end of the row (red), remove and return the clip to the starting position to start the rotation over again.

DO NOT REMOVE CITY OF CAROLINA PADDLES



www.NextUpPickleBall.com

NEXT UP →





From: Berni Clark <berniclark@att.net>
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2022 6:46 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: More Pickle Ball Courts in Carlsbad?

Good Morning Mick

I was advised to send you an email if I thought we could use more pickle ball courts in Carlsbad and I really do!

The courts are bringing folks together in a special way... meeting those we might not on a regular basis in the village. I feel they may be revenue generating to the city as well as people from around our area are flocking here as well...likely running errands on their path to and from the courts.

Big shout out to our lovely safe area too... I inadvertently left my paddle in the rack and went home to make dinner... not realizing the error until late the next day. Came by the courts at Poinsettia 30 hours later and there it was waiting for me... I LOVE Carlsbad! (dare I say this was NOT the first time 😊)

We could spread extra courts out between our parks to take some of the load off of Poinsettia... Calavera or Stage Coach? Just a thought.

Thank-you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Bernadette Clark

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Berni Clark <berniclark@att.net>
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2022 6:46 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: More Pickle Ball Courts in Carlsbad?

Good Morning Mick

I was advised to send you an email if I thought we could use more pickle ball courts in Carlsbad and I really do!

The courts are bringing folks together in a special way... meeting those we might not on a regular basis in the village. I feel they may be revenue generating to the city as well as people from around our area are flocking here as well...likely running errands on their path to and from the courts.

Big shout out to our lovely safe area too... I inadvertently left my paddle in the rack and went home to make dinner... not realizing the error until late the next day. Came by the courts at Poinsettia 30 hours later and there it was waiting for me... I LOVE Carlsbad! (dare I say this was NOT the first time 😊)

We could spread extra courts out between our parks to take some of the load off of Poinsettia... Calavera or Stage Coach? Just a thought.

Thank-you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Bernadette Clark

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Jeff Shane <shaneltd1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2022 12:01 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Please add more pickleball courts.
Attachments: 20220123_115356.jpg

Hi Mick,

As you can see from the photo, the pickleball courts are jammed pack yet the tennis courts are empty. Please add more pickleball courts asap.

Thanks,

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



From: lifeisverygood@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 12:33 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: More Pickleball courts multipurpose



It is 1230 and all the courts are taken... Please get us some thank you

Create a phenomenal day,
Joe

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

From: Denise Engels <dkengels@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 3:42 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Pickleball

Good afternoon Mick,

I frequent the Poinsettia Park to play Pickleball. There are always at least 8-20 people waiting to play. The least busy time appears to be over the lunch hour.

The area is underserved with available courts and needs to plan ahead for more courts.

I think Carlsbad would benefit from a large complex with Pickleball courts. It would lead to organized tournaments that would draw visitors and revenue for the city of Carlsbad in tourism dollars that would be in the cooler off seasons.

Perhaps there is some available property by a community college or park?

Pickleball is exploding in popularity and you should definitely consider spending some city dollars to bring in events to this lovely area. All ages are playing this game and it is very popular!

Thank you,

Denise Engels

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Public input to CA Coastal Commission and City of Carlsbad on Carlsbad CIP, Parks Master Plan, and Local Coastal Program Amendment

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 12:48 PM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input to CA Coastal Commission and City of Carlsbad on Carlsbad CIP, Parks Master Plan, and Local Coastal Program Amendment

Dear Council & CA Coastal Commission:

This is being submitted as public input on for the Carlsbad Council's CIP meetings of 4-20, 4-26, and 5-3-2022, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan Update, and to the CA Coastal Commission (CCC) for input on Carlsbad's Proposed LCP Amendment.

On all three (5-3-2022, 4-26-2022, and 4-20-2022) CIP meetings 100% of the speakers spoke in favor of Ponto Park. People for Ponto provided the following verbal testimony at those three meetings:

May 3, 2022 *Public testimony to Carlsbad City Council on CIP budget issues, and also for inclusion as official public input to the City & CA Coastal Commission on the Carlsbad Local Coastal Program Amendment, Parks Master Plan Update, and South Carlsbad Coastline project:*

"On April 20th & 26th we sent you data files and said Carlsbad Citizens need your help to create a much needed and Real Ponto Park. Carlsbad's Park Master Plan says that Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad is Not Served by City parks and these areas are where you the Council should make new Parks investments.

We shared wonderful news that 14.3 acres of Ponto land is for sale that could be a world-class Coastal Park for Carlsbad. You now have the "willing seller" you said was holding you back from investing in Ponto Park months ago. This 14.3 acre Ponto Park has world-class ocean/lagoon views, and provides adequate dimensions to host profitable Coastal view community/special events and other significant revenue and park grant opportunities for the City. You received a video showing this Ponto Park's greatness.

And the best part, we (and future generations of Carlsbad families) can have this 14.3 acres of NEW world-class City Park land at a \$20-40 million tax-payer cost savings compared to the proposed PCH Relocation Project. This cost savings pays for both PCH walkways & Monroe Street pool upgrades. The City's 2001 studies documented that PCH Relocation does not buy one single square foot of new City land; it only "rearranges the deck chairs" to create a few small isolated narrow land fragments along a roadway. We can save tax-payers \$20-40 million, and get 14.3 MORE acres of waterfront park with world class view, and create the much needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad - 62% of our Citizens and their families - and all this at up to a 50% discount relative to the PCH alternative, and allow State park grant funding. At prior budget/council meetings Carlsbad Citizens overwhelmingly asked for this Ponto Park. We ask you to put this world-class Ponto Park into your CIP and save tax-payers \$20-40 million. P4P Citizens are here to help you with revenue/grant issues.

We/You have a once in a lifetime opportunity to do something truly great and world-class for Carlsbad. Please seize this wonderful opportunity. You will be forever remembered based on your decision. Don't be shortsighted. Please listen to your citizens, listen to the data and logic, be fair to South Carlsbad citizens and families, and invest for our shared Carlsbad future. You can be great. Be great.

By Lance Schulte, Carlsbad citizen and People for Ponto

April 26, 2022 Public testimony to Carlsbad City Council on CIP budget issues, and also for inclusion as official public input to the City & CA Coastal Commission on the Carlsbad Local Coastal Program Amendment, Parks Master Plan Update, and South Carlsbad Coastline project:

On April 20th we spoke about how Carlsbad Citizens need your help to create a much needed and real Ponto Park. We noted that the City's Park Master Plan identifies Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad as Not Served by City parks and areas the City says that new Parks investments should be made. We also noted that there are 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37-acres in North Carlsbad serving 38% of Carlsbad's population yet there are no Coastal Parks meaning Zero Coastal Park Acres in South Carlsbad, leaving 62% of Carlsbad's population without a Coastal park.

On 4-25-22 we sent you 4 data files, and some wonderful news that 14.3 acres of Ponto land is for sale (by a willing seller) that could be a world-class Coastal Park for Carlsbad. This 14.3 acre Ponto Park would have spectacular ocean/lagoon views, provides adequate dimensions to host profitable Coastal view weddings/community/special events. I would be happy to show/walk this site with you so you can see its potential greatness.

And the best part, we can have this 14.3 acres of NEW world-class City Park land at a \$20-40 million tax-payer cost savings compared to the proposed PCH Relocation Project. PCH Relocation does not buy any new City land; it only creates small isolated narrow land fragments next to a major roadway. We can save tax-payers \$20-40 million, and get 14.3 MORE acres of park, with better world class views on waterfront land, and create the much needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad - 62% of our Citizens and their families - and all this at up to a 50% discount relative to the PCH alternative. In prior budget/council meetings Carlsbad Citizens overwhelmingly asked for this Ponto Park. You can choose to buy this land under Proposition C as it has qualifying sensitive habitat and required trails. We ask you to put this world-class Ponto Park into your CIP and save tax-payers \$20-40 million. P4P Citizens are here to help you address any revenue issues.

We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to do something truly great and world-class for Carlsbad. Please seize this wonderful opportunity. You will be forever remembered based on your decision. Be great. What do you as our City Council choose to do?

By Lance Schulte, Carlsbad citizen and People for Ponto

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2022 6:12 AM
To: council@carlsbadca.gov; 'City Clerk'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Public input to 4-20 & 26-2022 Carlsbad Council meeting on CIP - South Carlsbad Coastline Project

Dear Council & CA Coastal Commission:

This is being submitted as public input on for the 4-26-2022 Council CIP meeting, and to the CA Coastal Commission (CCC) for input on Carlsbad's Proposed LCP Amendment.

On the **4-20-2022** CIP meeting 100% of the speakers spoke in favor of Ponto Park. People for Ponto provided the following verbal testimony:

“Carlsbad Citizens need your help.

In 2017 Carlsbad Citizens first became aware that Ponto Planning Area F was required to be considered as a Public Park, but was never considered as required by Carlsbad’s LCP.

We all should know by now that City’s Park Master Plan has identified both Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad as areas Not Served by City parks – an unfair distribution of Parks. For example there are 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37-acres in North Carlsbad serving 38% of Carlsbad’s population with a minority of Carlsbad’s visitor accommodations yet there are Zero Coastal Parks totaling Zero Park Acres in South Carlsbad Not Serving 62% of Carlsbad’s population and the majority of Carlsbad’s visitor accommodations. We should also know that the City plans on losing 32+ acres of existing Coastal open space land (campground and beach) at Ponto and South Carlsbad in the next 30+ years due to sea level rise. We all should know that since 2001 the City has known that the very expensive PCH Relocation Project only opens up a few relatively small narrow slivers of useable land at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad – most City PCH land is constrained and not viable for a real and needed Park. Citizens, parks and coastal advocates, and the visitor industry have since 2017 sent you over 5,000 emails and provided years of requests with supporting data asking Council to provide a needed Ponto Park. Ponto Park will make the City money due to a variety of reasons I can talk with the Council about.

Citizens are wondering what’s causing the Council to not provide a needed, useable, adequately sized and dimensioned, and affordable Ponto Park,

we ask because avoiding the Park unfairness data of not providing Ponto Park and avoiding Citizens desires for a Ponto Park should not continue.

What do you as a Council - charged with representing Citizens desires - suggest be done?”

In February, People for Ponto Citizens provided the Council, City and CCC the following email and 2 attached data files (1 of 2, and 2 of 2) regarding Council’s South Carlsbad Coastline CIP Proposal (aka Carlsbad Blvd Realignment). The 2 data files have a good short summary and mapping of the major issues along the South Carlsbad Coastline. The 2 data file should be fully considered and evaluated:

- with other alternatives to provide for the documented need for a true City Coastal Park for South Carlsbad,
- to address the missing 30-acres of Coastal Open Space land use that Ponto developers were supposed to provide but the City falsely exempted developers from providing,
- to address the future loss of 32-acres of High-priority Coastal Open Space land use at the State Ponto Beach and Campground,
- to address unlimited future Carlsbad and CA population and visitor demand for High-priority Coastal Land Uses – Coastal Recreation and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations, and
- as part of the land use analysis of Carlsbad’s proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment, and Carlsbad’s additional proposed Coastal Zoning changes to Ponto.

In 2001 the City conducted the attached ERA Financial Feasibility Analysis of Carlsbad Blvd Realignment. The City’s 2001 Analysis optimistically notes small amounts of ‘Surplus Land’ between Island Way and La Costa Ave. This surplus roadway median land is relatively narrow and much constrained in its usability, as mapped and noted in the aforementioned attached ‘City’s PCH area map w numbered notes of constraints 2 of 2’ data file. In 2022 People for Ponto Citizens compiled recent City data into the attached ‘2022 General Comparative Cost/Benefits Analysis of PCH-PCH Modification-Ponto Park’ data file. This comparative cost/benefit data should be considered by Council. The \$60-85 million Carlsbad Blvd Realignment cost (for 2.3 miles from Island Way to La Costa Avenue, is \$26-37 million per mile) but will not buy 1 single square foot of new City land. These Financial Feasibility and tax-payer Comparative Cost/Benefits (‘bang for the buck’) data files should be read and considered by Council.

Actually buying vacant land is likely a better and more cost effective use of tax-payer dollars. Over the past 7-years the last 3 remaining vacant Coastal lands at Ponto have come up for sale and available for the City to buy as noted:

1. 11.1-acre Planning Area F was optioned from 2014-2019,
2. 14.3-acre Planning Area G, H & I was sold to Kam Sang in 2015 for \$20 million
3. 5-acre Site 18 (Ponto Storage area) was sold in February 2022, and now the
4. 14.3-acre Planning Area G, H & I is up for re-sale by Kam Sang; and is again now available for City purchase.

14.3 acre Planning Area G, H & I is a very special property with significant views to both the Ocean and abutting Batiquitos Lagoon. It can be a world-class site.

It seems City acquisition of vacant land would provide new and more useable land at a lower cost, and a better tax-payer value to address the documented need for a Ponto Park and Coastal land use planning issues.

The Planning Area F and Planning Area G, H & I sites include DCSS Habitat and proposed/required public trails, and are connected to adjacent Sensitive Habitat Open Spaces so qualify to be purchased by the Council under Proposition C without a citizens vote. Consistent with voter approved Proposition C and as part of the City's settlement of a lawsuit, last year City acquisition of Planning Area F was recommended by North County Advocates. It is understood that the City is required to consider North County Advocates' recommendation as part of the City's settlement agreement, but has yet to do so.

These 3 vacant Ponto lands are the last remaining adequately dimensioned and useable vacant Coastal lands. In the CIP the Council should be considering acquisition of some of these last remaining vacant Coastal lands at Ponto to address the critical documented need for Ponto Park, South Carlsbad's only opportunity for a Coastal Park, and the forever Coastal High-priority Coastal land use needs.

Thank you for your consideration. You have a limited window of opportunity to actually acquire Coastal land for a much needed Coastal Ponto Park. A true Ponto Park will leave a lasting positive legacy for future generations. We ask you to please not squander that opportunity.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 4:01 PM
To: 'Tom Frank'; 'Tiffany Metti'
Cc: 'Nikki Matosian'; 'Eliane Paiva'; 'Nathan Schmidt'; info@peopleforponto.com; Dale Ordas; Jane Naskiewicz; council@carlsbadca.gov; Carrie Boyle; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal
Subject: South Carlsbad Coastline Project - 2-23-22 meeting w People for Ponto

Dear Tom & Tiffany:

Thank you for inviting People for Ponto to provide input. Attached are two files of data and input into the potentially proposed South Carlsbad Coastline Project. Hopefully having the data/input in writing in advance will make your reporting easier and facilitate the most productive discussion within the allotted time tomorrow afternoon.

We have copied the City Council and CA Coastal Commission to facilitate open, consistent, and documented communication.

Thanks again, and we look forward to our meeting tomorrow.

Sincerely,
Lance

From: Tiffany Metti [<mailto:tmetti@swspr.com>]
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:52 AM
To: Lance Schulte; 'Tom Frank'

Cc: 'Nikki Matosian'; 'Eliane Paiva'; 'Nathan Schmidt'; info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: RE: South Carlsbad Coastline Project

Hello Lance,

Thank you very much for circling back.

Yes, we would like to coordinate a meeting specific for you and key members of Ponto area "People4Ponto." Do you have an upcoming meeting we may be able to join to discuss this project? Otherwise, I can provide some days/times directly to you that may work, so that we can send a meeting invitation.

We also see that Deb Mossa invited you to attend the Batiquitos Lagoon Meeting on Thursday, February 3 at 11 a.m. and you accepted.

Thank you,
Tiffany

Tiffany Metti
Director of Public Affairs
Southwest Strategies LLC

401 B Street, Suite 150 • San Diego, California 92101

858.541.7800 (ph)

Connect with us online: | www.swspr.com  

This email may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, reliance, copying, distribution or use of the contents is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies. Thank you.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:41 AM

To: 'Tom Frank' <Tom.Frank@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: Tiffany Metti <tmetti@swspr.com>; 'Nikki Matosian' <Nikki.Matosian@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Eliane Paiva' <Eliane.Paiva@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Nathan Schmidt' <Nathan.Schmidt@carlsbadca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: RE: South Carlsbad Coastline Project

Tom & Tiffany:

Have not heard from you, so checking in with you all to see when you want to meet for P4P citizen issues.

Lance
People for Ponto

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Saturday, January 15, 2022 9:00 AM

To: 'Tom Frank'

Cc: 'Tiffany Metti'; 'Nikki Matosian'; 'Eliane Paiva'; 'Nathan Schmidt'; info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: RE: South Carlsbad Coastline Project

Thanks Tom.

Can we talk next week so I can get some more information? Just let me know when is a good time for you.

Thanks again for connecting.

Lance

From: Tom Frank [<mailto:Tom.Frank@carlsbadca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2022 5:20 PM
To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Cc: Tiffany Metti; Nikki Matosian; Eliane Paiva; Nathan Schmidt
Subject: South Carlsbad Coastline Project

Hi Lance,

Now that Mike Grim has retired language, I am personally reaching out to you to begin our conversation regarding South Carlsbad Boulevard.

The City Council has asked staff to explore recreational opportunities that could be created along south Carlsbad Boulevard by realigning the road to the east. We are gathering input through a survey and two workshops as well as meetings with groups interested in the project.

The project area is limited to land the city controls immediately adjacent to Carlsbad Boulevard. You can read more about the project on the [city's website](#).

If you would like to meet with the project team to share feedback or invite others in your group to meet with us, please let us know. I have copied Tiffany, a member of our project team, who can coordinate a time and date.

Thanks in advance for your time. Looking forward to hearing from you.



Tom Frank, PE
Transportation Director/City Engineer
Public Works Branch
City of Carlsbad
1635 Faraday Avenue
Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

760-602-2766 | tom.frank@carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Flickr](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#)

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: FW: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance
Attachments: TPL Support for Ponto Park.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: RE: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance

Sorry: Here is Trust for Public land letter.

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2022 11:19 AM
To: 'Eric.lardy@carlsbadca.gov'; council@carlsbadca.gov; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Don Neu (Dneu@ci.carlsbad.ca.us)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Council and Parks and Planning Commissions, & CA Coastal Commission:

May 30th you received the 4 Parks and Open Space data files. Attached is another Parks data file that summarizes key comparative data on Park facilities provided in Carlsbad vis-a-vis the National Recreation & Parks Association database, and Trust for Public Land data base, and the letter to the Trust for Public Land letter to the City of Carlsbad. This data should also be considered by the City (and CA Coastal Commission) as part of the City's Growth Management Program Update, Parks Master Plan Update, Local Coastal Program Amendment process.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lance Schulte
35-year Carlsbad resident
former Carlsbad Growth Management and city planner

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, May 30, 2022 1:21 PM
To: 'Eric.lardy@carlsbadca.gov'; council@carlsbadca.gov; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Don Neu (Dneu@ci.carlsbad.ca.us)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - Parks & Unconstrained-Useable Open Space facilities

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Council and Parks and Planning Commissions, & CA Coastal Commission:

The Committee is tasked with recommending to the Council proposed changes to City Park and City Unconstrained/Useable Open Space Standards within the Growth Management Program Update.

Because Carlsbad is quickly running out of vacant land, the Committee's recommendations are critical for very obvious reasons. The Committee will be recommending (for all future generations) the final methods to supply Citizen desired Parks and Unconstrained/Useable Open Space. It is important the Committee wisely represent the interests of those future generations. The Park and Open Space supply solutions for future generations will amend Carlsbad's updated 2015 General Plan and the "as of 2013" Local Coastal Program.

Since 2017 many People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have overwhelmingly expressed their need and desire for:

1. Fairness, and a true adequately sized and dimensioned Ponto Park to address City Park Master Plan documented "lack of Park Service and Park Inequity" in this area, and
2. Correcting the City's documented 30-acre shortfall in required Unconstrained and Useable Open Space in the Ponto area, and
3. Correcting the City's planned loss of 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space at Ponto (the State Campground and Beach) first documented in 2017 and thus not a part of the City's General Plan & Growth Management Program.

Since 2017, over 5,000 Carlsbad Citizen and visitor petitions have been sent to the City & Coastal Commission expressing the desire and need of both Citizens and visitors to have these Parks and Open Space issues addressed. The Council has been narrowing deferring addressing these issues and noted waiting for the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee to consider both the data and Citizen and visitor desires.

Attached are 5 data files sent to the City by Carlsbad People for Ponto. The data files were sent as comments to the City's proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) Amendment that seeks to change Carlsbad's 2013 LCP with the outdated 2015 General Plan, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan Update process, and the Growth Management Program that your Committee will be making recommendations to change. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens conducted over 50 official Carlsbad Public Records Requests to compile this data. We provide these data files in preparation of your June 23rd meeting.

1. Coastal Recreation and comparative Park data: Summary data on supply/demand/distribution-fairness of City Parks in Carlsbad, unflattering comparative data on how much parkland and where Carlsbad provides Parks relative to Encinitas and Oceanside and national averages, documents Carlsbad's Park Master Plan mapping Park distribution unfairness at Ponto, and documenting that many Carlsbad's Park acres are Unusable for people because they are constrained habitat land protected from human use/intrusion.
2. Sea Level Rise & Carlsbad planned loss of Open Space at Ponto: A) Summary data on how sea level rise (SLR) will remove Open Space at Ponto. B) City GIS maps/data that shows 30-acres of required Unconstrained/Useable Open Space was not provided at Ponto (Zone 9) by using false exemptions while similar and adjacent Local Facility Management Zones (19 & 22) provided their required Unconstrained/Useable Open Space. C) City maps and data tables documenting the both loss of Open Space at Ponto from SLR and the missing Growth Management Open Space at Ponto.
3. Updated 2022-June Comparative Cost-Benefits of PCH Modification and Ponto Park: A) Summary City data comparing the Citizen and tax-payer Cost-Benefit of Park and Useable Open Space alternatives at Ponto. The data file initially compared cost-benefits of the 11-acre Ponto Planning Area F and pre-2022 City Cost data. However in May 2022 the City updated its PCH Relocation costs, and a willing seller of 14.3 acres of adjacent land (Ponto Planning Area G, H, and I; aka Kam Sang) was listed for sale. B) The Kam Sang list price of \$2.7 million per acre or a bit more than the \$2.4 to \$1.4 million per acre price of recent Ponto land sales noted

in the file but are close. C) The City's updated PCH Relocation Costs are similar. The Cost-Benefit Comparison still shows purchasing Ponto Park land is still a better value for Carlsbad Citizens, and saves tax-payers money. The Comparison references a City map and data showing sea level rise impact areas, and the City's PCH Relocation environmental and design constraints.

4. Citizens' City Budget Ponto Park need-requests: A) Summary data and verbatim documentation of Carlsbad Citizens requests to budget to address the need for Ponto Park, and Open Space issues at Ponto. B) The volume of Citizen input on Ponto Park and Open Space, and the actual verbatim Carlsbad Citizen comments should be considered. C) In addition since 2017 when Carlsbad Citizen first became aware of several Ponto Planning Mistakes by the City:
 - a. false Growth Management Unconstrained/Useable Open Space 'Standard exemption' at Ponto
 - b. failure in the 2010 Ponto Vision Plan that is the basis for the 2015 General Plan Update, and the failure of the 2015 General Plan Update to follow the 1996 Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy for Planning Area F that required the City to consider and document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land use prior to proposing a change in the Non-residential Reserve land use policy. Failing to fully disclose the Coastal Commission's rejection of the Ponto Vision Plan in 2010 because of these reasons, and not disclosing 2016, 2017 and 2022 directions to the City..
 - c. SW Quadrant Park deficits going back to 2012
 - d. Not considering 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Report that shows the loss of 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space land uses at Ponto.
 - e. As a corollary example, the City has additional history in collaborating with developers to skirt standards and allow development without developers providing their required public facilities - the Rosalena HOA Trail segment of the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff-top trail at Ponto is a classic example. This example resulted in delaying construction of the public trail by over 35-years and ended up costing about 75 Carlsbad homeowners over \$1 million in additional costs. It almost resulted in no trail being built and City and/or developer pocketing money meant to pay for the trail. This scenario could happen a far larger scale and cost if Ponto developers are not required to provide the missing 30 acres of required Useable Open Space at Ponto

Carlsbad People for Ponto Citizens have asked the City to provide the Citizen input since 2017 for all things Ponto related. Reviewing the public record of 5,000+ citizen communications since 2017 reveals only maybe a dozen (mostly developer paid or supported) are not in support of Ponto Park. Your fellow Carlsbad Citizens ask the Growth Management Committee to read their input and to consider future generations.

Thank you for serving on the Growth Management Committee. You each have a large and vital task, as your recommendations will be the beginnings of what (due to Carlsbad running out of vacant land) will be the 'final glide path' that forever defines Carlsbad's Quality of Life. After your recommendations, there will only be added population demands on the public facilities. As more infill development is added and there may be no vacant land to provide needed supplies of facilities like Parks and Unconstrained/Useable Open Space.

I speak from having already professionally followed the path you are on. After working on Carlsbad's Growth Management Program in the mid-1980s I addressed this same issues for the then new City of Dana Point that (in 1989) was at a similar stage of 'near buildout as Carlsbad is now.

Based on my professional experience I implore you seriously and fully consider that data and desires your fellow Carlsbad People for Ponto Citizens have provided you and the City. Based on where Carlsbad is we, and you, will only get this one chance to get it right.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
35-year Carlsbad resident
former Carlsbad Growth Management and Dana Point city planner

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



March 11th, 2022

Carlsbad City Council
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Re: Support creation of Ponto Park – a needed park for South Carlsbad

Dear Mayor Hall,

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is strongly supporting the efforts of ‘People for Ponto’ and thousands of Carlsbad residents to build Ponto Park in the 11-acre coastal parcel known as ‘Planning Area F’ in South Carlsbad. For over 40-years TPL has been designing and building parks in California and although we have world-class parks and beaches, the fact remains 3.2 million Californians don’t have access to a park, and some of those Californians are residents of South Carlsbad. While the National Recreation and Park Association calls for 10-acres of park lands per 1000 residents as standard metric for healthy and vibrant cities, Carlsbad has a comparatively and relatively low park standard of only 3-acres/1,000 population and no requirement to provide accessible parks within walking distance.

And according to our own Trust for Public Land 2020-21 ‘City Parkscore’, Carlsbad is also below national averages both providing park land acreage and in providing residents a park within a 10-minute walk.

The City of Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan on pages 86-89 documents park service and park equity/inequity. Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan documents that Ponto area has no park and all of South Carlsbad (over 61% of the entire city population) has no Coastal Park while . Carlsbad provides 10 City Coastal Parks (totaling over 35-acres) in North Carlsbad, while South Carlsbad has no coastal parks to serve the 64,000 residents, many of which are children. Ponto Park at 11-acre Planning Area F is the last remaining reasonable bit of vacant and currently unplanned Coastal land to provide a Coastal Park for South Carlsbad. Ponto Park would also be in the middle of a 6-mile long section of North San Diego County coastline without Coastal Park, and would help address a regional need for a Coastal Park for these 6-miles of coastline.

The CA Coastal Act has numerous policies that support the creation of Ponto Park and Coastal Recreation land use. The City of Carlsbad’s history of following these CA Coastal Act polies now and over the past 40-years in its Local Coastal Program should be considered now in the City’s proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment. Over the past 40-years Carlsbad and California residents have forever

lost numerous opportunities to create vital Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation for our growing population.

In addition to the clear need for coastal parks in South Carlsbad, the citizens are overwhelmingly supporting the creation of Ponto Park in Planning area F. As you know during the past 2-years during the City Budget and Local Coastal Program Amendment processes, residents strongly demonstrated their desire that the City Council purchase and build Ponto Park. In 2019, 2020 and 2021 over 90% of citizen input expressed need was for Ponto Park, along with extensive verbal and written citizen testimony.

As COVID-19 vividly pointed out, parks are not an amenity, but a key component to human physical and mental health. Parks also provide environmental benefits and contribute to cleaner air and water, climate adaptation and social cohesion. TPL think you have a great opportunity to address equity and access to park space and improving the lives of thousands of Carlsbad residents and strongly urge you to support the building of Ponto Park for families and community.

Sincerely,

Rico Mastrodonato
Government Relations Director

Subject: FW: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance
Attachments: NRPA Agency Prefomance Review camoarsion with Carlsbad Parks.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2022 11:19 AM

To: Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Council and Parks and Planning Commissions, & CA Coastal Commission:

May 30th you received the 4 Parks and Open Space data files. Attached is another Parks data file that summarizes key comparative data on Park facilities provided in Carlsbad vis-a-vis the National Recreation & Parks Association database, and Trust for Public Land data base, and the letter to the Trust for Public Land letter to the City of Carlsbad. This data should also be considered by the City (and CA Coastal Commission) as part of the City's Growth Management Program Update, Parks Master Plan Update, Local Coastal Program Amendment process.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lance Schulte
35-year Carlsbad resident
former Carlsbad Growth Management and city planner

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Monday, May 30, 2022 1:21 PM

To: 'Eric.lardy@carlsbadca.gov'; council@carlsbadca.gov; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Don Neu (Dneu@ci.carlsbad.ca.us)

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - Parks & Unconstrained-Useable Open Space facilities

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Council and Parks and Planning Commissions, & CA Coastal Commission:

The Committee is tasked with recommending to the Council proposed changes to City Park and City Unconstrained/Useable Open Space Standards within the Growth Management Program Update.

Because Carlsbad is quickly running out of vacant land, the Committee's recommendations are critical for very obvious reasons. The Committee will be recommending (for all future generations) the final methods to supply Citizen desired Parks and Unconstrained/Useable Open Space. It is important the Committee wisely represent the interests of those future generations. The Park and Open Space supply solutions for future generations will amend Carlsbad's updated 2015 General Plan and the "as of 2013" Local Coastal Program.

Since 2017 many People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have overwhelming expressed their need and desire for:

1. Fairness, and a true adequately sized and dimensioned Ponto Park to address City Park Master Plan documented "Lack of Park Service and Park Inequity" in this area, and
2. Correcting the City's documented 30-acre shortfall in required Unconstrained and Useable Open Space in the Ponto area, and
3. Correcting the City's planned loss of 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space at Ponto (the State Campground and Beach) first documented in 2017 and thus not a part of the City's General Plan & Growth Management Program.

Since 2017, over 5,000 Carlsbad Citizen and visitor petitions have been sent to the City & Coastal Commission expressing the desire and need of both Citizens and visitors to have these Parks and Open Space issues addressed. The Council has been narrowing deferring addressing these issues and noted waiting for the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee to consider both the data and Citizen and visitor desires.

Attached are 5 data files sent to the City by Carlsbad People for Ponto. The data files were sent as comments to the City's proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) Amendment that seeks to change Carlsbad's 2013 LCP with the outdated 2015 General Plan, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan Update process, and the Growth Management Program that your Committee will be making recommendations to change. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens conducted over 50 official Carlsbad Public Records Requests to compile this data. We provide these data files in preparation of your June 23rd meeting.

1. Coastal Recreation and comparative Park data: Summary data on supply/demand/distribution-fairness of City Parks in Carlsbad, unflattering comparative data on how much parkland and where Carlsbad provides Parks relative to Encinitas and Oceanside and national averages, documents Carlsbad's Park Master Plan mapping Park distribution unfairness at Ponto, and documenting that many Carlsbad's Park acres are Unusable for people because they are constrained habitat land protected from human use/intrusion.
2. Sea Level Rise & Carlsbad planned loss of Open Space at Ponto: A) Summary data on how sea level rise (SLR) will remove Open Space at Ponto. B) City GIS maps/data that shows 30-acres of required Unconstrained/Useable Open Space was not provided at Ponto (Zone 9) by using false exemptions while similar and adjacent Local Facility Management Zones (19 & 22) provided their required Unconstrained/Useable Open Space. C) City maps and data tables documenting the both loss of Open Space at Ponto from SLR and the missing Growth Management Open Space at Ponto.
3. Updated 2022-June Comparative Cost-Benefits of PCH Modification and Ponto Park: A) Summary City data comparing the Citizen and tax-payer Cost-Benefit of Park and Useable Open Space alternatives at Ponto. The data file initially compared cost-benefits of the 11-acre Ponto Planning Area F and pre-2022 City Cost data. However in May 2022 the City updated its PCH Relocation costs, and a willing seller of 14.3 acres of adjacent land (Ponto Planning Area G, H, and I; aka Kam Sang) was listed for sale. B) The Kam Sang list price of \$2.7 million per acre or a bit more than the \$2.4 to \$1.4 million per acre price of recent Ponto land sales noted in the file but are close. C) The City's updated PCH Relocation Costs are similar. The Cost-Benefit Comparison still shows purchasing Ponto Park land is still a better value for Carlsbad Citizens, and saves tax-payers money. The Comparison references a City map and data showing sea level rise impact areas, and the City's PCH Relocation environmental and design constraints.
4. Citizens' City Budget Ponto Park need-requests: A) Summary data and verbatim documentation of Carlsbad Citizens requests to budget to address the need for Ponto Park, and Open Space issues at Ponto. B) The volume of Citizen input on Ponto Park and Open Space, and the actual verbatim Carlsbad Citizen comments should be

considered. C) In addition since 2017 when Carlsbad Citizen first became aware of several Ponto Planning Mistakes by the City:

- a. false Growth Management Unconstrained/Useable Open Space 'Standard exemption' at Ponto
- b. failure in the 2010 Ponto Vision Plan that is the basis for the 2015 General Plan Update, and the failure of the 2015 General Plan Update to follow the 1996 Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy for Planning Area F that required the City to consider and document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land use prior to proposing a change in the Non-residential Reserve land use policy. Failing to fully disclose the Coastal Commission's rejection of the Ponto Vision Plan in 2010 because of these reasons, and not disclosing 2016, 2017 and 2022 directions to the City..
- c. SW Quadrant Park deficits going back to 2012
- d. Not considering 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Report that shows the loss of 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space land uses at Ponto.
- e. As a corollary example, the City has additional history in collaborating with developers to skirt standards and allow development without developers providing their required public facilities - the Rosalena HOA Trail segment of the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff-top trail at Ponto is a classic example. This example resulted in delaying construction of the public trail by over 35-years and ended up costing about 75 Carlsbad homeowners over \$1 million in additional costs. It almost resulted in no trail being built and City and/or developer pocketing money meant to pay for the trail. This scenario could happen a far larger scale and cost if Ponto developers are not required to provide the missing 30 acres of required Useable Open Space at Ponto

Carlsbad People for Ponto Citizens have asked the City to provide the Citizen input since 2017 for all things Ponto related. Reviewing the public record of 5,000+ citizen communications since 2017 reveals only maybe a dozen (mostly developer paid or supported) are not in support of Ponto Park. Your fellow Carlsbad Citizens ask the Growth Management Committee to read their input and to consider future generations.

Thank you for serving on the Growth Management Committee. You each have a large and vital task, as your recommendations will be the beginnings of what (due to Carlsbad running out of vacant land) will be the 'final glide path' that forever defines Carlsbad's Quality of Life. After your recommendations, there will only be added population demands on the public facilities. As more infill development is added and there may be no vacant land to provide needed supplies of facilities like Parks and Unconstrained/Useable Open Space.

I speak from having already professionally followed the path you are on. After working on Carlsbad's Growth Management Program in the mid-1980s I addressed this same issues for the then new City of Dana Point that (in 1989) was at a similar stage of 'near buildout as Carlsbad is now.

Based on my professional experience I implore you seriously and fully consider that data and desires your fellow Carlsbad People for Ponto Citizens have provided you and the City. Based on where Carlsbad is we, and you, will only get this one chance to get it right.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
35-year Carlsbad resident
former Carlsbad Growth Management and Dana Point city planner

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

National Recreation & Park Association (NRPA) Agency Performance Review – Carlsbad Parks
<https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/research-papers/agency-performance-review/>

The following in quotation marks is from the NRPA Agency Performance Review. Under each quote is how Carlsbad compares with this nationwide park data base.

“The typical park and recreation agency offers one park for every 2,323 residents served, with 10.4 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. But park and recreation agencies are as diverse as the communities that they serve, and what works well for one agency may not be best for your agency. Therefore, park and recreation professionals need data to identify the best practices to optimally serve their community.”

Carlsbad has one park for 2,797 residents with 2.95 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

Carlsbad is 20% below typical in providing the number of parks, and

Carlsbad is 72% below typical in providing acres of parkland.

Carlsbad data is from 2020 US Census, Carlsbad General Plan & data from new Buena Vista Reservoir Park in NW quadrant. City also counts school playgrounds as Parks, even though these are not 100% available for park use.

The NRPA Agency Performance Review also provides finer-grained data on a City’s relative performance based on population, population per square mile (aka population density), and City Park Budget size. Carlsbad’s 2020 population of 114,746 places it in the 100,000 to 250,000 category, Carlsbad’s population per square mile of 2,792.2 places it in the ‘over 2,500’ category, and Carlsbad 2022-23 Park Budget of \$2,601,669 places it in the \$1 to \$5 million budget category. NRPA data for these categories is:

| “Based on | Lower quartile | median | upper quartile |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Total city population:</u> | | | |
| Residents per park | 2,205 | 3,170 | 5,852 |
| Acres of park/1,000 residents | 4.6 | 8.9 | 16.3” |

Carlsbad is:

12% better than the median in providing the number of parks per residents

67% worse than the median in providing acres of park per resident

“Population/sq. mile (population density):

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Residents per park | 1,382 | 2,261 | 3,908 |
| Acres of park/1,000 residents | 3.9 | 7.9 | 14.5” |

Carlsbad is:

24% worse than the median in providing the number of parks per residents

63% worse than the median in providing acres of park per resident

“City Park budget:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Residents per park | 1,174 | 1,941 | 4,288 |
| Acres of park/1,000 residents | 5.1 | 10.6 | 18.3” |

Carlsbad is:

44% better than the median in providing the number of parks per residents

72% worse than the median in providing acres of park per resident

It is unclear in the NRPA data if the nationwide data includes and count school playgrounds as a park, (like Carlsbad does) even though school playgrounds are 100% available as parkland. The City's use of School facilities that are outside of the City Park System and City Park Budget to count as Parks may distort data comparisons.

The NRPA Agency Performance Review has no comparative data on the accessibility of Parks. The NRPA website references the Trust for Public Land's (TPL) Park Score data for Park accessibility data. The Trust for Public Land's Park Score for Carlsbad is at <https://www.tpl.org/city/carlsbad-california> . Carlsbad's TPL Park Score data indicates:

For a 10-minute walk to a Park, Carlsbad is:
33% below the Median for the TPL's 100 ParkScore® cities:
9% below the Median for the 14,000 cities and towns in the TPL ParkServe® database

For overall Park acreage, Carlsbad is:
26% below the Median for the TPL's 100 ParkScore® cities:
7% below the Median for the 14,000 cities and towns in the TPL ParkServe® database

The TPL database includes all parks within a city, including non-City parks. For instance TPL includes the State Campground as a Park; even though the Campground is a 'low-cost visitor accommodation' there is no park within the Campground. The TPL also counts restricted habitat areas within City Parks that cannot be used as parks.

The NRPA does provide information in support of park accessibility as noted in the following clips and links:

["10-Minute Walk Campaign](https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/evaluation-resource-hub/park-check/resources/) NRPA, The Trust for Public Land, and the Urban Land Institute have joined forces to ensure there is a great park within a 10-minute walk of every person across America. More than 220 mayors have committed to expanding equitable park access through local policy changes, master planning efforts and increased funding." <https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/evaluation-resource-hub/park-check/resources/>

"NRPA Park Check Principles, **Access:** Everyone deserves access to a high-quality park that is within a 10-minute walk of where they live. It is important that all members of the community, including lower-income residents, have walkable park access." <https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/evaluation-resource-hub/park-check/principles/>

"Ashburn, Va. (Sept. 24, 2018) — According to a recent [report](#) published by the [National Recreation and Park Association](#) (NRPA), the majority (85 percent) of Americans support efforts, such as the [10-Minute Walk campaign](#), to ensure every person has access to a great park within a 10-minute walk of their home. Currently, 3 in 4 Americans say they live within walking distance of a local park or other recreational facility and, on average, visit their local park and recreation facilities more than twice a month. ... A [report](#) issued by NRPA — in partnership with the Center for Regional Analysis at George Mason University — demonstrates the vast economic impact of local parks nationwide. Operations and capital spending for local parks generates more than \$154 billion in economic activity and supports more than 1.1 million jobs. This is a conservative estimate that does not capture parks' other economic benefits:

- Higher real estate values
- Health and wellness benefits
- Conservation/Resiliency benefits
- Tourism

- Economic development”

<https://www.nrpa.org/about-national-recreation-and-park-association/press-room/americans-agree-every-person-deserves-access-to-a-great-park-within-a-10-minute-walk/>

“Ashburn, Va. (Feb. 11, 2019) — As part of the [10-Minute Walk](#) campaign, which aims to address the fact that 1 in 3 Americans don’t have a park within a 10-minute walk (or half-mile) of home, the [National Recreation and Park Association](#) (NRPA), along with [The Trust for Public Land](#) (TPL) and the [Urban Land Institute](#) (ULI), has selected 10 campaign cities nationwide to receive grant funding totaling \$400,000. This funding will be used to support city planning and policy efforts that help increase access to high-quality, close-to-home parks and public green space.” <https://www.nrpa.org/about-national-recreation-and-park-association/press-room/new-grant-funding-supports-10-cities-participating-in-10-minute-walk-campaign/>

The City’s Park Master Plan (pages 86-xx) maps Park Service Areas and areas Unserved by City Parks. Following is a compilation the City parkland and the City areas Served (circled) and Unserved (outside the circles) by City Parks. This data was compiled and submitted to City in a ‘Coastal Recreation data file’ on 1/29/20 by People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens, along with submitting over 5,000 petitions regarding many comparative shortfalls in City Parkland:

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

Data Sources:

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlsbadcitycalifornia/PST045221>

<https://www.carlsbadca.gov/departments/community-development/planning/general-plan>

<https://www.carlsbadca.gov/departments/parks-recreation/parks-community-centers/parks/future-park-planning/buena-vista-reservoir-park>

<https://www.tpl.org/city/carlsbad-california>

<https://www.carlsbadca.gov/departments/parks-recreation/parks-community-centers/parks-master-plan>

Subject: Correction to 6-11-22 Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance
Attachments: NRPA Agency Prefomance Review comparison with Carlsbad Parks - 2022-6-19.pdf

From: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2022 10:50 PM
To: Charlene Buckalew <Charlene.Buckalew@carlsbadca.gov>; Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: FW: Correction to 6-11-22 Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance

Char-
Please forward this message onto the PRC.

Mick-
FYI, re. the department's MP update.

Thanks, both.
-Kyle

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2022 11:15 AM
To: Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: Correction to 6-11-22 Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Council and Parks and Planning Commissions, & CA Coastal Commission:

Please replace the attached corrected file originally sent on 6-11-22. It corrects one missing word "NOT" in the 1st paragraph on page 2.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2022 11:19 AM
To: 'Eric.lardy@carlsbadca.gov'; council@carlsbadca.gov; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Don Neu (Dneu@ci.carlsbad.ca.us)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Council and Parks and Planning Commissions, & CA Coastal Commission:

May 30th you received the 4 Parks and Open Space data files. Attached is another Parks data file that summarizes key comparative data on Park facilities provided in Carlsbad vis-a-vis the National Recreation & Parks Association database, and Trust for Public Land data base, and the letter to the Trust for Public Land letter to the City of Carlsbad. This data should also be considered by the City (and CA Coastal Commission) as part of the City's Growth Management Program Update, Parks Master Plan Update, Local Coastal Program Amendment process.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lance Schulte
35-year Carlsbad resident
former Carlsbad Growth Management and city planner

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, May 30, 2022 1:21 PM
To: 'Eric.lardy@carlsbadca.gov'; council@carlsbadca.gov; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Don Neu (Dneu@ci.carlsbad.ca.us)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - Parks & Unconstrained-Useable Open Space facilities

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Council and Parks and Planning Commissions, & CA Coastal Commission:

The Committee is tasked with recommending to the Council proposed changes to City Park and City Unconstrained/Useable Open Space Standards within the Growth Management Program Update.

Because Carlsbad is quickly running out of vacant land, the Committee's recommendations are critical for very obvious reasons. The Committee will be recommending (for all future generations) the final methods to supply Citizen desired Parks and Unconstrained/Useable Open Space. It is important the Committee wisely represent the interests of those future generations. The Park and Open Space supply solutions for future generations will amend Carlsbad's updated 2015 General Plan and the "as of 2013" Local Coastal Program.

Since 2017 many People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have overwhelmingly expressed their need and desire for:

1. Fairness, and a true adequately sized and dimensioned Ponto Park to address City Park Master Plan documented "lack of Park Service and Park Inequity" in this area, and
2. Correcting the City's documented 30-acre shortfall in required Unconstrained and Useable Open Space in the Ponto area, and
3. Correcting the City's planned loss of 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space at Ponto (the State Campground and Beach) first documented in 2017 and thus not a part of the City's General Plan & Growth Management Program.

Since 2017, over 5,000 Carlsbad Citizen and visitor petitions have been sent to the City & Coastal Commission expressing the desire and need of both Citizens and visitors to have these Parks and Open Space issues addressed. The Council has been narrowing deferring addressing these issues and noted waiting for the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee to consider both the data and Citizen and visitor desires.

Attached are 5 data files sent to the City by Carlsbad People for Ponto. The data files were sent as comments to the City's proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) Amendment that seeks to change Carlsbad's 2013 LCP with the outdated 2015 General Plan, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan Update process, and the Growth Management Program that your Committee will be making recommendations to change. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens conducted over 50 official Carlsbad Public Records Requests to compile this data. We provide these data files in preparation of your June 23rd meeting.

1. Coastal Recreation and comparative Park data: Summary data on supply/demand/distribution-fairness of City Parks in Carlsbad, unflattering comparative data on how much parkland and where Carlsbad provides Parks relative to Encinitas and Oceanside and national averages, documents Carlsbad's Park Master Plan mapping Park distribution unfairness at Ponto, and documenting that many Carlsbad's Park acres are Unusable for people because they are constrained habitat land protected from human use/intrusion.
2. Sea Level Rise & Carlsbad planned loss of Open Space at Ponto: A) Summary data on how sea level rise (SLR) will remove Open Space at Ponto. B) City GIS maps/data that shows 30-acres of required Unconstrained/Useable Open Space was not provided at Ponto (Zone 9) by using false exemptions while similar and adjacent Local Facility Management Zones (19 & 22) provided their required Unconstrained/Useable Open Space. C) City maps and data tables documenting the both loss of Open Space at Ponto from SLR and the missing Growth Management Open Space at Ponto.
3. Updated 2022-June Comparative Cost-Benefits of PCH Modification and Ponto Park: A) Summary City data comparing the Citizen and tax-payer Cost-Benefit of Park and Useable Open Space alternatives at Ponto. The data file initially compared cost-benefits of the 11-acre Ponto Planning Area F and pre-2022 City Cost data. However in May 2022 the City updated its PCH Relocation costs, and a willing seller of 14.3 acres of adjacent land (Ponto Planning Area G, H, and I; aka Kam Sang) was listed for sale. B) The Kam Sang list price of \$2.7 million per acre or a bit more than the \$2.4 to \$1.4 million per acre price of recent Ponto land sales noted in the file but are close. C) The City's updated PCH Relocation Costs are similar. The Cost-Benefit Comparison still shows purchasing Ponto Park land is still a better value for Carlsbad Citizens, and saves tax-payers money. The Comparison references a City map and data showing sea level rise impact areas, and the City's PCH Relocation environmental and design constraints.
4. Citizens' City Budget Ponto Park need-requests: A) Summary data and verbatim documentation of Carlsbad Citizens requests to budget to address the need for Ponto Park, and Open Space issues at Ponto. B) The volume of Citizen input on Ponto Park and Open Space, and the actual verbatim Carlsbad Citizen comments should be considered. C) In addition since 2017 when Carlsbad Citizen first became aware of several Ponto Planning Mistakes by the City:
 - a. false Growth Management Unconstrained/Useable Open Space 'Standard exemption' at Ponto
 - b. failure in the 2010 Ponto Vision Plan that is the basis for the 2015 General Plan Update, and the failure of the 2015 General Plan Update to follow the 1996 Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy for Planning Area F that required the City to consider and document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land use prior to proposing a change in the Non-residential Reserve land use policy. Failing to fully disclose the Coastal Commission's rejection of the Ponto Vision Plan in 2010 because of these reasons, and not disclosing 2016, 2017 and 2022 directions to the City..
 - c. SW Quadrant Park deficits going back to 2012
 - d. Not considering 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Report that shows the loss of 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space land uses at Ponto.
 - e. As a corollary example, the City has additional history in collaborating with developers to skirt standards and allow development without developers providing their required public facilities - the Rosalena HOA Trail segment of the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff-top trail at Ponto is a classic example. This example resulted in delaying construction of the public trail by over 35-years and ended up costing about 75 Carlsbad homeowners over \$1 million in additional costs. It almost resulted in no trail being built and City and/or developer pocketing money meant to pay for the trail. This scenario could happen a far larger scale and cost if Ponto developers are not required to provide the missing 30acres of required Useable Open Space at Ponto

Carlsbad People for Ponto Citizens have asked the City to provide the Citizen input since 2017 for all things Ponto related. Reviewing the public record of 5,000+ citizen communications since 2017 reveals only maybe a dozen (mostly developer paid or supported) are not in support of Ponto Park. Your fellow Carlsbad Citizens ask the Growth Management Committee to read their input and to consider future generations.

Thank you for serving on the Growth Management Committee. You each have a large and vital task, as your recommendations will be the beginnings of what (due to Carlsbad running out of vacant land) will be the 'final glide path' that forever defines Carlsbad's Quality of Life. After your recommendations, there will only be added population demands on the public facilities. As more infill development is added and there may be no vacant land to provide needed supplies of facilities like Parks and Unconstrained/Useable Open Space.

I speak from having already professionally followed the path you are on. After working on Carlsbad's Growth Management Program in the mid-1980s I addressed this same issues for the then new City of Dana Point that (in 1989) was at a similar stage of 'near buildout as Carlsbad is now.

Based on my professional experience I implore you seriously and fully consider that data and desires your fellow Carlsbad People for Ponto Citizens have provided you and the City. Based on where Carlsbad is we, and you, will only get this one chance to get it right.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
35-year Carlsbad resident
former Carlsbad Growth Management and Dana Point city planner

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

National Recreation & Park Association (NRPA) Agency Performance Review – Carlsbad Parks
<https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/research-papers/agency-performance-review/>

The following in quotation marks is from the NRPA Agency Performance Review. Under each quote is how Carlsbad compares with this nationwide park data base.

“The typical park and recreation agency offers one park for every 2,323 residents served, with 10.4 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. But park and recreation agencies are as diverse as the communities that they serve, and what works well for one agency may not be best for your agency. Therefore, park and recreation professionals need data to identify the best practices to optimally serve their community.”

Carlsbad has one park for 2,797 residents with 2.95 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

Carlsbad is 20% below typical in providing the number of parks, and

Carlsbad is 72% below typical in providing acres of parkland.

Carlsbad data is from 2020 US Census, Carlsbad General Plan & data from new Buena Vista Reservoir Park in NW quadrant. City also counts school playgrounds as Parks, even though these are not 100% available for park use.

The NRPA Agency Performance Review also provides finer-grained data on a City’s relative performance based on population, population per square mile (aka population density), and City Park Budget size. Carlsbad’s 2020 population of 114,746 places it in the 100,000 to 250,000 category, Carlsbad’s population per square mile of 2,792.2 places it in the ‘over 2,500’ category, and Carlsbad 2022-23 Park Budget of \$2,601,669 places it in the \$1 to \$5 million budget category. NRPA data for these categories is:

| “Based on | Lower quartile | median | upper quartile |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Total city population:</u> | | | |
| Residents per park | 2,205 | 3,170 | 5,852 |
| Acres of park/1,000 residents | 4.6 | 8.9 | 16.3” |

Carlsbad is:

12% better than the median in providing the number of parks per residents

67% worse than the median in providing acres of park per resident

“Population/sq. mile (population density):

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Residents per park | 1,382 | 2,261 | 3,908 |
| Acres of park/1,000 residents | 3.9 | 7.9 | 14.5” |

Carlsbad is:

24% worse than the median in providing the number of parks per residents

63% worse than the median in providing acres of park per resident

“City Park budget:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Residents per park | 1,174 | 1,941 | 4,288 |
| Acres of park/1,000 residents | 5.1 | 10.6 | 18.3” |

Carlsbad is:

44% better than the median in providing the number of parks per residents

72% worse than the median in providing acres of park per resident

It is unclear in the NRPA data if the nationwide data includes and count school playgrounds as a park, (like Carlsbad does) even though school playgrounds are NOT 100% available as parkland. The City's use of School facilities that are outside of the City Park System and City Park Budget to count as Parks may distort data comparisons.

The NRPA Agency Performance Review has no comparative data on the accessibility of Parks. The NRPA website references the Trust for Public Land's (TPL) Park Score data for Park accessibility data. The Trust for Public Land's Park Score for Carlsbad is at <https://www.tpl.org/city/carlsbad-california> . Carlsbad's TPL Park Score data indicates:

For a 10-minute walk to a Park, Carlsbad is:
33% below the Median for the TPL's 100 ParkScore® cities:
9% below the Median for the 14,000 cities and towns in the TPL ParkServe® database

For overall Park acreage, Carlsbad is:
26% below the Median for the TPL's 100 ParkScore® cities:
7% below the Median for the 14,000 cities and towns in the TPL ParkServe® database

The TPL database includes all parks within a city, including non-City parks. For instance TPL includes the State Campground as a Park; even though the Campground is a 'low-cost visitor accommodation' there is no park within the Campground. The TPL also counts restricted habitat areas within City Parks that cannot be used as parks.

The NRPA does provide information in support of park accessibility as noted in the following clips and links:

["10-Minute Walk Campaign](https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/evaluation-resource-hub/park-check/resources/) NRPA, The Trust for Public Land, and the Urban Land Institute have joined forces to ensure there is a great park within a 10-minute walk of every person across America. More than 220 mayors have committed to expanding equitable park access through local policy changes, master planning efforts and increased funding." <https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/evaluation-resource-hub/park-check/resources/>

"NRPA Park Check Principles, **Access:** Everyone deserves access to a high-quality park that is within a 10-minute walk of where they live. It is important that all members of the community, including lower-income residents, have walkable park access." <https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/evaluation-resource-hub/park-check/principles/>

"Ashburn, Va. (Sept. 24, 2018) — According to a recent [report](#) published by the [National Recreation and Park Association](#) (NRPA), the majority (85 percent) of Americans support efforts, such as the [10-Minute Walk campaign](#), to ensure every person has access to a great park within a 10-minute walk of their home. Currently, 3 in 4 Americans say they live within walking distance of a local park or other recreational facility and, on average, visit their local park and recreation facilities more than twice a month. ... A [report](#) issued by NRPA — in partnership with the Center for Regional Analysis at George Mason University — demonstrates the vast economic impact of local parks nationwide. Operations and capital spending for local parks generates more than \$154 billion in economic activity and supports more than 1.1 million jobs. This is a conservative estimate that does not capture parks' other economic benefits:

- Higher real estate values
- Health and wellness benefits
- Conservation/Resiliency benefits
- Tourism

- Economic development”

<https://www.nrpa.org/about-national-recreation-and-park-association/press-room/americans-agree-every-person-deserves-access-to-a-great-park-within-a-10-minute-walk/>

“Ashburn, Va. (Feb. 11, 2019) — As part of the [10-Minute Walk](#) campaign, which aims to address the fact that 1 in 3 Americans don’t have a park within a 10-minute walk (or half-mile) of home, the [National Recreation and Park Association](#) (NRPA), along with [The Trust for Public Land](#) (TPL) and the [Urban Land Institute](#) (ULI), has selected 10 campaign cities nationwide to receive grant funding totaling \$400,000. This funding will be used to support city planning and policy efforts that help increase access to high-quality, close-to-home parks and public green space.” <https://www.nrpa.org/about-national-recreation-and-park-association/press-room/new-grant-funding-supports-10-cities-participating-in-10-minute-walk-campaign/>

The City’s Park Master Plan (pages 86-xx) maps Park Service Areas and areas Unserved by City Parks. Following is a compilation the City parkland and the City areas Served (circled) and Unserved (outside the circles) by City Parks. This data was compiled and submitted to City in a ‘Coastal Recreation data file’ on 1/29/20 by People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens, along with submitting over 5,000 petitions regarding many comparative shortfalls in City Parkland:

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

Data Sources:

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlsbadcitycalifornia/PST045221>

<https://www.carlsbadca.gov/departments/community-development/planning/general-plan>

<https://www.carlsbadca.gov/departments/parks-recreation/parks-community-centers/parks/future-park-planning/buena-vista-reservoir-park>


<https://www.tpl.org/city/carlsbad-california>

<https://www.carlsbadca.gov/departments/parks-recreation/parks-community-centers/parks-master-plan>

Images of Park need at Ponto: Carlsbad Citizens forced to use vacant land & streets; and Ponto vacant land used as needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park for inland South Carlsbad citizens and families



Images of Park need at Ponto: Carlsbad Citizens forced to use vacant land & streets; and Ponto vacant land used as needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park for inland South Carlsbad citizens and families



From: Desiree Gibson <desiree.gibson@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 8:50 AM
To: Joanne McGhee
Cc: Mick Calarco
Subject: Re: Poinsettia Park

Hi Joanne,

Thanks so much for your response.

I would encourage you to take a look at what Encinitas has done in regards to underutilized tennis courts. Essentially they have striped all of their tennis courts so that they can be utilized as pickleball courts as well.

At Cottonwood Creek Park, for example, there were originally two tennis courts, neither of which were very well used. They striped both tennis courts so that they can be used for pickleball - making four pickleball courts. Portable nets are available.

Tennis court #1 has priority for tennis. So if tennis players show up, they have priority at all times. Court #2 has priority for pickleball. Each court has a max 1 hour playing time if people are waiting.

I have used these courts several times over the past week. In two instances, both courts were used for pickleball. In one instance, court 1 was used for tennis; court 2 for pickleball.

I appreciate that you are updating your master plan, but any new courts will take forever to implement; that's just how the government process works. You have 12 tennis courts that could be better utilized right now.

I would assume that one of the goals of Parks is to get people moving. There are plenty of people just waiting around for pickleball courts every day. Utilizing the tennis courts will get those people moving.

Desiree Gibson
6972 Batiquitos, Carlsbad

On Thu, Jun 30, 2022 at 10:14 AM Joanne McGhee <Joanne.McGhee@carlsbadca.gov> wrote:

Hello Ms. Gibson,

Thank you for sharing your concerns about the number of pickleball courts at Poinsettia Community Park. With the sport's popularity and growth over the past several years, there's been a growing demand for pickleball courts, and the pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park were built in response to community input such as yours.

There is also a steady and continuing demand for tennis courts, and the city strives to meet that need as well.

I will ask a park ranger to look into people holding private tennis lessons on the courts, which is against the rules. You may also report violations you witness to the Carlsbad Police Department's non-emergency number, at 760-931-2197. This is helpful because police keep track of service calls and will be able to use that information to determine when ongoing violations occur.

As for the sign posted on the tennis courts that say "No Pickleball," those signs were placed at the courts in response to a growing number of pickleball players who had been using the tennis courts when tennis players were waiting to use them, so the tennis players were not being able to play on the designated tennis courts.

The Parks & Recreation Department constantly assesses these sort of needs to try to appropriately balance the interests of all patrons. We have begun the process of updating the department's master plan, the planning document for Poinsettia Park and all of the city's parks and recreation programs. If you have a moment, we would appreciate your input on the master plan. It is a chance for you to share your priorities, and your input, and that of other community members, will help city staff and the city's consultant determine and address the future needs for pickleball and other recreational activities.

Here's a link to Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan Update [website](#). You can scroll down the page to the public input section to leave your feedback. We expect to have a draft master plan in late fall. There will be additional opportunities for you to provide feedback then, and also when we present the final draft to the City Council in early 2023.

Sincerely,

Joanne McGhee MS C.P.R.P

Recreation Area Manager

City of Carlsbad, Parks and Recreation Dept.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: FW: Why a Ponto Coastal Park is needed - another picture and words
Attachments: IMG_20200212_163014129.jpg

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Friday, July 1, 2022 7:48 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Why a Ponto Coastal Park is needed - another picture and words

Dear Carlsbad Council, Carlsbad Parks and Planning Commission, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

We ask you to please consider these emails and image, and request this be distributed/documentated as public input to the Carlsbad LCP Amendment, Park Master Plan Update, and Growth Management Program Update. Sitting at a stoplight years ago I saw this image of Cannon Park and prompted the email below to Kyle, our City Parks Director, to consider the real human impacts of not providing needed parks to children and their families.

The email and image illustrate that city planning, parks, and government is not just about numerically counting and balancing the ledger – Ponto's and SW & SE park deficits/needs are met by distant acres in NW Veterans Park (6-miles away). City planning, parks and government is about people. How we as Citizens in serving on the Growth Management Committee, Parks and Planning Commissions, and in electing our Council Representatives to create a city and environment that fosters our Citizens and their families growth and goodness is important human consideration, not just an accounting function.

Past flawed city growth management decisions (missing 30-acers of Useable Open Space at Ponto, and no provision for any City Parks at Ponto or all Coastal South Carlsbad) occurred at Ponto. Ponto has the last significant vacant land to correct those past flaws. Purchasing vacant Ponto land provides more benefits/value and saves Carlsbad tax-payers millions compared to trying to make useable some constrained thin strips of PCH median. We hope you correct the past Ponto Growth Management Planning flaws regarding Useable Open Space & Parks and the past failures to achieve the stated goals of Growth Management & our Carlsbad Community Vision.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte
34-year Carlsbad Citizen & former Carlsbad city planner

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2020 11:16 PM

To: Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov

Subject: Why a Ponto Coastal Park is needed

Kyle:

I know you said you are the Park guy. I saw this today driving on PCH past Cannon Park (the north end of 6-mile Coastal {west of I-5/rail corridor} Park gap centered around Ponto). The image kind of exemplifies what our Ponto citizens have been saying since 2017 when we first learned about the existing LCP requirement for the City to disclose to citizens about the requirement to Consider and Document the Need for a Ponto Park. The City is now starting to acknowledge (through CCC efforts) that the City failed to disclose and follow the LCP for over the past 10+ years. But the City built their proposed Ponto plan on this flawed foundation of non-disclosure and failure to invite the San Pacifico/Ponto/South Carlsbad citizens most effected to have a voice on their Park needs. Our kids at Ponto don't have a grassy Park to play in they can safely walk/bike to. Ponto and other west of I-5 kids have to have their parents drive them to Poinsettia or to Encinitas to play like this. They play in the street instead.

Ponto and other Citizens have spoken thousands of words to the City Staff and Council to try to convey some simple points on the need for a Ponto Coastal Park. Maybe this image is worth a thousand of those words. It is sad and detrimental to look at parks (and how they serve or citizens) like a cold accountant looks at counting dollars - we meet our bare-bones minimum 3-acres per 1,000 so check that box – and without caring about how that acreage is equitably dispersed and accessible to citizens and their Kids. How that lack of Park access hurts our kids well beyond their childhood is never accounted for. I hope you have the ability to understand this, and compassion and courage to help.

Lance

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*



Subject: Americans Agree: Every Person Deserves Access to a Great Park Within a 10-Minute Walk | National Recreation and Park Association

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, July 4, 2022 2:46 PM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Americans Agree: Every Person Deserves Access to a Great Park Within a 10-Minute Walk | National Recreation and Park Association

Dear Carlsbad Council, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Parks and Planning Commission, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Happy 4th of July. As we celebrate our nation's founding and principles of fair and true representative government, many of us in our parks it seemed appropriate to provide the City Council, Citizens Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Parks and Planning Commission, and CA Coastal Commission with the attached link. Please provide this email and linked report as public input to Carlsbad's Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, Growth Management Update meeting Aug 25th, Parks Master Plan Update.

Americans Agree: Every Person Deserves Access to a Great Park Within a 10-Minute Walk | National Recreation and Park Association - <https://www.nrpa.org/about-national-recreation-and-park-association/press-room/americans-agree-every-person-deserves-access-to-a-great-park-within-a-10-minute-walk/>

This link represents what People for Ponto Carlsbad (and other County) Citizens and visitors have been telling the Carlsbad Council, staff and CA Coastal Commission since 2017 – Carlsbad needs a true Ponto Park for Ponto neighborhood needs, Inland South Carlsbad needs for a true and meaningful Coastal Park (they have none), to correct a 6-mile regional Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto, for inland resident and visitor needs for a true Coastal Park.

People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have tried to convince our City Council about the sustaining benefit Ponto Park will provide, and it the link echoes that. There is urgent-once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to define our Growth Management future and make the needed purchase of Ponto Park.

We hope you read the attached link and you act as true representatives of citizen desires and provide the much needed Ponto Park.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 6, 2022 12:08 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mary Bernard
E-mail meameemer@gmail.com
Comments Since Pickleball is growing in popularity and demand for courts is high, what is being proposed to accommodate the demand?

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 4:23 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name
E-mail

Don Goms
dgstellar@hotmail.com

Comments

Hello. Thank you for this opportunity to have some input. I am a certified tennis professional with the USPTA and a pickleball professional with the IPTPA. So these remarks carry some experience. Tennis, while still popular, is not nearly as popular at this time as pickleball. For the short-term, I would recommend converting the two tennis courts nearest the Poinsettia Park pickleball courts to pickleball. Four pickleball courts could fit without much modification. Resurfacing of the courts with pickleball lines and 4 portable nets could be used. Alternatively, with more work, permanent nets could be installed. In the future, a larger pickleball center could be built at a different site. That I would recommend to be a managed club with a fee for court usage. Then, the converted tennis to pickleball courts at Poinsettia could be converted back to tennis, if there was demand. Lastly, I would recommend a company be hired to run a professional tennis program at the Poinsettia Park tennis courts. Right now, there is an uncertified person giving City sanctioned lessons. Plus, there are a few "other" people giving lessons on the courts, probably illegally. A managed club would have leagues, kids lessons, progressions to help students improve up to tournament level, ADA clinics, and of course private instruction. Good luck with your projects. Carlsbad is a wonderful city and a joy as a resident!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: citizen input for Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee (et. al.) regarding Parks - Park land dedication requirements for developers - an example of Ponto Site 18

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 9:05 AM

To: Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: citizen input for Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee (et. al.) regarding Parks - Park land dedication requirements for developers - an example of Ponto Site 18

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Park and Planning Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission:

This email is a follow-up to the July 7th email below, and only in regards to item #2 that deals with Park land dedication rules of 20.44 of the Carlsbad Municipal Code. Please include this email as public input to the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee (CTGMC), Parks Master Plan Update, Local Coastal Program Amendment, and Ponto Site 18 development file. Sorry for the length of this email, due to documentation to counter staff's incomplete information.

Role of Carlsbad Ordinance 20.44 - DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

The primary 20.44 requirement for developers to (at no cost to the City) provide land to the City to meet the development's demand for more City park acres, and the specific Park demand/supply situation at Ponto that clearly justifies the City Council pursuant to Council's (not staff's) authority under 20.44 to 1) require development to provide (dedicate without cost to the City) land for City Park that is sufficient to meet that development's park land demand (in the example of Ponto Site 18 that land area is 0.6118 acres), and 2) that pursuant to Council authority in 20.44, it is fiscally prudent and much better for the City and Citizens of Carlsbad to accept 'free' land v. receive a "park land in-lieu-fee" that only provides for 27% of the required land area called out in 20.44 and is thus ultimately results in a tax-payer subsidy of development. Tax-payer subsidy of development is also counter to the purpose of the City's Growth Management Program.

Staff misrepresentation of Citizen input

Some staff misrepresented my and other Carlsbad Citizens when staff said their Thursday, July 7, 2022 4:05 PM below: "The comment (citizen's 7/4/2022 8:33am email) claims that there is a requirement for the city to build a park in the southwest quadrant." What we said in our Mon 7/4/2022 8:33 AM emails was:

"2. Ponto needs a 6-7 acre Neighborhood Park to serve Neighborhood needs based on the current Ponto population & City's minimal Parkland Standard of 3 acre per 1,000 population. The SW Quadrant needs a new 6-7 acre City Park to make up for the Park acreage Deficit in the SW Quadrant since 2012. South Carlsbad (62% of the Carlsbad's population) needs a significant Coastal Park, as there is no City Park west of I-5 in South Carlsbad. Ponto is at the center of a 6-mile Regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant land that can provide a true Park. Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps Ponto as an 'area unserved by parks, and an area that the City should provide new parks'.

Since 2017 Carlsbad citizens have sent over 5,000 petitions to the City and CA Coastal Commissions regarding the need for a Neighborhood Ponto Park, and larger Coastal Park for South Carlsbad's (and region's) inland population. Citizens also called out flaws in the City's Ponto planning that failed to and consider and document these Park needs (and the need for "Low-cost Visitor Accommodation" land use). Citizens shared these citizen concerns and data to Fenton. Citizens asked Fenton to provide their required City Park land dedication in actual Park Land at Ponto. Carlsbad's park land dedication ordinance is CMC 20.44. Fenton and People for Ponto Citizens have indicated they would like together [meet] with the City to define how Fenton can provide Fenton's fair-share of actual Ponto Park land. Fenton's fair-share would be about .7 acre of Parkland. Fenton is trying to set a meeting with the City to do that."

We Citizens are saying we NEED a Ponto Park adequate for local Ponto Citizen needs, AND also a park adequate to serve the Coastal Park needs for All South Carlsbad (inland citizens) and address a regional 6-mile long Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto. Sadly, current City 'requirements' fail to recognize these NEEDS. The CTMC is charged with addressing these NEEDS and suggesting changes to City 'requirements'.

As a citizen, I am troubled by the some City Staff not being able to read what is being sent to them. Most troubling is some staff misrepresentations to Citizens serving as the City Council, City Commissions and Citizens Committees on what your fellow Carlsbad Citizens are communicating to you. It seems from a Citizen perspective that some staff are biased against citizens and citizen input that maybe contrary to what some staff want to do. As Citizens elected and appointed officials charged with directing, recommending, questioning, and overseeing City Policy and staff we hope you assure your processes, and City Staff serving you, provide an honest and truthful consideration of fellow Citizens' input.

Staff misrepresentation of Growth Management Program and Ordinance

Also of critical Citizen concern is that some City Staff are fundamentally misrepresenting what Carlsbad's Growth Management fundamentally is - setting MINIMUM required public facilities thresholds (aka MINIMUM Performance standards) below which development will be halted. All of Carlsbad's Growth Management resolves around this fundamental Principle - the GM Performance Standards are ONLY MINIMUMS that define when development must stop until that public facility is raised ABOVE the MINIMUM Performance Standard. Some City Staff are inaccurately presenting GM Performance Standards as the Ultimate, Final or Maximum desired level of a public facility to define Carlsbad's Quality of Life. Any facility above the MINIMUM Performance Standard is simply above the 'failure level' where development stops until we are above the Performance Standard threshold. Some of City Staff's misrepresentation of Performance Standards is very serious, and needs firm correcting. Reading the ballots establishing Growth Management and the City's own FY 2019-20 Growth Management Plan Monitoring Report confirms that: ""FAILURE TO MEET PRERFORMANCE STANDARD: The Growth Management Plan requires development activity to stop if a performance standard is not being met." The Growth Management Performance Standard line is a 'failure line', not a Maximum or Average level of Quality of Life we all voted for and aspire to. Some City Staff sadly thing that anything above failure (an F-grade defined by the GM Performance Standard) is success and deserves an A-grade.

The Growth Management Plan or City Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 does not restrict the City Council in any way from providing Public Facilities ABOVE the Growth Management (Minimum) Performance Standard: ""21.90.140 Obligation to pay fees or install improvements required by any other law. - **Nothing in this chapter [Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 and the Plans it is based on] shall be construed as relieving a builder, developer or subdivider from any public improvement requirement, dedication requirement** or fee requirement which is imposed pursuant to **Titles 13, 18, 20 or 21** of this code or pursuant to any city council policy. (Ord. 9808 § 1, 1986)"

This portion of Carlsbad law is supported by multiple City Council actions to exceed the MINIMUM Performance Standards, such as the 'oversupply' (relative to the MINIMUM Park Standard) of City Parks in the NW Quadrant. The Growth Management Plan plans for the NW Quadrant to have far more Park acreage than required by the MINIMUM (you have been provided this data in the Coastal Recreation data file). The SW and SE (and to a lesser extent the NE) Quadrants are failing to meet the MINIMUM, but the City uses an 'accounting trick' to say that Parks that are in the NW Quadrant are 'on-paper' in the SW, SE, NE Quadrant so a permanent future "Park failure" in the SW and SE Quadrants are covered up in accounting. But the reality on-the-ground for Citizens and their children is the reality – permanent

Park actual acreage/access failure in the SW & SE Quadrants. The City's 'accounting trick' thus CREATES AN ACTUAL PREFORMANCE STANDARD FAILIURE in the SW & SE Quadrants that Citizens and their families actually experience. You have seen the pictures of families having to play in streets, railroad right-of-way, and trespass on other vacant Ponto land to use as a Park; and been provided the 5,000+ emails as testament to these facts.

The fact is that the SW, SE and NE Quadrants do not have their MINIMUM required Park acreage Performance Standard actually within their Quadrants. The City used an 'accounting trick' to cover the that do not their bare MINIMUM of Park acres.

City Council regularly directs actions and funds to Oversupply (exceed) the Minimum Performance Standard for most all Growth Management public facilities

The Council recently acted to increase this 'oversupply' of Park land in NW Quadrant with the new Buena Vista Reservoir Park. This Park was NEVER in the Growth Management Plan nor was it REQUIRED to meet a MINIMUM Performance Standard. Sadly (for South Carlsbad Citizens) SW Carlsbad (that has had a 6.5 acre MINIMUM Park Deficit since 2015) has had to absorb more development and that SW Quad development paid for the NW Quadrant Buena Vista Reservoir Park via "Poinsettia 61". The City Council has also increased public facilities beyond the MINIMUM Performance Standard on multiple other occasion such as the recent Fire Service investments beyond the Performance Standard, and all over the City with City Administrative Facilities, Water, sewer, most Streets, and other public facilities in the City that are being provided Over and Above the MINIMUM Performance Standards (failure/no further development threshold) established for those facilities.

Carlsbad Citizens, in over 5,000 petitions and overwhelming input at numerous public meetings, clearly is documenting the NEED for the City Council to do (and direct Staff to do) what Carlsbad has done before:

- provide for Park acreages and Parks at Ponto and SW Quad that are above the Minimum Performance Standard (failure threshold),
- properly address the current 6-7 acre Park Deficit that has existed in the SW Quadrant since 2012 with a park WITHIIN the SW Quadrant,
- Properly address Carlsbad Citizens overwhelming desire for a True Ponto Park,
- Get rid of accounting tricks that falsely say that Parks actually in the NW Quadrant are 'considered to be in the SW, SE, and NE Quadrants'
- Require developers to provide their fair-share of actual Park Land per 20.44. Do this at Ponto! Park land is needed AT Ponto.
- Listen to Citizens, don't fight and try to crush Citizens' input and requests for you to address critical Quality of Life issues

City Council (not City Staff) Authority under Carlsbad Ordinance 20.44 - DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

As noted in my Thursday, July 7, 2022 5:17 PM email below, some City staff are also misdirecting issues and incomplete in their assessment on the City's Dedication of Land for Recreational Facilities Ordinance 20.44, and in what appear to be some staff trying to assume and take over the City Council's authority to make Park decisions under 20.44. Following is CMC 22.44.060 that clearly spells out the City Authority responsible for determining if Park land dedication or a "fee-in-lieu" is used. In the case of if only a SDP and CDP applications are needed for Ponto Site 18 development that 'decision making authority' would be Carlsbad Planning Commission, or if/when appealed to the City Council, the City Council.

20.44.060 Determination of land or fee.

A. **Whether the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map requires land dedication or elects to accept payment of a fee in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, shall be determined by the decision-making authority at the time of approval of the tentative map or tentative parcel map.** In making that determination, **the decision-making authority shall consider** the following:

- 1 Park and recreation element of the general plan;
- 2 Topography, geology, access and location of land in the subdivision available for dedication;
- 3 Size and shape of the subdivision and land available for dedication;
- 4 The feasibility of dedication;

- 5 Availability of previously acquired park property.
- B. The determination of the city council as to whether land shall be dedicated, or whether a fee shall be charged, or a combination thereof, shall be final and conclusive. (Ord. CS-192 § 49, 2012; Ord. 9614 § 1, 1982; Ord. 9190 § 6)

20.44.060 requires (shall) “consideration” of factors, but Council has discretion on how it ‘considers’ factors. “Consideration” is by definition a respectful, thoughtful, reflection and deliberation of issues. “Consideration” is NOT a straight-jacket. The City Council has already provided critical Policy direction to Staff to form the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee because according to the City’s website “the city is entering a new phase **where different tools will be needed to effectively manage growth.**” And that “**The city is now in the beginning stages of creating a new approach to managing growth in Carlsbad**, starting with a citizens committee.” So the decision whether to do what Park land dedication ordinances are intended to do receive land dedicated to the City by developers to offset that developer’s impact on Parks is solely the City Councils, and the City Council has started a processes to create new Park Standards and requirements. The CTGMC is charged with considering past and future Park Standards and Park Growth Management standards. The Ordinance allows the City Council to consider this and past information at the time the entire development application comes before the Council for approval, denial, or conditioning.

An example Carlsbad Ordinance 20.44 - DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES using as example the Fenton Ponto Site 18 development proposal:

Fenton recently purchased most of Ponto Site 18. They are proposing to develop most (4.64 acres), but not all their land. Fenton wants to reserve some (about 1 acre) of their Ponto Site 18 vacant land for future development. Fenton has land resources to provide actual Land as the DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES per 20.44.

Dedication of Land for Recreational Facilities calculation:

86 (DU of Fenton proposed development) X 2.64 (Carlsbad’s average population per DU per 2020 US Census) = 227 (population of Fenton project)

227 ÷ 1,000 (population that needs a minimum of 3 acres of Park land per CMC 20.44) = 0.22704 (the percentage of the 3 acres of Park land minimally required for 227 people)

0.22704 X 3 acres (minimally required Park land per 1,000 people) = **0.68112 acres of Park land is minimally required for Fenton's proposed 86 home based on City's minimum requirement**

Fenton recent land purchase cost is about \$2.178 million per acre. So Fenton’s 0.68112 acre minimum park site requirement’s land cost is \$1.484 million. However, the City’s “Park in-lieu-fee” for Fenton’s proposal is only \$4,636 per home or \$398,696. **So the City’s Park in-lieu-fee only covers 27% of the Park land value the City would receive if the City accepted land under 20.44.**

Cost of City failure to acquire ‘free Park land’ from developers, ‘in-lieu fees loose significant value adding to tax-payer liabilities, and failure to get free park Land dedication loses critically important opportunities to provided needed park:

The Fenton example shows that getting for free land is a much better deal for the City and Citizens. It seems fiscally irresponsible for the City Council not to acquire Free park land per 20.44. The City would be losing \$1.085 million per acre by accepting “Park in-lieu-fees” that are inadequate to pay for the cost of park land that the City would otherwise be provided free by a developers in their Park land dedication. **The City’s “Park in-lieu-fee” is basically a developer/development subsidy by the City and the City’s tax-payers.** This subsidy will ultimately be paid by Carlsbad tax-payers. This is one reason that developers love to pay ‘in-lieu-fees” as these fees never cover the developer’s full cost to mitigate their development’s impact on and obligations to a community/City. This subsidy dynamic of “in-lieu-fees” is well known but, cities tend to hide this information from citizens. Recall the history of Affordable Housing in-lieu-fees and update a while back. Per 20.44.08 the Park in-lieu-fee” is supposed to cover the fair-market value to buy the land that would otherwise be dedicated (for free) to the City. As shown above the City’s current Park-in-lieu-fee is not doing that:

20.44.080 Amount of fee in lieu of land dedication.

- A. **When a fee is required to be paid in lieu of land dedication, the amount of the fee shall be based upon the fair market value of the amount of land which would otherwise be required to be dedicated pursuant to Section 20.44.040.** The fair market value shall be determined by the city council using the following method:
- 1 The city manager may from time to time survey the market value of undeveloped property within the city. This survey may be prepared through various means including, but not limited to, selection of several real estate professionals within Carlsbad to provide current estimates of undeveloped property values with each of the city's four quadrants.
 - 2 The council shall adopt a resolution establishing the value of one acre of park land in each quadrant after considering the results of this survey and any other relevant information.
- B. Subdividers objecting to such valuation, may, at their own expense, obtain an appraisal of the property by a qualified real estate appraiser approved by the city, which appraisal may be accepted by the city council if found to be reasonable. If accepted, the fee shall be based on that appraisal. (Ord. NS-120 § 1, 1990; Ord. 9831 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9781 § 1, 1985; Ord. 9614 § 1, 1982; Ord. 9190 § 8)

A critical consideration for Carlsbad is that we are rapidly running out 'relatively cheaper' vacant land like at Ponto, and the City is better off getting developers to provide actual park land, or if an "in-lieu-fee" is paid that fee should accurately represent 100% of the actual cost to buy the acreage of park land within a 10-minute walk of that development. The City should not subsidize development and make parks inaccessible and outside of the 10-minute walk to the developments generating the need for park land. **These facts/issues should be consider by the CTGMC in formulating recommendations to City Council on Growth Management and Park land dedication.**

I am using the Fenton proposal as an example of Park Standard issues and the shortcomings of Carlsbad's current Park standards the CTGMC is charged with studying and making update recommendations to the Council. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens are trying to collaboratively work with Fenton to get park land at Ponto dedicated. This initial Park land dedication can be the beginnings of a much needed and larger Ponto Park to address the acute park needs at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad that are documented by the City, Carlsbad Citizens, and many others. Fenton has graciously offered to try to set a meeting between People for Ponto Citizens-City-Fenton to see how Fenton's Ponto park land dedication requirements can be met in Ponto. We are hopeful Fenton will provide a 0.68112 acre Park site as the 'down payment' for a much needed larger Ponto Park. We are hopeful the City Council will direct City Staff to work with Carlsbad Citizens to effect this.

Thank you for your consideration. Please know P4P citizens truly care and love Carlsbad and want to leave a better Carlsbad to future generation. P4P citizens have a lot of successful and creative expertise and can help the City in these issues.

Sincerely and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 5:17 PM

To: 'Jason Goff'

Cc: 'Eric Lardy'; 'Cliff Jones'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: RE: CITY RESPONSE RE: EMAIL DATED JULY 4, 2022 - public input on CDP 2022-0023 & SDP 2022-0003 - Ponto Site 18 - 4 major issues - CCC needs to be contacted

Jason, City Council, and Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee:

Thanks-

~~Regarding #1: Thank you. Is it possible to receive a copy of the CCC's response to your communication?~~

~~Regarding #2: Your reading of 20.44, is incomplete. It also seems you are also incorrectly speaking 'as the City Council' on what is a City Council decision based on 20.44 and that has yet to be rendered by the Council regarding this development proposal. 20.44 does NOT explicitly disallow Dedication of Ponto land for a needed Ponto Park from and for a Ponto development. Not acquiring Park land or not using park land "in-lieu-fees" at Ponto to provide a Park at Ponto for a Ponto development is further removed from the intent and purpose of the Park land dedication ordinance.~~

~~What is the City Council's and City staff's intent to use Park land dedication 'In-lieu-fees' for to serve the Park needs of this Ponto development? There is a 6.5+ acre Park deficit in the SW Quadrant. Where will the Park for this Ponto development be provided - 6-miles away in the NW Quadrant's Veterans Park?~~

~~If you read 20.44 how the Council chooses to require park land dedication or accept a Park land dedication 'In-lieu-fee' is a City Council policy decision that is made when the project is being heard for consideration. Your 20.44 citation even supports the dedication of park land at Ponto by the proposed development as such a land dedication would be the best way to "... shall bear a reasonable relationship to the use of the park and recreational facilities by the future inhabitants of the subdivision." As clearly documented in the City Park Master Plan, Ponto is an area of the City 'unserved by Parks' and an 'area the City should look to provide new Parks'. Again, per 20.44 it is The City Council's policy decision/direction as to if the City wants park land dedicated at Ponto for Ponto development or it wants to receive a park land dedication 'in-lieu-fee'. The City Council should make that policy decision/directive to staff if it wants park land or equivalent park land 'in-lieu-fees'.~~

~~Also, the City is formally in the process of re-evaluating the Growth Management Parks Standard. Citation of past GM Park Standard compliance reports to City Council when the City Council has already provided direction to staff and acknowledged such Standards should be studied and potentially updated or replaced should have been acknowledged, and is a critical aspect of information City Council should consider as part of a 20.44 Council determination of whether to require Park land at Ponto for Ponto Park impacts or accept a park land 'in-lieu-fee' for Ponto Park impacts. This issues seems appropriate for the Citizens Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee to provide input to the City Council on.~~

~~Regarding #4: What will be the City's response and responsibilities if/when parking impacts spill on to City Streets and Public beach parking (from inadequate City parking requirements)?~~

From: Jason Goff [<mailto:Jason.Goff@carlsbadca.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2022 4:05 PM

To: Lance Schulte

Cc: Eric Lardy; Cliff Jones

Subject: CITY RESPONSE RE: EMAIL DATED JULY 4, 2022 - public input on CDP 2022-0023 & SDP 2022-0003 - Ponto Site 18 - 4 major issues - CCC needs to be contacted

Dear Mr. Schulte,

Thank you for the email comments on the project known as FPC Residential (SDP 2022-0003/CDP 2022-0023). The following is the City's response to the email comments received on July 4, 2022 (attached):

City's Response to Comment No. 1:

The comment claims that the project should be required to apply for various amendments to the city's land use documents. However, the applicant is proposing a development project that is consistent with the current land use designations for the property; therefore, amendments to the General Plan, Zoning and Local Coastal Program Land Use and Zoning designations are not included. As previously noted, the property is currently designated a combination of VC

(Visitor Serving Commercial) and R-23 (19 to 23 dwelling units per acre). The comment implies that the current project requires written confirmation from the Coastal Commission to process consistent with these designations. The city disagrees. The city's review of current policies indicates that the combo districts in Ponto can be built as one or the other land use or as a combination of both with the area of each land use delineated on the land use map (typically determined at the time of a development proposal).

Additionally, the hotel north of the subject Ponto combo district is on parcels that were also previously a combination district; however, the parcels were built entirely with visitor serving uses (parcels redesignated VC during GP update but were previously TR/RMH).

Development of the property is subject to the city's review and approval. The city has authority to issue Coastal Development Permits (CDPs) in this area, and therefore, Coastal Commission approval of the project is not required. In addition, the property is not within the Coastal Commission's appeal jurisdiction and the city's approval of a CDP on the property is not appealable to the Coastal Commission. This information has been shared with Coastal Commission staff.

City's Response to Comment No. 2:

The comment claims that there is a requirement for the city to build a park in the southwest quadrant. There is not a requirement for construction of a park in this area. As reported in the city's latest Growth Management Plan (GMP) Annual Report and further detailed to the City Council on January 26, 2021, and July 13, 2021, the city is in compliance with the GMP's performance standards for open space and parks and there is not a requirement to purchase additional park land in the southwest quadrant. We acknowledge the conversations with the citizens and developer relating to applying park fees for park space in this area. However, Carlsbad Municipal Code § 20.44.090 governs the use of the collected fee and states *the land and fees received under this chapter shall be used for the purpose of developing new or rehabilitating existing park and recreational facilities which serve the population within the park quadrant within which the subdivision for which the fees are received is located and the location of the land and amount of fees shall bear a reasonable relationship to the use of the park and recreational facilities by the future inhabitants of the subdivision.* (Ord. NS-842 § 1, 2007; Ord. 9680 § 12, 1983; Ord. 9190 § 11). As currently written, the code does not explicitly allow for park fees to be dedicated to a specific park or area within the quadrant.

Link to latest GMP Annual Report:

<https://www.carlsbadca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/8573/637744924012530000>

Link to January 13, 2021, City Council Staff Report:

<https://records.carlsbadca.gov/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=5244472&dbid=0&repo=CityofCarlsbad&searchid=4d4f5873-14c1-42fb-a3c6-d6da0037b658>

Link to July 13, 2021, City Council Staff Report:

<https://records.carlsbadca.gov/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=5432896&dbid=0&repo=CityofCarlsbad&searchid=8e946f0a-1e58-462f-98f5-11d939f53b36>

City's Response to Comment No. 3:

Comment highlights the existence of the SoCal Gas natural gas easement. This is acknowledged. Staff is aware of the SoCal Gas natural gas easement and pipeline running north-south through the subject site as well as along the west side of the railroad right-of-way, which is also located directly adjacent to other residential land uses throughout the city. The applicant was notified in the first review of the project application as to the gas line's presence and is presently working with SoCal Gas and the city to provide proper setbacks to ensure that the public's health and safety is maintained.

City's Response to Comment No. 4:

Regarding concerns with parking adequacy, the city's municipal code section covering parking ratios associated with multiple-family residential dwellings (apartments only) and required visitor parking is outlined in § 21.44.020.B.Table A. This section of the municipal code is used throughout the city, including the coastal zone pursuant to our local coastal plan, for required parking associated with apartments and visitor parking needs. While the applicant can voluntarily add additional parking stalls, the city cannot legally require more parking spaces than what current code requires.

Thank you,

Jason Goff



Community Development Department

Jason Goff | Senior Planner

Planning Division

1635 Faraday Avenue

Carlsbad, CA 92008

442-339-2643 | jason.goff@carlsbadcagov

FOR SUBMITTAL APPOINTMENTS PLEASE CALL OR EMAIL YOUR REQUEST:

Phone: 442-339-2600 (select Option 2)

Email: planning@carlsbadca.gov

www.carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Flickr](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#)

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

From: Shaun Alger <shaun@volohaus.com>
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:46 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: More pickle courts

I have been a carlsbad homeowner & entrepreneur for 35 years. I pay a LOT of taxes. To see 60 people waiting to play pickleball and NOBODY playing tennis says - more pickleball courts needed

With Gratitude,

Shaun Alger
Revenue Process Engineer

VoloHaus
Sell MORE & GROW
(760) 815-4464

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Subject: Public input to 1-mile PCH Relocation Proposal - FW: public input to 7-5-22 Traffic Committee meeting - South Carlsbad Boulevard Climate Adaptation Project

Attachments: Comments on PCH Relocation and design Options offered - 2022 July.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2022 6:05 PM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Tom Frank <Tom.Frank@carlsbadca.gov>; Nathan Schmidt <Nathan.Schmidt@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>

Subject: Public input to 1-mile PCH Relocation Proposal - FW: public input to 7-5-22 Traffic Committee meeting - South Carlsbad Boulevard Climate Adaptation Project

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Traffic, Parks, Planning Commission; Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee; & CA Coastal Commission:

I was unable to attend July 5th meeting. However today I had time to watch the July 5th Traffic Committee meeting but did not see the issues noted in the July 4th email and attachment noted. I am not sure if the July 4th input (attached and below) was considered, but was encouraged by the Traffic Commission's call for data, comprehensiveness, congestion considerations; and logical and principled desire to make 'data driven decisions'.

The Traffic Commission's concerns reflected some of the attached and below concerns. Of key concern is rushing in asking for 'incremental' decisions on what is to be a critical MM (vehicle, bike, ped, Transit vehicle, and emergency vehicle) Traffic corridor without a verified Multi-modal Traffic LOS (vehicle, bike, ped, Transit vehicle, and emergency vehicle) data that not only covers the 'pre-Covid' condition, but addresses also addresses the "Forever/Final/Buildout MM Traffic Volumes" that any major reconfiguration of PCH will have to perform within.

I can appreciate and sympathize with staff in their rush, but potentially tragically, in that rush (solely driven by timing of a grant and grant funds) to be forcing Citizen Commissions to make disconnected decisions without critical data and a comprehensive perspective on such an important issue seems both unfair and "penny wise and pound foolish", "putting the cart before the horse", "jumping before looking" or any other common sense truth about rushed uninformed actions. In retrospect maybe planning a Joint Commission meeting on this issue after all the critical data was compiled may have been a better processing approach.

To the July 4th email/attachments of issues and data I hoped the City's Commissions and City Council would have considered on July 5th etc. I add the following:

1. Study keeping existing PAR/PCH design (free flowing) and simply move SB PCH lane (and bike/ped improvements) inland before "turnarounds" to merge with the PAR to SB PCH lane to a 4-lane PCH at So Lamar (option 2 design - south of So Lamar). I think this was what one Traffic Commissioner was suggesting.
2. The Staff report used traffic volumes for a location about 2-miles away (PCH/Avenida Encinas) v. using traffic counts for PCH/Cannon Road & Terramar that is a lot closer, is directly impacted by any induced congestion from NB PCH Traffic entering Terramar and the PPCH/Cannon intersection and by possible congestion backups into Terramar and the PCH/Cannon intersection from removing the current SB free flow of traffic until you reach Solamar. Terramar congestion is bad and potentially congesting 1-mile of PCH directly south of congested Terramar seems will make Terramar congestion worse and likely extend congestion further south (possibly to

Island Way). Terramar also represents how pedestrian traffic across PCH impacts PCH non-pedestrian congestion.

3. Taking MM Traffic counts (vehicle-bike-ped-transit-emergency vehicle) at Carlsbad's current 3-way & 1-lane PCH/State Street Traffic roundabout would give an 'on-the-ground' model on which to test the same type of roundabouts in the two roundabout based alternatives and then MM Traffic Model the future/final/buildout growth in all MM volumes on such 3-way 1-lane roundabouts. Any major PCH redesign/relocation will be a permanent/final/forever decision so making 100% sure we know how it will work in the future is critical.
4. Conduct a documented MM (vehicle-bike-ped-transit-emergency vehicle) Traffic LOS analysis of 3-way 1-lane PCH/State Street Roundabout for existing, pre-Covid, and future/final/buildout growth in volumes, so we have an understanding of how present MM LOS differs from Pre-Covid and future/final/buildout growth MM LOS.
5. Calibrate the above MM LOS models to a) the current MM Traffic Counts at the 1-mile PAR/PCH volumes and then adjust for both b) Pre-Covid volumes and also to c) projected final/Forever Carlsbad MM Traffic volumes based on 2015 General Plan and updated projections used to define Carlsbad's 'buildout MM Traffic Volumes' at and along PAR and PCH for the 1-mile PAR/PCH segment; and how it impacts the current, pre-Covid and future/final/buildout growth MM LOS at Terramar.
6. Provide a clear understanding of how Transit services will be impacted by delay, congestion and removing a NB and SB passing-lane in the 2-lane (50%) reduced proposals. Confirmation from the NCTD as to the Transit Service impacts should be provided to the public and City decision makers.
7. Provide a clear understanding of how Emergency vehicles, response times and services will be impacted by delay, congestion and removing a NB and SB passing-lanes in the 2-lane (50%) reduced proposals. Emergency vehicles will not be able to pass congested traffic, which seems like a significant impact in an area the City is spending millions in capital and forever operational and pension costs to provide another fire station along PCH for the current 4-lane (with passing lanes) condition. Will the proposed PCH reconfigurations force the City to have to provide another fire station along PCH due to potential increases in congestion and inability to pass congestion during emergencies? City decision makers should have that data so they can make data driven decisions relative to emergency services.

I hope this email and attachment are provided to you and that you honestly and sincerely consider it.

I am not against a possible 2-lane PCH if it Performs Better both now and forever into the future. The concerns are that we do not yet have the data to judge if the limited options (or other viable options) Perform Better and will be Perform Better forever for Carlsbad. We also seem to be shortchanging (or glossing over) significant citizen and stakeholder concerns/issues in the incremental rush.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, July 4, 2022 3:39 PM
To: traffic@carlsbadca.gov; 'Nathan Schmidt'
Cc: 'City Clerk'; council@carlsbadca.gov; 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: public input to 7-5-22 Traffic Committee meeting - South Carlsbad Boulevard Climate Adaptation Project

Dear Carlsbad Traffic Commission:

We hope you had a wonderful 4th of July, and ask you please sincerely consider the attached questions/comments regarding on 7-5-22 and on other meetings regarding the South Carlsbad Boulevard Climate Adaptation Project.

I travel PCH often from South to North Carlsbad – car, bike and walk. It is my main travel and exercise corridor. The congestion at Terramar as 4-lanes are compressed into 2-lanes is kind of a nightmare at times and will get more traffic from continued growth. Proposing to permanently and irreversibly doubling that nightmare and congestion with some of the designs needs serious and very well vetted public discussion. Providing needed pedestrian sidewalks/paths is

critical, and providing safer bike lanes are appreciated, but permanently eliminating over 50% of vehicle capacity and expanding congestion does not seem to make any common sense. The Roadway options also urbanize (see the profiles) PCH and fundamentally change the open wide median and rural Old Carlsbad and Old California Character of our Historic 101.

Having worked as a City Planner for several Coastal cities, and having lived on the coast for my entire adult life, I speak with some experience about the folly that can occur by abandoning capacity, and by unneeded lane reduction that is not fully and properly analyzed and public vetted with a specific focus on the long-term transportation demands. With a price-tag of \$70 million per mile, to in 2 of the options permanently reduce by over 50% vehicle transportation capacity, we hope your considerations are very thorough and future orientated.

It is in-fad to promote vehicle congestion, to slow traffic, and max-out LOS to close to failure as a wise use of pavement. This is counter to what most all people want. Imagine how difficult and unpleasant it is to travel in a congested lane, and how frustrating and 'LA like' it is to travel in a congested network. We may be using pavement efficiently, but we pay the price in our mobility, travel experience, and road rage. Roads should work for people, not people having to work frustratingly on congested roads.

Thank you for your consideration,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, July 3, 2022 4:50 PM
To: 'Katie Hentrich'
Cc: 'James Wood'; 'Tom Frank'; 'Nikki Matosian'; 'Nichols, Katie@SCC'
Subject: RE: South Carlsbad Boulevard Climate Adaptation Project

Katie:

Thanks. Yes I do have questions and comments. See attached.
I look forward to hearing from you and understanding/participating in the next steps in gathering citizen input.
Thanks,

Lance Schulte

From: Katie Hentrich [<mailto:Katie.Hentrich@carlsbadca.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2022 4:09 PM
Cc: James Wood; Tom Frank; Nikki Matosian; Nichols, Katie@SCC
Subject: South Carlsbad Boulevard Climate Adaptation Project

Hi all,

Thank you for participating in the listening sessions held for the [South Carlsbad Boulevard Climate Adaptation Project](#). Since then, Mike Grim, who served as the previous project manager, has retired and I have taken his place; if I've yet to meet you in person or virtually, hello!

Due to your participation and interest in this project, I wanted to share a status update. We now have three draft conceptual roadway options that protect public infrastructure from future sea level rise for the one-mile project area

along south Carlsbad Boulevard from Manzano Drive to Island Way. At this time, the conceptual designs are just focused on the roadway and enhancements to walking and biking.

The City of Carlsbad is committed to engaging the community and is continuing to provide public input opportunities about the future use of Carlsbad's southern coastline. You can learn more about the project's current status and next steps [here](#). The [project webpage](#) is also updated.

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Thank you very much,



Katie Hentrich
she | her | hers
Climate Action Plan Administrator
Environmental Management
City of Carlsbad
1635 Faraday Ave.
Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

442-339-2623 | katie.hentrich@carlsbadca.gov
[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#)

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Comments on PCH Relocation & design Options offered – Manzano to Island Way – 2022 July

Comments on all three Options:

1. PCH Relocation as noted in the City's 2001 Study was focused on allowing the City to develop PCH Median land for commercial uses and advance the City acquiring in-trade State land (primarily the Manzano site just south of the Terramar neighborhood) for commercial development. The land trade would then allow the Carlsbad Campground to move inland along PCH so as to move out of the "Coastal hazard zone" of coastal erosion, bluff erosion and now sea level rise and climate changes that will accelerate these Coastal Hazards. There are several vacant areas in all three Options that are similar to the areas proposed for commercial development in the City 2001 PCH Study. Although the 1-mile PCH Relocation proposal includes the Manzano Site and covers the northern tip of the Campground, a clear explanation if the original intents of PCH Relocation are still part of the City's proposal – commercial development of PCH median land.
2. The City should map and enumerate the actual length of PCH roadway facilities – vehicle lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks that are in the "Coastal hazard zone". For instance if only a couple hundred feet of the southbound lanes of PCH at "the dip" bridge are in the "Coastal hazard zone", it may be more cost effective to simply address Relocation of that segment.
3. Was a simple and likely far less costly PCH redesign that simply lifted up and/or moved inland those PCH roadway facilities – vehicle lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks that are in the "Coastal hazard zone" considered and designed? Why?
4. Clearly provide a 'profile of the Existing Condition' of PCH lanes, bike lanes, pedestrian paths for the various segments of the Study Area. It should be clear to citizens what we have now and what new added features each design provides for the various segments.
5. A basic traffic study showing impact to both link and intersection Vehicle LOS and Vehicle speed should be conducted now so citizens clearly understand what the vehicle LOS and speed consequences from existing PCH and all PCH Relocation designs.
6. Clearly describe what the "Coastal hazard zone" is, and if it conforms to the latest CCC requirements of SLR analysis and Coastal planning.
7. Clearly describe what the "Las Encinas Creek restoration area" is and clearly outline the borders of the "Las Encinas Creek restoration area".
8. Use wider landscaped medians to provide areas for shade, a coastal tree-scape and soften the extensive hardscape. The proposed minimal 4' wide median in all three Options is a very 'urban roadway' design and very out of character with our existing Historic 101 and well regarded wide and natural landscaped PCH median. The proposed minimal 4' wide and landscaped median is grossly out-of-character, particularly when seen in profile with the continuous/adjoining pavement.
9. A clear map and itemization of all existing parking spaces should be conducted and names or letters used to identify each existing parking area.
10. All new parking areas should be named or a numbered to correspond to the Existing Parking lot name or letter. For example Existing Turnarounds lot A, Proposed Turnarounds Lot A-1
11. An Existing and Proposed Parking map and accounting of the number of spaces should be provided so citizens know where and how many beach parking spaces we have and where and how many proposed spaces there are and the net difference between existing and proposed.
12. Move "Retain existing parking" at "turnarounds" inland to be outside of "Coastal hazard zone", and use old PCH pavement as parking spaces.
13. Provide a plan to transfer the spaces in the "existing parking to remain" at the "glider port" to the "Turnarounds" parking area. Label the "glider port"

14. Move “Retain existing parking” at the north end of the Campground (north of Island Way) inland to be next to the PCH Roadway so vehicles do not have to cross the “Class 1 shared path for pedestrians, slower moving mobility options”, and to place this parking outside of “Coastal hazard zone”.

Comments on Option 1: 4-lane road with traffic signals:

1. Replace all 4 traffic signals with 4 traffic circles. For PAR use separate ‘free-right’ lanes outside of traffic circle to reduce volume in the circle. This design is used at LEGOLAND. Given T-intersections using free-right or straight through bi-pass lanes will allow better flow.
2. A narrow 4’ wide median maybe needed on the Bridge, but an honest consideration of a separate 2-lane bridge or 2 2-lane bridges that provides more separation between NB and SB lanes should be explored.

Comments on Option 2: 2-lane road with roundabouts & Option 3: 2-lane road with roundabout and one enhanced pedestrian crossing:

1. A 50% reduction in vehicle travel lanes will have a dramatic impact on current and future vehicle and transit capacity on PCH. This impact is over 50% in that by removing the 2nd passing lane and ability to pass, all vehicle speeds are reduced the ‘slowest’ vehicle in the lane. This will have significant impacts not only to citizens in their vehicles, but also to transit vehicles as they will be slowed down due to more than doubling lane congestion, being slowed down in trying to re-enter the single lane after dropping/picking up passengers, and by the slower speeds that will accompany the 50% lane reduction to a single lane in each direction and by reducing the existing wide landscape median with a minimal 4’ wide urban street median.
2. A 50% reduction in vehicle travel lanes will have a dramatic impact on the City’s current and future Emergency Vehicles (police-fire-ambulance-lifeguard) travel speeds on PCH. This impact is over 50% in that by removing the 2nd passing lane and ability to pass, all vehicle speeds are reduced the ‘slowest’ vehicle in the lane. As noted before this will have significant impacts to Emergency Vehicles as they will be slowed down due to more than doubling lane congestion, and maybe completely stopped as the most likely Emergency will be on the single PCH lane and all traffic will be stopped. The adjacent 11’ wide bike lane and buffer area is narrow and limits Emergency Vehicles using that bike lane area as a ‘passing lane’ around stopped vehicles, or for vehicles to pull over into the bike lane to try to let Emergency Vehicles pass.
3. The City has noted wanting to provide a new Emergency Vehicle Services operation along PCH, noted the higher Emergency incidence along PCH, and noted the very high cost to buy, build, equip, provide personal to operate, and post-service pension costs to provide an additional fire/EMT and/or Lifeguard operation along PCH. If PCH travel is slowed down, or more emergency incidents be created by a reducing PCH to one-lane in each direction with a minimal 4’ median would a 2nd Emergency Vehicle Services operation along PCH be needed?
4. Given the State of California’s requirement that Carlsbad and all other areas of the State provide for unlimited population growth and that PCH vehicle, transit, bike and pedestrian volumes will have commensurate increases into the future, and that PCH Relocation and lane reduction would be very expensive (\$70 million from 2022 CIP Council meetings April 20 & 26, and May 3, 2022) and forever City commitment it would be difficult to under consider the impacts and consequences of forever reducing lanes while Carlsbad has to accommodate forever unlimited population and traffic growth.

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update - Parks & Open Space at Ponto-Coastal South Carlsbad

Attachments: CTGMC key issues and suggestions -2022-8-8.pdf; 2022-June General Comparative cost-benefits of Completing PCH-PCH Modification-Ponto Park - Part 1 of 2.pdf; City's PCH area map w numbered notes of Constraints - 2 of 2.pdf; Ponto State Park - 2022 July.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 10:07 AM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update - Parks & Open Space at Ponto-Coastal South Carlsbad

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

We ask you to please consider this email and attachments in the Upcoming Parks and Open Space discussions by the CTGMC, LCP Amendment, PCH Relocation project, Park Master Plan Update, and development proposals at Ponto.

As always, and as we have repeatedly asked for since our initial 2017 letter to the City Council, People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens asks for and are willing able to work with you to find the solutions for:

- the documented Park Inequity at Ponto & Coastal South Carlsbad,
- the documented missing Unconstrained Open Space at Ponto,
- the future loss of 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space (State beach and Campground) due to sea level rise,
- the needed upgrades to Carlsbad's Growth Management Program and Standards (and developer required land dedications and mitigations) to account for an Unlimited population and the need for Unlimited increases in Carlsbad Parks and Open Space to address those Unlimited populations so as to assure we maintain our quality of life,
- beneficial collaborations and donations, and
- the wiser use of tax-payer dollars to address tax-payer needs

The attached PowerPoint file has important information and images for people not as familiar with Ponto, and the attached YouTube video helps show what a great park Ponto Park will be <https://youtu.be/bQuilyLcuyEc>

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Sincerely and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

2022-June General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, 2.3 miles of PCH Modification (Island Way to La Costa Ave.), and 14.3 acre Ponto Park (Kam Sang) to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto in South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2

Key points regarding tax-payer Cost/Benefit comparison:

City Park Fairness: Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad has ZERO Parks and ZERO Park acres v. 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37 park acres in North Carlsbad. South Carlsbad is home to 62% of Carlsbad citizens and major City visitor businesses - they have no Coastal Park. North Carlsbad is home to 38% of Carlsbad citizens have the City's entire Coastal Parks west of I-5. The City also falsely allowed Ponto Developers to NOT provide the required 15% unconstrained Growth Management Open Space required by other adjacent developers in Carlsbad. Consequently Ponto is already developed at a density over 46% higher than the rest of City.

What is missing from 2.3 miles of South PCH: The only missing components of a Carlsbad Livable (Complete) Street is an adequate sidewalk on only about 1.6 miles of the 2.3 miles from Island Ways south to a Costa Ave.. Better safer protected bike paths for the volume of bike traffic on a higher-speed roadway are highly desired. Both these missing features can be cost-efficiently provided in the existing PCH configuration. The City had over 35-years to provide the missing sidewalks on PCH and should have added sidewalks years ago. City cost data indicates providing 1.6 miles of missing sidewalk at \$3-5 million.

Generalized Costs: Costs initially came from publicly stated costs by Mayor Hall in a 2019 at Meet the Mayor Realtor luncheon at Hilton Garden Inn, the City's 2001 PCH Feasibility Analysis for PCH Relocation, the earlier \$13 million per mile cost for the simpler .85 mile City CIP #6054 PCH Modification Project at Terramar, general City cost data from official public records requests, and vacant Ponto land costs of \$1.4 to \$2.4 million per acre from recent recorded land sales at Ponto.

In May, 2022 the City released an updated cost increase for the .85 mile Terramar PCH Modification of \$22.4 million per mile; and updated the cost for the 2.3 mile South PCH Relocation Proposal to between \$85 - \$60 million or \$40 to 26.1 million per mile. Kam Sang listed their 14.3 acre vacant site at Ponto for sale for \$2.7 million per acre in May. The Kam Sang list price is a bit higher than recent Ponto land costs, but the Kam Sang site is of significantly higher quality being adjacent to Batiquitos Lagoon, and with 270 degree lagoon and ocean views.

Generalized Benefits: The number of acres and the quality and usability of each of those acres, and the number of new added beach parking for each of the known Option's define each Option's benefits. There may be other unknown Options that have different benefits. The City's 2001 PCH Relocation Feasibility Analysis's highest Park and Open Space Option (2001 ERA Financial Analysis "Alternative 1-parks and open space scheme") only made possible a 4-acre Active Park north of Palomar Airport Road in North Carlsbad. The City's 2013 PCH Relocation Concept design eliminated that 4-acre Active Park and only showed a few small open space areas with picnic tables. Any PCH Modification benefits are limited by existing constraints in the PCH median. See attached Part 2: City PCH map with numbered notes on various existing environmental and land use constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Modification Design.

PCH Modification limitations: Most critically PCH Modification does NOT add any new City land. Rearranging existing PCH land may add some usability beyond the usability of existing parkway areas along PCH. However significant land in PCH right-of-way is already constrained by habitat, slopes, and water quality detention basins. Past City Studies in 2001 and 2013 showed relatively modest changes in useable acreage from major PCH

Modifications. Forever removing 2-travel lanes (over 50% of PCH capacity due to removing passing ability) will create Terramar like traffic congestion, but could repurpose that City pavement for open space. Any net usable land in the PCH median will be relatively narrow and may be modest once all constraints are accounted for. PCH Modification should be accurately compared with the existing usable and open space parkway areas in the existing PCH configuration and Ponto Park situation. See attached Part 2: City PCH map with numbered notes on various existing land use constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Modification Design.

Four (4) Comparative tax-payer Cost/Benefits:

1. Completing PCH & adding missing sidewalk/path and additional public parking and bike safety:

4 vehicle lanes and 2 bike lanes 177 parking spaces currently exist along South Carlsbad Blvd

The only missing component of "Complete/Livable Street" is a pedestrian sidewalk/path on about 70% of PCH

Total Cost to provide missing sidewalks per City data = \$3-5 million (based on path width)

Costs for desirable safety upgrade to existing bike lanes are not known

Cost to add more Beach parking on City owned abandoned PCH North and South of Poinsettia ranges from:

- 273 additional spaces = \$ 0.76 million
- 546 additional spaces = \$ 1.1 million
- Plus an estimated \$1.5 million for 2 signalized intersection upgrades for full 4-way access
- Cost per parking space is estimated at \$19,275 to \$13,899 per additional parking space

Total cost: \$ 3.8 to 6.1 million to provide missing sidewalk/path and add more parking + unknown amount for any desired upgrades to existing bike lanes

2. '2013 2.3 mile PCH Modification Proposal' [AECOM 11/26/2013 Alternative Development Meeting]

Total Cost is \$75 million per Mayor Matt Hall, but updated by City to \$85-60 Million or \$40-26.1 million per mile.

The costs appear consistent with 20-years of cost inflation of the basic (unmitigated environmental and traffic)

2001 costs of \$26.5 to 37.3 million (in 2001 dollars) identified by the City's 2001 Feasibility Analysis by ERA. The City's 2001 ERA Analysis indicated fully mitigated costs will be higher.

Total \$85 to 60 million PCH Modification cost comes to:

\$ 21 to 6 million per acre to reuse existing City land into narrow open space areas (from portions of city roadway median)

\$872,093 per additional parking space

- 86 additional parking spaces created = 263 replacement spaces - 177 existing spaces removed
- Includes multi-use pathway (sidewalk) within primarily native/natural landscaping.
- Possible 50% reduction in vehicle lanes (from 4 to 2 lanes) with corresponding traffic congestion like at Terramar. Not clear if Citizens and tax-payers can/will approve spending \$85 - 60 million to double traffic congestion.
- Includes about 4 - 10 acres for possible narrow passive Park area identified in City's 2001 PCH Modification Feasibility Analysis by ERA. However the City's 2013 PCH Modification (AECOM) plans look like smaller acreage is provided.
- Does not purchase any new City land (only reconfigures existing City land) so requires Carlsbad Citizens to vote to expend funds per Proposition H, and as noted in the City's 2001 Feasibility Analysis likely will not qualify for regional, State or Federal tax-payer funding.

- 2013 PCH Modification proposal could not/did not consider and map City's 2017 sea level rise data to show what areas would be lost due to sea level rise and account for any added cost and issues.
- For the 2.3 mile PCH segment, the State beach and Campground are the only lands impacted by sea level rise per the 2017 study. Loss of the Campground is significant loss for the City as it is the City's only "low-cost Visitor Accommodations" - a high priority under the CA Coastal Act and the City has several Campground related Local Coastal Program land use plan policies the City must follow.

3. 14.3 acre Ponto Coastal Park

Total Cost: \$52.3 million that includes \$38 million (full list price) to purchase 14.3 acres plus \$1 million per acre to landscape/irrigate like the recent development cost for Buena Vista Reservoir Park (aka Poinsettia 61). \$ 3.7 million per acre is the cost for buying 14.3 acres of New City land and developing a true City Park.

Ponto Park purchase:

- **is \$3.7 million per New Added Park Acre v. \$21 to \$6 million per acre to NOT buy new land but simply repurposed existing City land in PCH,**
- **Saves tax-payers \$17.3 million to \$2.3 million per acre,**
- **Saves tax-payers \$32.7 to \$7.7 million, and**
- **Provides up to 278% to 43% more Parkland than the 2.3 mile 'PCH Modification option'**
- Includes adding 14.3-acres of new and viable parkland similar to (but twice as large) as Carlsbad's Holiday Park. Site includes habitat and habitat connection to Batiquitos Lagoon, and lagoon and ocean view trails that connect to the ocean and eventually east along Batiquitos Lagoon to El Camino Real.
- Since an Open Space land purchase per Proposition C acquisition voters exempted such purchases from Proposition H. NCA already recommended vacant Ponto land be considered for City purchase as Open Space per the City's obligations under a lawsuit settlement.
- Ponto Park's cost savings over '2.3 mile PCH Modification' = \$32.7 to 7.7 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks cost savings over 'PCH Modification' = \$28.7 to 2.7 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks + 273 additional parking spaces cost savings over "PCH Modification" = \$28 to 2 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks + 546 additional parking spaces cost savings over "PCH Modification" = \$27.6 to 1.6 million

4. Combining both #1-PCH Completion and #3-Ponto Park:

Combining #1 and #3 creates a cost effective and more beneficial Coastal Park-Coastal Parking-Completes Streets solution. This solution actually adds 14.3-acres of New City land for a needed Park, provides for a Complete PCH without increasing traffic congestion, does not forever congest PCH travel if future PCH traffic increases, adds comparatively more beach parking, and preserves PCH land and provides the City with Coastal land use and sea level rise planning flexibility to address future needs by not forever committing the City's PCH land to a Final solution. See map on page 4 showing land use synergy of combining #1 and #3. **\$27.6 to 1.6 million in tax-payer cost savings are estimated from combining #1 & #3 compared to the estimated \$85 - 60 million PCH Modification of 2.3 miles. Combining #1 and #3 provides all the PCH Modification features, added beach parking benefits, and Adds 14.3 acres of New City land for parks, provides the City 100% of the flexibility it will need to address sea level rise, and do so for a reduced cost to tax-payers.** Page 5 shows the synergistic beach parking and Ponto Park relationship. The new 14.3 acre Kam Sang Ponto Park site is just south of the 11-acre Planning Area F site and between Avenida Encinas and Batiquitos Lagoon.

- a. Ponto Park's location allows it to use the 337-610 parking spaces created by #1 above (177 existing + 273 to 546 new parking spaces). The 337-610 parking spaces will allow Ponto Park to effectively host Carlsbad's special community events.
- b. Acquiring Ponto Park's 14.3-acres provides both the City and State of CA with important future land use options to address the Sea Level Rise and Coastal Erosion (SLR) planned by the City. These options are created by leaving the exiting South Carlsbad Blvd right-of-way substantially the same (except for adding needed sidewalks and using the existing Old paved roadway for parking) thus allowing future upland relocation of the Campground. If \$85 to \$60 million is spent on #2 the likelihood this very expensive City expenditure would never be abandoned by the City to allow relocation of the Campground.
- c. Carlsbad' 2017 Sea Level Rise study shows SLR will eliminate ½ of the State Campground – a high-priority Coastal land use under the CA Coastal Act. The CA Coastal Act calls for "upland" relocation of high-priority Coastal land uses due to SLR impacts. Ponto Park could also provide for "upland" relocation of the State Campground.

Part 2 of this Comparative analysis is a separate 2-page map and data file. This Part 2 file consists of the City's PCH map of a reduced one lane in each direction (greater than 50% roadway capacity reduction) PCH configuration that maximizes potential 'excess right-of-way'. That map has numbered notes to marking locations of PCH environmental and design constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Relocation design, maps the City's 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Areas, and for reference outlines the easterly 6.5 acre portion of the 11-acre Planning Area F site for acreage comparison purposes.




City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input 2 of 2

The City's map below is marked with the following numbered list of Area Constraints and Issues. The Constraints are from the City's 2013 PCH Modification designs, the City's older 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Study, and on-site observations. The Constraints will limit any fundamental change to the existing PCH landscape. For instance existing slope and habitat area will remain or have to be relocated which will limit the use of any excess land area from PCH Modification. These Constraints will then reduce from 62 acres the actual number of unconstrained and acres that are actually useable and can be used for different uses than currently exist.

1. Loss of the last section of Old "Historic 101" design, ambiance, and openness. Will it be replaced with typical urban arterial design?
2. Freshwater habitat
3. Sewer pumping facility
4. City's 2013 PCH plan for RESTORED RIPARIAN HABITAT
5. Sea Level Rise 2 meter Impact Area
6. City's 2013 PCH plan for BIO SWALE AND RESTORED RIPARIAN HABITAT
7. Existing beach parking to be retained
8. Least Tern habitat
9. Major storm water detention basin
10. Water
11. Slopes will likely need retaining walls to move road inland closer to proposed Kam Sang Resort
12. Endangered Species Habitat
13. City's 2013 PCH plan for COASTAL SAGE SCRUB RESTORATION
14. City's 2013 PCH plan for NATIVE GRASSLAND RESTORATION
15. City's 2013 PCH plan for BIO SWALE AND RESTORED RIPARIAN HABITAT
16. Eliminating access road for homes/businesses south of Cape Rey Resort. Who pays to replace?
17. Removes Cape Rey Resort developer required GMP Open Space for this LFMP. This GMP Open Space will have to be replaced. Who Pays?
18. City's 2013 PCH plan for L.I.D. BASIN / BIO SWALE
19. City left several acres vacant for 20+ years. This area can cost-effectively provide 200-500 more parking spaces w/o any PCH relocation.
20. Unusual jog in roadway. Is this viable?
21. City's 2013 PCH plan for RESTORED NATIVE LANDSCAPE
22. Habitat & need to provide major storm water quality detention basin before discharging urban and creek runoff into ocean.
23. Slopes will likely need retaining walls to move road inland closer to mobile home community.
24. Steep unusable slopes needed for Palomar Airport Road overpass over railroad corridor.

For a Cost/Benefit reference point, the City's PCH Modification at Terramar (CIP project #6054 from Cannon to Manzano) that is less constrained and simpler than South Carlsbad is projected to cost around \$13 million per mile. Vacant primarily unconstrained land sale costs at Ponto are documented at around \$1.4 to \$2.4 million per acre. Honest Cost/Benefit of these two options should be a public tax-payer discussion.



Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment: Right-of-Way and Available Land Analysis*

- Proposed ROW (Approximately 43 acres)
- Area Available for Other Uses (Approximately 62 acres)



July 13, 2021

Item #14

Page 47 of 53

* Analysis is based on aerial imagery. Right-of-way boundaries and acreages are approximate and intended for planning level analysis only.

* For comparative visual reference the * area is the 6.5 acre eastern portion of Planning Area F.

CTGMC key issues and suggestions – People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens

1. The State of CA is forcing Carlsbad and all cities/counties in CA to provide for unlimited or Infinite Population and Visitor growth. So there will be an Infinite population & visitor demands for Parks, Open Space, water, and demands on our roads/transportation systems, and other Growth Management (GM) Quality of Life facilities. **Carlsbad's new GM Standards will have to provide for a system of Infinite increases in the supply of Parklands, Open Spaces, water, transportation facility capacity, etc. or our Quality of Life will diminish.**
 - a. Suggestions:
 - i. Completely restructure the General Plan, Local Coastal Program and Growth Management Program to clearly recognize these facts and State requirements to provide Infinite Population and Visitor demands on City/State quality of life.
 - ii. **Being a Coastal city Carlsbad has an added responsibility to provide high-priority land uses needed at a statewide level to address visitor needs for Coastal Recreation, access, and affordable accommodations.** Carlsbad needs to work with the State of CA Coastal Commission to completely restructure Carlsbad's Coastal Land Use Plan to addresses the State's requirement to provide an Infinite amount high-priority Coastal land uses for that Infinite Population and Visitor demand.
 - iii. **Trying to ignore these Infinite demands for Carlsbad's Quality of Life facilities – like Parks and Open Spaces is a path to disaster and the ultimate degradation of Carlsbad's Quality of Life.**

2. **Carlsbad has a huge Jobs v. Housing supply imbalance – far too many jobs around the airport for our amount of housing. This creates negative and costly land use and transportation planning distortions that radiate from the Airport Central Jobs through Carlsbad in all directions.** CA Housing law penalizes imbalanced cities like Carlsbad by requiring more housing in Carlsbad to bring jobs/housing ratio into balance. Carlsbad can correct this imbalance by 1 of 2 ways: 1) greatly increase housing supply (and thus increase the need and City expense for more GM Quality of Life facilities), or more logically and cost effectively 2) greatly decrease the amount of Jobs land use, so Carlsbad's housing supply is in balance with jobs. These jobs will move to surrounding Cities that have more housing than jobs. **Rebalancing by reducing jobs land use creates added benefits for Carlsbad and our region by reducing Carlsbad's peak-hour job commute traffic volumes and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and by reducing the costs Carlsbad has to pay to accommodate this commute traffic. Carlsbad reducing jobs land use will also reduce the amount of housing the State of California and SANDAG requires Carlsbad provide in its Element thus reducing forcing incompatible high-density development into established neighborhoods.**
 - a. Suggestions:
 - i. **Carlsbad can logically and cost effectively balance Jobs/housing supply by updating Growth Management Policy to reduce jobs to be in balance with housing by changing some of Carlsbad's General Plan land use around the airport into several high-density residential mixed-use Villages.** The City has started some of this, but can expand this effort but has not planned creating mixed-use village environments. These high-density villages will reduce jobs and provide both high-quality and high-density (affordable) housing within walking/biking distance to the major job center and new neighborhood commercial and Park uses in the Villages.

- ii. Prioritize transportation investments in safe bike paths, walking paths between Carlsbad’s Central Jobs Core around the airport and Carlsbad’s housing, particularly strongly connecting new High-density mixed-use villages with the Central Jobs Core.
 - iii. Update General Plan land use and housing policy to reduce concentrations of higher-density housing

- 3. Although some very critical areas (such as the Coastal lands at Ponto) are still vacant and can be wisely used for critical Quality of Life needs, much of Carlsbad is largely developed. **Redevelopment of developed land will require creating increased supplies of Parkland, Open Spaces, transportation capacity, and other Quality of Life facilities.**
 - a. Suggestions:
 - i. **Completely rethink all City planning on existing vacant lands to assure that land is planned and being used wisely to address critical Quality of Life needs, and not squandered.** The location of vacant land to address critical Park & Open Space needs should be preserved with land use planning.
 - ii. Work with the State and CA Coastal Commission to preserve our Finite vacant Coastal lands for the Infinite population and visitor demands internal and external to Carlsbad that are/will be placed on them.
 - iii. Fully and at the very beginning of any Carlsbad General Plan, Local Coastal Program and Growth Management Program actions going forward fully disclose, map and require consideration of future sea level rise and coastal erosion impacts to Coastal land acres and land uses. Carlsbad has lost and will accelerate losing Coastal land and we must know, see, and discuss these losses BEFORE making any land use decisions in Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone.

- 4. **Carlsbad General Plan & Growth Management Plan do not provide a fair distribution of adequately sized City Parks for all Carlsbad families.** Veterans Park is a classic example. What will be the City’s largest park is only about 1-mile from three other major City Parks (Zone 5, and future Robinson Ranch and Hub Parks). This is a misallocation City Park land resources. Saying Veterans Park is ‘the park to serve SW, SE, and NE Carlsbad families’ when those families are upwards of 6-miles away on major commercial arterials that kids can’t logically/safely use, and is inaccessible by almost all its intended users except by driving their cars and then storing their cars in parking lots on Parkland thus making less park land available for actual park use makes little common sense. This is dysfunctional along with being very unfair to families in SW, SE and NE Quadrats that are denied park acres near their homes. **Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan maps ‘Park Service’ areas of existing known Park Inequity or Unfairness (dysfunction), to show where new City Park investments should be made (See City map image with notes below).**

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



The Trust for Public Land provides a Park-Score to compare both a City's amount of park acres and the 'fairness' of access (within a 10-minute walk) to parks. **Carlsbad is below national averages in both park acres and fair access to parks.** Carlsbad is also well below what our adjacent Coastal cities of Encinitas and Oceanside provide. Carlsbad only requires 3 acres of Park land per 1,000 population, while Encinitas and Oceanside require 5 acres - 67% more than Carlsbad – of parkland. Also, Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be within a 10-minute walk to their citizens and families. Carlsbad has no such requirement.

a. Suggestions:

Carlsbad should change its General Plan, Parks and Growth Management Standards and CMC 20.44 to:

- Be Above Average Nationally in both providing park acreage and in locating adequate park acreage to be within a 10-minute walk to all neighborhoods.**
- Raise its park acreage standard to 5 acres per 1,000 population, versus the minimum 3 acres per 1,000. Carlsbad should be at least as good as Encinitas and Oceanside in requiring 5 acres, not 40% below what our adjacent Cities require/provide.**
- Raise its park location standard to require an adequately sized park be provided to serve the neighborhood population within a 10-minute walk for all neighborhoods.**
- Prioritize City Policy and Park Budgets and investments to achieve park fairness in 'Park Unserved areas' identified by Carlsbad's Park Master Plan.**
- Per Carlsbad's Municipal Code Chapter 20.44- DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES to require developers in 'Park Unserved areas' and in areas that do not have an adequately sized (5 acres per 1,000 population) park**

within a 10-minute walk to provide their developments required Park land acre dedication in actual Park land within a 10-minute walk to their development.

- vi. **Update the City's Park-in-lieu fee to assure the fee is adequate to actually buy the amount of park land a developer is to provide within a 10-minute walk of their development.** The City's current 'Park-in-lieu-fee' is far too low and inadequate to actually buy land in area surrounding the proposed development.
 - vii. **Only allow developers to pay a Park-in-lieu-fee where there is an adequately sized park (provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk of their development, and growth management planned future development in that area will not require more park land to provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk.**
 - viii. Consider updating Park policy to provide more multi-use flexibility in park land acres and development on Parks. Many Carlsbad Park acres are developed/dedicated to a single-purpose use, and unavailable for other park uses.
 - ix. Consider eliminating car parking lots from land that can be counted as parkland; or by significantly limiting park land used for parking to around 5%.
 - x. **Eliminate the counting of Protected Endangered Species Habitat land as Park land. Protected Habitat land by definition is not useable by people. Habitat dedicated for plants and animals. Parks are open spaces dedicated intended for people. Parkland calculations should exclude Protected Habitat land and only count 100% people Useable land as Park land.** Where Park land abuts Habitat land a sufficient buffer space shall be provided to prevent people for animals (ex. Rattlesnakes, etc.) and animals from people (habitat disturbance or destruction). This buffer area should not be counted as Park or Habitat acres, but as natural/developed buffer open space acres, and counted as part of the City's 15% Growth Management Aesthetic open Space.
5. Carlsbad's Coast is the most, or one of the most, important features of Carlsbad as identified by citizens and businesses and our Community Vision. **Carlsbad's Coastal Parks (west of the I-5 corridor) are grossly unfairly distributed and do not match the locational needs of the population. North Carlsbad that is 38% of Carlsbad's population has 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37+ acres in size. South Carlsbad that is 62% of Carlsbad's population has 0 [ZERO] Coastal Parks totaling 0 [ZERO] acres.** Again, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps this unfairness says that The City should look at these areas unserved by City Parks as areas the Carlsbad should correct by making new Park purchases to create City Parks in these unserved areas of Park Inequity.

To address Coastal Park unfairness the current City Council wants to spend \$60-85 million in Carlsbad tax-payer funds to Relocate 2.3 miles of constrained Pacific Coast Highway median to try to make some narrow areas 'useable'. This \$60-85 million cost (\$26-37 million per mile) does NOT add one single square foot of new City land, it only inefficiently rearranges existing City land resources. The City's 2001 PCH Relocation Financial Study indicated minimal useable land could be achieved by Relocation, and that the high tax-payer cost to do so would be difficult to fund. However, **a better and less costly solution to provide a much needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park is to simply buy currently vacant land that is for sale.** The City did this (although the City actually bought existing homes) when it expanded Pine Park. **Carlsbad tax-payers have used the City's own data to compare the tax-payer Cost/Benefits of simply purchasing vacant land v. trying to rearrange existing City owned land at PCH. Simply buying vacant land saves tax-payers saves tax-payers \$32.7 to \$7.7 million.** Please read the following data files:

- 2022-June General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, 2.3 miles of PCH Modification (Island Way to La Costa Ave.), and 14.3 acre Ponto Park (Kam Sang) to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto in South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2
- City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input: Part 2 of 2

The Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is clearly unfair to the majority of Carlsbad citizens and their families, is unfair to our major Visitor serving industries in South Carlsbad, and is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act, Carlsbad's Community Vision, and common sense. The Coastal South Carlsbad Park Inequity is also unfair to North Carlsbad because South Carlsbad's Coastal Park demand is being forced into Coastal North Carlsbad and congesting those parks, and adding to Coastal North Carlsbad traffic and parking impacts. It also increases greenhouse gases and VMT as it forces longer vehicle trips.

a. Suggestions:

- i. Ponto Planning Area F has a specific Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy that says The City of Carlsbad must for the Ponto Area LCP 'Consider and Document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and or Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations west of the railroad tracks (at Ponto) prior to any Land Use change. The discussion of Parks by the CTGMC is such a situation. Official public records requests have shown the City never followed this LCP Land Use Policy Requirement during the 2005 Ponto Vision Plan and 2015 General Plan Update, and in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission rejected the Ponto Vision Plan and told the City in 2017 that that land uses at Ponto could change based on the need for Coastal Recreation and/or Low Cost Visitor Accommodations.
 - ii. Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan Update and Growth Management Plan (GMP) did not, and was not updated to, consider the 2017 report on Sea Level Rise (SLR) impacts on Carlsbad's Coastal Land Use – primarily Open Space Land Use (beach and Campground). **Both the General Plan (and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan) and GMP should be updated to account for the loss and replacement of these Open Space Land Use acres due to SLR. Ponto LCP and CA Coastal Act Land Use Polies call for such consideration and 'upland relocation'.**
 - iii. The recent availably of the only sufficiently sized vacant land suitable for a Ponto/South Carlsbad Coastal Park, and the 5/3/22 Citizen requests to jointly study acquisition of this vacant land for a needed (and only possible) true and meaningful Coastal Park for South Carlsbad should be recommended. Carlsbad's GMP should be updated to incorporate acquisition of this last opportunity to provide the needed and Coastal Park for South Carlsbad. Small slivers of excess roadway median is not a park.
6. Carlsbad Growth Management Standard is that 15% of all the Useable (unconstrained and unbuildable) areas is to be preserved as Useable Open Space, and that the 25 Local Facility Management Plans (LFMP) show how that 15% is provided. The City says:

OPEN SPACE

A. Performance Standard

Fifteen percent of the total land area in the Local Facility Management Zone (LFMZ) exclusive of environmentally constrained non-developable land must be set aside for permanent open space and must be available concurrent with development.

Yet the City has acknowledged that this 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard was not complied with. The City also acknowledges that without changes to current City planning the 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard will not be complied with. The City acknowledges that only 13% has/will under current plans be provided. This missing 2% equals 501 acers. **Carlsbad law the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90, and section '21.90.130 Implementation of facilities and improvements requirements'; provide guidance on how non-compliance with a Performance Standards is to be handled.**

a. Suggestions:

- i. **An inventory of all 25 LFMP Zones shall be conducted and an inventory of each LFMP Zones provision of at least 15% Useable Open Space shall be compiled. No LFMP Zone shall be allowed to be "exempt" from this inventory.** The City's computerized GIS mapping system makes the fairly easy and clear as shown in the following City GIS map for LFMP Zone 9.



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara includes the same lagoon.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were not required to comply with the 15% Useable Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the Growth Management Standard of 15% Useable Open Space at Ponto

472 Acres
(197 Acres)
 275 Acres
X 15%
 41 Acres
(11 Acres)
30 Acres

Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 Constrained land excluded from Growth Management (GMP) Open Space
 Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required
 GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data
Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

- ii. In instances like LFMP Zone 9 that did not provide at least 15% Useable Open Space and/or were falsely “exempted” an **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** shall be developed that explores the use, land use planning, and/or possible acquisitions of remaining vacant land acres to make up for any shortfall in meeting the 15% Useable Open Space in that a Zone.
- iii. A **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** should involve a Citizens Advisory Committee composed of citizens within Zone and appointed by the Council Members representing the Zone, and a representative of each vacant land owner over of over 1-acre in size.
- iv. Consistent with the Growth Management Ordinance land use changes and development applications within a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** Zone shall be deferred until the applications can considered with (or after adoption of) a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan**.

Ponto Park

the last and best opportunity to
address Sea Level Rise impacts to
Carlsbad State Park

Presented by

Ponto Beachfront Park

501c

- * Planning Area F (11-acres) & Planning Area G&H (14.3 –acres)
- * Across PCH & inland from South Carlsbad State Campground
- * Most tax-payer efficient solutions for ‘managed retreat’ from Sea Level Rise impacts to Carlsbad State Campground



What's at stake

Planning Area G & H

- * Planning Area G & H (PAGH) – 14.3 acre site is for sale Now and landowner will work with citizens on selling for a Park
- * Next to CA State owned Batiquitos Lagoon Preserve
- * Site includes Federally protected habitat
- * Next to CA State Campground to allow Campground's managed retreat from Sea Level Rise
- * Limited window of opportunity for City and/or State and Federal governments to acquire site to expand State Preserve and Campground



Ponto Planning Area G-H:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto State Park
Connection to beach

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

What's at stake

Planning Area F

- * Planning Area F (PAF) - last vacant 'unplanned coastal property' next to CA State Campground to allow Campground's managed retreat from Sea Level Rise
- * CA Coastal Commission (CCC) requires the City, both 1) Citywide and 2) for PAF and Ponto area, to study and document the "buildout" need for 'High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation' land uses as part of Carlsbad's proposed LCP Amendment # LCP-6-CAR-21-0087-3
- * Site includes Federally protected habitat

Ponto Planning Area F: from center looking north



Ponto Planning Area F: from center looking south & beyond



What's at stake for Ponto, Carlsbad & CA

- * Based on the 'Buildout Need', the CA Coastal Commission may require the City to provide more Coastal Recreation & Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land uses in the City's proposed LCP Amendment
- * The 'Buildout Need Study' will have to factor in unlimited population growth per State Housing Law
- * Carlsbad has significantly under-performed in providing both Coastal Recreation & Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land uses

What's at Stake –Timing is critical as vacant land could be gone

- * 14.3 acre Planning Area G&H is available Now to buy and provide needed Coastal Recreation and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land uses and mitigate the planned loss of South Carlsbad State Campground
- * Buying this site saves tax-payers many millions more than City's proposed realignment of narrow strips of Historic Old Coast Highway.
- * Realignment add zero (0) acres of new public land, only rearranges existing City land.
- * Realignment can serve as a future SLR mitigation area



Ponto Planning Area G-H:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto State Park
Connection to beach

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise

- * Carlsbad SEA LEVEL RISE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT, of Dec 2017 not considered by City & CCC in 2015 General Plan
- * 2 meter SLR will eliminate 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space:
 - * All sandy beaches at South Carlsbad State Beach
 - * Most all of the Campground sites and Campground
- * See following images of areas to be lost to SLR

Ponto State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise



Figure 5: CoSMoS Bluff Erosion Projections by 2100
(CoSMoS-COAST 2015)

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise



Figure 7: Southern Shoreline Planning Area – Year 2050

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise



Colors & lines show
loss of Campground
and new shoreline in
2100 from base SLR
projection in 2017



Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise

1. Planning Area G & H is “Upland” site for Managed Retreat:
 1. Provides State a site for Campground relocation due to SLR
 1. 14.3 acres = around 200 campsites, + day-use park and habitat
 2. Provides some City Coastal Recreation Parkland
2. If not used for Managed Retreat of key Coastal land uses
 1. State Campground has no or only one very limited, expensive and suboptimal “Upland” option; or be forced to be lost due to SLR.
3. Federal, State, County and Carlsbad opportunity to share costs on the most cost-efficient solution – **Buy vacant land**

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise

1. Planning Area F is “Upland” site for Managed Retreat:
 1. Provides State a site for Campground relocation due to SLR
 1. 11.1 acres = around 100 campsites, + day-use park and habitat
 2. Provides some City Coastal Recreation Parkland
2. If not used for Managed Retreat of key Coastal land uses
 1. State Campground has no or only one very limited, expensive and suboptimal “Upland” option; or be forced to be lost due to SLR.
3. Federal, State, County and Carlsbad opportunity to share costs on the most cost-efficient solution – Buy vacant land

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise

1. Planning Area F existing LCP Land Use Policy requirement
 1. Carlsbad must “consider and document the need for both Coastal Recreation and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations in the City’s proposed land use for Planning Area F s part of City’s LCP Amendment
 2. Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan documents in maps that Ponto is ‘unserved by Parks’ and an area the City should make new Park investments.

City's Ponto Planning mistakes & CCC direction to City 1 of 2

- * Following is from a 7/3/17 CCC letter to City Staff on the City's proposed land use changes at Planning Area F. City Staff provided this to City Council on 1/28/20:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. **For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad. ... and this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”**

City's Ponto Planning mistakes & CCC direction to City 2 of 2

- * CCC Staff acknowledged the City has not yet complied with the LCP and in an 8/16/2017 email said:

“The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. **The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City’s Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City’s land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area.**”

Ponto & State Park

Carlsbad's Park Master Plan

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps showing park locations (blue dots) and areas served by parks (blue circles). Blank areas are unserved by Parks' and an area the City should make new Park investments.

Ponto Coastal Park beach connection

- * Ponto Coastal Park provides a direct planned pedestrian connection to the Campground and beach
- * Under north-bound Carlsbad Boulevard and then signalized pedestrian crossing (like those in Downtown Carlsbad) or under future south-bound



Ponto

A Special Place for all is needed Now

- * In the middle of a 6-mile long section of coastline without a Coastal Park – over 8% of San Diego's coast without a Park
- * Southern Coastal gateway to Carlsbad
- * On iconic and old historic 101 Coastal Highway
- * Ocean Views and Beach Access
- * Batiquitos Lagoon Preserve and Public lagoon trails connect a Coastal Park with habitat lands
- * City's Park Master Plan already says Ponto an area Unserved by Parks or Park Inequity and should be an area the City makes new Park Investments



Ponto Planning Area G & H:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto State Park
Connection to beach

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

An aerial photograph of a coastal area. In the foreground, there is a large, green, vegetated area with a dirt path. A road runs along the right side of this area. In the middle ground, a bridge crosses a body of water. To the left of the bridge, there is a residential area with houses and palm trees. To the right, the ocean is visible with waves breaking on a sandy beach. The sky is clear and blue.

Ponto Planning Area G & H:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto State Park
Connection to beach

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

Funding Needs & Tax-payer Benefits


- * \$38 million to purchase 14.3 acre Planning Area G &H at current 'list price'
- * Unknown 'list price' to purchase 11-acre Planning Area F
- * Park development costs about \$ 1million per acre
- * Most all Fed-State-City 'soft environmental study costs' already paid for at both these two sites
- * Saves tax-payers \$32.7 to \$7.7 million compared to City of Carlsbad's proposed 'Road Relocation' that add 0 land
- * Opportunity for private 501c3 donations and Bequests to help fund acquisition and operations

Funding Needs & Tax-payer Benefits

- * Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation's proposed Coastal Science and Cultural Center adds funding opportunities
- * Permanente Donor Recognition in world-class bronze whale sculpture already offered for donation to Park
- * Your legacy for future generations of public use at a very special & vanishing part of California's Coastline
- * Opportunity to fund Coastal Science Education for future generations
- * A Park for Jr Lifeguards and other Coastal Recreation programs

Donor Recognition Sculpture

- * Permanente Donor Recognition in bronze whale sculpture & base plaque
- * Artwork to be donated for Ponto Coastal Park by 501c3



“Young Grey”

Clay maquette

*Clay proof
height: 12 ft.*

Jan., 2013

Working Together to make Ponto Coastal Park a reality

- * People for Ponto researches, informs and works to protect Ponto for all generations to come
- * Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 receives tax-deductible donations for initial Ponto Coastal Park acquisition, and refund of initial donations.
- * Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation 501c3 receives donations for the Science/Cultural Center within a Ponto Park

An aerial photograph showing a coastal area. On the left is a sandy beach. A multi-lane highway runs parallel to the coast. To the right of the highway is a large, flat, green field. In the background, there is a residential area with many houses. The sky is blue with some clouds.

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto Planning Area G & H:
A future Coastal Park?

Subject: Sharing a video of Pickleball vs. Tennis at Pointsettia Community Park

From: John Riedy <john@johnriedy.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 11:12 AM

To: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>

Subject: Sharing a video of Pickleball vs. Tennis at Pointsettia Community Park

Good afternoon Kyle,

I was hoping you could take about 45 seconds to watch a video I shot just a few days ago at Pointsettia Community Park...

[\(1458\) Pickleball vs. Tennis court usage at Pointsettia Community Park in Carlsbad, CA - YouTube](#)

This video was shot on Saturday, August 6, 2022 at Pointsettia Community Park in Carlsbad at 4:30pm on a beautiful summer day. This is the FIRST time I ever brought my drone to the park and I had no idea how many players would be playing Pickleball or tennis. I flew the drone over the tennis courts and saw that ONE of the TEN tennis courts were in use. All six pickleball courts were in use with several teams waiting to play. A friend had been there earlier in the day and left immediately when she saw there were 14 paddles waiting for the TWO high level Pickleball challenge courts. Luckily for me, when I was there, the wait was far shorter. Still, this illustrates the excess demand for public pickleball courts and the surplus supply of tennis courts. TWO of these ten tennis courts could be converted over to dedicated pickleball courts at very minimal expense (as compared to building new pickleball courts from scratch.

Also, you may have heard that Bobby Riggs Racket and Paddle in Encinitas, which was once the premier tennis facility in San Diego county with seven dedicated tennis court will, as of next week, have converted over entirely to Pickleball. There will be 22 dedicated pickleball courts making it far and away the top private facility in the county if not all of SoCal. This is the marketplace talking. I hope Carlsbad is listening.

Thank you for your time.

John Riedy
3317 Avenida Anacapa
Carlsbad 92009.



www.johnriedy.com

818-445-7752 (c)

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: input on pickleball/tennis courts at Pointsettia

From: shelly ibri <shellyibri@gmail.com>

Date: August 18, 2022 at 12:14:17 PM PDT

To: Priya Bhat-Patel <Priya.Bhat-Patel@carlsbadca.gov>

Subject: input on pickleball/tennis courts at Pointsettia

Hi Priya,

My husband, Thierry, and I attended the state of the city event at the library this week. Congratulations on all the good work and especially on the amazing dog park effort you led. Makes me think about getting a dog just to enjoy that amazing space...(well, not really haha).

Thierry is a volunteer on the city growth committee, as you know. We've been playing a lot of pickleball since retiring here last October, and find that we're limited in play time by the inadequate number of public pickleball courts in Carlsbad. While at the same time, we see so many unused tennis courts at the Poinsettia facility, and wanted to suggest that those courts be opened for mixed use purposes to meet the needs of the growing pickleball community (vs. shrinking tennis community). I know this is a hot topic right now but we find that the interest in pickleball isn't going away and that providing an opportunity for mixed use courts could be a good middle ground for both tennis and pickleball supporters.

What are your thoughts?

Thanks,
Shelly Ibri

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: public input on Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance and City losses
Attachments: image017.emz; Example of Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance - Ponto Site 18 - 2022 Sep.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:39 AM
To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: public input on Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance and City losses

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Housing and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Please consider this data file and public input email/attachment in the CTGMC, Housing Element and Parks Master Plan Updates, Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, and the Ponto Site 18 proposed land use changes and development application.

'Example of Carlsbad's Park-in-lieu Fee failing to actually provide the required Parkland or improvements

The example is for Ponto Site 18 one of the City's proposed General Plan & Local Coastal Program land use changes to provide RHNA required housing sites for the years 2021-2029. Ponto Site 18 is the Ponto Storage site and surrounding lots. Ponto Site 18's map and City description is provided on pages 4-5 below.

The example shows Carlsbad loses significant amounts of money, and more critically loses precious and irreplaceable Parkland that developers are required to provide for free. These City losses are absorbed by current and future Carlsbad tax-payers. For the relatively small 5 acre and 86 dwelling unit Ponto Site 18 proposal the loss to Carlsbad is \$ 1.084 million in lost parkland value. Below is the spreadsheet calculation of that loss.

Beyond showing a typical over \$ 1 million loss per 86 dwellings, there is added concern for the CTGMC in that this example is a proposed Carlsbad General Plan & Local Coastal Program Land Use Change to try to accommodate the years 2021-2029 the RHNA requirement to add/increase Residential use. Every 8 years we are/will be changing our General Plan land use to add more high-density housing and increasing City Park demand particularly for areas developed more densely.

If these higher-density projects do not dedicate actual City Park within walking distance not only is Carlsbad losing over \$1 million per 86 dwellings, we are losing free and easy opportunities to get City Parkland dedicated for free per CMC 20.44, and will slowly be degrading our Quality of Life in these areas and also Citywide.

Calculation of Ponto Site 18 Parkland dedication requirement and City losses from the Park-in-lieu Fee:

| Ponto Site 18 - Fenton proposed development's Park land dedication requirement | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | https://library.qcode.us/lib/carlsbad_ca/pub/municipal_code/item/title_20-chapter_20_44 |
| US Census data | https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlsbadcitycalifornia/POP060210#POP060210 |
| Carlsbad Park Dedication Requirement is 3 acres of land per 1,000 population of the proposed development. Population of proposed development is based on population per household based on latest US Census data 2020 US Census data is 2.64 people per household | |
| FYI, Carlsbad 3 acres /1,000 is comparatively very low both locally and nationally. And there is no 'walkably requirement'. 5 acres /1,000 population is what Encinitas and Oceanside require along with a 10-minute walk location requirement. | |
| Fenton owns almost 6 acres of land in Site 18, 4.64 acres of which they want to develop now, and the other 1+ acre part they want to develop later. on the 4.64 acre site change VC-Visitor Commercial/R-15 (15 dwellings per acre) General Plan land use and Zoning to 100% residential and develop at 19.125 dwellings per acre on 4.64 acres. On the 1+ acre site, instead of providing their required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between PCH & Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. Instead of providing the required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between Pecha and Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. | |
| Site 18 (Fenton) development proposal for the 4.64 acre portion is development of 86 household units (over 19 dwelling units per acre in higher occupancy units than typical) consisting of: | |
| 8 | 2-bedroom homes = 9% of total units proposed |
| 40 | 3-bedroom homes = 47% of total units proposed |
| 38 | 4-bedroom homes = 44% of total units proposed |
| 86 | 100% |
| Fenton is proposing 91% of the project with 3 or 4 bedrooms so the project will have higher occupancy, and likely more children, per housing unit than the Citywide average of 2.64 people per housing unit | |
| Fenton Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | |
| calculation | 86 DU of Fenton proposed development |
| X | 2.64 average population per DU per 2020 US Census |
| - | 227 estimated population of Fenton project |
| / | 1,000 population that needs 3 acres of Park land per CMC 20.44 |
| - | 0.22704 percentage of 3 acres of Park land required for 227 people |
| X | 3 acres of Park land required per 1,000 people |
| - | 0.68112 acres of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| X | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| - | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| | 1 acre of Fenton's unused vacant 'ice plant lots' between PCH & Ponto Drive that can provide Fenton's Park land requirement |
| \$ | 398,696 per City Master Fee Schedule. Consistent with what Fenton said was would be the 'Park-in-lieu Fee for their 86 DU project |
| \$ | 50 Estimated SF cost Fenton paid for Ponto Site 18 or S 2.18 million per acre |
| \$ | 1,483,479 cost of 29,670 SF of Ponto Site 18 land to satisfy Fenton's Park land requirement |
| for the Ponto Site 18 5-acre 86 dwelling unit land use change and development proposal: | |
| \$ | (1,064,783) Dollars the City is losing in Park land value and not receiving in its Park-In-lieu Fee, so this is a gift to the developer |
| | -73% % of lost Park land value City is losing and not receiving in its PIL Fee, so this is a City gift to the developer |
| \$ | 1,000,000 per acre cost to develop a Park like Buena Vista Reservoir Park |
| | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| \$ | 22.96 Cost per sq. ft. |
| | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| \$ | 681,120 Cost to develop Fenton's 29,670sq. ft. of Park Land Dedication as a Park |
| \$ | (282,424) Dollars City loses from Park-In-lieu Fees not even being adequate to cover Actual Minimal Park Development Costs |

Following this calculation:

- on page 3-4 are the relevant excerpts of Carlsbad's Dedication of Land for Recreational Purposes Ordinance 20.44, and
- on page 5-6 is the City's map and description of the proposed Ponto Site 18 land use change

20.44 Dedication of Land for Recreational Facilities

20.44.010 Purpose.

This chapter is enacted pursuant to the authority granted by Section 66477 of the Government Code of the State of California. The park and recreational facilities for which dedication of land and/or payment of a fee is required by this chapter are in accordance with the recreational element of the general plan of the City of Carlsbad. (Ord. 9614 § 1, 1982; Ord. 9190 § 2)

20.44.040 Standards and formula for dedication of land.

If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that a park or recreational facility is to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents of the subdivision, the subdivider shall, at the time of the filing of the final or parcel map, dedicate land for such facility pursuant to the following standards and formula:

The formula for determining acreage to be dedicated shall be as follows:

Average no. of persons per dwelling unit (based on most recent federal census)

x

3 park acres per 1,000 population

x

Total number of dwelling units

The total number of dwelling units shall be the number permitted by the city on the property in the subdivision at the time the final map or parcel map is filed for approval, less any existing residential units in single-family detached or duplex dwellings. The park land dedication requirement will be reviewed annually effective July 1, and adjusted as necessary by resolution of the city council to reflect the latest federal census data. (Ord. CS-192 § 49, 2012; Ord. CS-162 § 1, 2011; Ord. NS-757 § 1, 2005; Ord. NS-588 § 1, 2001; Ord. 9831 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9770 § 1, 1985; Ord. 9724 § 1, 1984; Ord. 9644 § 1, 1982; Ord.

20.44.050 Standards for fees in lieu of land dedication.

A. If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that there is no park or recreational facility to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision, the subdivider shall, in lieu of dedicating land, pay a fee equal to the value of the land prescribed for dedication in Section 20.44.040 and in an amount determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 20.44.080.

B. If the proposed subdivision contains 50 parcels or less, only the payment of fees shall be required except that when a condominium project, stock cooperative, or community apartment project exceeds 50 dwelling units, dedication of land may be required notwithstanding that the number of parcels may be less than 50.

20.44.060 Determination of land or fee.

A. Whether the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map requires land dedication or elects to accept payment of a fee in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, shall be determined by the decision-making authority at the time of approval of the tentative map or tentative parcel map. In making that determination, the decision-making authority shall consider the following:

- 1 Park and recreation element of the general plan;
- 2 Topography, geology, access and location of land in the subdivision available for dedication;
- 3 Size and shape of the subdivision and land available for dedication;
- 4 The feasibility of dedication;
- 5 Availability of previously acquired park property.

B. The determination of the city council as to whether land shall be dedicated, or whether a

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is a group of eight vacant and underutilized properties in the Ponto area, located south of the Cape Rey Carlsbad Beach hotel and east of Carlsbad Boulevard. The site is bisected by Ponto Drive. North of Ponto Drive are three underutilized parcels containing a mini storage, miscellaneous buildings and other storage uses on nearly five acres. To the south, across Ponto Drive, is a cluster of five small vacant properties total just over an acre.

Site topography is generally flat. Some of the parcels may be constrained due to environmentally sensitive habitat. One parcel is alongside the railroad corridor. All the parcels are located outside the McClellan-Palomar Airport flight path.

The site does not include a vacant 11-acre parcel along either side of Ponto Drive and fronting Avenida Encinas. The parcel is commonly referred to as "Planning Area F."

SITE FEATURES

- Vacant/underutilized
- Utilities accessible
- In the Coastal Zone
- Site constraints

SITE OPPORTUNITY

The site consists of a mix of residential and non-residential land use designations. Two of the eight parcels have a split land use designation of VC (Visitor Commercial) and R-15 (11.5 to 15 dwelling units per acre, or du/ac). The one parcel alongside the railroad corridor is designated R-15. The R-15 designation often applies to small lot single family or detached or attached condominium development. The cluster of five vacant parcels south of Ponto Drive is designated GC (General Commercial). General Commercial permits a broad range of commercial uses. It also permits properties to be developed in a mixed-use format, with limited residential above first floor commercial.

Staff has received a letter from one property owner expressing support for higher density.

Except for the VC-designated portion of the two parcels, which is not anticipated to change, the redesignation of all parcels to R-23 is contemplated. R-23 is a residential designation the state identifies as suitable for moderate income households. The R-23 designation would permit a density range of 19 to 23 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). This density is typical of two- and three-story apartment and condominium developments.

To change any designation, amendments to the General Plan, Local Coastal Program, zoning, Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, and the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan would be required. These amendments would require City Council and California Coastal Commission approval.



Upper area proposed for land use change & higher density

Part of Lower area can (should) be dedicated to provided needed parkland

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Parcels Numbers | 216-010-01, 216-010-02, 216-010-03, 216-010-04, 216-010-05, 214-160-25, 214-160-28, 214-171-11 | GMP Quadrant | Southwest |
| Ownership | Private (separate ownership) | Parcel Size | Approximately 6 acres (all parcels) |
| Current General Plan Designations | R-15 (Residential 8-15 du/ac), VC (Visitor Commercial)/R-15, GC (General Commercial) | Proposed General Plan Designation | R-23 (Residential, 19 to 23 du/ac)* <i>*The VC designation, which applies to two properties, is not anticipated to change and would remain in the same location.</i> |
| Current Residential Opportunity | Approximately 44 units (based on the existing R-15 designation and limited residential permitted on GC-designated properties) | Proposed Residential Opportunity | Approximately 90 units (at 19 du/ac)* <i>*No yield is determined from portions of property designated VC.</i> |
| Income category of units (based on minimum density) | Moderate | | |

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Sincerely and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Example of Carlsbad's Park-in-lieu Fee failing to actually provide the required Parkland or improvements

The example is for Ponto Site 18 one of the City's proposed General Plan & Local Coastal Program land use changes to provide RHNA required housing sites for the years 2021-2029. Ponto Site 18 is the Ponto Storage site and surrounding lots. Ponto Site 18's map and City description is provided on pages 4-5 below.

The example shows Carlsbad loses significant amounts of money, and more critically loses precious and irreplaceable Parkland that developers are required to provide for free. These City losses are absorbed by current and future Carlsbad tax-payers. For the relatively small 5 acre and 86 dwelling unit Ponto Site 18 proposal the loss to Carlsbad is \$ 1.084 million in lost parkland value. Below is the spreadsheet calculation of that loss.

Beyond showing a typical over \$ 1 million loss per 86 dwellings, there is added concern for the CTGMC in that this example is a proposed Carlsbad General Plan & Local Coastal Program Land Use Change to try to accommodate the years 2021-2029 the RHNA requirement to add/increase Residential use. Every 8 years we are/will be changing our General Plan land use to add more high-density housing and increasing City Park demand particularly for areas developed more densely.

If these higher-density projects do not dedicate actual City Park within walking distance not only is Carlsbad losing over \$1 million per 86 dwellings, we are losing free and easy opportunities to get City Parkland dedicated for free per CMC 20.44, and will slowly be degrading our Quality of Life in these areas and also Citywide.

Calculation of Ponto Site 18 Parkland dedication requirement and City losses from the Park-in-lieu Fee:

| Ponto Site 18 - Fenton proposed development's Park land dedication requirement | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | https://library.qcode.us/lib/carlsbad_ca/pub/municipal_code/item/title_20-chapter_20_44 |
| US Census data | https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlsbadcitycalifornia/POP060210#POP060210 |
| Carlsbad Park Dedication Requirement is 3 acres of land per 1,000 population of the proposed development. | |
| Population of proposed development is based on population per household based on latest US Census data | |
| 2020 US Census data is 2.64 people per household | |
| FYI, Carlsbad 3 acres /1,000 is comparatively very low both locally and nationally. And there is no 'walkably requirement'. | |
| 5 acres /1,000 population is what Encinitas and Oceanside require along with a 10-minute walk location requirement. | |
| Fenton owns almost 6 acres of land in Site 18, 4.64 acres of which they want to develop now, and the other 1+ acre part they want to develop later. | |
| on the 4.64 acre site change VC-Visitor Commercial/R-15 (15 dwellings per acre) General Plan land use and Zoning to 100% residential and develop at 19.125 dwellings per acre on 4.64 acres. | |
| On the 1+ acre site, instead of providing their required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between PCH & Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. | |
| Instead of providing the required Park Land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between Pecha and Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. | |
| Site 18 (Fenton) development proposal for the 4.64 acre portion is development of 86 household units (over 19 dwelling units per acre in in higher occupancy units than typical) consisting of: | |
| 8 | 2-bedroom homes = 9% of total units proposed |
| 40 | 3-bedroom homes = 47% of total units proposed |
| 38 | 4-bedroom homes = 44% of total units proposed |
| 86 | 100% |
| Fenton is proposing 91% of the project with 3 or 4 bedrooms so the project will have higher occupancy, and likely more children, per housing unit than the Citywide average of 2.64 people per housing unit | |
| <u>Fenton Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44</u> | |
| <u>calculation</u> | 86 DU of Fenton proposed development |
| X | 2.64 average population per DU per 2020 US Census |
| = | 227 estimated population of Fenton project |
| / | 1,000 population that needs 3 acres of Park land per CMC 20.44 |
| = | 0.22704 percentage of 3 acres of Park land required for 227 people |
| X | 3 acres of Park land required per 1,000 people |
| = | 0.68112 acres of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| X | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| = | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| 1 acre of Fenton's unused vacant 'ice plant lots' between PCH & Ponto Drive that can provide Fenton's Park land requirement | |
| \$ 398,696 | per City Master Fee Schedule. Consistent with what Fenton said was would be the 'Park-in-lieu Fee for their 86 DU project |
| \$ 50 | Estimated SF cost Fenton paid for Ponto Site 18 or \$ 2.18 million per acre |
| \$ 1,483,479 | cost of 29,670 SF of Ponto Site 18 land to satisfy Fenton's Park land requirement |
| for the Ponto Site 18 5-acre 86 dwelling unit land use change and development proposal: | |
| \$ (1,084,783) Dollars the City is loosing in Park land value and not receiving in its Park-in-lieu Fee, so this is a gift to the developer | |
| -73% % of lost Park land value City is loosing and not receiving in its PIL Fee, so this is a City gift to the developer | |
| \$ 1,000,000 | per acre cost to develop a Park like Buena Vista Reservoir Park |
| 43,560 | square feet per acre |
| \$ 22.96 | Cost per sq. ft. |
| 29,670 | square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| \$ 681,120 | Cost to develop Fenton's 29,670 sq. ft. of Park Land Dedication as a Park |
| \$ (282,424) Dollars City looses from Park-in-lieu Fees not even being adequate to cover Actual Minimal Park Development Costs | |

Following this calculation:

- on page 3-4 are the relevant excerpts of Carlsbad's Dedication of Land for Recreational Purposes Ordinance 20.44, and
- on page 5-6 is the City's map and description of the proposed Ponto Site 18 land use change

20.44 Dedication of Land for Recreational Facilities

20.44.010 Purpose.

This chapter is enacted pursuant to the authority granted by Section 66477 of the Government Code of the State of California. The park and recreational facilities for which dedication of land and/or payment of a fee is required by this chapter are in accordance with the recreational element of the general plan of the City of Carlsbad. (Ord. 9614 § 1, 1982; Ord. 9190 § 2)

20.44.040 Standards and formula for dedication of land.

If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that a park or recreational facility is to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents of the subdivision, the subdivider shall, at the time of the filing of the final or parcel map, dedicate land for such facility pursuant to the following standards and formula:

The formula for determining acreage to be dedicated shall be as follows:

Average no. of persons per dwelling unit (based on most recent federal census)

x

3 park acres per 1,000 population

x

Total number of dwelling units

The total number of dwelling units shall be the number permitted by the city on the property in the subdivision at the time the final map or parcel map is filed for approval, less any existing residential units in single-family detached or duplex dwellings. The park land dedication requirement will be reviewed annually effective July 1, and adjusted as necessary by resolution of the city council to reflect the latest federal census data. (Ord. CS-192 § 49, 2012; Ord. CS-162 § 1, 2011; Ord. NS-757 § 1, 2005; Ord. NS-588 § 1, 2001; Ord. 9831 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9770 § 1, 1985; Ord. 9724 § 1, 1984; Ord. 9644 § 1, 1982; Ord.

20.44.050 Standards for fees in lieu of land dedication.

A. If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that there is no park or recreational facility to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision, the subdivider shall, in lieu of dedicating land, pay a fee equal to the value of the land prescribed for dedication in Section 20.44.040 and in an amount determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 20.44.080.

B. If the proposed subdivision contains 50 parcels or less, only the payment of fees shall be required except that when a condominium project, stock cooperative, or community apartment project exceeds 50 dwelling units, dedication of land may be required notwithstanding that the number of parcels may be less than 50.

20.44.060 Determination of land or fee.

A. Whether the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map requires land dedication or elects to accept payment of a fee in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, shall be determined by the decision-making authority at the time of approval of the tentative map or tentative parcel map. In making that determination, the decision-making authority shall consider the following:

- 1 Park and recreation element of the general plan;
- 2 Topography, geology, access and location of land in the subdivision available for dedication;
- 3 Size and shape of the subdivision and land available for dedication;
- 4 The feasibility of dedication;

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is a group of eight vacant and underutilized properties in the Ponto area, located south of the Cape Rey Carlsbad Beach hotel and east of Carlsbad Boulevard. The site is bisected by Ponto Drive. North of Ponto Drive are three underutilized parcels containing a mini storage, miscellaneous buildings and other storage uses on nearly five acres. To the south, across Ponto Drive, is a cluster of five small vacant properties total just over an acre.

Site topography is generally flat. Some of the parcels may be constrained due to environmentally sensitive habitat. One parcel is alongside the railroad corridor. All the parcels are located outside the McClellan-Palomar Airport flight path.

The site does not include a vacant 11-acre parcel along either side of Ponto Drive and fronting Avenida Encinas. The parcel is commonly referred to as "Planning Area F."

SITE FEATURES

- Vacant/underutilized
- Utilities accessible
- In the Coastal Zone
- Site constraints

SITE OPPORTUNITY

The site consists of a mix of residential and non-residential land use designations. Two of the eight parcels have a split land use designation of VC (Visitor Commercial) and R-15 (11.5 to 15 dwelling units per acre, or du/ac). The one parcel alongside the railroad corridor is designated R-15. The R-15 designation often applies to small lot single family or detached or attached condominium development. The cluster of five vacant parcels south of Ponto Drive is designated GC (General Commercial). General Commercial permits a broad range of commercial uses. It also permits properties to be developed in a mixed-use format, with limited residential above first floor commercial.

Staff has received a letter from one property owner expressing support for higher density.

Except for the VC-designated portion of the two parcels, which is not anticipated to change, the redesignation of all parcels to R-23 is contemplated. R-23 is a residential designation the state identifies as suitable for moderate income households. The R-23 designation would permit a density range of 19 to 23 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). This density is typical of two- and three-story apartment and condominium developments.

To change any designation, amendments to the General Plan, Local Coastal Program, zoning, Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, and the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan would be required. These amendments would require City Council and California Coastal Commission approval.



Upper area proposed for land use change & higher density

Part of Lower area can (should) be dedicated to provided needed parkland

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Parcels Numbers | 216-010-01, 216-010-02, 216-010-03, 216-010-04, 216-010-05, 214-160-25, 214-160-28, 214-171-11 | GMP Quadrant | Southwest |
| Ownership | Private (separate ownership) | Parcel Size | Approximately 6 acres (all parcels) |
| Current General Plan Designations | R-15 (Residential 8-15 du/ac), VC (Visitor Commercial)/R-15, GC (General Commercial) | Proposed General Plan Designation | R-23 (Residential, 19 to 23 du/ac)* <i>*The VC designation, which applies to two properties, is not anticipated to change and would remain in the same location.</i> |
| Current Residential Opportunity | Approximately 44 units (based on the existing R-15 designation and limited residential permitted on GC-designated properties) | Proposed Residential Opportunity | Approximately 90 units (at 19 du/ac)* <i>*No yield is determined from portions of property designated VC.</i> |
| Income category of units (based on minimum density) | Moderate | | |

Subject: public input on proper recording and consideration of July Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee - General Plan Land Use Plan Imbalance - Parks & Traffic
Attachments: San Diego County cities lose affordable housing lawsuit cbs8.com.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2022 7:58 AM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: public input on proper recording and consideration of July Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee - General Plan Land Use Plan Imbalance - Parks & Traffic

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Housing and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

I was unable to attend the August meeting, but found my public input at the July meeting was not fully reflected/recorded in the minutes. I would like to request that my public comments submitted in July as evidenced on <https://carlsbadca.new.swagit.com/videos/178280> at 4:40 to 7:43 be more properly and accurately documented.

I also, saw in the August meeting what appeared to be the staff response to my July comments on the General Plan land use plan imbalances. But Staff ONLY replied to the Jobs/Housing Imbalance and did not include the Parks/Housing Imbalance that has been a critical concerns to may Carlsbad Citizens. Carlsbad's General Plan Land Use Element page 2-23 specifically discusses Job/Housing Balance. This should be reviewed and compared with Staff's August presentation to the CTGMC.

The Park/Housing Imbalance that I mentioned in July is clearly seen in the following Park Service Area Map from the City's Park Master Plan and in the US Census data that show Ponto and South Carlsbad currently developed at much higher densities that the Citywide average. Both these facts were presented to the City and CCC several times before, but appear to being ignored by in the City's consideration of the issues and public citizen input.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



See: Coastal Recreation data file

Housing density Imbalance – more housing density at Ponto and in South Carlsbad. No Parks in Ponto and large areas mapped UNSERVED by Parks in South Carlsbad :

| Council District | Quad | ZIP Code | % of Square Miles | % of City's SM | Population | % of City Pop. | Population Density (pop/SM) | Population Density relative to Citywide average |
|---------------------|------|----------|-------------------|----------------|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1,2 | NW | 92008 | 11 | 28% | 27,429 | 24% | 2,494 | 84% |
| 2,1 | NE | 92010 | 8 | 21% | 16,565 | 14% | 2,071 | 70% |
| 3,4,2 | SW | 92011 | 7 | 18% | 24,405 | 21% | 3,486 | 118% |
| 4,3,2 | SE | 92009 | 13 | 33% | 47,003 | 41% | 3,616 | 122% |
| City total = | | | 39 | 100% | 115,401 | 100% | 2,959 | 100% |
| Ponto = | | | 0.397 | | 1,632 | | 4,111 | 139% |

See: 9/27/2021 email resent to City and to you on 9/11/2022

The City and US Census data is very clear, and is the point we People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens are trying to make to you that Carlsbad's General Plan is unfairly Imbalanced with regard to Park/Housing distribution. This Park/Housing Imbalance will harm Carlsbad in many ways if not corrected.

It is also Imbalanced in Jobs/Housing.

I also stated the fact that the concept of Carlsbad "Buildout" is a fallacy as every 8-years Carlsbad receives a new requirement to change the General Plan/Local Coastal Plan add more residential land use. See the attached article about existing 'built-out' cities in SD County that are being required to significantly add new residential land use to their existing 'built-out' cities. The article points to where Carlsbad is will be in 2029.

How the CTGMC assures the City will ADD new Parkland to fix the current Park/Housing Imbalance, and add new parks (due to conversion of developed land to Parks like what was done at Pine Park) for new Housing is a critical Quality of Life issue for current and future generations of Carlsbad Citizens and their families.

Our future housing develop will be higher-density that does not have backyards and significant grassy open space to play. Carlsbad's City Parks will provide the open significant open green play and recreation places. Carlsbad's Parks need to be fairly distributed so they are within walking distance to all current and future residents.

I will send you a important Data File on Carlsbad's Parkland Dedication Ordinance that is an important means for new develop to provide their required Parkland if properly administrated.

I will also send you an important Draft Data File on relative VMT and logically appears to show how Carlsbad's Park/Housing Imbalance increases Carlsbad's VMT relative to the region.

Please know your fellow People for Ponto Citizens deeply care for Carlsbad and want to maintain and enhance Carlsbad's Quality of Life. We hope you care, will listen to the facts and desires we present you, and will work address the clear and time sensitive need for Ponto Park.

Sincerely and with Aloha Alina for Carlsbad,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 10:07 AM

To: committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov)

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update - Parks & Open Space at Ponto-Coastal South Carlsbad

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

We ask you to please consider this email and attachments in the Upcoming Parks and Open Space discussions by the CTGMC, LCP Amendment, PCH Relocation project, Park Master Plan Update, and development proposals at Ponto.

As always, and as we have repeatedly asked for since our initial 2017 letter to the City Council, People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens asks for and are willing able to work with you to find the solutions for:

- the documented Park Inequity at Ponto & Coastal South Carlsbad,
- the documented missing Unconstrained Open Space at Ponto,
- the future loss of 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space (State beach and Campground) due to sea level rise,
- the needed upgrades to Carlsbad's Growth Management Program and Standards (and developer required land dedications and mitigations) to account for an Unlimited population and the need for Unlimited increases in Carlsbad Parks and Open Space to address those Unlimited populations so as to assure we maintain our quality of life,
- beneficial collaborations and donations, and
- the wiser use of tax-payer dollars to address tax-payer needs

The attached PowerPoint file has important information and images for people not as familiar with Ponto, and the attached YouTube video helps show what a great park Ponto Park will be <https://youtu.be/bQulyLcuyEc>

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Sincerely and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

INVESTIGATIONS

Coronado, Lemon Grove, Imperial Beach, and Solana Beach lose legal battle over affordable housing requirements

The San Diego County cities say SANDAG used an unfair vote that increased number of new housing required in their city. An appellate court rejected those claims.



Author: Dorian Hargrove

Published: 5:49 PM PDT June 22, 2022

Updated: 12:20 PM PDT June 27, 2022



SAN DIEGO COUNTY, Calif. — Coronado, Lemon Grove, Imperial Beach, and Solana Beach have lost a legal battle over new housing guidelines that were approved by the [San Diego Regional Association of Governments \(SANDAG\)](#).

On June 20, [an appellate court rejected the appeal](#) from the four cities, meaning the case is now dismissed.

The cities sued SANDAG in September 2020. In the lawsuit, the cities say the regional planning agency used a weighted vote to increase the requirements for new housing in each of the 18 cities in the county. Representatives from the cities say that as part of the weighted vote, larger cities get more say in regards to what happens in smaller cities where conditions are different.

RELATED: ['Using public land for public good' | County leaders announce plan to bring affordable housing to San Diego](#)

WATCH RELATED: *County leaders announce plan to bring affordable housing to San Diego*

'Using public land for public good' | County leaders announce plan to bring affor...



According to the September 2020 complaint, each city said the number of new housing units jumped drastically since the previous housing determination.

In Coronado, the previous Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) plan which was adopted in 2011 determined that the city needed to build 50 affordable housing units. For the 2020 revision, that number spiked to 912 units to be built by 2029.

In Imperial Beach, the number of new affordable housing units jumped from 254 new affordable units to 1,375 in the new plan. Attorneys for Imperial Beach called the new guidelines, "unreachable." Based upon the 1,375 units allocated, Imperial Beach would need approximately 172 housing units constructed each year," reads the 2020 lawsuit. "This yearly allocation is patently unrealistic give that Imperial Beach is a built-out city."

RELATED: ['The buck stops with me' | SANDAG CEO responds to credit card misuse, toll road mistake](#)

WATCH RELATED: *SANDAG CEO responds to credit card misuse*

Audit: SANDAG improperly used credit cards to spend taxpayer money



In Lemon Grove, the 2011's affordable housing plan determined that the city needed to build 309 new units. In the following plan, the number rose to 1,359.

And, for Solana Beach, the new affordable housing requirement went from 340 in 2011 to 875 in the 2020 plan.

Attorneys for the cities argued that SANDAG's board of directors approved the plan relying solely on the weighted vote for each city. That means smaller cities such as Coronado, Lemon Grove, Imperial Beach, and Solana Beach had little say compared to San Diego and other larger cities.

SANDAG ultimately won the legal dispute by arguing that the courts could not overturn the Regional Housing Needs Assessment and that only state lawmakers could change the law.

A San Diego Superior Court judge agreed.

And, on June 20 an appellate court also agreed, delivering the final blow to the lawsuit from the four municipalities.

"We conclude that the trial court properly sustained SANDAG's demurrer without leave to amend on the ground that judicial review of SANDAG's RHNA allocation is not permitted," reads the June 20 appellate ruling.

Attorneys for the four cities did not respond to CBS 8's request for comment.

"People become homeless here they don't come from other places. The only way to solve that is to provide enough housing so the people who live, work here and serve these communities are actually able to afford to live here," said Stephen Russell, president and CEO of the San Diego Housing Federation.

He said the housing assessment calculates the number of affordable housing units based on an array of factors including the types of jobs in the area.

"One of the things that has driven the calculations has been what we call job fit," he said.

"Communities actually provide housing for the folks who are working in those communities and that the housing should fit the wage profiled of folks working there."

People who work on Coronado wouldn't have to commute each day to go to their lower-wage jobs if more housing was available on the island, he said.

EDITOR'S NOTE: A previous version of this article cited the lawsuit and included the draft RHNA number of 1,001 new units for Coronado. SANDAG says Coronado is required to build a total of 912 new units, with 481 units for very low and low-income housing.

LOADING NEXT ARTICLE...

Subject: DPR Our Home Our Future
Attachments: RE: Carlsbad Citizen Questions and request to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions for Carlsbad Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA-Housing Element & Parks Master Plan Updates - 11-30-2020

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2022 6:30 AM
To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: Public Input - Our Home Our Future citizen input - Why a park is needed within walking distance to multifamily housing & why a meaningful Coastal Park is needed for Ponto/South Carlsbad - public input to DLCPA, Housing and Park planning

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Planning and Housing Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Please review and consider the following US Census data on Carlsbad Housing Density in various areas of the City in working to correct Carlsbad's Parks/Housing Imbalance; and also in understanding how Affordable housing supply currently at Ponto.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 3:13 PM
To: 'Scott Donnell'
Cc: 'Mandy.Mills@carlsbadca.org'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: RE: Our Home Our Future citizen input - Why a park is needed within walking distance to multifamily housing & why a meaningful Coastal Park is needed for Ponto/South Carlsbad - public input to DLCPA, Housing and Park planning

Thanks Scott. Much appreciated

If you could also please consider in your process:

1. US Census data that shows that Ponto, even with some of the remaining vacant Coastal land, has already been developed at a 39% greater residential density that the City.

Given there is no Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad the City should doubly consider the higher residential density and populations in South Carlsbad Quadrants relative to citywide averages. Denser residential development created by Carlsbad's General Plan and GMP 1.0 basically means on-average in South Carlsbad Quadrants there are a combination of smaller backyards, less City parkland, and less open space. Common sense and good planning should provide more City Parkland for denser residential development, not less (or none). This is however not what Carlsbad's General Plan and GMP 1.0

provided in South Carlsbad as clearly documented by City data. The following census data reconfirms South Carlsbad park inequity data/concerns People for Ponto has sent to Council:

| Council District | Quad | ZIP Code | Square Miles | % of SM | % of population | Population Density (pop/SM) | Population Density relative to Citywide average |
|------------------|------|----------|--------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1,2 | NW | 92008 | 11 | 28% | 27,429 | 2,494 | 84% |
| 2,1 | NE | 92010 | 8 | 21% | 16,565 | 2,071 | 70% |
| 3,4,2 | SW | 92011 | 7 | 18% | 24,405 | 3,486 | 118% |
| 4,3,2 | SE | 92009 | 13 | 33% | 47,003 | 3,616 | 122% |
| City total = | | | 39 | 100% | 115,401 | 2,959 | 100% |
| Ponto = | | | 0.397 | | 1,632 | 4,111 | 139% |

Key Census data points: 1) 62% of Carlsbad’s population are in South Quadrants. 2) South Quadrants are 18% and 22% more Dense than the Citywide average, thus have relatively more City Park and open space needs. 3) Ponto’s 936 dwellings have a residential density of 4,111 pop/SM that is 39% more dense than the Citywide average. This makes sense when one looks at the attached Open Space data; People for Ponto Open Space map/analysis documenting missing GMP open space. This Ponto GMP Open Space shortfall is made worse by the projected/planned loss of 32+ acres Ponto Coastal Open Space Land Use due to sea level rise. The Council should know about and consider the residential density and Parks/Open Space disparities in this data and reflected by the thousands of Citizen Emails referencing this disparity.

2. the attached public input and data that you received on 11/30/20, with a particular focus on comments related to page 10-169 in the Housing Element that relate to the Ponto area:
 - a. “Of Ponto’s 1,025 current homes, 202 in the San Pacifico Community Association were built to be affordable condominium homes with very small ‘exclusive use’ lots, zero-side yards/building setbacks and only 10-15’ wide ‘back yards’; and 384 Lakeshore Gardens homes are affordable age-restricted manufactured homes. So 586 of Ponto’s 1,025 current homes or 57% of Ponto’s housing were planned and built to be affordable. At 57% Ponto has and was developed with a consideration of affordable housing, but also was denied needed City Park facilities of at least 8-acres to meet minimum City Park Standards.

Consistent with Policy 10-P.7 Ponto Planning Area F should be used to address Ponto’s ‘Park Inequity’ being ‘unserved’, and not used to increase the “over concentration” of affordable housing that was already planned and built at Ponto.”

I am not against affordable housing and high density to ‘actually achieve affordable housing’, and have PMed several Housing Elements and high-density TOD land use plans and high-density projects. However, as development goes up and is more dense it is critical that Parks be provided for these dense areas and urban design requirements provide significant ground level open spaces to manage and make livable higher densities. This is the biggest issue I have in how the City is exploring densification. The City does not even mention or ask about access to Parks in your survey. Yet this is one of the most obvious and clear land use nexus with high-density residential development. The City does not appear to be presenting, discussing and addressing 3 fundamental principles of urban planning - the key requirement to require and provide sufficient Parkland within walking distance to higher density residential, provide adequate walkable parkland access to all residential neighborhoods, and for all our inland residents provide significant and sufficiently sized/dimensioned Coastal Parks to make sure inland residents, particularly those in high-density developments, have a Coastal Park to go to.

Thanks,
Lance

From: Scott Donnell [<mailto:Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>]
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 10:30 AM
To: Lance Schulte
Subject: FW: Our Home Our Future citizen input - Why a park is needed within walking distance to multifamily housing & why a meaningful Coastal Park is needed for Ponto/South Carlsbad - public input to DLCPA, Housing and Park planning
Importance: High

Good morning,

Thank you for your comments. They will be included in the public input summary report presented to the City Council early next year. You can also provide additional input through October 1 via our online survey, available at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/housingsites> and continue to provide mail and email comments through October 22.

You are also welcome to keep apprised of the project by visiting the housing plan webpage, www.carlsbadca.gov/housingplan. Further, at the bottom of this webpage is a link to sign up for email updates on the housing plan should you know other people who may want to keep tabs on the project.

Last, I have forwarded your email to Mandy Mills, Housing and Homeless Services Director, as she is the current liaison to the Housing Commission. If you wish to send correspondence to the Housing commission, please copy her.

Thank you.

Scott Donnell
Senior Planner
1635 Faraday Avenue
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7314
www.carlsbadca.gov

760-602-4618 | 760-602-8560 fax | scott.donnell@carlsbadca.gov

DURING THE CURRENT PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY:
FOR ONGOING PROJECTS, PLEASE CONTACT YOUR PROJECT PLANNER TO SCHEDULE A RESUBMITTAL DROP-OFF APPOINTMENT.
FOR NEW PROJECT SUBMITTALS AND LANDSCAPE SUBMITTALS/RESUBMITTALS/ASBUILTS, PLEASE CALL OR EMAIL YOUR REQUEST FOR A SUBMITTAL DROP-OFF APPOINTMENT:
Phone: 760-602-4610
Email: planning@carlsbadca.gov

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 8:20 AM
To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com; 'Mehmood, Sohab@HCD' <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; 'McDougall, Paul@HCD' <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; 'McDonell, Glenn' <Glenn.McDonell@asm.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'

<Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>

Subject: Our Home Our Future citizen input - Why a park is needed within walking distance to multifamily housing & why a meaningful Coastal Park is needed for Ponto/South Carlsbad - public input to DLCPA, Housing and Park planning
Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Housing Commission, Planning Commission, and Park Commission; and CA Coastal Commission and HCD:

The following is citizen feedback on Carlsbad's 9-13-21 email to 'Give input on locations for future housing'. It is also for consideration in Carlsbad's Draft LCP and Parks Master Plan Amendment Processes.

At the very heart of these comments is: There is finite vacant land in Carlsbad and an even smaller fragment of Vacant Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This small amount of is getting smaller due to documented coastal erosion and sea level rise. Over 32 acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space < Lance Use will be lost at Ponto/South Carlsbad. This very small finite vacant Coastal land is all we have to provide for the "infinite" demands for high-priority Coastal Recreation and Low-cost access to the Coast land uses from this "infinite" amount of future generations of Carlsbad and inland cities residents; and of outside Visitors to Carlsbad's Coast. How Carlsbad, and the CA Coastal Commission and HCD, uses those precious finite fragments of vacant Coastal Land is the vital question. Since 2017 Carlsbad citizens have been asking the Council for a true, honest, open and comprehensive consideration of these issues at Ponto. Over 4,500 emails have been sent to the Council, many City Budget Workshop requests, Hours of public testimony, and hundreds of pages of documents facts gained via official Carlsbad Public Records Requests.

The proposed land use changes to high density R-23 for the 8 properties of Site 18, seem to be being operating in a 'incomplete policy silo' that only looks at affordable housing and is not considering needed City Park and wider Coastal Land Use issues at Ponto. This 'policy silo process' seems to be counter to the wise consideration and use of the last remaining vacant and redevelopable Coastal land – particularly at Ponto/South Carlsbad.

Having managed creation of a Coastal City General Plan and several Housing Elements I understand and sympathize with the challenges City Staff and Council face in trying to provide for unlimited high-density residential development growth, but we need to look at preserving vacant land to provide needed City Parks to balance these high-density developments and provide needed Parks for these homes that have no/little yards. But it seems, as citizens have asked since 2017, there is better way to address those challenges.

The 9/13/21 City email states:

- "The city needs to identify locations for about 2,600 new homes to fulfill the state's requirement that all cities in the region provide enough housing to meet anticipated needs. Most of these homes **need to be affordable for people with moderate to low incomes, according to state formulas for household income levels.**"

Input: Per pages 33-34 of 3/23/21 2020 Housing Element Annual Progress Report to the Carlsbad City Council stated that:

"Prices of Affordable Housing – Generally, the federal and state rule is that housing is affordable to a given family if the family pays no more than 30% of its monthly income for housing expenses that include the rent or mortgage payment, property taxes, insurance, utilities, and the like."

The staff report then documents that a home in Carlsbad to be affordable to Low and Moderate Incomes, requires the following home sale or rental prices:

“Table 3: CY 2020 qualifying rent and utility expenses by number of bedrooms

| Income Group | Number of bedrooms | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 1 bedroom | 2 bedrooms | 3 bedrooms | 4 bedrooms |
| Very Low | \$1,155 | \$1,444 | \$1,675 | \$1,906 |
| Low | \$1,849 | \$2,310 | \$2,680 | \$3,050 |
| Moderate | \$2,225 | \$2,781 | \$3,226 | \$3,671 |
| Above Moderate | > \$2,225 | > \$ 2,781 | > \$ 3,226 | > \$ 3,671 |

Source: "Household Income Limits 2020", City of Carlsbad (effective April 30, 2020)"

And the “for Sale Prices that are Affordable” for each income group:

| Area Median Income | 2020 Annual Income | Affordable Purchase Price |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Very Low (30% to 50%) | \$34,651 to \$57,750 | \$82,001 to \$186,000 |
| Low (50% to 80%) | \$57,751 to \$92,400 | \$186,001 to \$342,000 |
| Moderate (80% to 120%) | \$92,401 to \$111,250 | \$342,001 to \$510,000 |
| Above Moderate | \$111,251 or above | \$510,001 and above” |

However, Carlsbad developers seeking to justify increase residential density site in the name of ‘Affordability’ to Low or Moderate incomes are not providing homes that meet these affordable rents or purchase prices. Carlsbad’s land use regulations that promote larger unit sizes and building height and bulk work in the opposite direction and instead promote Above Moderate housing as clearly evidenced in Carlsbad’s Village where housing developed at 28-35 dwelling units per acre (that should be affordable to Low Incomes – i.e. 1-4 bedroom rent at \$1,849 - \$3,050, and at sales or purchase prices from \$186,001 to \$342,000) are instead being sold for \$1.8 to \$3 million as seen in the following:

RECENT SALES

2687 State Street



2 Bed | 2.5 Bath | 2,022 Sq. Ft.
SOLD \$1,846,500

2683 State Street



3 Bed + Bonus Room | 2 Bath | 2,143 Sq. Ft.
SOLD \$1,800,000

2677 State Street, 301



2 Bed + Office Space | 2.5 Bath | 2,150 Sq. Ft.
SOLD \$2,250,000

2677 State Street, 302



3 Bed | 3.5 Bath | 2,717 Sq. Ft.
SOLD \$3,000,000

This data is not a criticism of expensive housing or developers seeking to maximize their profits.

It simply shows that Carlsbad's land use regulations and 'Affordability quid-pro-quo for increasing land use density' are not functioning as intended to promote Affordability. Carlsbad's land use approach is simply increasing developer profit that serves to drive up land costs (land is a residual cost in land use development pro formas) and thus works to instead reduce Affordability. Simply changing land use to increase dwelling unit density to R23 or R-28-35 to provide "Affordable Housing is not really true.

It is suggested that with a change in land use to increase density should be a commitment recorded on the land to actually provide the number of Affordable units being cited as the rationale for increasing the density. This is an honest and accurate 'Affordable quid pro quo'. This commitment, along with land use regulation reform, will help reduce speculative land costs that discourage Affordability.

Citizens are being inaccurately told that density increases are needed to provide Affordability yet developers do not create, nor are not required to create, those Affordable units.

Unaccountable density increases do however create more speculative developer profits, and increase land costs. Density increases also increases the need for City Parks (high density by its nature depends on City Parks and Open Space for livability) along with other City services and infrastructure. Yet unaccountable density increases not does not provide actual Affordable housing. So at the next City Housing Element even more Affordable Housing will be required since the prior unaccountable density increases did not create it. During this unaccountable process vacant land disappears. That vacant land is vitally needed to provide City Parks to balance and provide useable park space for residents in high density apartments/condos.

The City Staff's documents that one of the Site 18 land owners/developers are requesting an increase in land use density to R-23 that is to provide housing Affordable to Moderate Incomes. Yet there is no developer commitment or City requirement to create the numbers of Moderate Income housing identified in City Staff's Site 18 documentation.

There is no accessible City Park in the area to provide the needed City Park and open space needed for higher density development – the 'Veterans Park solution is 6-miles away and is effectively unusable for citizens at Ponto.

- "We'd like your input on 18 proposed locations for future housing chosen based on public input gathered last year."

Input: Site 18, was not a site 'chosen based on public input gathered last year', but was just recently chosen by a speculative developers of Site 18. As staff documents: "Staff has received a letter from one property owner expressing support for higher density." Site 18 consists of 8 properties, so it is unclear if all 8 properties are requesting higher density. Site 18 is being proposed as a "Moderate Income housing site" (i.e. a site that will provide 90 dwelling units [DU] affordable to Moderate Incomes as noted in the City Staff's analysis:

"Potential Housing: Site 18

Site Description: Vacant

Property Name: North Ponto Parcels

Site Group Acres: 5.9

Potential units site can accommodate (all parcels): 90

Income Category: Moderate (based on proposed minimum density)”

There is no copy of the ‘letter’ showing an accountable Affordable rental or developer commitment, or a requirement by the City that Site 18 will be developed and rented or sold to provide the 90 dwellings Affordable to Moderate Income as noted above. If the Site 18 developers would commit to recording providing that affordability it would be a responsible and accountable Affordability quid pro quo for consideration.

- The City Staff report also does not discuss the various land uses changes to increase density in a properly holistic or fully comprehensive planning way. All sites should be compared on all the key metrics for suitability. For high density housing, the most fundamental metric is walkability to a meaningful City Park for outdoor recreation and breathing room. This is fundamental in that high density housing, by definition has little/no park and recreational open space - high density means many people living on a small area of land. High density without significant large and usable City Parks within walking distance simply creates dense urban environments that over time will not sustain quality of life.

In addition for Site 18 and other at the Coast locations there are other land use demands of large inland populations or families and visitors come to the Coast and increase even more demands for City Parks. A comprehensively considered Coastal Land Use Plan needs to assure vacant and redevelopable lands along the Coast provide sufficient Park land acreage for local Park needs (i.e. high density development requires more Park acreage), but also to provide extra Park acreage to address the Park needs of hundreds of thousands of inland residents and visitors to the Coast. Densifying the Coast with high density residential development runs counter to this need for Coastal Parks.

The following email and attached images were submitted on 9/8/21 that illustrate the City Parks needs generated by R-23 higher density and why it is important to provide meaningful City Parks within walking distance to higher density development.

Thank you for your consideration. You say it is Our Home Our Future. We hope you do the right thing for present and future generations of Carlsbad and CA citizens and visitors. Please do not let short-term and short sighted silo thinking lead to a bad decisions on the use of the last bit of vacant coastal land.

Respectfully,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 11:55 AM

To: 'CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov';

'Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'scott.donnell@carlsbadca.gov'

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'; Mehmood, Sohab@HCD (Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov); McDougall, Paul@HCD (Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov); 'McDonell, Glenn'; Moran, Gina@Parks (Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov); Smith, Darren@Parks (Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov); Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov)

Subject: Why a park is needed within walking distance to multifamily housing & why a meaningful Coastal Park is needed for Ponto/South Carlsbad - public input to DLCPA, Housing and Park planning

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Commission and Housing Commission; and CA Coastal Commission:

I request this email and attachments be provided as official public input to the Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, Housing Element land use changes, Parks Master Plan Amendment, and land use activities at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad.

For many years Carlsbad and People for Ponto Citizens have been trying to communicate the need for a meaningful Coastal Park for South Carlsbad. There is NO City Coastal Park west of I-5/rail corridor in South Carlsbad (yet there are 10 such City Parks totaling over 35 acres in North Carlsbad). The Citizens and visitors to South Carlsbad have No Coastal Park, and Ponto is the last vacant unplanned Coastal land left to provide this needed Coastal Park.

The attached images of high-density housing (R-23) in Carlsbad clearly illustrate why City Parks are needed within walking distance to multifamily housing. It also illustrates why meaningful Coastal Parks are needed to provide Coastal Recreation for a unlimited growing population that will primarily be housed by high-density housing that minimizes outdoor recreation space.

High-density housing, by definition, provides minimal outdoor recreation space per dwelling unit. So City Parks are the only meaningful sized areas where high-density housing occupants (particularly Children) can have room to play. This is particularly critical in regards to Coastal Parks, as Coastal Parks absorb the Coastal Park demands/needs from significant large inland and visitor populations. This critical need is made all the more serious given sea level rise and coastal erosion impacts to Coastal Open Space.

The State of California is advancing dense high-density housing to promote affordability, yet most of the benefits of simply increasing density tend to result in increasing developer profit margins and thus increase residual land costs as Carlsbad has seen in Carlsbad Village. The State of California Housing Law currently does not address the logical and concurrent need to both increase City Park acreage and equitably distribute that City Park acreage within walking distance to housing – particularly high-density housing.

Having a City Park within a 10-minute walk from high-density housing is vital for the long-term viability, livability, and quality of life for high-density housing and the citizens and families that live in this housing. Hopefully the City of Carlsbad can advance the concurrent increase in City Park acreage and 10-minute walk accessibility in its Coastal land use, land use, housing, and parks plans.

As a former city, coastal and urban planner having worked in high-density situations I have several planning policy ideas that maybe helpful if the City Council would like to discuss them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lance Schulte

From: City of Carlsbad [<mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com>] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad

Sent: Thursday, September 2, 2021 4:39 PM

To: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Give input on locations for future housing

OUR HOME OUR FUTURE



Give input on locations for future housing

The City of Carlsbad is seeking input on where new housing units could be built in Carlsbad to satisfy a state requirement that cities accommodate their fair share of the region's housing needs, including homes for people of all income levels and stages of life. Eighteen proposed locations were chosen based on public input gathered last year, input from a citizens advisory committee and direction from the City Council.

Of the 3,900 new housing units that make up Carlsbad's fair share, about 2,100 need to be affordable for people with very low to moderate incomes. The city had already identified vacant residential locations and planned housing projects to help meet the state's housing requirement, but it wasn't enough to meet the need for 3,900 units.

[Review sites on an online map.](#)

Community members have three ways to provide feedback:

Survey

An [online survey](#) will be available through Oct. 1.

Virtual public workshops (held via Zoom)

Wednesday, Sept. 15, 5:30 to 7 p.m. | [Register here](#)

Wednesday, Sept. 22, 5:30 to 7 p.m. | [Register here](#)

City staff will provide an overview of the city's housing plan update process and how the potential housing sites were selected. Participants will then break into smaller groups to ask questions and provide input on the potential locations.

*Persons with a disability may request meeting materials in appropriate alternative formats as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Reasonable accommodations and auxiliary aids will be provided to effectively allow participation in the meeting(s). Please contact Sue Armstrong at 760-434-5352 (voice), 711 (free relay service for TTY users) or

sue.armstrong@carlsbadca.gov at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to discuss accessibility needs.

Comments via mail or email by Oct. 22

Scott Donnell, Senior Planner, Community Development
1635 Faraday Ave., Carlsbad, CA 92008
scott.donnell@carlsbadca.gov

The city is seeking input on proposed sites that would need to be rezoned, either to allow housing where it's not allowed today or increase the number of units allowed on sites already zoned for housing. Owners and people living within 600 feet of all the potentially affected properties have been notified by mail of the potential rezoning.

The city would not build housing on these sites. Instead, the city's obligation is to identify space for housing and create policies that would facilitate new housing to be built based on different income levels and stages of life.

Next steps

City staff will update the map of proposed sites based on community input and then share it with the City Council in early 2022 for approval to move forward with the environmental review of those sites.

- Sept. 2 - Oct. 22, 2021: Public input on potential sites for future housing
- Early 2022: City Council public meeting to receive input and consider endorsing final map(s) for environmental review
- Spring 2022 - Winter 2022/2023: Environmental review of housing sites and public input on environmental analysis document

Background

The City of Carlsbad has updated its housing plan, something required by state law to ensure the city is meeting the housing needs of all members of the community. The new plan includes policies designed to encourage the number and types of housing the state requires. It also identifies locations where new housing could be built. In all, the City of Carlsbad needs to show how about 3,900 housing units could be built over the next eight years to meet state requirements.

Learn more

- [Map of potential housing sites](#)
- [Approved housing plan](#) (policies and strategies)
- [Housing plan update website](#)
- Scott Donnell, senior planner, scott.donnell@carlsbadca.gov, 760-602-4618



[Visit the Website](#)



City of Carlsbad | 1200 Carlsbad Village Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

[Unsubscribe info@peopleforponto.com](mailto:info@peopleforponto.com)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by planning@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mick Calarco

Subject: Carlsbad Citizen Questions and request to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions for Carlsbad Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA-Housing Element & Parks Master Plan Updates - 11-30-2020

Attachments: 2020 Nov 30 - Draft Housing Element Update - People for Ponto Public Comments.pdf; #1 - Carlsbad FY 2019-20 Budget Public Input Report - Summary analysis for Public Comments on Budget-DLCPA-PMU.pdf; #2 - South Carlsbad Ponto Beach Park Letter of Request - SPCA 2017 Aug 17.pdf; #3 - 2020-11-30 Citizen Questions and request for Carlsbad on Draft LCP-LUPA-Housing Element and Parks Master Plan Updates.pdf; #4 - 2020 Jan 28 Carlsbad CC meeting item #14 public testimony1.pdf; #5 - Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto additional Comments - Coastal Recreation w - 1.pdf; #6 - Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - Public Comments - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations.pdf; #7 - 2020 Sept 14 public inout to Carlsbad-CCC-HCD on DLCP-LUPA-HEU-PMPU.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2020 2:14 PM

To: Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Mike Pacheco' <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; david.decordova@carlsbadca.gov; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Lisa Urbach <lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; Planning <Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov>

Cc: McDougall, Paul@HCD <Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov>; Mehmood, Sohab@HCD <Sohab.Mehmood@hcd.ca.gov>; Bret Schanzenbach <Bret@carlsbad.org>; Kathleen@carlsbad.org

Subject: RE: Carlsbad Citizen Questions and request to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions for Carlsbad Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA-Housing Element & Parks Master Plan Updates - 11-30-2020

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning Commission, Housing Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Element Advisory Committee, CA Coastal Commission & HCD:

Attached is 2020 Nov 30 public input on the Draft Housing Element Update, and Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment and Parks Master Plan Amendment. Because the Draft Housing Element Update refers and relates to and is thus connected with these other processes, particularly the Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment process, the comments are sent to all.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

Submitted: May 28, 2020

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and Coastal Commission:

The City Budget should address both short-term Covid-19 impacts, and near/longer-term investments needed for Economic Recovery and Revitalization.

The quality of our Carlsbad coastline, Coastal Parks and open spaces are continually rated by Carlsbad citizens and businesses as the critical foundation of our quality of life, economic strength, and tourism industry. Ponto Coastal Park is a critically needed investment, and the last opportunity for the City to make an investment for Carlsbad's long-term sustainability. South Carlsbad Citizens, visitors, and the Visitor Industry have no Southern Coastal Park. Ponto is the only place to provide that needed investment for residents and visitors, and advance Economic Recovery and Revitalization of South Carlsbad's significant Visitor Industry. Coastal Recreation is the major attraction for visitors.

With these understandings we submit the following testimony and data from the City's FY 2019-20 Budget Public Input Report that highlights the documented significant number of citizens asking for a Ponto Coastal Park. We also note concerns about the Report's dilution of specific citizen input provided at both the March 4, 2019 and 2020 Citizen Workshops.

Citizen input on the need for a Ponto Coastal Park was the most numerous specific place need/desire citizens mentioned in the City's:

- Budget Public Input process,
- Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment process, and
- Parks Master Plan Update process.

The Budget Public Input process documented 85 specific, verbatim citizen comments on Ponto area park needs and over 90% of citizen requests that Council budget to address this need. These 85 Verbatim Citizen comments (listed at the end of this testimony and data) specifically address how they would like their (Park) tax dollars budgeted. Additionally, 2,500 similar public input email/petitions were submitted as public comments on Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment and Park Master Plan Update processes spoke to the need for a Ponto Coastal Park.

As you know, the 11-acre Ponto Planning Area F site is for sale. This site is similar in size/shape as Holiday Park, providing a Coastal site for similar multipurpose community functions.

Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (and thus General Plan and Zoning Code) requires the City to first consider and document the need for a "Public Park" before any land use can be planned for the Planning Area F site.

The City's Park Master Plan already documents the need for a Ponto "Public Park", showing the area as "unserved" by City Parks and an area of Park "inequity" correlating well with Citizen input.

The City also received offers of potential donations, or cost-saving collaborations from Carlsbad Citizens and non-profits to advance the much needed Ponto Coastal Park. The City disappointingly has not replied to these special opportunities.

Therefore, it is requested the City budget for a Ponto Coastal Park and contact the Planning Area F landowner regarding site purchase.

Consistent with Budget Public Input Report page 3 it is requested that this this testimony and data be provided to the Planning and Parks Commissions; and Coastal Commission as public input on the City Staff's proposed 1) City Budget, 2) Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, and 3) Parks Master Plan Update.

Thank you.
People for Ponto

The following data is from the Carlsbad FY 2019-20 Budget Public Input Report:
<https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=38546>

In reading the data different text treatment is used to differentiate between actual page number and text in the Report, Important Report text, and public comments and analysis of Report text. Following is a legend to those text treatments:

- (p.X) is the Report page number where the information is found, and normal text is the actual Report text.
- Text in **Bold Face** is particularly important Report text.
- **Arrow bullets and Text in Bold Italic Text** are analysis and comments on the Report's information.

Introduction (p. 3):

- **Members of the public have a right to be involved in decisions affecting their lives.**
- **It is the city's responsibility to seek out and facilitate the involvement of those interested in or affected by a decision. The city errs on the side of reaching out to people who might not be interested, rather than potentially missing people who are.**
- **City staff provide balanced and factual information to the public and do not engage in advocacy.**
- **Public dialogue strives for a focus on values over interests and positions.**
- **Public involvement planning is coordinated across all city departments to ensure consistency and avoid process fatigue.**

On (p. 5) specific Verbatim Public Input was generalized by City Staff as follows:

Main Themes: The following themes were a high priority overall:

- **Neighborhood quality of life**
- **Access to nature, trails and open space**
- Environmental sustainability
- Traffic and mobility

Most Important Services: City services in the following areas were identified as the most important:

- **Neighborhood quality of life**
- **Parks and recreation**
- Law enforcement
- Fire and paramedic service

- Environmental sustainability

Specific Areas for Budget Enhancement: When asked which services they would like to see enhanced in next year's budget, the top five responses were:

- **Neighborhood quality of life**
- **Parks and recreation**
- **Environmental sustainability**
- **Mobility/transportation**
- Arts and culture

- *The lack of a Coastal Park at Ponto impacts all South Carlsbad neighborhoods' quality of life. Carlsbad's Park Master Plan documents that Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad are "not served" by parks and Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is an area of park "inequity"*
- *The City and CA Coastal Commission are required to consider and document the need for a "Public Park" before any planning to allow any land use on Ponto Planning Area F. For over 10-years the City failed to disclose and follow this requirement – making multiple "Ponto planning mistakes". The City will now have to correct its multiple "Ponto planning mistakes" as part of the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment*
- *The lack of a Park at Ponto also impacts both Environmental Sustainability and Mobility/Transportation:*
 - *Prevents parks within walking distance, forces driving (and the need for more parking in our Park) to access parks.*
 - *Forces South Carlsbad Neighborhoods to drive long distances to North Carlsbad and/or Encinitas to access a Coastal Park*
 - *Congests North Carlsbad and/or Encinitas Coastal Parks with South Carlsbad Coastal Park demands*
 - *Congests North Carlsbad and/or Encinitas roadways and parking facilities with South Carlsbad Coastal Park demands.*
 - *Importantly, it would forever negatively impact the economic sustainability of Carlsbad's Visitor industry. There are thousands of inland South Carlsbad resort/hotel rooms that have no access to a Coastal Park. This will ultimately undermine the attractiveness and competitiveness of South Carlsbad's Visitor industry and the tax revenue the City receives from that industry.*

Word Maps (pp 6-8)

Staff provided 3 'word maps' saying the show the words mentioned at the March 4th 2020 workshop attend by 38 citizens.

- *There is citizen concern about the accuracy of these word maps and what is conveyed on pages 6-8 of the Report.*
- *Several of those 38 citizens, provided specific written (individual index cards) and verbal (round table flip chart notes) Pubic Input several stating the need for a "Ponto Coastal Park", another mentioned a "liner Park", and several mentioned the "Senior Center", all these written/verbal comments were not accurately documented or reported on pages 6-8. It appears the City Staff interrupted and translated/transformed the actual citizen comments (as documented in the index cards and flip chart notes) when creating the word maps. There is a concern that specific citizen input provided at the actual workshop was not accurately*

- Poinsettia Park: 2 times, this is 2% as much as Ponto area
- Veterans Park: 2 times, this is 2% as much as Ponto area
- Rancho Carrillo: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area
- Hub Park: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area
- Crossings Golf Course: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area
- Robertson Ranch: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area
- Palomar Airport: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area

➤ ***As the Budget Public Input Report suggests, reading of each of the Verbatim Comments of actual public input should be done. The place names area specific list above does not include broad places such as “beaches” the names of specific roads, and other names that appeared vague. It is clear in reading through and counting the place name references that the Ponto area expressed as Ponto, Zone 9 (i.e. Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9), and the coastal park references to Southwest Carlsbad and South Carlsbad was by far the greatest area of public input. This makes perfect sense in that for half of the City Ponto is the last significant vacant Coastal land available to address two of Carlsbad Citizens’ most important budget concerns ‘Neighborhood quality of life’ and ‘Parks and recreation’ that relate to core community values around Carlsbad’s “Beach”, “small beach town character”, and “valued open space”.***

Following is the listing of the Verbatim Public Input (Appendix A in Public Input Report, pp 24-91) that specifically referenced Ponto or a clear reference to Ponto such as Zone 9 or Coastal Park needs in Southwest Carlsbad. There are many more comments such as “The purchase of remaining open space for preservation of the last remaining coastal areas.” that logically and clearly refers to the Ponto situation. However these many additional comments were excluded from the list below since they did not specifically mention Ponto, Zone 9, or SW Carlsbad place names.

Of the 85 citizen comments below specifically referencing Ponto, 77 or 90.6% were asking the City to budget for a Ponto Coastal Park. Only 8, or 9.4% of those citizen comments were not asking for a Ponto Coastal Park. We are not sure if the 8 commenters knew about the City’s now acknowledged “Ponto planning mistakes” dating back over the past 10-years, as the City only first briefly acknowledged this recently on 1/28/20. We have found once citizens are truly aware of the facts and prior “Ponto planning mistakes” there is almost uniform desire for a Ponto Coastal Park. There is citizen concern that these “Ponto planning mistakes” are not being fully, openly and accurately being disclosed to Citizens during the various Public Input processes, thus tainting those Public Input processes.

Verbatim Ponto City Budget Public Input from pages 24-91 of FY 2019-20 Budget Public Input Report:

1. My biggest disappointment is the lack of park facilities in my section of the city, near South Ponto Beach. Lots of open land but no park within at least 2 miles. This should be a city priority
2. It used to be the beach but now Ponto & South Carlsbad are more like rocky shores. I’d like to see the rocks cleared up and more sand added to these beaches
3. COMMENT TRAFFIC IS BEING SPAMMED HERE TO PUSH THIS PONTO PARK PLOY (PPP) Develop Ponto and have the hotel maintain our beach! It’s all rocks currently!
4. Ponto Beach. We do NOT need a commercial development or hotel there. That needs to be a park and/or open space for future generations.

5. Ponto beach.
6. Don't ruin South Ponto Beach with condos and/or hotel, need to restore the sand on the beach.
7. Like most residents and visitors I treasure the beach. I feel the highest priority should be open space and parks that serve the beach region. Particularly important is the open space still available in the Ponto region. There is ample space here for an extraordinary area of open space and even a park. There is not one of either of these in the southwest quadrant near the beach. Children cannot walk safely to a park from that area. Open space and a park in the Ponto area would serve all residents, visitors, and the business community.
8. Beaches, parks, safe neighborhoods, OPEN SPACE! Need Beach parks like Del Mar Powerhouse/Sea Grove Park & Encinitas Community Park. Ponto Beach needs some attention.
9. I love the beach and the parks and fields and open space and hiking trails in Carlsbad. I wish we had more!! We have had 3 kids in sports in Carlsbad. Currently, field/park space is very limited and often over committed. Currently, there aren't enough fields to meet the need of the community. Adding more parks and fields would create a better community in the following ways.... The sports played on these fields help keep our kids fit and healthy; It keeps kids busy and out of trouble; It fosters friendships and community; it teaches team work and fosters dedication and teaches a willingness to help others succeed; it brings in community \$\$ from other teams who come to play on Carlsbad fields; It's a wonderful way to showcase our city to others who will want to return thus helping grow tourism. Additional Parks would offer the same benefits. We do not need more high density building. And, Please do NOT ruin Ponto with more building!!!!!!
10. We love the beach and the small-town feel Carlsbad has. We love the scattered open spaces and trails. Carlsbad is a great place to live and spend time outdoors, like the Ponto area. Let's keep it that way by not developing every last square foot into a condo complex, hotel or shopping mall, if that's what you want please move to Oceanside.
11. Let us protect the valuable open space that is left and not develop every square inch. Especially at the beach, let us save the land across the coast highway from Ponto Beach and make a beautiful park, not more condos and hotels. Carlsbad is in great financial shape and does not need to go after every development and tax dollar it can get. Some things are more important, like quality of life, than a fat wallet. I know that this will fall upon deaf ears amongst the two older members of the City Council, but maybe some rearranging of priorities is in order.
12. Would love to see the last areas of open land to stay that way. I have lived here for 25 years and have seen a tremendous amount of development eating away at the open beauty of the area. We have enough shopping centers and homes. Please leave the area at Ponto open and do not approve the Ponto development.
13. Keep Ponto Beach development free!
14. Preserving Open Space and Building Ponto Park in the South West Quadrant!
15. I second Tisha Klingensmith's comment and all the others regarding Ponto Beach development.
16. Preserving open space and maintaining high quality Parks and Rec with park location emphasis on geographical location. It's time to build a park in the SW quadrant near the beach for locals and visitors alike. Veterans Park is not a solution for each quadrant's deficiency, particularly in the south.
17. We need more parks, especially in southwest Carlsbad!
18. I agree, we need more parks and open space. I live in Zone 9 and don't have a park anywhere within walking distance.
19. We need to continue to preserve open space and NOT develop Ponto into an awful condo complex. We would love a park!

20. We need a park in the Ponto area and not a development. It is the last open space next to the beach left
21. I agree with the need to preserve open space throughout Carlsbad and NOT develop Ponto into awful condo complex.
22. We need to preserve our open space --it's what keeps the city feeling like a small town. We need more parks -esp one at Ponto in the SW quad!
23. Preserve the open space and build a park in SW quadrant at Ponto. We do not need or want any more huge developments, especially right by the beach in one of the last remaining open spaces. Once it's built, you can't un-build it. Build Ponto Park in SW quadrant. Do the right thing. Especially for our children and grandchildren. They won't thank us for building outrageously tall high density condos, hotels and unnecessary shops right by our gorgeous beaches. The only people this benefits are some wealthy developers, not the people of Carlsbad. Think long term, not short term. We have a beautiful city and community-preserve it now or it's gone forever!
24. We really need a park in the southwest quad by the beach. This could be an amazing asset (on SO many levels) for the community and visitors alike. The revenue stream would return the city investment in spades!
25. Parks. Needed in Ponto area our children in this area don't have a close park. And the house lots in our area are small.
26. I agree that we should be very mindful that the citizens of Carlsbad voted out the retail space plan at the power plant site a few years ago. The new Ponto project should not replace that. Citizens should be part of the decision to build out that area
27. We need to preserve our open space and we need a park at Ponto!
28. We need a park in the Southwest quadrant of our community. Safety in the community is what we like best in this area
29. Carlsbad's small town feel, friendly atmosphere and location has made it our ideal place to live for the past 20 years, We live across from South Ponto Beach and DESPERATELY need a park for our area residents. It would be sad to see the area overbuilt with high density projects and not retain some of the open space at this southern entrance to our "Village by the Sea". PLEASE help preserve some of its appeal before it is too late.
30. I love the quaintness of the Village, the open land areas, trails, small businesses and the arts. A huge NO to PONTO. Please stop the excessive building and development of the open areas of our beautiful and unique city. We have lived here for over 30 years and are sad to see so much over development. Keep our special village a village, and please don't turn it into another ordinary city.
31. Favorite is small town feel and the beach --the beach provides us with all the open space we need. The city has enough open space with all the lagoons, etc. --we don't need any more parks --especially at PONTO --I am thrilled to see and drive by every day the new resort at La Costa which is in Encinitas and that is what we need here at the South end of Carlsbad --more residential --NO more open space
32. What I love about Carlsbad is that it has a small village feel but it also has the beach and some restaurants and then little town. I really would like more to walk to around the Ponto area. Specifically I think it should be more of a beat centered area with places to grab ice cream or grab some food or a coffee and walk to the beach.
33. I love that our village that is not a strip of 101. The quaint cottages helped Carlsbad have a downtown feel. It has several streets with unique interest. I love the Trees on Grand! The landscape of the trees setting the height of the town. Unfortunately the taller buildings are killing that. Vertical dwellings are taking over.. think of the reason you travel to Europe. It's not

for Developers Generica. We also want the NRG power plant space into a Park... and... I would LOVE for the city to finish the rail trail to Ponto. Imagine taking a trail to Ponto? It would be a dream!


34. Our San Pacifico Community and the surrounding neighborhoods need a local park. So far Carlsbad has no real performing arts venue of any size to meet the needs of a city of more than 100,000. This should be a serious consideration when the new civic center is being designed.
35. We need more coastal parks and open space. Especially in zone 9
36. protect more open space, including Ponto
37. We need Veterans Park completed and Ponto park developed. Everyone in Carlsbad is engaged and we have been talking about the park deficits for a while now. Veterans park is over-due!!!
38. Our libraries are the best in the region! But I have to put them 4th to our Neighborhood quality of life, which is being impacted by huge developments destroying our property values, our piece of mind and privacy. We do need to insure that our environment is cared for, since all of these housing projects are going in. I do love our parks but we need to insure that the SW quadrant has their share of parks (think-Ponto).
39. Zone 9 (in southwest Carlsbad) does not have a park within walking distance! I hope the City can remedy this.
40. Ponto needs a park not a hotel or more condos. Please stop building on every last piece of land
41. See previous comment concerning the lack of a local, beach oriented park in the South Ponto area. Ditto a performing arts venue.
42. PLS get the Ponto Proyect development going....., that area of Carlsbad needs it asap
43. I support Ponto Development. PLs get it going...
44. Ponto has 2 miles of unobstructed beach access and a lagoon that already act as a "park within walking distance". The Ponto project was approved long ago and is part of the citizen approved master plan. Please get it done.
45. Strengthen and protect the financial stability of the City. Businesses pay a significant amount of taxes, property, sales and income and those employed spend and live here. Encourage affordable housing opportunities for everyone, think outside the box and find some unique solutions. Complete build out in areas available, Ponto Beach is a great opportunity and the project is well thought out, get it built. And please don't become a 'Nanny City' and waste time to pass frivolous laws restricting straws, plastic bags, soda consumption, etc.
46. Development of open space and parking space in the Ponto region
47. Specifically, I want the city to remedy the lack of equal access to parks and trails evident in the southwest quadrant of the city. I support a park project at Ponto: in the long run, the south coastal gateway to Carlsbad needs a welcoming park with beach access and supporting facilities. Though less extensive than Village beach areas, good design would merge a Ponto park with access to beach and access to the 'memorial area on the bluff at city border with the ecology of the Batiquitos Lagoon adjacent to make a marvelous creek to beach environment accessible for all and ever.
48. There are two miles of unobstructed beach plus the lagoon within "walking distance" of the neighborhoods near Ponto. The project was approved long ago and is part of the Master Plan approved by the citizens of Carlsbad. Zoning changes and project vote downs are often just another way to steal private property.
49. Local park deficits continue to be a problem. Let's please support Ponto Park development. We as a city are losing an unobstructed landmark in our community. Please share some of that with local residents. And, did I mention parking??
50. The extreme southwestern (Ponto) area of Carlsbad does not have a park within walking distance -this is my top priority to fix.

51. We have wonderful neighborhood parks, but not in Ponto and it's on the beach; Veteran's Park is more of a hiker/nature lover's place to enjoy nature.
52. We need a park at Ponto - to serve not only residents, but visitors and tourists.
53. A park is much needed in SW Quadrant of the city
54. Ponto Park. So much has been done for businesses, tourism, etc. This is the last bit of Carlsbad coast line left. And the residents could use more park space in the south part of the City. I don't want to see this area developed. Carlsbad has become overdeveloped.
55. I want to see a park for the Ponto road area. I feel that that area should not be used for condo - residential development. It is so important to showcase that wonderful piece of property, which is so rare to find all up the coast of Calif. and would be a welcomed park for all as you drive north into Carlsbad. ALSO I am very concerned that the Palomar Airport and the larger airplanes the new plan will bring and ask that the city stay involved to support our concerns, thank you for help I appreciate all off the councils work.
56. Ponto area open space and park development
57. Take control of our coastline, bring fire rings to Ponto beach, every family should have the experience of gathering around a roaring fire on evening.
58. Cancel the Ponto development tragedy. Build a free park and keep the free beach parking there.
59. Buy the land for open space on Ponto Drive and build a park in Zone 9 that has no park even though developers paid into the park fees for 20 + years.
60. support Ponto development
61. Now that we have removed the jetty and allowed Warm Waters to wash away, and now we are planning to build on Ponto, where will locals access the beach? If 50% of responders stated the beach is the best part of Carlsbad living, why are continually squandering this gift? I know the council would live to sell Agua Hedionda to a developer too. When will there be decisions made to maintain our quality of life? Furthermore, I selected transportation because my commute time has DOUBLED in the past 5 years. The 55mph speed limit on El Camino is a joke. It takes me 2 light cycles just to cross each intersection now due to this unmitigated growth with no regard for how people will get around. I'm continually dismayed by this city.
62. Preserve the open space at Ponto. Keep traffic under control.
63. Preserve open space in zone 9
64. Money for persevering open space in zone 9 and building parks in the SW quadrant!
65. More parks and open space in Southwest Carlsbad!
66. Why another proposed hotel at Ponto? There are an abundance of hotels & stores already available ---even more than necessary. Preserving nature & some green space is more important than more concrete & businesses with "lease available" signs everywhere!
67. Prop to aid Ponto to keep it natural, as park area & natural habitat.
68. Put budget money towards Parks and Recreation, specifically Preserving Open Space in Zone 9 and Building #PontoPark in the SW Quadrant (p 84)
69. Please put budget money towards Parks and Recreation, specifically Preserving Open Space in Zone 9 and Building #PontoPark in the SW Quadrant (p 85)
70. need a park in the southwest Carlsbad post development
71. Parks in southwest Carlsbad!
72. Zone 9's lack of park and open space is sad. The SW quadrant needs more places to take kids to play, seniors to walk and get outside, and for the community to gather. A park at Ponto would be an ideal place for that and would make for a beautiful and welcoming entry into Carlsbad for locals and tourists.
73. We need a park site near Ponto Beach on the property now slated for a 5 star hotel which has not been built despite attempts by several developers over the last ten plus years.

74. Please spend more on Parks and Recreation. We need to Preserve Open Space in Zone 9 and Build Ponto Park in the SW Quadrant. We do not need more homes congesting the already packed Coast Hwy. Adding sand to Ponto Beach would be nice too -too rocky!
75. I'm asking the City to put budget money towards Parks and Recreation, specifically Preserving Open Space in Zone 9 and Building #PontoPark in the SW Quadrant -this will enhance the quality of life in Carlsbad, contribute to the highest and best use, meet the requirement to have a park in this area, and make the area so desirable that it will allow raising of local tax rates (I don't believe I'm saying this). Best Regards, David Johnson
76. Put some park and playgrounds in SW Carlsbad. There are none near Ponto, yet there are open spaces, near Avenida Encinas and 101. Nothing to walk to. Thank you
77. We could really use a park in southwest Carlsbad especially the San Pacifico area. Thank you
78. Work toward filling the deficit in parks and open space in the Southwest part of Carlsbad, especially Ponto.
79. Would truly love the Ponto Beach Park! As a resident of South Carlsbad we need this!!!
80. There are no Parks in South Carlsbad. We are neglected here yet I pay very high taxes.
81. Build a Park at Ponto! Keep the open space!
82. I would like to see the city buy the Ponto property and develop it into a park.
83. Build a park at ponto
84. Appropriate development of open space and park space in the Ponto region. We are currently at huge deficit of both of these in the Ponto region
85. We are very quickly running out of open space. This is probably one of the most beautiful areas in the country, we need to preserve that beauty and maintain some open space. The open land near South Ponto beach must be preserved. There are no parks in the area, developing that area would not only add to the pollution but it would sacrifice one of the most beautiful parts of Carlsbad. Towns and Cities across the country are prioritizing open space that is so important, it is time we did that in Carlsbad. We need open space near Ponto Beach.

A few of the many Citizens asking the City Council to budget for a much needed Ponto Coastal Park







August 31, 2017

To:

Carlsbad City Council council@carlsbadca.gov

Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Commission at mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov

Carlsbad Planning Commission at Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov

Kevin Crawford, City Manager at manager@carlsbadca.gov

Chris Hazeltine, Parks & Recreation, City of Carlsbad chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov

Don Neu, Planning, City of Carlsbad Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov

Subject: City Park Standard in Southwest and South Carlsbad

Dear Carlsbad City Council:

The San Pacifico Community Association (SPCA) represents over 450 homes (around 1,000 Citizens) in the Southwest Quadrant/Park District of Carlsbad, and is the primary component and stakeholder of the Poinsettia Shores Planned Community (Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program). SPCA supported the residents in creating the Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee (PBDRC) to:

- Provide information to all San Pacifico residents (and surrounding neighborhoods) on the developments. (See www.PontoLocals.com)
- Obtain and consolidate constructive feedback from the residents. Give this feedback to the residents, developers and City so that we can have productive/timely input into the projects and their designs.
- Act as a strong, unified voice and with the support of our residents in upcoming Planning, Council and Coastal Commission meetings.

Since PBDRC has been formed there has been a growing participation and concurrence from other Carlsbad areas and groups on the consensus PBDRC has consolidated.

PBDRC and the SPCA are pleased that the City has taken action to fix a timeline defect in the Growth Management Program related to meeting a City Park standard. However there is another truly once in a lifetime opportunity to improve how the City Park standard is proposed to be met in Ponto and coastal South Carlsbad that we would like to request of the City Council. This opportunity stems from the fact that Ponto is the only vacant coastal land in South Carlsbad and is currently being evaluated for low-priority housing and other types of development. Should it be developed in this way, there will never be another opportunity to have a meaningful park in coastal Southwest Carlsbad west of Interstate 5. The request is to work with Pontolocals to provide a comprehensive and open process for citizens of the City [primarily Southwest and Southeast Carlsbad Citizens] to discuss and define possible better approaches to implement a coastal park in Southwest that can serve all of South Carlsbad. We recently had a community meeting attended by approximately 200 people and this letter reflects some of the near unanimous (90%+) concerns from that meeting. We believe these concerns are also likely to be reflective of many others living in South Carlsbad, and also in North Carlsbad.

The City Park Standard is “3.0 acres of Community Park or Special Use Area per 1,000 population **within the Park District**”. So for every 1,000 Citizens in a Park District, such as the coastal Southwest Quadrant Park District, there is to be 3 acres of City Park to meet the standard. The rationale for such a location specific standard is that parks should be distributed so as to be reasonably accessible by all citizens. It is also important to have reasonable and safe park access via walking and biking, not just by motor vehicles. The staff report on correcting the timeline defect in the Park Standard stated that correcting the timeline to correct the park quadrant deficits is “... specifically relevant to the southwest and southeast quadrants. As stated in the report a need for more park acreage in those two quadrants was identified four years ago (during FY 2012-13).” A 6.6 acre park deficit within the Southwest quadrant was identified in the Growth Management Monitoring Report for FY 2014-15. However the report indicates that “Based on the Fiscal Year 2015-16 Capital Improvement Program list of projects, Veteran’s Memorial Park (91.5 acres, with 22.9 acres applied to each quadrant) is proposed to be constructed prior to buildout.” Under this proposal the future Veteran’s Park, that is located in the Northwest Park District and located many miles away from the coastal Southwest and Southeast Quadrants and Park Districts, would be used to meet the population and citizen demand for Parks for citizens within the coastal Southwest and Southeast Quadrant’s Park Districts. We know there is an outstanding opportunity for the City to do a great thing for the community and to add tremendous value to the quality of life by augmenting, enhancing, and/or adjusting planned park supply to better serve citizens and the City; and be more consistent with the General Plan and core values of the Growth Management Plan.

The fundamental intent of creating four Park Districts (one for each quadrant) and managing and matching demand and supply of City Parks into smaller geographical areas (quadrant park districts) is to make the supply of City Parks reasonably accessible to their demand and more equitably distributed for citizens. Equitable distribution of City Park facilities is the right thing to do and has many citizen and city benefits:

- Children and elderly can more easily walk and bike to City Parks when they are close by and within a safe walking and bicycling distance with properly designed access pathways;
- Park supply created so far away from park demand creates the need to drive in a car to access the park, thus increasing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Depending on locations this also limits park access for citizens without cars or unable to drive;
- When city parks are accessible to their demand by walking/bicycling then less city park land is needed to park cars. Citizens get more actual useable park space for each acre of park land;
- When city parks are close to their demand busy families can quickly get to them after their workday which allows more park time for families during busy weekends;
- Nearby city parks create a stronger sense of stewardship for the “neighborhoods” park and city parks in general. Citizens watch out and care for their nearby park;
- Nearby city parks that are equitably distributed and based on surrounding neighborhood demand serve to strengthen neighborhood quality and property values by providing park amenities close by. It is both a good neighborhood and economic development strategy to assure park demand and supply are locationally matched; and
- Fundamentally it is the right thing to do to place park demand and supply in close proximity to each other and promote and equitable distribution public facility demand and supply.

In coastal Southwest Carlsbad and South Carlsbad we have some glaring gaps in demand and supply of city parks. For instance:

The Carlsbad General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, Figure 4-3 Parks: Shows no existing or planned coastal parks or special use areas west of Interstate 5 for all of South Carlsbad. In North Carlsbad there are 10, parks and special use areas west of Interstate 5 and on or close to the beach (9 of these are existing parks and 1 is a future park). This seems a clear and inherently unfair distribution of coastal park facilities. This unfair distribution severely reduces critical access to coastal park open space near the beach for South Carlsbad Citizens (half the City and over 26,000 homes, and over 64,000 citizens).

This unserved demand for city park space in coastal South Carlsbad is evidenced by the dangerous use of the Carlsbad Boulevard [old highway 101] road shoulder and bike lanes and campground road for recreational purposes, parking demand and the frequent unauthorized recreational use of Ponto vacant land. People are using whatever land they can for needed recreational use. South Carlsbad Citizens in Aviara, La Costa, Rancho Carrillo, Bressi Ranch, La Costa Valley and all the other South Carlsbad inland neighborhoods have no coastal South Carlsbad City Beach Park areas to access the coast. Their only option is to drive significant distances (with increase VMT and greenhouse gas emissions) crosstown to access city beach parks in the North, or travel to Encinitas. This forces increased VMT and greenhouse gas emissions which is counter to both State and General Plan goals. Citizens in South Carlsbad only have a State Beach pay parking lot and a retreating primarily steep cobble beach as their "local" beach. The non-beach portion of the South Carlsbad State Beach campground is a road and lodging facility for primarily out-of-town visitors that are near this beach. It is not a city park. The Campground is not designed to serve the park needs of Carlsbad citizens, but is a great place primarily for visitors to affordably pay to spend nights camping near the beach. The lack of any park facilities at the campground is evidenced by the frequent use of the campground driveway (a significant area of the campground) by children and adults as a play area.

There is an added benefit in that adding a coastal South Carlsbad Ponto Beach Park would help alleviate growing overcrowding, and increased traffic and parking congestion at North Carlsbad's coastal parks.

Citizens west of Interstate 5 in South Carlsbad have very limited access to a city park. Depending on the neighborhood one lives in, access our nearest park [Poinsettia Park] is between a 2 to 4 mile trip. Residents must cross Interstate 5 using one of only two crossings in the space of over 3 miles. These crossings are on major multi-lane, higher speed roadways (Poinsettia Lane or Palomar Airport Road). The route is not the most safe or direct, and it forces one to drive in a vehicle to access a park which increases VMT. Park access for children, the elderly, and those walking dogs west of Interstate 5 in South Carlsbad is severely restricted or effectively eliminated.

Coastal Southwest and all of South Carlsbad have not met their quadrant's Park area standard since 2012 (per the City's Growth Management Program). A specific comprehensive and open discussion with the Southwest and all if South Carlsbad citizens on how that deficient should be resolved should occur. The current City solution to meet local park needs of coastal Southwest and South Carlsbad with a paper allocation of park acreage in the Northwest part of the City that is many miles away does not seem right. It seems inconsistent with the core values and Vision of our City.

From Carlsbad General Plan Community Vision:

"...the Carlsbad Community Vision, which is the foundation for this plan." This is the foundation for the General Plan.

“...In the future, ... social connections will be enhanced through ... more public gathering places, family-friendly activities, and open spaces within walking distance of people’s homes ...”

“The community is proud of the exceptional amount of open space in the city, and envisions a future of continued City commitment to open space protection and strategic acquisitions to further the city’s open space system.”

“Parks, Fields, and Facilities for All Ages: The network of parks and recreation facilities will be improved to meet the community’s active lifestyle needs. Such improvements may include the strategic addition of more parks, ... New facilities will be located to maximize use and access by all neighborhoods, tailored to the needs of local populations, and designed with all ages in mind.”

“Beach Uses and Improvements: The beach is an important outdoor recreational resource, and protecting and enhancing access to the beach and the quality of the beach experience is a top community priority.”

“ ... Access to the beach and the quality of the beach experience will be improved through new compatible and supportive uses on or in close proximity to the beach, which may include ... a park ...”

“Tailored Tourism Strategy: Tourism is an important component of the city’s economy today, and it remains an attractive economic sector for the future since it emphasizes the very resources that make the city attractive to existing residents—the ocean and beach ...”

“Easy and convenient pedestrian connections will be available from every neighborhood to help children get safely to schools and parks.”

From General Plan Land Use Element:

“Beach Access and Activity: ...the community expressed an overwhelming preference for an active waterfront development strategy, which provides opportunities for activities and uses to be more integrated with the ocean. ... Access to the beach will be enhanced through ... open space, parking, and amenities ...”

General Plan Land Use Policy: “2-G.20 Develop an active ocean waterfront, with new growth accommodated west of Interstate 5, to enable residents and visitors to enjoy more opportunities for ... recreating along the coastline. Develop public gathering places and recreational opportunities along the coastal corridor.”

The City’s Park and Recreation Master Plan includes many areas of direction that strongly support a coastal park west of interstate 5 in South Carlsbad. Many of the most important park facilities and program needs identified in the City’s Park and Recreation Master Plan could be most efficiently addressed with a coastal park in the Ponto area. There are also significant and unique opportunities to create both public/private and public/public partnerships that would not only help reduce City recreation costs but also expand and create unique and special recreational program opportunities currently identified in the City’s Park and Recreation Master Plan.

A Ponto city coastal park also implements a major General Plan policy which calls for an active waterfront and creates solutions to long standing Local Coastal Program policy and State Parks Campground issues. There are very unique and special land use compatibility opportunities and synergy from a coastal city park in south Carlsbad and Ponto area that are inline and implement high priorities identified in the City's Park and Recreation Master Plan.

In summary, Carlsbad has a once in a generation opportunity to create very special coastal South Carlsbad Ponto Beach Park in South Carlsbad. This opportunity will be true to our Carlsbad Community Vision and General Plan and the heart and soul of our Growth Management Plan's standard of matching park demand with park supply within a particular park district. We believe this request benefits not only coastal Southwest Carlsbad and South Carlsbad but all of Carlsbad and is more consistent with the City General Plan, Growth Management Program, and Parks Master Plan and will result in a better, more valued and more sustainable City.

We are a key Stakeholder in Ponto and the Poinsettia Shores Maser Plan and Local Coastal Program. We have been hearing similar concerns from other Carlsbad citizens about coastal beach park access and request that the City Council seize this opportunity to work with us to establish a comprehensive and open community discussion about the strategic acquisition of a coastal South Carlsbad Ponto Beach Park for South Carlsbad citizens and businesses. We also request before a solution to the 2012 Southwest quadrant park standard deficit is created we have an open citizen discussion with the Citizens of coastal Southwest Carlsbad on how that solution can better address the park demand created in the Southwest Park District with a better park supply created within that District. Like our City Park Standard says: "3.0 acres of Community Park or Special Use Area per 1,000 population **within the Park District**". We request that a coastal City Park West of Interstate 5 be developed in South Carlsbad to be fair and equitable and to meet the needs of South Carlsbad for a coastal City Park to serve all the Citizens of South Carlsbad. This can take advantage of special land use synergies to help promote public/private collaboration, create added property and transit occupancy tax revenues for the City by creating a valuable and synergistic amenity [where none now exists] for over half the City and over 26,000 homes, along with providing support to our City's visitor serving businesses and activities. It is the right and smart thing to do.

The San Pacifico Community Association and PBDRC as key Stakeholders in Ponto wish to be a key participant any proposed City or CCC actions regarding these subjects, and would like to meet with you to see how we can discuss and advance this for the benefit of South Carlsbad Citizens. As we are citizen volunteers we sincerely appreciate advance notification to allow for preparation and coordination with our work lives and to communicate back to our members and other South Carlsbad Citizens. We wish to be notified in advance of any proposed actions related to the issues in thus letter. The San Pacifico Community Association contact information is:

San Pacifico Community Association and PBDRC
c/o Walters Management, Lee Leibenson
9665 Chesapeake Drive, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92123
lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com

The Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee conducted the research cited in this letter. Along with general communications, please contact the following if you have technical questions regarding this letter. Key Committee contact information is:

jeanscamp@yahoo.com

sebbiessixpack@att.net;

meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net

Thank you for your consideration.

San Pacifico Community Association Board of Directors:

Mr. Jim Nardi jtnardi1@msn.com

Mr. Bill Van Cleve billvancleve@prodigy.net

Mr. Adriaan van Zyl Vanzyl.aakc@live.com

Mr. Tony Ruffolo tonyruffolo616@gmail.com

Mr. Chas Wick chaswick@reagan.com

cc:

Board of Directors

California Coastal Commission at Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov and gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov

Carlsbad Citizens' questions for the City Council, Planning, Housing and Parks Commissions, & Housing Element Advisory Committee on South Carlsbad Coastal Park needs & Ponto Planning Area F relative to Carlsbad's proposed Draft LCP-LUPA, Housing Element Update, & Parks Master Plan Update

Submitted 2020 Nov 30

For some time all four (4) of the current City Council members have on multiple occasions publicly stated they think Carlsbad's current General Plan and Growth Management Plan need comprehensive updating. As one of our current Council members recently said about Ponto:

"I believe that our best strategy is to support a new Growth Management Plan and General Plan that will reflect the desires of today's residents. Our old plan has served us well but has become outdated. A revised plan could address a variety of services and infrastructure, including parks. I support an updated plan that is built on the desires of our current residents."

So the City Council considering a General Plan and Growth Management Plan change as part of Staff's proposed Draft LCP-LUPA and Housing Element relative to Ponto Planning Area F is not out of the question. There appears unanimous City Council support to consider changes to the 2015 General Plan that are 'built on the desires of our current residents.' – "including parks."

Also in showing the 2015 General Plan is not 'locked in stone' the City Council and Staff have advanced some piecemeal updates to the General Plan and Growth Management Plan. City Staff's proposed Draft Housing Element Update alone includes 13 General Plan Land Use Designation changes. But it appears the City Council has not yet provided direction to City Commissions and City Staff to start a Ponto General Plan and Growth Management Plan Update process, even though a consistent major request by significant numbers of Carlsbad Citizens since 2017.

The City Council recently split 2-2 several times on providing more substantive direction to City Staff on Ponto Park land use issues, other than unanimous agreement that the 2015 General Plan Update does not seem to be working very well in some areas like Ponto. Now with a 5th Councilmember, who represents Ponto and much of South Carlsbad, this 2-2 split will be resolved. **So, People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens are asking - and it seems very logical - that the Planning Commission, Housing Commission and Housing Element Advisory Committee, hold off on making any decisions on Ponto Planning Area F until the new full City Council has the opportunity to meet, consider, publicly discuss, and provide direction to City Staff on the City Council consensus on the 2015 General Plan Update Land Use Map that all the City Council say needs some changes – most likely at Ponto.**

Following are some data on South Carlsbad's Coastal Park needs & Ponto Planning Area F, and important policy questions to your Individual and collective decisions on Carlsbad's staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA, Housing Element Update, & Parks Master Plan Update. The data and citizen to fellow citizen policy questions are important and hope you sincerely consider them.

1. People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens have since 2017 1) documented to the City Council & CA Coastal Commission the public's consensus need for the Planning Area F Ponto Coastal Park, 2) request the City fund Ponto Coastal Park, and 3) City fully acknowledge and fix past City Ponto planning errors

that failed to disclose to citizens the since 1996 Ponto (Poinsettia Shores [aka San Pacifico Community Association] Master Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP) Planning Area F requirement to “prior to any planning activity” study/document the need for a “Public Park” at Ponto and involve citizens, particularly District 4 San Pacifico citizens, in that study. Over 2,500 emails and over 200 pages of public testimony have been submitted to Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission in support for a park in Ponto at Planning Area F. At City Council meetings on 1/28, 6/2, and 6/24/20 Carlsbad’s City Council was deadlocked in 2 to 2 ties on Ponto Park needs issues and thus rejected responding to citizen communications expressing the need and desires for Planning Area F Ponto Coastal Park. Data Slide #1 below shows the current LCP for San Pacifico’s Planning Area F.

- a. Will you consider and respect massive citizen input since 2017 that clearly documents the need and desire for Ponto Coastal Park and supports creation of Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F in your respective and interrelated and interconnected analysis and decisions?
 - b. Will you acknowledge significant citizens’ input that documents the need and desire for Ponto Coastal Park and supports creation of Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F?
 - c. Will you direct City staff to work as a partner with People for Ponto and Carlsbad Citizens in advancing Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F?
2. During the Jan 28, 2020 City Council Meeting (item #14), Carlsbad City staff for the first time as a side-bar comment admitted the City made some ‘Ponto planning errors’ going back over 15 years. Those City planning errors where first called out when the CA Coastal Commission (CCC) denied Carlsbad’s Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (the referenced foundation for Carlsbad’s 2015 General Plan Update) in 2010 in part due to the City’s mistake. The CCC’s denial conflicts with the City Staff’s interruption of the City Ponto planning process. The CCC in denying in 2010 the Ponto Vision Plan (the foundation for Carlsbad’s 2015 General Plan Update at Ponto) specifically said with direct reference to Ponto Planning Area F:

“Currently, this area [*Planning Area F*] has an Unplanned Area land use designation. In order to facilitate **any type of development in this portion of the Ponto area, an LCP amendment modifying the land use will have to be brought forward to the Commission for review and approval.**”

“... the Commission would reject such proposed uses because **there has been no evidence presented that would support the elimination of these [*Planning Area F*] areas for some lower cost overnight accommodations or public recreational amenities in the future.** The Commission's past action of **the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan specifically called for such an assessment, and none has been submitted to date.** The concerns related to the lack of lower cost overnight accommodations in Area F (ref. Exhibit #7) are further discussed in the findings later.”

“City is inadvertently sending a message to potential developers that 1) the identified development (townhouses) is the primary type of use the City will support, or 2) that development type is consistent with the current land use and zoning designations. Neither of those assumptions is correct. As the previously certified **Poinsettia Shores Master Plan states, any type of development at this location would first require an LCP amendment to establish the land use and zoning, which would have to be certified by both the City and the Coastal Commission. Additionally, the Master Plan further states that some component of the**

development at this location must consider the need for the provision of lower cost accommodations or recreational facilities.”

“While residential use is one of the land uses listed for this area in the Poinsettia Shores Specific Plan, it may not be the most appropriate designation. As previously stated, the project will at least need to consider the incorporation of some kind of lower cost accommodations, and any proposed zoning designation for the site will have to be found consistent with the policies contained in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan. Furthermore, the standard of review for any change to the current land use designation is the Coastal Act, and thus will also have to be found consistent with all its applicable policies.

Recently, the Commission has become concerned with the lack of lower-cost accommodations statewide. Thus, the establishment of a residential land use at this location may not be what is ultimately determined to be certified as consistent with the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, or the Coastal Act.”

“B. High-Priority Uses - Lower Cost Visitor Accommodations in ‘Area F’:

The Coastal Act has numerous policies promoting public access to the beach and state:

Section 30210 - In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and **recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people** consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

Section 30213 - Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. **Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.** The commission shall not: (1) require that overnight room rentals be fixed at an amount certain for any privately owned and operated hotel, motel, or other similar visitor-serving facility located on either public or private lands; or (2) establish or approve any method for the identification of low or moderate income persons for the purpose of determining eligibility for overnight room rentals in any such facilities.

Section 30221 **Oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for in the area.**

Section 30222 - **The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”**

“... in 1996, the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan was certified as part of the City's LCP, and replaced the [Visitor serving] land use designation as an "Unplanned Area." In an attempt to maintain a lower-cost visitor-serving component at this location, the Commission, through a suggested modification, required language within the Master Plan that would serve to protect this type of use. The language in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, for this location, "Area F," included: As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and

document the need for the provision of lower cost accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.”

“The Ponto Beachfront area is an area that could be considered as a high-priority location for lower cost overnight accommodations. While located across the street from a State Park (South Carlsbad State Park) containing camping facilities, during peak summer months, the campground is consistently at capacity. ... If at any time in the future, this State Beach campground is converted to day use sites, the market and the need for low cost overnight accommodations will be significantly amplified. Thus the Vision Plan, as proposed by the City, cannot be found consistent with the Coastal Act.”

“H. Conclusions: ... concerns regarding the determination of preferred land uses in an ‘unplanned’ area, the lack of provision of lower-cost accommodations and recreational uses, ... remain. All of these oversights could result in impacts to public access and recreation and other coastal resources and, therefore, the Vision Plan, as submitted, is therefore inconsistent with the Coastal Act, and therefore, shall be denied as submitted.”

The City’s past and present Ponto planning errors were not, and are still not being, fully and honestly disclosed to citizens the City’s CCC requirement on Ponto Planning Area F to “prior to ANY planning activity” (like before the Ponto Vision Plan and General Plan Update) to study Ponto’s need for a “Public Park”. The City’s past failure to accurately disclose the CCC requirements fundamentally flawed the Public Participation process by not allowing proper citizen input on the Ponto Park need. The City’s Public Participation flaws thus flawed the prior City planning efforts at Ponto. The extensive Citizen input now is a clear and obvious result of the City’s prior flawed Ponto planning process. People for Ponto Citizens had to submit and research over 40 official Carlsbad Public Records Requests to find the truth about the City’s prior flawed processes and errors at Planning Area F. The City didn’t clearly, publicly and honestly communicate to Citizens and then conduct the required Ponto Park needs before both the 2010 Ponto Vision Plan and 2015 General Plan Update as documented in Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests.

In 2010 and again in 2017, the CA Coastal Commission told the City that the City is required to correct the past planning errors at Ponto Planning Area F. Please see Data Slide #2 on page 11 for the 2017 CA Coastal Commission communication.

A critical part of the City’s past planning errors at Ponto were failures to ask Ponto and South Carlsbad Citizens for their input (Public Participation) on their Ponto Park needs as part of the City’s required ‘documented need’ study for Ponto, and if a park is needed, Ponto Planning Area F should be considered for the Park site. Citizens, now that they and been informed by Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests have now provided an overwhelmingly clear and Documented Need for Ponto Coastal Park. This LCP requirement is to be done “prior to any planning activity”. The City failed to do that in 2010, 2015, but now should do it and fully consider the overwhelming and documented Citizen need and desires for Ponto Park at Planning Area F. See Data Slides #2 & #3. The City has still not fully and broadly communicated to all Carlsbad Citizens these “Ponto planning mistakes”, nor yet disclosed and presented to Carlsbad Citizens and the Parks-Planning-Housing Commissions for their recommendations the Park needs studies for Ponto Planning Area F.

In addition the City is also required to conduct a Citywide Coastal Recreation buildout needs-supply-demand Study as required by the CA Coastal Commission in 2016. The City has yet to disclose and

present to Carlsbad citizens and the Parks-Planning-Housing Commissions for their recommendations on this Citywide Coastal Recreation buildout needs-supply-demand Study.

The City has already Documented the Park need at Ponto in its Park Master Plan - pages 86-88 shows that Ponto is both "Unserved" by City Parks, and an area of "Park Inequity".

- a. Do you think it is important for citizens to fully and honestly know the City made "Ponto planning mistakes" going back before 2010 that have impacted prior Coastal land use planning and the City's General Plan, city housing planning and City parks planning at Ponto? Given the long-term compounded nature of these City Ponto planning mistakes should the City provide a means to work with citizens, particularly the San Pacifico, Ponto and South Carlsbad Citizens most impacted by the City's prior Ponto planning mistake?
 - b. Due to past mistakes, will you recommend or direct staff to retain or revert to Planning Area F's 'existing Non-residential Reserve' Coastal land use designation in the Existing Local Coastal Program (i.e. Defer Certification) and amend the General Plan to reflect that retention/reversion until a new citizen-based Ponto planning process is completed?
 - c. Will you recommend or direct City Staff to require the citizen-based planning process to substantially and directly involve San Pacifico Community, District 4, and District 3 citizens most impacted by the lack of any City Park at Ponto, and coastal (west of I-5) South Carlsbad?
 - d. During this citizen-based Ponto planning process, will you recommend or direct City Staff to, be consistent with City and State permit streaming laws, and deny "Shopoff's" Planning Area F land use change and development application due to applicant withdrawal (by recorded Quit Claim) and inaction since 2019?
 - e. During the citizen-based Ponto planning process, will you recommend or direct City Staff to be consistent with the existing LCP and suspend all City Staff proposed land use changes on Planning Area F and retain the existing LCP 'Non-Residential Reserve' land use designation on Planning Area F?
 - f. Do you feel it is appropriate that the City is using tax-payer dollars, to change Planning Area F's land use from the existing Non-residential Reserve" to high-density residential on behalf of and to benefit the Shopoff developers, particularly while the City's Ponto planning mistakes dating back to before 2010 are not being publicly disclosed and discussed, and properly considered by City Commissions and citizens?
3. Before the above mentioned Ponto (San Pacifico's) Planning Area F Ponto Park study requirement is even presented to Citizens, the Planning, Housing and Parks Commissions, Housing Element Advisory Committee, and City Council for review and consideration, the City Staff has already proposed land use changes on Ponto/San Pacifico's Planning Area F. The City Staff's proposed land use change would allow building development with 486% more intensity and heights 33% taller than San Pacifico. The City never in the past 15+ years directly asked the San Pacifico Community Association for its input, nor directly invited/engaged San Pacifico Community Association involvement in the City's proposed land use change to San Pacifico's Planning Area F land use from its existing "Non-residential Reserve" land use. The City's proposed changes to San Pacifico's Planning Area F will fundamentally change the Character of the San Pacifico Community and neighborhood. Data Slide #4 documents both existing and City-proposed land use intensity at San Pacifico and Planning Area F.

- a. Do you think changing land use to increase density by 486% and increase building heights by 33% within an established 'planned community' like San Pacifico is appropriate?
 - b. Do you think the City should directly and fully inform, invite and encourage Planned Communities, communities and neighborhoods to participate in City proposed land use changes to Planning Areas in their Community or neighborhood?
 - c. Will you recommend or require the City planning staff to directly inform and involve the Planned Communities, communities and neighborhoods impacted by City proposed changes to their Planned (and/or unplanned) Community or neighborhoods?
4. Ponto (LFMP Zone 9) does not meet the City's Growth Management Open Space Standard, which states that when land is developed, 15% of the 'unconstrained and developable land' needs to be set aside as Open Space. Carlsbad has had this standard since 1987. Per the City's Citywide Facilities Management Plan if by 1987 Ponto had already been developed or if Ponto already had 15% of its unconstrained and developable land reserved as Open Space, the City's 1987 15% unconstrained Open Space Standard would not apply. However, City data/documentation show that neither of these 2 conditions was/is applicable, and that Ponto developers' switched land use plans that removed Growth Management Standard Open Space and thus falsely allowed a completely different land use plan to not provide the required 15% of unconstrained land as Open Space. City data very clearly show in fact that Ponto was not developed in 1987, and City GIS mapping data also clearly shows Ponto (LFMP Zone 9) is actually missing 30 acres of unconstrained Open Space as per the Growth Management Open Space Standard.

Yet, even with this City documented Open Space Standard shortfall, the City has been allowing, and continues to allow, developers to over-develop Ponto by not requiring the missing 30-acres of unconstrained Growth Management Standard Open Space be provided at Ponto. The LFMP for Zone 9 must be formally amended to account for the new added public facility impacts for the proposed change in Planning Area F land use from the existing 'Non-residential Reserve' land use to the City staff's proposed R-23 high-density residential and General Commercial land uses that were never planned for by the adopted LFMP Zone. See Data Slides #5, #6 and #7 showing actual City data on how the City's Growth Management Program Open Space Performance Standard is not being met at Ponto (LFMP Zone 9), and the City's Open Space Performance Standard and Sections 21.90.130 and 180 of the City's Growth Management Ordinance. The City's Growth Management Ordinance (Carlsbad Code 21.90.130 & 180) require the City Manager and City Council to address any situation where a Growth Management Standard is not being met – exactly like Ponto's missing 30-acres of Growth Management Standard Open Space as documented in City data on Data Slides #5 & 6. To illustrate how out of compliance with the Open Space Standard LFMP Zone 9 is City and Developers are counting a Sewage pumping station (parcel 2165606400) that pumps raw sewage as Open Space. If the City's GIS map with corresponding documentation of each Open Space parcel is desired, People for Ponto can provide and discuss that data. The City has/is being sued by others due to the City's failure to follow the 15% unconstrained Growth Management Open Space Standard. A Ponto Park at Planning Area F would help mitigate the missing Open Space. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think:

- a. the Growth Management Standard Open Space is important?

- b. the City should follow its Growth Management Ordinance, particularly, 21.90.130 & 180 and address the 30-acres of missing Growth Management Standard Open Space at Ponto?
 - c. the City should directly invite and involve Ponto Citizens in addressing and resolving Ponto's missing 30-acres of Growth Management Standard Open Space?
 - d. the City should follow the Growth Management Ordinance and suspend all development and City proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan changes at Ponto until Ponto's Open Space Performance Standard deficit and issues are resolved?
 - e. the City should temporally suspend all City proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan changes at Ponto until the lawsuit against the City is resolved?
5. As of 2020 there are 1,025 homes at Ponto and over 2,660 adults and children living in those homes. These homeowners already paid City taxes and Park-in-Lieu fees. The in-lieu fees and tax base is sufficient for the City to buy and build 8 acres of City Park. 8-acres of parkland would meet the minimum City park needs of Ponto's 3-acre/1,000 population City Park standard. Carlsbad's Park Standard is relatively low compared with the Cities of Encinitas and Oceanside. **Carlsbad allows developers to provide 40% less Parkland and collects 40% less money for parks than both Oceanside and Encinitas.** The City so far has not required Ponto developers to build these 8 acres of required park at Ponto, but instead took park-in-lieu fees to spend the money elsewhere. This is one reason why Ponto Planning Area F, was in 1996 Coastal land use zoned "Non-Residential Reserve" that requires before 'any planning activity' that proposes changing this Coastal land use zoning, that the City/Developer must consider and document the need for high-priority "Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park)" at Ponto and if needed Planning Area F could provide that "Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park)".
- a. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think it is appropriate to charge Carlsbad homeowners City park-in-lieu fees and then spend the money in areas where those same homeowners cannot effectively access the parks created by those fees?
 - b. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think Ponto homeowners deserve from the City an 8 acre park in Ponto that they already paid the City fees for, that the City's Parks Master Plan identifies as an area unserved by City Parks and park inequity, and where an overwhelming amount of Carlsbad citizens have documented their need and desire for a Ponto Park?
 - c. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think Carlsbad should have the lowest park standard relative to our adjoin Coastal cities?
 - d. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think Carlsbad developers should provide 40% less parkland than Encinitas and Oceanside developers?
6. The City's proposed Veterans Park in NW Carlsbad is being funded by fees paid by homeowners in new homes built after 1991. Since most all the homes built in Carlsbad after 1991 are in the SW, SE, and NE quadrants, most of the funding for Veterans Park is from SW, SE and NE Quadrant Homeowners. These SW, SE and NE homeowners are in Quadrants where there are current City Park acreage deficits per the City's Growth Management Parks Standard. Many of these SW, SE, and NE neighborhoods have no City Park within 10-minute walking distance from their homes. Proposed Veterans Park is from 1 - 5 miles away (as the crow fly's) and from 1.4 - 11.1 miles away (via City Streets) from the SW, SE, and NE Quadrant homeowners that paid for almost all of the proposed

Veterans Park. These distances make the proposed Veterans Park effectively unusable for children and most homeowners in SW, SE and NE quadrants.

Along with Veterans Park, there are many other areas of the City where Carlsbad homeowners pay the City park-in-lieu fees to address the local park demands created by the new development, but no local park is created by the City. The Cities of Encinitas and Oceanside both have strong Park planning policies that direct the City to provide Parks within a 10-minute walk for all homeowners. Carlsbad has no such requirement, but only documents in its Park Master Plan areas “Unserved” by Parks and areas of “Park Inequity”.

- a. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think City Staff should come up with some options for a more fair and equitable use of the Veterans Park funding paid by SW, SE, and NE homeowners so that funding actually provides Parks needed in the SW, SE, and NE and that are accessible for their children?
 - b. Both Encinitas and Oceanside have Park accessibility policies and plans to provide a City Park within a 10-minute walk from every home. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think Carlsbad should have a similar park accessibility requirement so Carlsbad children and citizens have a park within walking distance from their homes?
 - c. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think City Staff should be directed to start working with Carlsbad Citizens to create a Park Master Plan that address fixing the city’s documented “Park Inequities” in various Carlsbad neighborhoods the City documents as “Unserved” by City Parks?
7. San Pacifico’s Planning Area F in Ponto is currently for sale and can be purchased for a Park. The cost would be considerably less than the City’s proposed South Carlsbad Boulevard “promenade” using the existing median of Carlsbad Blvd. The Carlsbad Blvd roadway median although wider than most roadway medians, is still relatively narrow and does not allow many open space uses other than linear walk/pathways that can be most cost effectively provided in the existing right-of-way.

Mayor Matt Hall has publicly said that Ponto Park at Planning Area F would cost \$20-22 million and the City’s narrow promenade would cost \$75 million. If the city purchases Planning Area F, it would add 11 new acres to city-owned property, whereas the promenade (which is basically adding a walkway and parking spaces) adds 0 (zero) acres to city-owned property (the City already owns the roadway median).

There is a smarter and better way. The Promenade walkway and parking can basically be provided for as little as 4%-10% of the City’s proposed \$75 million Promenade cost. This is done by retaining South Carlsbad Boulevard (Historic Coast Highway 101) in its current historic configuration with natural median, and not relocating the south bound pavement to create a wide urban roadway. South Carlsbad Boulevard is one of the last substantially unaltered stretches of San Diego County’s Historic 101 dating back to the 1920’s. Data show it is not threatened by Sea Level Rise so does not need to be relocated. It seems appropriate to retain this historic street and landscape. South Carlsbad Boulevard only needs to add pedestrian paths or sidewalks to be Complete. This can cost effectively be designed and done while preserving the historic features of Historic Coast Highway 101, and creatively reusing old 101 pavement at the Campground entrance to also cost-effectively provide parking.

Based on City data an 8 foot wide concrete walkway within the wide right-of-way could be provided on both sides of South Carlsbad Boulevard for about \$3 million. Parking already exists along some sections of South Carlsbad Boulevard and additional parking can be cost-effectively provided on the old South Carlsbad Boulevard roadway pavement near the Campground entry. In addition if it is possible and desirable to reduce vehicle roadway capacity by over 50% and increase vehicle traffic congestion on South Carlsbad Boulevard the existing outside 2-lanes in each direction could be very cost effectively converted to on-street parking. This would provide around 6-miles of on-street parking or about 12,000 parking spaces.


\$72-67.5 million of tax-payer money savings can be achieved by rethinking the City's \$75 million South Carlsbad Boulevard Promenade concept while still providing the needed pedestrian path and parking. This \$72-67.5 million can be used to fund the more practical, functional, beneficial and tax-payer desired Ponto Park at Planning Area F, and have about \$50 million left over to fund many more Coastal Park and open space improvements in Carlsbad.

Planning Area F would create a park similar in shape to Holiday Park, but more than 1.8 times larger than Holiday Park. Ponto Park at Planning Area F would create Carlsbad's Crown Jewell Coastal Park; with ocean and sunset views, direct pedestrian access to the beach and Batiquitos Lagoon trails, and the size and shape to host Carlsbad community events. Ponto Park at Planning Area F would create a Coastal Crown Jewell Park for both Carlsbad Citizens and visitors that will last for generations. As of 2020 over 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens and hundreds of thousands of visitors in South Carlsbad's resort hotels have no Coastal Park. This inequity damages Carlsbad's current and long-term attractiveness and sustainability of our residential quality of life and visitor experience.

Like Del Mar's Powerhouse Park, Solana Beach's Fletcher Cove Park, Encinitas's Moonlight Beach Park, La Jolla's Scripps Cove Park and La Jolla Shores Park, Coronado's Tidelands Park and Coronado Cays Park; Ponto Park can provide Carlsbad a much needed iconic Coastal Park and community place. Ponto is also at the center of a 6-mile Regional Coastal Park gap – there is no Coastal park between Encinitas's Moonlight Beach and Carlsbad's small Cannon Park. Based on the data Ponto Park is a much better park space and appears to be a far better and wiser use of tax payer money.

- a. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning will you direct City Staff to contact the Planning Area F landowner to discuss the City being a purchaser of the site?
- b. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning did you know that the 400-acre Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course cost Carlsbad Taxpayers \$70 million?
- c. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think spending \$75 million to add a sidewalk and some parking (aka Promenade) on narrow land the City already owns and that could alternatively be provided with a little over \$3 million is a wise use in taxpayer dollars?
- d. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think spending \$20-22 million to actually buy 11-aces of new City parkland is a better use of Carlsbad's taxpayer dollars compared to spending \$75 million and NOT adding one single acre of new City land?
- e. In your recommendations or decisions for land use, housing, and parks planning do you think a City Park that is 1.8 times larger than Holiday Park, and with coastal views and pedestrian access to the beach and Batiquitos Lagoon would be a great benefit to the City in hosting community events like Holiday Park currently does?

Data Slide #1: San Pacifico Community – Planning Area, Coastal General Plan Land Use, & Acreage Map. Planning Area F is unplanned and zoned NRR (non-residential reserve) and will remain so until a “Park Need” Study is completed and both the City and CA Coastal Commission determine no Park is needed. Only if both the City and CA Coastal Commission determine Ponto’s park needs are met, can Planning Area F be planned and developed for something else.



Source: page 20 of exiting Poinsettia Shores Master Plan/Local Coastal Program

Data Slide #2: One of Carlsbad's "Ponto Planning Area F planning mistakes" and CA Coastal Commission (CCC) direction to Carlsbad

At the 1/28/20 (item #14) Carlsbad City Council meeting City Staff for the 1st time admitted 15+ years f some Ponto 'planning mistakes' on Ponto Planning Area F. This was over 10-years after the City knew of these 'Ponto planning mistakes' by the 2010 CA Coastal Commission (CCC) denial of the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those mistakes and some other flaws.

Following is from a 7/3/17 CCC letter to City Staff on the City's proposed land use changes at Planning Area F. City Staff for the 1st time provided this to City Council on 1/28/20:

"The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad. This is an issue that the San Pacifico HOA community group is raising in regards to the Shopoff/Ponto development proposal, and this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed."

In 2017 after citizens received the City's reply to Public Records Request 2017-260, citizens meet with CCC staff to reconfirm the City failed since before 2010 to publicly disclose and comply with Planning Area F's LCP requirements. CCC Staff acknowledged the City has not yet complied with the LCP and in an 8/16/2017 email said:

"The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City's Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City's land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area."

In 2016, the CCC told City that Carlsbad's proposed 2015 General Plan land use map could change based on the outcomes of both a Citywide Coastal Recreation needs Study, and also the specific Planning Area F LCP requirement to study Park needs at Ponto. The City is apparently failing to fully disclose to Citizens these facts and the City's prior "Ponto Planning Area F planning mistakes".

Data Slide #3: from Carlsbad's adopted Park Master Plan (see pages 86-88). Blue dots = Parks, and blue circles = areas served by Parks. City's adopted Park service map clearly shows Park need at Ponto.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

Special Use Areas Map
Recommended Standard of
0.1 Acres per 1.00 Population

Carlsbad, California
Parks and Recreation Service
According to Park Master Plan

There is no Coastal Park to serve South Carlsbad Citizens-Visitors-Businesses. There are 10 Coastal Parks in North Carlsbad. The lack of Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad seems both unfair to South Carlsbad Citizens-Visitors-Businesses; and is unfair to North Carlsbad by forcing congestion into North Carlsbad & Encinitas/Solana Beach where there are Coastal Parks.

Legend:
Park & Rec Site
City Service Area
Local Road
Major Road
Highway
Coastal Boundary

Scale: 1 in = 1 mile


Data Slide #4: Existing and City’s Planning Area F proposed development intensity (FAR) comparisons

FAR (floor area ratio) is a well-established planning method to compare land use intensity (lower FARs reflect lower intensity and higher FARs reflect higher intensity). City Staff is proposing at San Pacifico’s Planning Area F an extremely high FAR land use intensity that will radically change the established character of our San Pacifico Community. The CA Coastal Commission has State Law Polices to protect the character of Coastal communities and a requirement that new development be "visually compatible with the character of the surrounding area." It does not appear that the City’s proposed 486% increase in development intensity for San Pacifico’s Planning Area F is visually compatible with the character of San Pacifico.

Comparison of FAR Data:

| | <u>FAR</u> | <u>% more intense than San Pacifico</u> | <u>Building Height</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------|
| San Pacifico Community - existing | .31 | 0% | 30 feet |
| San Pacifico’s Planning Area F - City proposed change | 1.79 | 486% | 40 feet |
| Cape Rey Resort - existing | .52 | 70% | 35 feet |
| Encinitas Beach Hotel - in construction | 1.21 | 295% | unknown |
| Kam Sang Resort - developer application w/ City | .72 | 136% | 35 feet |

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) diagram of examples of 0.5, 1.0 and 2.0 FAR



Below is what the City’s proposed 1.79 FAR at Planning Area F looks like. A 40 foot tall and 1,000 feet long wall of buildings. View is looking NE from corner of Avenida Encinas/Ponto Dr.



Ponto Planning Facts – development standards not being met

City's GIS data of Growth Management Standard Open Space at Ponto

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from GMP Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS data |

73% of the City's minimum required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of Ponto

Data Slide #6: City GIS map – Light Green is ‘Unconstrained land’ and can be used to meet City’s Growth Management Open Space Standard. The Pink and Purple areas are ‘Constrained land and water’, respectively, and cannot be used to meet the Standard.

Ponto Planning Facts – development standards not being met cont.

- City’s GIS map of Ponto’s (LFMP Zone 9) Growth Management Standard Open Space:
 - Only light green areas on map meet City’s 15% unconstrained GMP Open Space Standard
 - Most Ponto Open Space (pink & purple areas on map) is constrained and does not meet the Standard
 - City required Aviana east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?



Data Slide #7: City's Growth Management Open Space Standard

The City's website says: **"The Growth Management Program standard for Open Space requires that "15 percent of the total land area in the Local Facilities Master Plan Zone, exclusive of environmentally constrained non-developable land, must be set aside for permanent open space and must be available concurrent with development."** <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/cityhall/clerk/summaries/space.asp>

The City's Growth Management Ordinance (Carlsbad Municipal Code 21.90) states:

"21.90.130 Implementation of facilities and improvements requirements: ... (b) The city-wide facilities and improvement plan and the local facility management plan process is part of the city's ongoing planning effort. It is anticipated that amendments to the plans may be necessary. Adoption of a facilities management plan does not establish any entitlement or right to any particular general plan or zoning designation or any particular development proposal. **The city-wide facilities and improvements plan and the local facilities management plans are guides to ensure that no development occurs unless adequate facilities or improvements will be available to meet demands created by development. The city council may initiate an amendment to any of the plans at any time if in its discretion it determines that an amendment is necessary to ensure adequate facilities and improvements.**

(c) If at any time it appears to the satisfaction of the city manager that facilities or improvements within a facilities management zone or zones are inadequate to accommodate any further development within that zone or that the performance standards adopted pursuant to Section 21.90.100 are not being met he or she shall immediately report the deficiency to the council. If the council determines that a deficiency exists then no further building or development permits shall be issued within the affected zone or zones and development shall cease until an amendment to the city-wide facilities and improvements plan or applicable local facilities management plan which addresses the deficiency is approved by the city council and the performance standard is met.

(d) The city planner shall monitor the development activity for each local facilities management zone and shall prepare an annual report to the city council consisting of maps, graphs, charts, tables and text and which includes a developmental activity analysis, a facilities and improvements adequacy analysis, a facility revenue/expenditure analysis and recommendation for any amendments to the facilities management plan. **The content of the annual report shall be established by the city council.**

(e) The city council shall annually review the city-wide facilities and improvements plan at the time it considers the city's capital improvement budget. (Ord. 9808 § 1, 1986"

&

"21.90.180 Public facility reductions: Notwithstanding any previous sections of this chapter, the city council shall not materially reduce or delete any public facilities or improvements without making a corresponding reduction in residential density unless such a reduction or deletion of public facilities is ratified by a vote of the citizens of Carlsbad. (Ord. 9829 § 4, 1987)"

People for Ponto apologize for this late and hastily, review and comments. We just found out about the meeting this morning. We citizens know we can together achieve grate things if you allow us to work with you.

Staff
Report

Page clarification/correction:

1 The LCP Land Use Plan Update is in fact an Amendment to an Existing LCP Land Use Plan. The Existing LCP Land Use Plan is already certified by the CA Coastal Commission as being consistent with the CA Coastal Act, except for some Amendments needed to address Sea Level Rise impacts and some other issues.

The LCP Amendment proposes to change the Existing CA Coastal Commission certified LCP Land Use Plan's "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use and Policy on Planning Area F to consider and document the need for "i.e. Public Park" at Ponto .

- 1 Staff summarizes the CA Coastal Act objectives to "ensure maximum public access to the coast and public recreation areas."
 - Carlsbad's Adopted Park Service Area/Equity Mapping shows there is no Park Service for the Ponto Area and Ponto Citizens, and no Park Service for the Coastal South Carlsbad area west of Interstate-5 and the rail corridor.
 - The City's mapping of land that meets the developer required Growth Management Open Space Standard of 15% Unconstrained land shows about 30-acres of this Open Space is missing at Ponto. This missing Open Space could have provided needed Park facilities that are missing at Ponto.
 - Citizens in over 2,500 emails to the City Council have cited the need for a Public Park at Ponto as part of the Existing LCP Land Use Plan Amendment proposed at Ponto. These requests area consistent with the CA Coastal Act.
- 3 2nd bullet: says city staff proposes to replace, amend, or retain various Existing LCP policies, so the Staff has a documented understanding how each Existing LCP policy and how each Existing policy is being treated in the proposed Amendment. Citizens asked in Oct 20, 2019 for this 'redline' version of the Existing LCP Policies and Land Use Maps so citizens can understand what the Amendments are so we as citizens could then provide informed public comment. This 'redline' version is also important for the City Council and Planning and other Commissions so they know what Amendments to Existing City LCP Land Use policy are being proposed. Citizens again request this 'redline' version that it appears the staff already has as they know what Existing LCP Land Use policies are being replaced, amended, or retained.
- 4 V is incomplete: the community asked on Oct 20, 2019 for 3 things: 1) a 'redline' version as noted above, 2) true Public Workshops to help inform and resolve community concerns about the proposed LCP land Use Plan Amendments, and 3) more public review time to provide for the above two other requests. All 3 requests should be acknowledge in the staff report. All 3 requests are rational and reasonable considering the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan

Amendment is the “buildout” plan for Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone and there were multiple documented fundamental “planning mistakes” regarding past City public information and participation in the Coastal Land Use planning. Providing such a process would help to correct these documented ‘planning mistakes’ that have gone on for many years. It is the right thing to do and most productive approach for all concerned.

7 Staff should accurately disclose that in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission in fact rejected the City’s proposed Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for failing to disclose and comply with the then and current LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto. Carlsbad Public Record Requests confirmed the staff did not disclose to citizens the existence LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto, so citizens had no idea a Public Park at Planning Area F at Ponto needed to be considered. How can citizens, provide input if they don’t have complete and accurate to review and comment on?

8 Staff should correctly disclose that the 2015 application at Planning Area F at Ponto is first for a Local Coastal Program Amendment and Master Plan Amendment. These are both applications to change City Land Use Plan Policy and Zoning regulations. The actual applications for ‘development’ permits can in fact not even be considered by the City the Local Coastal Program Land Use of “Non-residential Reserve” is changed and Master Plan rezoning is approved. Then the ‘development’ permit application can applied for. The developer abandoned their application to change the LCP and Master Plan and then apply for developer permit review about a year ago. However, the city staff is keeping the application ‘alive’ even though there has been no progress on the application for over a year. It is unclear if the staff has authority to do this, or if the City Council has authority to withdrawal the application due to non-activity. The City has permit standards that withdraw applications if applicants make no progress on the applications after 6-months. What is troubling is that it appears the city staff proposal is to process the developer’s application to change the Existing LCP Land Use Plan for the developer.

Staff notes that the Planning Area F sites now designated as Residential R-23 and General Commercial by the Carlsbad General Plan Update. However, staff fails to disclose that until the Existing LCP Land Use Plan Amended is in fact approved by the CA Coastal Commission the Existing LCP Land Use Plan for Planning Area F supersedes the City’s General Plan Update. **Carlsbad’s General Plan Land Use Element clearly states this on page 2-26 “The city’s LCP Land Use Plan will be updated consistent with this General Plan. However, to take effect, the LCP must be certified by the Coastal Commission as well as adopted by the city. Until such time that this occurs, the existing (as of 2013) LCP must be adhered to.”** So until the City Council adopts the staff’s proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment, AND the CA Coastal Commission “certifies” that LCP LUP Amendment; the City’s General Plan Update Land Use change cannot take effect. The General Plan Land Use at Ponto Planning Area F has in fact not been changed by the General Plan Update, but can only change with staff’s proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment that the City Council can choose to approve or disapprove. Also official Public Records Requests have documented that the City’s General Plan Update planning process was fundamentally flawed at Ponto. Again, like during Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan planning process a few years earlier the city failed to comply with the then and current LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto. The flawed General Plan Update process at Ponto prevented Citizens from knowing the facts so they could properly participate and provide review and comment during the General Plan Update. The significant citizen comments to the City Council asking for a Ponto Coastal Park is reflective of the fundamental public disclosure

and processing flaws that the city is only now acknowledging as one of the repeated 'planning mistakes' at Ponto. This is why citizens are asking for full disclosure of the facts and a complete planning process re-boot at Ponto. It also should be noted that the Existing LCP Land Use Policy for Planning Area F states that **"as part of any future planning effort ... consideration of a "Public Park" is required.** CA Coastal Commission Staff has indicated the City's proposed land use planning changes at Ponto as part of the General Plan Update are subject to change.

At the bottom of the page regarding SB 330, as noted above the "residential land use designation on the site" is not in effect until the currently proposed LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is both approved by the City Council AND also certified by the CA Coastal Commission, so SB 330 does not apply. Also SB 330 has specific language that exempts land use in the Coastal Zone. SB 330 (Skinner) Section 13 states: **"(2) Nothing in this section supersedes, limits, or otherwise modifies the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976** (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code). **For a housing development project proposed within the coastal zone, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an affected county or an affected city from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition necessary to implement or amend a certified local coastal program consistent with the California Coastal Act of 1976** (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code)." This language is consistent with CA case law, and other housing laws that recognize the obvious – there is very limited amount of Coastal land v. significant land area inland. Limited Coastal Land per the CA Coastal Act is needed for "High-Priority" Coastal Land Uses" - i.e. Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodations. The CA Coastal Act identifies both residential and general commercial land uses as "low-priority". So although affordable housing is important there are other more appropriate locations, than on the last remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad will be needed to address the "High-Priority" Coastal Land Uses to serve Carlsbad and California's 'buildout' needs. CA case law recognizes the supremacy of the CA Coastal Act over CA Housing Laws as noted in "Kalnel Gardens, LLC v. City of Los Angeles". This case law data has already been provided to the City Council as part of Staff's housing discussions over the past few years. The staff report should have disclosed the above information, as it appears SB 330 is not a factor at Ponto.

- 13 2005-2010 Housing Element: As noted above the General Plan Land Use Element states the General Plan Land Use Plan is not effective until the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is both approved by the City Council AND certified by the CA Coastal Commission. So, the Housing Element Cannot recognize the proposed residential use change at Ponto until then. Also as noted before there were multiple documented fundamental 'planning mistakes' in public disclosure, participation and process that flawed the Housing Element. It should be noted that these flaws occurred during the time the CA Coastal Commission specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan due to those flaws. The now City acknowledged 'planning mistakes' at Ponto prevented Carlsbad citizens from providing informed participation during the Housing Element.

Also, it is unclear why the staff misrepresented the amount of housing proposed in the Housing Element on the Ponto Planning Area F site as "the Ponto site for high density residential use at a minimum density of 20 dwellings per acre (128 units minimum)"; as this is not true. The City's General Plan promises only the minimum 15 dwelling units/acre for the R-23 Land Use designation. See the "Ponto" unit capacity table below from the City of Carlsbad General Plan Housing Element Table B-1 on page B-2 that lists 98 dwellings for the site on the east side of

Ponto Road and 11 **optional dwellings** on the west side of Ponto Road for 109 total units for both sites, v. the 128 units mentioned by staff. Not sure why staff misrepresented the density by 17 to 30%.

| Table B-1: Vacant Sites for Lower and Moderate Income Housing | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----|----------|
| APN | General Plan Designation ¹ | Zoning District | Site Size (Acres) | Unit Capacity, by Household Income | | |
| | | | | Very Low | Low | Moderate |
| 2090901100 (Sunny Creek) | R15 (12 du/ac) | RD-M | 9.6 | - | - | 115 |
| 2161404300 (Ponto) | R23 | P-C | 6.5 | - | - | 98 |
| | GC (Mixed Use) ³ | P-C | 3 | - | - | 11 |

2007 Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan: As noted several times above there were fundamental public disclosure and participation flaws with this plan. It was rejected by the CA Coastal Commission in 2010 part for those reasons. These flaws are confirmed by the City’s own data as a result of multiple Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests. This should be disclosed to the City Council and citizens.

- 14 2015 General Plan Update: As noted several times above there were fundamental public disclosure and participation flaws with this Update with regards to Ponto. These flaws are confirmed by the City’s own data as a result of multiple Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests. This should be disclosed to the City Council and citizens.

Citizens are asking the City Staff and City Council:

- for honesty, to fully and publicly recognize and disclose the past “planning mistakes” at Ponto, and fundamental flaws from the from those mistakes that prevented citizens from knowing about and participating in the planning process for Ponto.
- To keep the Existing LCP Land Use Plan at Ponto until a new open-honest and inclusive Community-based planning process can be achieved at Ponto.
- To be honest with respect to Park Serve Area and Equity issues at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad west of I-5 and the rail corridor.
- Consider the needs for inland South Carlsbad citizens, visitors and business to have their ONLY Coastal Park.
- Consider the larger regional Coastal Park need, and the forever ‘buildout’ Coastal Recreation needs for future generations.
- To be true and honest in translating and implementing our Community Vision

Coastal Recreation:

1. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

2. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
 - a. Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - b. Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - c. Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

3. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - a. Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - b. Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - c. This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 "... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ... "; 2). This data should be used in the City's analysis and the public's review and discussion about the City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Land Use Plan. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount "maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone" and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to "assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast". Most of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

4. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City's proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at Planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

5. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is obviously an unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.


How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail




Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



6. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:
 - a. Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - Source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- b. Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- c. We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

- 7. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- a. The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaining

undeveloped lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.


Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- b. The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

8. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.


Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.

9. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.
 - a. Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
 - b. Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
 - c. Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
 - d. Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water

(the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for 'planned developments' to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



10. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to 'exempted' Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that 15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a

summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

11. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiqitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:
 - a. Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
 - b. In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
 - c. In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.
 - d. Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's

Coastal land use ‘planning mistake’ by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F’s LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.

- e. In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal ‘planning mistakes’ by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City’s 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal ‘planning mistakes’ to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City’s over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by ‘restarting’ Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens’ requests have been rejected.
- f. In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land use, without first disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens’ requests.
- g. In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior ‘planning mistakes’ at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto’s Planning Area F to either:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of “Non-Residential Reserve” until such time as the City’s past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space (“i.e. Public Park”) to provide both “High-Priority” coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

12. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words “shall”) these “low priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur

in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds' low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment's proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this "High-Priority" low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the 'Buildout' condition due to coastal erosion. **So the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad's Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP's planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP's planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City "may" or 'may not' choose (per the proposed "may" LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City's (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy 'shell game'. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to be a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two "may" criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only "low-priority" residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by "shall" policy) winners, and "high-priority" Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal 'long-shot' ("may" policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the documented "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct municipal course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

13. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

14. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback.

Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a “site constraint”? There should be some explanation of what a “site constraint” is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiquitos Lagoon’s adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiquitos Lagoon’s and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad’s landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

Low Cost Visitor Accommodations:

1. P. 3-3 cites CA Coast Act (CCA) Policies. But the City's proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) Land Use Plan (LUP) in the Ponto Area, particularly for Planning Area F, appears inconsistent with these CCA policies:
 - a. Section 30213 – protect, encourage and provide Lower-Cost Visitor & Recreation Facilities.
 - b. Section 30221 – Visitor serving & Recreation uses have priority over Residential & General Commercial uses.
 - c. Section 30223 – Upland areas reserved to support coastal Recreation uses
 - d. Section 30252(6) – correlate development with Local Park acquisition & on-site recreation

2. Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's LUP and LCP Samis Master Plan for Ponto. In the 1996 this LUP was changed to the now current LCP and LUP designation of "Non-Residential Reserve" with a specific LCP requirement to reconsider a high-priority recreation or visitor serving Coastal land use while other Ponto land uses were changed to low-priority residential uses (see Poinsettia Shores Master Plan/LCP). It seems appropriated that the LUP should re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park" in the existing LCP) to provide high-priority coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses: in part for the following reasons:
 - a. Planning Area F's existing LCP requirement requires this consideration, but the City has never disclosed this requirement to Citizens nor follow this requirement during the Cities two prior 'planning efforts' in 2010 and 2015 as documented by official Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, 262.
 - b. Ponto developers (both Samis and Kaisza) were both allowed to overdevelop Ponto, by not providing the minimum Open Space required by Carlsbad's and Citizen approved Growth Management Open Space Standard. Over 30-acres of land that should have been dedicated to Growth Management Open Space (a high-priority land use) was instead allowed to be developed with low-priority residential development. If the City's Growth Management Open Space Standard was properly applied at Ponto there would be 30-acres more open space at Ponto then there is now. This is a significant impact to CCA policies that can be corrected by changes in the Ponto LUP to properly implement City Open Space Standards and CCA policies.
 - c. The LCPA acknowledges that past (2005-17) and near-term (2019-23) growth in Carlsbad visitor demand for coastal recreation and accommodations, and indicate high past hotel occupancy rates that implies current hotel supply is just meeting current demand. Although the LCPA does not discuss the high occupancy rates at the Low-Cost campground facilities, It is assumed the campground occupancy rate and demand is higher than that of hotels. This should be defined. Based on current and near term demand for visitor accommodations the LCPA states on page 3-12 "... the City should identify and designate land where new hotels and other visitor-serving uses can be developed." It is clear where he 'City should identify and designate [this] land'? What new land(s) should be so identified and designated? However, the LCPA does not disclose longer-term visitor accommodation needs beyond 2023, nor provide a long-term plan for meeting this long-term need. The LCPA should publicly disclose, analyze and provide for the longer-term (beyond present and to beyond 2023) needs for visitor Coastal accommodations, particularly Low-Cost Accommodations and Recreation needs because the LCPA's LUP is a long-term plan for Carlsbad's buildout estimated to extend beyond 2035. Also, given the fact that there are very few vacant Coastal Sites (like Ponto) that are still available to address these long-term high priority Coastal land uses – recreation and visitor serving – reserving these vacant lands for high priority coastal land uses is consistent with the CCA Policies. Following are some longer-term projections of resident demand for Coastal park and recreation needs. It seems logical that long-term visitor will increase at a similar rate as the general population increase

rate, unless our coast becomes too overcrowded and unattractive vis-à-vis other visitor destinations. A long-term visitor demand (to go with the below long-term resident demand long-term Sea Level Rise impacts) for Coastal recreation resources should be a part of the proposed LCPA and part of the long-term LUP to provide resources for those long-term needs and to mitigate for those long-term Sea Level Rise impacts.



Increasing demand for Coastal recreational land

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County

| | | |
|------|------------|------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 | |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 | |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 | |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 | |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 | = average 100,000 visitors per day |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 | or 2.83% of Population per day |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 | or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day |

Typically around 1.6% annual increase in visitors

San Diego Tourism Authority, San Diego Travel Forecast, December 2017

- d. City in the LCPA inaccurately analyzes and misrepresents how much Visitor Serving Accommodations, particularly Low-Cost Accommodations, Carlsbad currently provides on a relative or comparative basis. The LCPA's inaccurate and simplistic analysis does not adjust for the different sizes of the Coastal Zone in the 3 cities (Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas) used in the analysis. Carlsbad's Coastal Zone is significantly larger than both the other cities, so it has more land and accommodations, just like San Diego's Coastal Zone is larger than Carlsbad's and San Diego is larger than its smaller neighbors Del Mar and National City. A simplistic how many accommodations are in your adjacent cities is an inappropriate analytical method for Carlsbad-Oceanside-Encinitas; just as it is inappropriate to compare the number of San Diego's hotels with the number hotels in San Diego's smaller neighbors Del Mar and National City. The accurate method to do a comparative analysis is based on a common denominator, such as the amount of accommodations per 1,000 acres of Coastal Zone land along with comparing each city's relative percentages. This is a more accurate and appropriate analysis that the LCPA should provide, and not that provided on page 3-13. The LCPA analysis also does not fully discuss and compare "Low-Cost" accommodations that are part of the CCA policies; nor provide a mitigation approach for "Low-Cost" accommodations lost, just 'Economy hotel rooms'. Below is data from the LCPA and other LCPs that shows the proper and more accurate comparison of existing Visitor Serving Accommodations in Carlsbad-Oceanside-Encinitas and includes Low-Cost Accommodation numbers/comparisons that are totally missing in the LCPA analysis. As the data shows, Carlsbad does not perform as well in Visitor Accommodations, and most particularly in "Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations", as the LCPA states and proposes in the LUP relative to Oceanside and Encinitas. An honest analysis like below should be provided in the LCPA LUP, particularly given the very limited amount of vacant Coastal land left to provide for high-priority Coastal Uses. Ponto is one of the last remaining vacant Coastal areas.


Carlsbad's proposed 2019 LCPA uses comparative 3-city data to address how Carlsbad's 2019 LCPA addresses Visitor Serving Accommodation needs. "Low-Cost" Accommodations are an important CA Coastal Act issue

| <u>Visitor Serving Accommodations (VSA) data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | | <u>Data source</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Coastal Acres (i.e. in Coastal Zone) | 9,216 | 1,460 | 7,845 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019 & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| VSA rooms: total | 3,211 | 975 | 634 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, pp 3-12 - 15 |
| VSA rooms: Economy | 589 | 346 | 346 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, pp 3-12 - 15 |
| VSA rooms: Low-Cost (campsites) | 220 | 272 | 171 | | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019, State Parks, Oceanside & Paradise-by-the-sea data Carlsbad Draft LCPA 2019 does not evaluate other City's Low-Cost Accommodations |
| <u>Data analysis</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>3-city Average</u> | <u>Key Findings</u> |
| VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 348 | 668 | 81 | 366 | Carlsbad provides overall Visitor Accommodations at slightly below the 3-city average |
| % of VSA rooms that are Economy | 18% | 35% | 55% | 36% | Carlsbad provides a percentage of Economy Accommodations about 50% below the 3-city average |
| Economy VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 64 | 237 | 44 | 115 | Carlsbad provides Economy Accommodations about 50% below the 3-city average |
| % VSA rooms that are Low-Cost | 7% | 28% | 27% | 21% | Carlsbad provides a percentage of Low-Cost Accommodations about 66% below the 3-city average Carlsbad LCPA also does not provide protection for loss of "Low-Cost" campground rooms, only "Economy hotel rooms" |
| Low-Cost VSA rooms/1,000 Coastal acres | 24 | 186 | 22 | 77 | Carlsbad provides Low-Cost Accommodations about 70% below the 3-city average |

- e. The LCPA is not providing for any new "Low Cost Visitor Accommodation" land uses in the proposed LUP for current/long-range needs, even though page 3-12 points out the current demand for accommodations, and the current Existing LCP has polices to increase "Low Cost Visitor Accommodation" land uses. We

understand that “Low-cost Visitor Accommodation” occupancy rates at CA State Campground at near 90%. This occupancy rate is much higher [signifying higher demand] than the occupancy rates of both the hotels, and “Economy Visitor Accommodations” which the LCPA seeks to protect. The Proposed LCPA LUP should provide historic and current “Low-cost Visitor Accommodation” occupancy rate data at CA State Campground and compare to occupancy demand for other accommodations to determine the highest occupancy demands and therefore needs. Why is the Proposed LCPA LUP not protecting AND EXPANDING (for future growth and visitor demand) the supply of this higher demand for “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” at the State Campground, particularly given the Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies on this issue, long history of this issue documented in the Current Existing Carlsbad LCP Mello II Segment, and the fact that “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” are a Statewide ‘high-Coastal-priority’ land use in CA Coastal Act Goals and Policies? Why is the proposed LUP not recognizing and incorporating these issues? The Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies [see Existing Carlsbad LCP Mello II Segment polies 2.3, 4.1, 6.1, 6.4, 6.5, 6.9, 6.10, 7.5, and 7.15 for example] are not referenced and discussed in the Proposed LUP nor is a comprehensive long-term analysis of the impact of the proposed LUP’s elimination of theses Current Existing Carlsbad LCP policies vis-à-vis the CA Coastal Act Goals and Policies? How and why is the City proposing changes to these Existing Carlsbad LCP policies in the Mellow II Segment, particularly given the improved knowledge about Sea Level Rise, and Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff erosion impacts on the State Campground’s “Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” - High-Coastal-Priority land use under the CA Coastal Act?

- f. At Ponto there is no low-cost/no-cost Recreational use as shown by the City of Carlsbad’s adopted Parks Master Plan (pp 87-89) that show the City’s adopted Park Service Areas in the following image. The image’s blue dots are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s adopted service areas:



Per the current Existing LCP requirements for Planning Area F at Ponto an “(i.e. Public Park)” must be considered. How is the Proposed LCPA LUP not reserving Upland Areas at Ponto for recreational uses given

Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff erosion impacts as shown in Proposed LCPA LUP Attachment B, and Exhibits B6 and B7? There is very limited amount of vacant Upland Coastal land at Ponto and South Coastal Carlsbad to accommodate low-cost/no-cost Recreational use "(i.e. Public Park)", so why is this last remaining vacant Coastal land at Ponto not being reserved for "high-Coastal Priority Land Uses"? Why is the Proposed LCPA LUP proposing this last remaining vacant Coastal land at Ponto be converted from "Non-residential Reserve" to 'low-coastal-priority residential and general commercial land uses'?

3. The proposed LCPA approach to protect existing 'economy hotels' but not 'Low-cost Visitor Accommodations' appears inappropriate. Existing hotel owners providing 'Economy' rooms are penalized while all other more expensive 'non-economy hotel' owners are not required to mitigate for their not providing more affordable accommodations. It seems like a fairer and rational approach is to use the same framework as the City's inclusionary affordable housing requirements and have the requirement and burden of providing affordable accommodations required by all visitor accommodation providers, including short-term rentals of residential homes. Use of any per accommodation "in-lieu fee" should be SUFFICIENT TO FULLY MITIGATE for not providing a required affordable accommodation by being sufficient to fully fund a new 'affordable accommodation' on a one-for one basis. City Transit Occupancy Tax revenues could also potentially be used to provide a catch-up method for existing "non-low-cost and/or non-economy accommodation providers" to address what would nominally be their inclusionary contribution. It seems like the LCPA approach needs significant rethinking to provide a rational program to include reasonable long-term and sustainable affordability in visitor accommodation's, particularly give the Sea Level Rise and Coastal Bluff Erosion impacts on Carlsbad's Only "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations" and the State Campground and beaches and Carlsbad's Coastal access roadways.
4. The Proposed LCPA LUP does not provide a means for citizens to understand the proposed changes to the current Existing LCP goals and policies. There are numerous current Existing LCP goals and policies regarding "Low-cost Visitor Accommodations". These all should be listed in the Proposed LCPA LUP along with a description on how and why these current Existing LCP Goals and policies are being modified or removed in the Proposed LCPA LUP.

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 10:46 AM

To: Council Internet Email (CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov); Scott Chadwick (Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov); Erin Prahler (Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov); Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Cort Hitchens (cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov); Lisa Urbach (lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov); 'Zachary.Olmstead@hcd.ca.gov'; 'Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov'; 'scott.donnell@carlsbadca.gov'

Cc: Brhiggins1@gmail.com; Phil Urbina (philipur@gmail.com); Lela Panagides (info@lelaforcarlsbad.com); Team Teresa for Carlsbad (teamteresaforcarlsbad@gmail.com); People for Ponto (info@peopleforponto.com); Laura Walsh (lauraw@surfridersd.org); 'Steve Puterski'; Philip Diehl (philip.diehl@sduniontribune.com)

Subject: Citizen public input for Housing ElemLance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>ent & Parks Master Plan Updates, & Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Housing-Parks-Planning Commissions & Housing Element Advisory Committee; & State of CA Coastal Commission, Parks, Housing & Community Development Department:

As one of the many People for Ponto (www.peopleforponto.com), we wanted to make sure this email and attachments have been provided to you and that the issues/data in this email be publicly presented/discussed during both the City's and State's consideration of the above planning and any other related activities.

1. Legality of 'Buildout' and quality of life standards in both California and a City within California; and if planning for "buildout" is illegal, can we California Citizens be provide the specific citation in CA State Law that forbids the State and/or Cities within California from land use and public infrastructure planning to cap to a finite or "buildout" population/development condition. As California and Carlsbad citizens it important to know the State's legal policy on "buildout"; and State policy laws on how are an infinite amount of Coastal Recreation and other high-priority Coastal land uses can be correspondently provided for infinite population growth within a largely developed and finite (and shrinking due to sea level rise) Coastal Zone?

The following public testimony and questions were presented the 6/23/20 Carlsbad Budget meeting. Coordinated answers from the State of CA and City of Carlsbad on how State Coastal and Housing planning priorities are ordered and reconciled is important. Carlsbad has a very small fragment of remaining vacant coastal land and once it is developed it essentially lost forever. This is being planned now with the above mentioned planning efforts. Most all of Carlsbad's Coastal lands are already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential land use, or off-limits due to endangered habitat preservation. Coastal Parks or Campgrounds can only be provided along the Coast and they are currently very crowded, and will continue to get more crowed and eventually degrade over time by increased population demands if new Coastal Parks and campgrounds are not created by coordinated Coastal Land Use planning by the State and City. How is the State of CA and City of Carlsbad to address maintaining our coastal quality of life (coastal recreation) with infinite population growth and rapidly shrinking coast land resources?

Citizens need a coordinated State of CA and City response to: *"6-23-20 City Council Budget meeting – pubic testimony by Lance Schulte: People for Ponto submitted 130-pages of public testimony on 6/2/20, would like to submit the following public input to both the 6/23/20 City Budget Meeting and the City proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment – and with reference to a proposed*

change the land use of Planning Area F from its Existing Non-Residential Reserve land use to City proposed low-coastal priority high-density residential and general commercial land uses. Contrary to what was said by 2 Council members the City's LCP policy covering Planning Area F is not a Citywide LCP policy, but is specific to the Sammis/Poinsettia Shores LCP area, and the policy's scope and regulatory authority is limited by the boundaries of the Sammis/Poinsettia Shores LCP area.

The Planning Area F Ponto Coastal Park is critical to the long-term economic vitality and sustainability of South Carlsbad's neighborhoods and extensive Visitor Industry; and Carlsbad's 1st and 3rd highest revenue sources.

Beyond Ponto there is an additional and separate Citywide Coastal Recreation requirement related to CA Coastal Commission concerns about Carlsbad's proposed LUP land use changes and proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment (LCPA) adequately providing for a Citywide 'buildout' need for Coastal Recreation land.

It is not clear if 'buildout' is a set and final amount of City and State population and development or if 'buildout' represents accommodating an endless amount of future population and development in Carlsbad and the State of California. If 'Buildout' is an endless future amount of population growth and development, then how is the City planning to provide a commensurate endless amount of City Parks and Open Space? How is an endless amount of Coastal Recreation provided to accommodate endless amount of City and Statewide growth?

Until these questions can be authoritatively answered by the City and State of California the preservation and acquisition of vacant Coastal land should be a City priority. Because once land is developed it will never be available for Park and Coastal Recreation use. Continual population and development growth without corresponding Park and Open Space growth will lead to a gradual but eventual undermining of the quality of life for Carlsbad and California, and our Carlsbad economy. It is for these and other important reasons People for Ponto ask the City to budget for the purchase of Planning Area F for Coastal Recreation and City Park needs – needs that City has documented exist now, and needs that will only grow more critical and important in the future. Thank you, People for Ponto love Carlsbad and our California Coast. We hope you love Carlsbad also and you take responsibility as a steward of our California Coast."

2. Attached is an email regarding clarification of apparent City errors/misrepresentations on 1/28/20 regarding a) the CA Coastal Act's relationship with CA Housing laws regarding CA land use priorities and requirements within the CA Coastal Zone, and b) City planning documents and City planning and public disclosure mistakes regarding Ponto. The clarification of the issues noted on 1/28/20 should be comprehensive, and holistically and consistently disclosed/discussed in each of the City's and State's Coastal-Land Use Planning-Parks-Housing planning efforts showing the principles and legal requirements for how potential conflicts within State/City Policies are to be resolved.
3. Similar to #2 above, People for Ponto has provided public testimony/input of over 200-pages of documented data on the need for a "Public Park" and over 2,500 Citizens' requests for that Park. Those 200+ pages and the email requests from 2,500 citizens, and the CA Coastal Commission direction to the City as noted below should also be shared with the Carlsbad's Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions, and the City's Housing Element as part of the respective land use-parks-housing discussions.

The CA Coastal Commission has also provided direction to the City regarding some of the City's planning mistakes at Ponto, and those directions should also be shared with the City's Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions and Housing Element Advisory Committee regarding Coastal Land Use planning at Ponto Planning Area F. CA Coastal Commission has provided the following direction to the Carlsbad:

- a. Following is from a 7/3/17 CCC letter to City Staff on the City's proposed land use changes at Planning Area F. City Staff provided this to City Council on 1/28/20: "The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. **For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad.** This is an issue that the San Pacifico HOA community group is raising in regards to the Shopoff/Ponto development proposal, and this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. **If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed."**
- b. In 2017 after citizens received the City's reply to Public Records Request 2017-260, citizens meet with CCC staff to reconfirm the City failed since before 2010 to publicly disclose and comply with Planning Area F's LCP requirements. CCC Staff acknowledged the City has not yet complied with the LCP and in an 8/16/2017 email said: "The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. **The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City's Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City's land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area."**

Please do not misinterpret these comments as anti-housing or anti-development, it is the exact opposite, they are in support of existing and future development. It is a logical recognition of what is the best use of very limited (and shrinking) vacant Coastal Land resources. It is prudent and sustainable State and City Coastal Land Use planning to best serve all CA residents – now and in the future. Housing can be developed in many large inland areas that are better connected with job centers and transit. New Coastal Parks can only be located on the last few remaining vacant parcels within a short distance to the coast. This very small area (vis-a-vis) large inland areas must serve all the coastal Park and recreation needs of California's almost 40 million residents and the additional millions of annual visitors to California's coast. This very small amount of Coastal land drives a lot what makes CA desirable and successful, but it is getting very overcrowded due to population/visitor growth while at the same time shrinking due to coastal erosion and sea level rise. Squandering the few remaining Coastal vacant land resources, and not reserving (planning) these lands for more high-priority Coastal Recreation Land Uses will ultimately undermine CA both socially and economically. The attached 'Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment' file should be provided to and reviewed by Carlsbad's Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions and the Housing Element Advisory committee in their consideration of Carlsbad's proposed Housing Element update and proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment, and also jointly by CA HCD and CCC in providing Carlsbad direction on CA Coastal Land Use priorities in the Coastal Zone relative to those two (2) City proposals.

Thank you all for your consideration and comprehensive inclusion of the various issues in both the City and States upcoming evaluation of proposed Coastal land use plan, Housing Element and Parks Master Plan updates. There is precious little vacant Coastal land left and how it is planned to be used and developed is critical and needs full public disclosure/involvement and a comprehensive and coordinated approach.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
www.peopleforponto.com

Following are the 2 attachments to the above 9/14/20 email:

1. 4/21/20 email of Public input to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions and CA Coastal Commission on DLCPA-PMU-HEU processes: Dear Carlsbad City Council, and Planning, Parks and Housing Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission: People for Ponto submits this email, and the attachment that was provided to the Carlsbad City Council for Item#14 at the 1/28/20 meeting. The attachment provided at the 1/28/20 City Council meeting has not been recorded on the Carlsbad City website that documents public input provided at that 1/28/20 meeting. Consequently we request this email and attachment be provided to the Carlsbad City Council, and Planning, Parks and Housing Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission as public input on the City Staff proposed 1) Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, 2) Parks Master Plan Update, and 3) Housing Element Update processes. The attachment documents apparent errors, omissions, and/or misrepresentations in the 1/28/20 Item #14 Staff Report/Presentation to the City Council. We wish this email and the attached public comments be provided to the Council and Commissions addressed to in this email and be included as public comments to be addressed in the 3 planning processes listed. Thank you. Email confirmation of receipt and delivery of this email/attachment is requested. Thank you. Sincerely, Lance Schulte People for Ponto
 - a. Attachment: Carlsbad City Council meeting of 1-28-20 agenda item #14 [typo corrected on 2-4-20]: People for Ponto apologize for this late and hastily, review and comments. We just found out about the meeting this morning. We citizens know we can together achieve great things if you allow us to work with you.

Staff
Report

Page clarification/correction:

1 The LCP Land Use Plan Update is in fact an Amendment to an Existing LCP Land Use Plan. The Existing LCP Land Use Plan is already certified by the CA Coastal Commission as being consistent with the CA Coastal Act, except for some Amendments needed to address Sea Level Rise impacts and some other issues. The LCP Amendment proposes to change the Existing CA Coastal Commission certified LCP Land Use Plan's "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use and Policy on Planning Area F to consider and document the need for "i.e. Public Park" at Ponto .

1 Staff summarizes the CA Coastal Act objectives to "ensure maximum public access to the coast and public recreation areas." Carlsbad's Adopted Park Service Area/Equity Mapping shows there is no Park Service for the Ponto Area

and Ponto Citizens, and no Park Service for the Coastal South Carlsbad area west of Interstate-5 and the rail corridor. The City's mapping of land that meets the developer required Growth Management Open Space Standard of 15% Unconstrained land shows about 30-acres of this Open Space is missing at Ponto. This missing Open Space could have provided needed Park facilities that are missing at Ponto. Citizens in over 2,500 emails to the City Council have cited the need for a Public Park at Ponto as part of the Existing LCP Land Use Plan Amendment proposed at Ponto. These requests are consistent with the CA Coastal Act.

- 3 2nd bullet: says city staff proposes to replace, amend, or retain various Existing LCP policies, so the Staff has a documented understanding how each Existing LCP policy is being treated in the proposed Amendment. Citizens asked in Oct 20, 2019 for this 'redline' version of the Existing LCP Policies and Land Use Maps so citizens can understand what the Amendments are so we as citizens could then provide informed public comment. This 'redline' version is also important for the City Council and Planning and other Commissions so they know what Amendments to Existing City LCP Land Use policy are being proposed. Citizens again request this 'redline' version that it appears the staff already has; as they know what Existing LCP Land Use policies are being replaced, amended, or retained.
- 4 V is incomplete: the community asked on Oct 20, 2019 for 3 things: 1) a 'redline' version as noted above, 2) true Public Workshops to help inform and resolve community concerns about the proposed LCP land Use Plan Amendments, and 3) more public review time to provide for the above two other requests. All 3 requests should be acknowledged in the staff report. All 3 requests are rational and reasonable considering the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is the "buildout" plan for Carlsbad's Coastal Zone, and there were multiple documented fundamental "planning mistakes" regarding past City public information and participation in the Coastal Land Use planning. Providing such a process as outlined by the 3 requests would help to correct these documented public disclosure/participation and 'planning mistakes' that have gone on for many years. It is the right thing to do and most productive approach for all concerned.
- 7 Staff should accurately disclose that in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission in fact rejected the City's proposed Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for failing to disclose and comply with the then and current LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto. Carlsbad Public Record Requests confirmed the staff did not disclose to citizens the existence LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto, so citizens had no idea a Public Park at Planning Area F at Ponto needed to be considered. How can citizens, provide input if citizens don't have complete and accurate information to review and comment on?
- 8 Staff should correctly disclose that the 2015 application at Planning Area F at Ponto is first for a Local Coastal Program Amendment and Master Plan Amendment. These are both applications to change City Land Use Plan Policy and Zoning regulations. The actual applications for 'development' permits can

in fact not even be considered by the City until the Local Coastal Program Land Use of “Non-residential Reserve” is changed and Master Plan rezoning is approved. Only then can the ‘development’ permit application can applied for. The developer abandoned their application to change the LCP and Master Plan and then apply for developer permit review about a year ago. However, the city staff is keeping the application ‘alive’ even though there has been no progress on the application for over a year. It is unclear if the staff has authority to do this, or if the City Council has authority to withdrawal the application due to non-activity. The City has permit standards that withdraw applications if applicants make no progress on the applications after 6-months. What is troubling is that it appears the city staff proposal is to process the developer’s application to change the Existing LCP Land Use Plan for the developer.

Staff notes that the Planning Area F sites now designated as Residential R-23 and General Commercial by the Carlsbad General Plan Update. However, staff fails to disclose that until the Existing LCP Land Use Plan Amendment (as proposed by City Staff) is in fact approved by both the City and the CA Coastal Commission the Existing LCP Land Use Plan for Planning Area F supersedes the City’s General Plan Update. Carlsbad’s General Plan Land Use Element clearly states this on page 2-26 stating: “The city’s LCP Land Use Plan will be updated consistent with this General Plan. However, to take effect, the LCP must be certified by the Coastal Commission as well as adopted by the city. Until such time that this occurs, the existing (as of 2013) LCP must be adhered to.” So until the City Council adopts the staff’s proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment, AND the CA Coastal Commission “certifies” that LCP LUP Amendment; the City’s General Plan Update Land Use change cannot take effect. The General Plan Land Use at Ponto Planning Area F has in fact not been changed by the General Plan Update, but can only change with staff’s proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment that the City Council can choose to approve or disapprove. Also official Public Records Requests have documented that the City’s General Plan Update planning process was also fundamentally flawed at Ponto. Again, like during Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan planning process a few years earlier the city failed to comply with the then and current LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto. The flawed General Plan Update process at Ponto prevented Citizens from knowing the facts so they could properly participate and provide review and comment during the General Plan Update. The significant citizen comments to the City Council asking for a Ponto Coastal Park is reflective of the fundamental public disclosure and processing flaws that the city is only now acknowledging as one of the repeated ‘planning mistakes’ at Ponto. This is why citizens are asking for full disclosure of the facts and a complete planning process re-boot at Ponto. It also should be noted that the Existing LCP Land Use Policy for Planning Area F states that “as part of any future planning effort ... consideration of a “Public Park” is required. CA Coastal Commission Staff has indicated the City’s proposed land use planning changes at Ponto as part of the General Plan Update are subject to change.

At the bottom of the page regarding SB 330, as noted above the “residential land use designation on the site” is not in effect until the currently proposed LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is both approved the City Council AND also certified by the CA Coastal Commission, so SB 330 does not apply. Also SB 330 has specific language that exempts land use in the Coastal Zone. SB 330 (Skinner) Section 13 states: “(2) Nothing in this section supersedes, limits, or otherwise modifies the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code). For a housing development project proposed within the coastal zone, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an affected county or an affected city from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition necessary to implement or amend a certified local coastal program consistent with the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code).” This language is consistent with CA case law, and other housing laws that recognize the obvious – there is very limited amount of Coastal land v. significant land area inland. Limited Coastal Land per the CA Coastal Act is needed for “High-Priority” Coastal Land Uses” - i.e. Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodations primarily in a city such as Carlsbad. The CA Coastal Act identifies both residential and general commercial land uses as “low-priority”. So although affordable housing is important there are other more appropriate locations, than on the last remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad that will be needed to address the “High-Priority” Coastal Land Uses to serve Carlsbad and California’s ‘buildout’ needs. CA case law recognizes the supremacy of the CA Coastal Act over CA Housing Laws as noted in “Kalnel Gardens, LLC v. City of Los Angeles”. This case law data has already been provided to the City Council as part of Staff’s housing discussions over the past few years. The staff report should have disclosed the above information, as it appears SB 330 is not a factor at Ponto.

- 13 2005-2010 Housing Element: As noted above the General Plan Land Use Element states the General Plan Land Use Plan is not effective until the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is both approved by the City Council AND certified by the CA Coastal Commission. So, the Housing Element Cannot recognizes the proposed residential use change at Ponto until then. Also as noted before there were multiple documented fundamental ‘planning mistakes’ in public disclosure, participation and process that flawed the Housing Element. It should be noted that these flaws occurred during the time the CA Coastal Commission specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan due to those flaws. The now City acknowledged ‘planning mistakes’ at Ponto prevented Carlsbad citizens from providing informed participation during the Housing Element.

Also, it is unclear why the staff misrepresented the amount of housing proposed in the Housing Element on the Ponto Planning Area F site as “the Ponto site for high density residential use at a minimum density of 20 dwellings per acre (128 units minimum)”; as this is not true. The City’s General Plan promises only the minimum 15 dwelling units/acre for the R-23 Land Use designation. See the “Ponto” unit capacity table below from the City of Carlsbad General Plan

Housing Element Table B-1 on page B-2 that lists 98 dwellings for the site on the east side of Ponto Road and 11 optional dwellings on the west side of Ponto Road for 109 total units for both sites, v. the 128 units mentioned by staff. Not sure why staff misrepresented the density by 17 to 30%.

2007 Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan: As noted several times above there were fundamental public disclosure and participation flaws with this plan. It was rejected by the CA Coastal Commission in 2010 in part for those reasons. These flaws are confirmed by the City's own data as a result of multiple Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests. This should be disclosed to the City Council and citizens.

- 14 2015 General Plan Update: As noted several times above there were also fundamental public disclosure and participation flaws with this General Plan Update with regards to Ponto. These flaws are confirmed by the City's own data as a result of multiple Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests. This should be disclosed to the City Council and citizens.

Citizens are asking the City Staff and City Council:

- for honesty; to fully and publicly recognize and disclose the past “planning mistakes” at Ponto, and fundamental flaws from the from those mistakes that prevented citizens from knowing about and participating in the planning process for Ponto.
 - To keep the Existing LCP Land Use Plan at Ponto until a new open-honest and inclusive Community-based planning process can be achieved at Ponto.
 - To be honest with respect to Park Serve Area and Equity issues at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad west of I-5 and the rail corridor.
 - Consider the needs for inland South Carlsbad citizens, visitors and business to have their ONLY Coastal Park.
 - Consider the larger regional Coastal Park need, and the forever ‘buildout’ Coastal Recreation needs for future generations.
 - To be true and honest in translating and implementing our Community Vision
2. The 2nd attachment to the 9/14/20 email to Carlsbad City Council, Housing-Parks-Planning Commissions & Housing Element Advisory Committee; & State of CA Coastal Commission, Parks, Housing & Community Development Department: Carlsbad City Council, Housing-Parks-Planning Commissions & Housing Element Advisory Committee; & State of CA Coastal Commission, Parks, Housing & Community Development Department was a 26-page document with a Subject line and submitted as official Citizen public input for the Housing Element & Parks Master Plan Updates, & Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment regarding ‘Coastal Recreation’ facts, needs, issues for Ponto Planning Area F and citywide. Due to the size of the document it is being included as a separate PDF file.

Nov 30, 2020

People for Ponto citizen public input on:

Carlsbad's Draft Housing Element Update

Carlsbad Planning Commission for the Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment;

Carlsbad Park Commission for the Draft Parks Master Plan Update; and

City Council and CA Coastal Commission for all the above Draft updates and amendments

Page# Citizen concern & public input

Overall Since 2017 there has been extensive Carlsbad Citizen input provided to the City Staff and City Council concerning the documented past/present 'City Coastal land use planning mistakes' at Planning Area F at Ponto (a site the City Staff is including in the housing inventory), and Citizens documenting and expressing the need for Ponto Park on Planning Area F and desire for the City Council to acquire it for a much needed (and only) Coastal Park for South Carlsbad.

The extensive Carlsbad Citizen input to the City gathered by People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens (as of Nov 2020) includes over 2,700 emailed requests for the Ponto Park, over 200-pages of public testimony and data documentation showing the Carlsbad Citizen need for Ponto Park, and numerous presentations to the City Council showing Ponto Park needs and Citizen's requests for Ponto Park. Ponto Park was also by far the most cited Citizen need and request for City Council funding during both the 2019 and 2020 Budget processes. Over 90% of Citizen requests during both those City budget processes asked for Ponto Park [see attachment 1 & go to the 6/2 & 6/24/20 City Budget at <https://carlsbadca.swagit.com/play/06022020-906> & <https://carlsbadca.swagit.com/play/06232020-1181> and listen to and read the public testimony as the files are too big to email]. Due to the 4-person City Council and 2-2 City Council split these extensive Citizens needs and requests were not acted on. With the recent election, there is now a 5th Council person (from District 4 that includes Ponto) to provide a City Council decision on Citizen needs and desire for Ponto Park. People for Ponto citizens have asked the City Staff circulate and provide the extensive Carlsbad Citizen input, need and request for Ponto Park to Carlsbad's Planning, Parks and Housing Commissions, and the Housing Element Advisory Committee (HEAC), so the primary CA Coastal Land Use planning issues area coordinated between the City Staff's proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment, Housing Element Update, and Parks Master Plan Update processes. Unfortunately, City Staff communication, coordination and inviting People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens to be involved when the Ponto Planning Area F land use issues are being considered by the Planning, Parks and Housing Commissions, and the Housing Element Advisory Committee does not seem to be happening.

On 2017 what is now a much larger People for Ponto group of Carlsbad Citizens asked the City Council and City Staff for a better Ponto Planning Process, and documented why Ponto Park is more consistent with Carlsbad's Community Vision (the foundation for Carlsbad's General Plan, and land use plan) [see attachment #2]

In 2017 People for Ponto filed official Carlsbad Public Records Requests, and found the City make multiple 'planning mistakes' at Ponto, and particularly at Planning Area F with regard to non-compliance with Carlsbad existing Local Coastal Program and also overall Growth Management Standard Open Space acreage requirements at Ponto. These have been

documented to the City on several occasions and are highlighted on pages 2-5, 6-7, 11-12, and 14-16 in Attachment #3.

As summarized on page 11 in Attachment #3, in 2017 the CA Coastal Commission informed the City how the City's proposed Ponto Planning Area F General Plan Land Use designation change from the existing "Non-residential Reserve" to R-23 & General Commercial could change if 'higher-priority' Coastal Recreation or Low-cost Visitor Accommodations area needed at Ponto. City Staff first and only provided that information to the City Council (and one assumes also the Carlsbad Planning, Parks and Housing Commissions) on 1/28/20. On 1/28/20 City Staff introduced the Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment process to the City Council. We are not sure if City Staff provided the CA Coastal Commissions' direction to the City on Ponto Planning Area F to the Planning, Park, and Housing Commissions and HEAC? The CA Coastal Commission is the final land use authority at Ponto since Ponto is in the CA Coastal Zone and is governed by the CA Coastal Act, which supersedes Carlsbad's General Plan. Land use in the CA Coastal Zone and the State law that governs land use in the CA Coastal Zone, the CA Coastal Act is not constrained by many CA Housing laws. This is logical as the Coast is a very limited State resource and many critical Coastal land uses can only be provided in the Coast, whereas housing can be provided over a much larger land area and based on beneficial surrounding land use adjacencies is better located in inland locations.

At the above mentioned 1/28/20 City Council meeting there were numerous apparent errors, omissions or misrepresentations in the Staff Report. These errors/omissions/misrepresentations had critical reference and relevance to the Draft Housing Element and how CA Coastal Act and state housing laws interact. People for Ponto submitted written and verbal testimony at the 1/28/20 meeting on these errors/omissions/misrepresentations [see attachment #4]. The Housing Commission and HEAC, Planning Commission and Parks Commission should review and consider Attachment #4 in evaluating the Draft Housing Element Update, Draft LCP-LUPA and Draft Parks Master Plan Update.

As documented in Attachment #5 Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan clearly recognizes that Carlsbad's General Plan land use changes to Carlsbad's Coastal Zone from the 2015 General Plan Update are not valid until the CA Coastal Commission fully "Certifies" a Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment (LCP-LUPA). This has not yet occurred. The CA Coastal Commission will likely consider Carlsbad's Draft LCP-LUPA in 2021-2022. As noted in Attachment #3, based on the 2010 and two 2017 communications from the CA Coastal Commission, the CA Coastal Commission may or may not "Certify" the City's proposed, Coastal land use change at Ponto Planning Area F from its current "Non-residential Reserve" land use to R-23 Residential and General Commercial. People for Ponto Citizen data provided to both the City and CA Coastal Commission show Carlsbad appears to both significantly lag behind other Coastal cities in providing both Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation that at high-priority Coastal land uses at Ponto [see Attachments #5 & #6]. Thus the CA Coastal Commission may direct Carlsbad to change its General Plan at both Ponto Planning Area F and maybe at other areas to provide these 'higher-priority' Coastal land uses consistent with the CA Coastal Act, and Carlsbad's existing LCP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F. The Housing Commission and HEAC, Planning Commission and Parks Commission should review and consider Attachments #5 & #6 in evaluating the Draft Housing Element Update, Draft LCP-LUPA and Draft Parks Master Plan Update.

Ponto Planning Area F is only 11-acres in size, and is the last remaining vacant and unplanned Coastal land in South Carlsbad to provide for the 'forever supply' of Coastal Recreation to accommodate the 'forever increasing population and visitor demands' of 'High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations'. This issue of Coastal 'buildout' of 'High-priority Coastal land uses v. a forever increasing Carlsbad and CA residential population and visitor demand for those 'High-Priority Coastal land uses was presented to and asked of Carlsbad's City Council; Planning, Housing and Parks Commissions, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission and CA Housing and Community Development on 9/14/20 by People for Ponto Citizens [see attachment #7 on page XX below]. As yet there has been no City/State reply and City opportunity to fully discuss the issues in the 9/14/20 email. Ponto Planning Area F is the last critical and most economical area for those high-priority uses in South Carlsbad. Conversely, Planning Area F has a negligible impact on Carlsbad's affordable housing supply as documented in the Draft Housing Element. The Draft Housing Element documents a significant oversupply of housing and most critically affordable housing opportunities without even including the potential (only if both the City ultimately proposes and CA Coastal Commission actually 'Certifies' a change to Ponto Area F Coastal land use to residential) for Ponto Planning Area F's residential use. As noted on the comments below relative to Draft Housing Element page 10-92 and Table 10-29, the City's proposed Planning Area F's R-23 residential and General Commercial use would yield a potential 108-161 min-max range of dwellings. Of these 20% would be required to be affordable at the "Lower" income category since the City would have to transfer "excess Dwelling Units" to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" Coastal Land Use. This 20% is a relatively small 22-32 "Low" income units. 22-32 "Low" income units is only .40% to .59% of all the "Lower" income housing units provided by Carlsbad in the Draft Housing Element; and is only .66% to .96% of the amount of the "Excess" (beyond the RHNA requirement) Lower Income housing units" provided by Carlsbad's Draft Housing Element. So Ponto Planning Area F has no impact on Carlsbad meeting its RNHA allocation, and has a negligible 0.66% to 0.96% impact on the amount of "Excess" (beyond the RHNA requirement) Lower Income housing units" provided by Carlsbad's Draft Housing Element. Yet Ponto Planning Area F has a profound, critical and truly forever impact on Carlsbad's and the State of California's Coastal Land Use Priorities for Coastal Recreation for the 64,000 current and growing numbers of South Carlsbad residents who want and need a Coastal Park. Ponto Planning Area F is the last meaningful vacant and unplanned Coastal land in South Carlsbad to provide Coastal Park, and the most affordable and tax-payer efficient Park Carlsbad could provide. Forever squandering this last bit of precious Coastal Land for residential use so a few (86-129) can buy \$ 1+ million homes, and a few 'lucky' (22-32) subsidized affordable homeowners have a coastal location; while forever denying a far greater 64,000 (and growing) South Carlsbad residents-children their only South Carlsbad Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Ponto Park) opportunity does not make sense for either the City or State of California. Forever squandering Ponto Planning Area F for a few years of "Excess" residential land for some very expensive luxury homes does not seem to make sense.

So, the Housing Commission and HEAC should at this time remove Ponto Planning Area F from the Housing Element at this time. The City should only consider including it in the Housing Element as 'vacant housing site' if and after the CA Coastal Commission 'Certifies' the City's proposed Coastal Land Use change from the existing LCP-LUPA "Non-residential Reserve" land use to a 'lower-Coastal-priority' residential land.

Additional Data in support of the above Citizen request, & Draft Housing Element Comments:

- 10-63 States: "Coastal Zone: Although sites located within the Coastal Zone, as defined in the 2019 Local Coastal Program (LCP) Land Use Plan, are not excluded, areas within the Coastal Zone have been carefully considered, as any necessary redesignations in this zone would require additional processes and time, which can be a constraint to housing development." It is unclear what this means?

Also, this section fails to disclose some very critical Coastal Zone, that are governed by the CA Coastal Act, issues relative to the CA Coastal Act's superiority over CA Housing Laws if there is competing land use priorities or conflicts. This is logical and also written into State Law such as SB 330 (Skinner) Section 13 that states: "(2) **Nothing in this section supersedes, limits, or otherwise modifies the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976** (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code). **For a housing development project proposed within the coastal zone, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an affected county or an affected city from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition necessary to implement or amend a certified local coastal program consistent with the California Coastal Act of 1976** (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code)." This language is consistent with CA case law, and other housing laws that recognize the obvious – there is very limited amount of Coastal land v. significant land area inland. Limited Coastal Land per the CA Coastal Act is needed for CA "High-Priority" Coastal Land Uses" - i.e. Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodations primarily in a city such as Carlsbad. The CA Coastal Act identifies both residential and general commercial land uses as "low-priority" as these can be well provided in non-Coastal Zone areas. So although affordable housing is important there are other more appropriate locations, than on the last remaining vacant Coastal land in South Carlsbad that will be needed to address the "High-Priority" Coastal Land Uses to serve Carlsbad and California's 'buildout' needs. CA case law recognizes the supremacy of the CA Coastal Act over CA Housing Laws as noted in "Kalnel Gardens, LLC v. City of Los Angeles" et. al.

The Coastal Zone section on 10-63 should be clarified and acknowledge the CA Coastal Act Policies that concern California's Coastal Land Use priorities. Given future increases in Carlsbad and CA populations (and visitors) and those populations needing increases in Coastal Land for Coastal Recreation, it is prudent for the City of Carlsbad to plan and reserve the last remaining fragments of Coastal Land for Coastal Recreation land use to address these population increases [see Attachment 7].

- 10-92 Table 10-29: This table shows that Carlsbad has more than sufficient housing sites to address all its RHNA numbers in this cycle. Carlsbad and the State of California both have higher priority Coastal Land Use needs at Ponto Planning Area F then for housing. This is all the more relevant in that the housing proposed at the 11-acre Ponto Planning Area F is:
- relatively small and has negligible impact on overall city housing goals,
 - would not really further Carlsbad's nor the State of California's affordable goals, in that housing being designed-marketed and that housing market will price and sell homes for well over \$1 million per unit; and even if you build 3-5-10 stories high the market sell price would be the same or very similar, due to its Coastal location, will likely not even be exclusively used for housing, but market forces will promote more profitable short-term or medium term visitor rental use, and

- if for some reason the City will still be requiring the Ponto Planning Area speculative land owner to actually provide 20% of Planning Area F's potential 108-161 min-max range of dwellings as affordable at the "Lower" income category as is currently required, this is a relatively small 22-32 "Low" income units. 22-32 "Low" income units is only .40% to .59% of all the "Lower" income housing units provided by Carlsbad and is only .66% to .96% of the amount of "Excess" Lower Income housing units" provided by Carlsbad's land use plan. The landowner already has tried to offload their 20% Lower income requirement to an inland location around the airport but could not do so for several reasons, but likely will try again. So Ponto Planning Area F is well below 1% influence on Carlsbad housing; yet has a significant impact on Carlsbad's and the State of California's Coastal Land Use Priorities for Coastal Recreation.
- In reference to the above bullet, The current Coastal Land Use for Ponto Planning Area F is "Non-Residential Reserve" and has no residential land use associated with it under Carlsbad's General Plan as currently Certified by the CA Coastal Commission. So the City of Carlsbad currently requires under its Growth Management Plan to transfer some excess SW Quadrant dwelling units from the City's housing unit bank to the Ponto Planning Area F site change the Area F's land use for residential use. For this dwelling unit transfer the City requires a developer/land owner to provide 20% of the dwelling as affordable to "Low" incomes. The City has a formal agreement with the Ponto Planning Area F land owner requiring this 20% "Low" income housing on-site in exchange for City's 'transfer of Excess Dwelling Units' specifically to an existing "Non-residential Reserve" Coastal land use site in Carlsbad's current LCP. Draft Housing Element pages 10-117 to 119 documents the City's 'Excess Dwelling Units' program.

10-110 Construction and Labor Costs: The Draft Housing Element states that the total cost to build housing is composed of the following cost components - 63% are construction building materials and labor, 19% are administrative legal, professional, insurance, and development fee costs, 10% are conversion (title fees, operating deficit reserve) cost, and 8% are acquisition costs (land and closing costs). Developer profit is then added on top of these costs and sets the 'minimum price' a developer can offer to sell/rent a housing unit. Typical minimum estimated developer profit to determine if a project is feasible is around 10%. So land cost at 8% is the lowest cost component in housing development. Developer profit can increase beyond this in a hotter housing and can reduce in a cooler market than the Developer projects in their project pro-forma. A market housing builder, understandably, looks to maximize their profit and if possible reduce risk.

So should the Draft Housing Element focus on the major housing cost factors (construction costs) and possibly reduce developer risk by providing more robust policies to provide direct subsidies to market developers to pay for their developer's 10% profit and some of the major construction costs for in exchange for permanent affordability on the dwellings so subsidized? It may be a non-typical idea, but would kind of be like developer profit insurance, and maybe worth exploring. If a market developer is guaranteed their 10% profit on their dwelling unit costs then this would seem good for them – they are guaranteed to make their 10% profit. The challenge would be how to fund the City's, or State HCD's developer profit insurance pool to fund such an affordability program.

10-115 Growth Management Plan Constraints Findings: This section starts out with the following statement: *"With the passage of SB 330 in 2019, a "city shall not enact a development policy,*

standard, or condition that would...[act] as a cap on the number of housing units that can be approved or constructed either annually or for some other time period." This opening statement is very incomplete and misleading on four (4) major points:

1. For clarity the statement should document that SB 330 applies to Charter Cities like Carlsbad. Carlsbad Charter has specific language relative to the Growth Management Program, and this should be explained.
2. SB 330 is clearly short-term 6-year housing crisis legislation, that is set to will expire on 1/1/2025 – 5-years from now.
 - a. This short-term 6-year applicability of SB 330 should be clearly disclosed up-front particularly if a short-term law is being used to overturn Carlsbad's City Charter and change decades of Carlsbad infrastructure planning. It will likely take Carlsbad 5-years to create and get adopted by the City and CA Coastal Commission (for Carlsbad's Coastal Zone) to comply with SB 330 only to have SB 330 expire.
 - b. Also, as is logical in a short-term law that will expire in 5-years, SB 330 is only applicable to a City "enacting" such policy within the time SB 330 is law (i.e. until 1/1/2025). SB 330 language is "enact" and that word reflects future action not a past City action. SB 330 being short-term 6-year legislation uses the word 'enact' that refers to a future action To be apical to a past action the language would have to be 'have enacted' but should have clearly indicated all such past laws are now invalid until 1/1/2025. It is illogical to have a short-term crises legislation that expires in 1/1/2025 overturn over 30-years of pre-SB 330 development policies in Carlsbad and possibly other cities, particularly when the actual language of SB 330 does not clearly state so.
3. Carlsbad's Draft Housing Element will be valid from 2021-2029 or 4-years beyond the expiration of SB 330. If the Draft Housing Element is meeting its RHNA numbers for the years 2021-2029 and not creating "a cap on the number of housing units that can be approved or constructed" during the 6-year period when SB 330 is the law (only until 1/1/2025) then there seems no Growth Management Program "Constraint" on the 2021-2029 RHNA numbers and SB 330 set to expire on 1/1/2025.
4. As noted above for page 10-63, SB 330 (Skinner) Section 13 states that: **"(2) Nothing in this section supersedes, limits, or otherwise modifies the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976** (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code). **For a housing development project proposed within the coastal zone, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an affected county or an affected city from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition necessary to implement or amend a certified local coastal program consistent with the California Coastal Act of 1976** (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code)." This should be clearly stated.

This section of the Draft Housing Element needs more research and full disclosure of the four (4) above SB 330 issues.

Also the Section should address the 3 foundational issues emailed on 9/14/20 'Citizen public input for Housing Element & Parks Master Plan Updates, & Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment' to the 'Carlsbad City Council, Housing-Parks-Planning Commissions & Housing Element Advisory Committee; & State of CA Coastal Commission, Parks, Housing & Community Development Department' [Attachment7].

- 10-119 Mitigating Opportunities, 2nd paragraph: the 3 foundational issues emailed on 9/14/20 'Citizen public input for Housing Element & Parks Master Plan Updates, & Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment' to the 'Carlsbad City Council, Housing-Parks-Planning Commissions & Housing Element Advisory Committee; & State of CA Coastal Commission, Parks, Housing & Community Development Department' should be address here also. **How can Carlsbad or any California City plan to assure their land use plans' "primary tenant that public facilities keep pace with growth" occur if population growth is unlimited and will increase each RHNA cycle while at the exact same time a City's vacant land, and critical vacant Coastal Zone land, is getting smaller and will eventually effectively be gone?**

Without new vacant land and critical new vacant Coastal Zone Land to provide new City Parks and new Costal Recreation to 'keep pace with growth' in population and visitors how can Carlsbad's and California's quality of life be maintained or enhanced?

Are City Park Standards of 3-5 acres of Parkland per 1,000 populations to become void when there is no more vacant land to provide New Parks needed for an unlimited growth in population? Will California's Coastal Recreation resources not be allowed to concurrently grow in land area and be appropriately distributed with population and visitor growth? Will California's beloved and economically important Coastal Recreation resources then become 'loved to death' by more overcrowding from unlimited population and visitor growth? Without providing concurrent, equivalent, and unlimited growth in new Coastal Recreation land for the growth of those two populations a slow, but eventual deterioration will occur. These are fundamental issues of CA State priorities, particularly between the CA Coastal Act and CA Planning and Zoning and housing laws.

- 10-123 California Government Code Section 65863: The California Government Code Section 65863 exceptions should all be listed, and if section 65863 supersedes the CA Coastal Act and how the CA Coastal Commission may finally decide to finally Certify Coastal land use at Ponto in he next year or so. As per Carlsbad's General Plan the General Plan at Ponto is not adopted until the CA Coastal Commission fully Certifies or Certifies with Modifications Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment. Carlsbad's Draft Housing Element already shows "Excess" housing capacity to meet RHNA numbers limits without the need for Ponto Planning Area F.

- 10-149 California Coastal Commission: This section is incomplete. It is missing some key fundamental and common-sense land use principles regarding the CA Coastal Commission; CA Coastal Act; State 'Coastal Land Use Priorities' under the CA Coastal Act that Carlsbad needs to follow; and that CA housing law does not 'supersede, limit, or otherwise modify the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976'.

The fundamental and common sense land use principles are that the Coastline and Coastal Land near the Coast area a very small areas that need to provide high-priority Coastal land use to serve a magnitudes larger inland area and visitors to the coast. This very small Coastal Land needs to "forever" provide for All the Future Coastal Recreation needs for Carlsbad, Cities inland of Carlsbad, CA Citizens such as those coming from LA Metro region, and for all the out-of-state Visitors that visit Carlsbad. This is a huge amount of both Present and Future Coastal Recreation demand focused on a very small land area. Attachment #5 data documents the projection of both population and visitor growth that will increase demands for Coastal Recreation.

Most all of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone is already developed and not available to address those needs. In 2008 only 9% of Carlsbad was vacant, and maybe only ½ or less of that 9%, say only 4.5% was vacant land in the Coastal Zone. This 4.5% of vacant land is likely even a smaller percentage in 2020, and will be an even smaller in 2029 at the end of the Housing Element's planning horizon. The Draft Housing Element does not indicate amount of Vacant Coastal Land in Carlsbad in 2020. This small remaining less than 4.5% of Carlsbad must forever provide for All the future Coastal Priority Land Use needs such as critical Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) that is the lowest cost method to access and enjoy the coast. Ponto Planning Area F is the last remaining vacant land to provide for "High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Uses" in an area in need of a Coastal Park consistent with CA Coastal Act.

Housing however can be, and is better located in more inland areas where there is more land, more vacant land, more affordable land, and where there is 360 degrees of surrounding land that supports housing, such the bulk of employment and commercial centers and public services such as schools. The common-sense logic that very limited and finite Coastal Land should be used primarily for only those land uses that can only be provided by a Coastal location finally came to forefront in the 1970's after years of sometimes poor Coastal land use decisions by Cities.

In the 1970's CA citizens and then the CA State government addressed how California's limited Coastal Land area should be 'Prioritized' for use with the CA Coastal Act. In that regard the CA Coastal Act (CA PRC Section 30001.5) has the following goals:

(c) **Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners.

(d) **Assure priority for coastal -dependent and coastal-related development over other development** on the coast.

In support of these Goals there are numerous regulatory policies that prioritize and guide how Coastal Land should be used such as:

- Section 30212.5 ... **Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities**, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**
- Section 30213 ... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**
- Section 30221 **Oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for in the area.**
- Section 30222 The use of **private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation**

shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.

- Section 30223 **Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible.**
- Section 30251 ... **The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development
- Section 30255 **Coastal-dependent developments shall have priority over other developments on or near the shoreline**

The CA Coastal Commission (CCC) uses the CA Coastal Act Goals and Polices in reviewing the Coastal Zone areas of Carlsbad's General Plan and thus Coastal Zone area of the Housing Element to determine if the CCC can certify the Coastal Zone of Carlsbad's General Plan as being in compliance with the CA Coastal Act. Carlsbad's General Plan Land Use Element clearly states on page 2-26 that "The city's LCP Land Use Plan will be updated consistent with this General Plan. **However, to take effect, the LCP must be certified by the Coastal Commission as well as adopted by the city. Until such time that this occurs, the existing (as of 2013) LCP must be adhered to.**"

For one small 11-acre vacant site – Ponto Planning Area F – Carlsbad's existing Local Coastal Program land use plan and regulations are:

"Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. **Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area, for which land uses will be determined at a later date when more specific planning is carried out for areas west of the railroad right-of-way.** A future Major [*Poinsettia Shores. aka San Pacifico Community Association*] Master Plan Amendment will be required prior to further development approvals for Planning Area F, and shall include an LCP Amendment with associated environmental review, if determined necessary. ... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**"

Although the City has twice tried to change the General Plan land use designation on Ponto's Planning Area F to R-23 Residential and General Commercial the City has:

1. Never complied with this Coastal regulatory requirement as has been documented by official Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 2017-262, R000930-072419, R001280-021720, & R001281-02170.
2. Never clearly and publicly disclosed and engaged Carlsbad citizens, and particularly to the San Pacifico Community Association in which Planning Area F belongs to, in "any future planning effort" and in in our Community, South Carlsbad, and Citywide "need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.",

3. Never conducted a “Major Master Plan Amendment”, and never invited nor engaged the San Pacifico Community Association that composes over 70% of the Master Plan area to be consulted on possible changes to the Community’s Master Plan, and
4. Had the City’s/Developer’s proposed land use change from Non-residential Reserve to R-23 & General Commercial denied by the CA Coastal Commission in 2010,
5. Not yet had the CA Coastal Commission yet consider/rule on Certification of Carlsbad’s proposed Draft Local Coastal Program - Land Use Plan Amendment to change Planning Area F’s existing ‘Non-residential Reserve’ Coastal land use. The City maybe submit the City’s proposal in 2021-2,
6. Received specific direction in 2016 and 2017 from the CA Coastal Commission regarding the City’s proposed land use change for Ponto Planning Area F. Specifically:
 - a. CCC Staff acknowledged the City has not yet complied with the LCP and in an 8/16/2017 email said: **“The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City’s Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City’s land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area.”**
 - b. CCC Staff sent Carlsbad City Staff on 7/3/17. City Staff provided this to City Council on 1/28/20: **“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad.** This is an issue that the San Pacifico HOA community group is raising in regards to the Shopoff/Ponto development proposal, and **this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”**

Carlsbad’s Draft LCP-LUPA, Draft Housing Element Update and Parks Master Plan Update should ALL land use plan and reserve Ponto Planning Area F and the other last few remaining vacant Coastal Lands to address the ‘forever’ or ‘Buildout’ High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Visitor serving Land Use needs for Carlsbad, North San Diego County, and California.

10-169 Draft Policy 10-P.7 says “Encourage distribution of development of affordable housing throughout the city to avoid over concentration in a particular area, excluding areas lacking necessary infrastructure or services.” Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan identifies Ponto as an area lacking park services, stating and showing on maps Ponto as ‘unserved’ by City Parks, and an area of ‘Park Inequity’. Ponto currently has 1,025 homes that creates an 8-acre City Park demand (based on the City minimal 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard) yet is ‘Unserved’

by City Parks per the City's Park Master Plan. Ponto development and homeowners paid City park-in-lieu-fees sufficient for 8-acres of City Park.

Of Ponto's 1,025 current homes, 202 in the San Pacifico Community Association were built to be affordable condominium homes with very small 'exclusive use' lots, zero-side yards/building setbacks and only 10-15' wide 'back yards'; and 384 Lakeshore Gardens homes are affordable age-restricted manufactured homes. So 586 of Ponto's 1,025 current homes or 57% of Ponto's housing were planned and built to be affordable. At 57% Ponto has and was developed with a consideration of affordable housing, but also was denied needed City Park facilities of at least 8-acres to meet minimum City Park Standards.

Consistent with Policy 10-P.7 Ponto Planning Area F should be used to address Ponto's 'Park Inequity' being 'unserved', and not used to increase the "over concentration" of affordable housing that was already planned and built at Ponto.

10-171 Figure 10-13: Sites Requiring No Zone Change: Ponto Planning Area F needs to be removed from Figure 10-13. As has been previously documented Planning Area F is currently Certified in the Existing Carlsbad Local Coastal Program as "Non-residential Reserve". Both the City's General Plan Land Use Element and Zoning Code clearly state the City needs to receive CA Coastal Commission 'Certification' of Carlsbad's Proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment (sometime in 2021-22) to change that existing Certification before Ponto Planning Area F's Coastal Land Use and Zoning is fully changed to R-23 Residential and General Commercial. Based on Ponto Planning Area F's existing Certified LCP regulations and well documented need for high-priority Coastal land uses at Ponto, it is likely Planning Area F's ultimate land use approved by the CA Coastal Commission could change.

10-191 Program 2.1: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance: this section states that "For all residential projects of fewer than seven units, payment of a fee in lieu of inclusionary units is permitted. The fee is based on a detailed study that calculated the difference in cost to produce a market rate rental unit versus a lower-income affordable unit. As of 2020, the in-lieu fee per market-rate dwelling unit was \$4,515." The City's in-lieu-affordable-housing fees seems very inadequate, as other cities like the City of Laguna Beach's (I recall) \$160,000 per unit in-lieu affordable housing inclusionary housing fee that actually reflects the in-lieu cost. This cost and fee should be similar to Carlsbad's situation. If in fact the Carlsbad's in-lieu affordable inclusionary housing cost to provide an affordable housing unit is only \$4,515 per dwelling, then the City appears have sufficient resources in the as I understand \$19 million Affordable Housing Inclusionary Fee accounts to provide the gap funding to 'buy' over 4,200 affordable dwellings. Since an in-lieu fee is to cover the costs of actually providing the affordable dwelling the fees should then be able to purchase that affordable dwelling someplace else in the housing market. There is a critical need to explain in much more detail why the in-lieu fee is what it is, if it is truly adequate in funding affordable housing "in-lieu" of a developer providing the affordable housing? If the in-lieu fee is the total cost difference between affordable and market construction then is the difference in affordable and market dwelling sales/rental price the market housing developers' Profit? If so then developer profit is the major barrier to affordable housing, as total costs are not that much different. If so then it seems logical to address this major barrier to affordable housing.

10-192 Program2.2: Replace or Modify Growth Management Plan (GMP): As mentioned before is seems imprudent to overturn the GMP for a temporary crisis housing law (SB 330) set to expire on 1/25/20. Also, it should be clearly stated in the this section that SB 330 has limited applicability or enforceability in the CA Coastal Zone if the City is pursuing compliance with the CA Coastal Act as documented in Attachment #4.

SB 330 reflects a very unusual time when national and international economic market distortion by central banks has created, historically low interest rates and resulting in historic Housing (and other) Asset (stocks and bonds) values. This manufactured temporary inflationary market stimulus is to be temporary, not long-term, and will be a temporary market distortion that will likely see asset prices 'revert to mean' once the cost of capital is properly priced. If SB 330 legally overrides Carlsbad's GMP until 2025 then that is what the State is mandating Carlsbad do. However, it is very imprudent and inappropriate to use SB 330's temporary crises language as rational for long-term changes to critical foundations of GMP. Once the temporary crises that SB 330 is designed to address is over is the time to methodically approach wise long-term and sustainable land use policy.

Attachment #7:

From: Lance Schulte [mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 10:46 AM

To: Council Internet Email (CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov); Scott Chadwick (Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov); Erin Prahler (Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov); Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Cort Hitchens (cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov); Lisa Urbach (lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov); 'Zachary.Olmstead@hcd.ca.gov'; 'Megan.Kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov'; 'scott.donnell@carlsbadca.gov'

Cc: Brhiggins1@gmail.com; Phil Urbina (philipur@gmail.com); Lela Panagides (info@lelaforcarlsbad.com); Team Teresa for Carlsbad (teamteresaforcarlsbad@gmail.com); People for Ponto (info@peopleforponto.com); Laura Walsh (lauraw@surfridersd.org); 'Steve Puterski'; Philip Diehl (philip.diehl@suniontribune.com)

Subject: Citizen public input for Housing Elem & Parks Master Plan Updates, & Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Housing-Parks-Planning Commissions & Housing Element Advisory Committee; & State of CA Coastal Commission, Parks, Housing & Community Development Department:

As one of the many People for Ponto (www.peopleforponto.com), we wanted to make sure this email and attachments have been provided to you and that the issues/data in this email be publicly presented/discussed during both the City's and State's consideration of the above planning and any other related activities.

1. Legality of 'Buildout' and quality of life standards in both California and a City within California; and if planning for "buildout" is illegal, can we California Citizens be provide the specific citation in CA State Law that forbids the State and/or Cities within California from land use and public infrastructure planning to cap to a finite or "buildout" population/development condition. As California and Carlsbad citizens it important to know the State's legal policy on "buildout"; and State policy laws on how are an infinite amount of Coastal Recreation and other high-priority Coastal land

uses can be correspondently provided for infinite population growth within a largely developed and finite (and shrinking due to sea level rise) Coastal Zone?

The following public testimony and questions were presented the 6/23/20 Carlsbad Budget meeting. Coordinated answers from the State of CA and City of Carlsbad on how State Coastal and Housing planning priorities are ordered and reconciled is important. Carlsbad has a very small fragment of remaining vacant coastal land and once it is developed it essentially lost forever. This is being planned now with the above mentioned planning efforts. Most all of Carlsbad's Coastal lands are already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential land use, or off-limits due to endangered habitat preservation. Coastal Parks or Campgrounds can only be provided along the Coast and they are currently very crowded, and will continue to get more crowded and eventually degrade over time by increased population demands if new Coastal Parks and campgrounds are not created by coordinated Coastal Land Use planning by the State and City. How is the State of CA and City of Carlsbad to address maintaining our coastal quality of life (coastal recreation) with infinite population growth and rapidly shrinking coast land resources?

Citizens need a coordinated State of CA and City response to: *"6-23-20 City Council Budget meeting – pubic testimony by Lance Schulte: People for Ponto submitted 130-pages of public testimony on 6/2/20, would like to submit the following public input to both the 6/23/20 City Budget Meeting and the City proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment – and with reference to a proposed change the land use of Planning Area F from its Existing Non-Residential Reserve land use to City proposed low-coastal priority high-density residential and general commercial land uses. Contrary to what was said by 2 Council members the City's LCP policy covering Planning Area F is not a Citywide LCP policy, but is specific to the Sammis/Poinsettia Shores LCP area, and the policy's scope and regulatory authority is limited by the boundaries of the Sammis/Poinsettia Shores LCP area.*

The Planning Area F Ponto Coastal Park is critical to the long-term economic vitality and sustainability of South Carlsbad's neighborhoods and extensive Visitor Industry; and Carlsbad's 1st and 3rd highest revenue sources.

Beyond Ponto there is an additional and separate Citywide Coastal Recreation requirement related to CA Coastal Commission concerns about Carlsbad's proposed LUP land use changes and proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment (LCPA) adequately providing for a Citywide 'buildout' need for Coastal Recreation land.

It is not clear if 'buildout' is a set and final amount of City and State population and development or if 'buildout' represents accommodating an endless amount of future population and development in Carlsbad and the State of California. If 'Buildout' is an endless future amount of population growth and development, then how is the City planning to provide a commensurate endless amount of City Parks and Open Space? How is an endless amount of Coastal Recreation provided to accommodate endless amount of City and Statewide growth?

Until these questions can be authoritatively answered by the City and State of California the preservation and acquisition of vacant Coastal land should be a City priority. Because once land is developed it will never be available for Park and Coastal Recreation use. Continual population and development growth without corresponding Park and Open Space growth will lead to a gradual but eventual undermining of the quality of life for Carlsbad and California, and our Carlsbad economy. It is for these and other important reasons People for Ponto ask the City to budget for the purchase of

Planning Area F for Coastal Recreation and City Park needs – needs that City has documented exist now, and needs that will only grow more critical and important in the future.

Thank you, People for Ponto love Carlsbad and our California Coast. We hope you love Carlsbad also and you take responsibility as a steward of our California Coast.”

2. Attached is an email regarding clarification of apparent City errors/misrepresentations on 1/28/20 regarding a) the CA Coastal Act’s relationship with CA Housing laws regarding CA land use priorities and requirements within the CA Coastal Zone, and b) City planning documents and City planning and public disclosure mistakes regarding Ponto. The clarification of the issues noted on 1/28/20 should be comprehensive, and holistically and consistently disclosed/discussed in each of the City’s and State’s Coastal-Land Use Planning-Parks-Housing planning efforts showing the principles and legal requirements for how potential conflicts within State/City Policies are to be resolved.
3. Similar to #2 above, People for Ponto has provided public testimony/input of over 200-pages of documented data on the need for a “Public Park” and over 2,500 Citizens’ requests for that Park. Those 200+ pages and the email requests from 2,500 citizens, and the CA Coastal Commission direction to the City as noted below should also be shared with the Carlsbad’s Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions and the City’s Housing Element as part of the respective land use-parks-housing discussions.

The CA Coastal Commission has also provided direction to the City regarding some of the City’s planning mistakes at Ponto, and those directions should also be shared with the City’s Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions and Housing Element Advisory Committee regarding Coastal Land Use planning at Ponto Planning Area F. CA Coastal Commission has provided the following direction to the Carlsbad:

- a. Following is from a 7/3/17 CCC letter to City Staff on the City’s proposed land use changes at Planning Area F. City Staff provided this to City Council on 1/28/20: “The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. **For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad.** This is an issue that the San Pacifico HOA community group is raising in regards to the Shopoff/Ponto development proposal, and this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. **If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”**
- b. In 2017 after citizens received the City’s reply to Public Records Request 2017-260, citizens meet with CCC staff to reconfirm the City failed since before 2010 to publicly disclose and comply with Planning Area F’s LCP requirements. CCC Staff acknowledged the City has not yet complied with the LCP and in an 8/16/2017 email said: “The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. **The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City’s Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City’s land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area.”**

Please do not misinterpret these comments as anti-housing or anti-development, it is the exact opposite, they are in support of existing and future development. It is a logical recognition of what is the best use of very limited (and shrinking) vacant Coastal Land resources. It is prudent and sustainable State and City Coastal Land Use planning to best serve all CA residents – now and in the future. Housing can be developed in many large inland areas that are better connected with job centers and transit. New Coastal Parks can only be located on the last few remaining vacant parcels within a short distance to the coast. This very small area (vis-a-vis) large inland areas must serve all the coastal Park and recreation needs of California's almost 40 million residents and the additional millions of annual visitors to California's coast. This very small amount of Coastal land drives a lot what makes CA desirable and successful, but it is getting very overcrowded due to population/visitor growth while at the same time shrinking due to coastal erosion and sea level rise. Squandering the few remaining Coastal vacant land resources, and not reserving (planning) these lands for more high-priority Coastal Recreation Land Uses will ultimately undermine CA both socially and economically. The attached 'Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment' file should be provided to and reviewed by Carlsbad's Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions and the Housing Element Advisory committee in their consideration of Carlsbad's proposed Housing Element update and proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment, and also jointly by CA HCD and CCC in providing Carlsbad direction on CA Coastal Land Use priorities in the Coastal Zone relative to those two (2) City proposals.

Thank you all for your consideration and comprehensive inclusion of the various issues in both the City and States upcoming evaluation of proposed Coastal land use plan, Housing Element and Parks Master Plan updates. There is precious little vacant Coastal land left and how it is planned to be used and developed is critical and needs full public disclosure/involvement and a comprehensive and coordinated approach.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
www.peopleforponto.com

Following are the 2 attachments to the above 9/14/20 email:

1. 4/21/20 email of Public input to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions and CA Coastal Commission on DLCPA-PMU-HEU processes: Dear Carlsbad City Council, and Planning, Parks and Housing Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission: People for Ponto submits this email, and the attachment that was provided to the Carlsbad City Council for Item#14 at the 1/28/20 meeting. The attachment provided at the 1/28/20 City Council meeting has not been recorded on the Carlsbad City website that documents public input provided at that 1/28/20 meeting. Consequently we request this email and attachment be provided to the Carlsbad City Council, and Planning, Parks and Housing Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission as public input on the City Staff proposed 1) Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, 2) Parks Master Plan Update, and 3) Housing Element Update processes. The attachment documents apparent errors, omissions, and/or misrepresentations in the 1/28/20 Item #14 Staff Report/Presentation to the City Council. We wish this email and the attached public comments be provided to the Council and Commissions addressed to in this email and be included as public comments to be addressed in the 3 planning processes listed. Thank you. Email confirmation of receipt and delivery of this email/attachment is requested. Thank you. Sincerely, Lance Schulte People for Ponto

- a. Attachment: Carlsbad City Council meeting of 1-28-20 agenda item #14 [typo corrected on 2-4-20]: People for Ponto apologize for this late and hastily, review and comments. We just found out about the meeting this morning. We citizens know we can together achieve great things if you allow us to work with you.

Staff
Report

Page

clarification/correction:

- 1 The LCP Land Use Plan Update is in fact an Amendment to an Existing LCP Land Use Plan. The Existing LCP Land Use Plan is already certified by the CA Coastal Commission as being consistent with the CA Coastal Act, except for some Amendments needed to address Sea Level Rise impacts and some other issues. The LCP Amendment proposes to change the Existing CA Coastal Commission certified LCP Land Use Plan's "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use and Policy on Planning Area F to consider and document the need for "i.e. Public Park" at Ponto .
- 1 Staff summarizes the CA Coastal Act objectives to "ensure maximum public access to the coast and public recreation areas." Carlsbad's Adopted Park Service Area/Equity Mapping shows there is no Park Service for the Ponto Area and Ponto Citizens, and no Park Service for the Coastal South Carlsbad area west of Interstate-5 and the rail corridor. The City's mapping of land that meets the developer required Growth Management Open Space Standard of 15% Unconstrained land shows about 30-acres of this Open Space is missing at Ponto. This missing Open Space could have provided needed Park facilities that are missing at Ponto. Citizens in over 2,500 emails to the City Council have cited the need for a Public Park at Ponto as part of the Existing LCP Land Use Plan Amendment proposed at Ponto. These requests are consistent with the CA Coastal Act.
- 3 2nd bullet: says city staff proposes to replace, amend, or retain various Existing LCP policies, so the Staff has a documented understanding how each Existing LCP policy is being treated in the proposed Amendment. Citizens asked in Oct 20, 2019 for this 'redline' version of the Existing LCP Policies and Land Use Maps so citizens can understand what the Amendments are so we as citizens could then provide informed public comment. This 'redline' version is also important for the City Council and Planning and other Commissions so they know what Amendments to Existing City LCP Land Use policy are being proposed. Citizens again request this 'redline' version that it appears the staff already has; as they know what Existing LCP Land Use policies are being replaced, amended, or retained.
- 4 V is incomplete: the community asked on Oct 20, 2019 for 3 things: 1) a 'redline' version as noted above, 2) true Public Workshops to help inform and resolve community concerns about the proposed LCP land Use Plan Amendments, and 3) more public review time to provide for the above two other requests. All 3 requests should be acknowledged in the staff report. All 3 requests are rational and reasonable considering the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is the "buildout" plan for Carlsbad's Coastal Zone, and there were multiple

documented fundamental “planning mistakes” regarding past City public information and participation in the Coastal Land Use planning. Providing such a process as outlined by the 3 requests would help to correct these documented public disclosure/participation and ‘planning mistakes’ that have gone on for many years. It is the right thing to do and most productive approach for all concerned.

- 7 Staff should accurately disclose that in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission in fact rejected the City’s proposed Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for failing to disclose and comply with the then and current LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto. Carlsbad Public Record Requests confirmed the staff did not disclose to citizens the existence LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto, so citizens had no idea a Public Park at Planning Area F at Ponto needed to be considered. How can citizens, provide input if citizens don’t have complete and accurate information to review and comment on?

- 8 Staff should correctly disclose that the 2015 application at Planning Area F at Ponto is first for a Local Coastal Program Amendment and Master Plan Amendment. These are both applications to change City Land Use Plan Policy and Zoning regulations. The actual applications for ‘development’ permits can in fact not even be considered by the City until the Local Coastal Program Land Use of “Non-residential Reserve” is changed and Master Plan rezoning is approved. Only then can the ‘development’ permit application can applied for. The developer abandoned their application to change the LCP and Master Plan and then apply for developer permit review about a year ago. However, the city staff is keeping the application ‘alive’ even though there has been no progress on the application for over a year. It is unclear if the staff has authority to do this, or if the City Council has authority to withdrawal the application due to non-activity. The City has permit standards that withdraw applications if applicants make no progress on the applications after 6-months. What is troubling is that it appears the city staff proposal is to process the developer’s application to change the Existing LCP Land Use Plan for the developer.

Staff notes that the Planning Area F sites now designated as Residential R-23 and General Commercial by the Carlsbad General Plan Update. However, staff fails to disclose that until the Existing LCP Land Use Plan Amendment (as proposed by City Staff) is in fact approved by both the City and the CA Coastal Commission the Existing LCP Land Use Plan for Planning Area F supersedes the City’s General Plan Update. Carlsbad’s General Plan Land Use Element clearly states this on page 2-26 stating: “The city’s LCP Land Use Plan will be updated consistent with this General Plan. However, to take effect, the LCP must be certified by the Coastal Commission as well as adopted by the city. Until such time that this occurs, the existing (as of 2013) LCP must be adhered to.” So until the City Council adopts the staff’s proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment, AND the CA Coastal Commission “certifies” that LCP LUP Amendment; the City’s General Plan Update Land Use change cannot take effect. The General Plan Land Use at Ponto Planning Area F has in fact not been changed by the General Plan Update, but can only change with staff’s proposed

Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment that the City Council can choose to approve or disapprove. Also official Public Records Requests have documented that the City's General Plan Update planning process was also fundamentally flawed at Ponto. Again, like during Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan planning process a few years earlier the city failed to comply with the then and current LCP Land Use Plan policy for Planning Area F at Ponto. The flawed General Plan Update process at Ponto prevented Citizens from knowing the facts so they could properly participate and provide review and comment during the General Plan Update. The significant citizen comments to the City Council asking for a Ponto Coastal Park is reflective of the fundamental public disclosure and processing flaws that the city is only now acknowledging as one of the repeated 'planning mistakes' at Ponto. This is why citizens are asking for full disclosure of the facts and a complete planning process re-boot at Ponto. It also should be noted that the Existing LCP Land Use Policy for Planning Area F states that "as part of any future planning effort ... consideration of a "Public Park" is required. CA Coastal Commission Staff has indicated the City's proposed land use planning changes at Ponto as part of the General Plan Update are subject to change.

At the bottom of the page regarding SB 330, as noted above the "residential land use designation on the site" is not in effect until the currently proposed LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is both approved the City Council AND also certified by the CA Coastal Commission, so SB 330 does not apply. Also SB 330 has specific language that exempts land use in the Coastal Zone. SB 330 (Skinner) Section 13 states: "(2) Nothing in this section supersedes, limits, or otherwise modifies the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code). For a housing development project proposed within the coastal zone, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an affected county or an affected city from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition necessary to implement or amend a certified local coastal program consistent with the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code)." This language is consistent with CA case law, and other housing laws that recognize the obvious – there is very limited amount of Coastal land v. significant land area inland. Limited Coastal Land per the CA Coastal Act is needed for "High-Priority" Coastal Land Uses" - i.e. Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodations primarily in a city such as Carlsbad. The CA Coastal Act identifies both residential and general commercial land uses as "low-priority". So although affordable housing is important there are other more appropriate locations, than on the last remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad that will be needed to address the "High-Priority" Coastal Land Uses to serve Carlsbad and California's 'buildout' needs. CA case law recognizes the supremacy of the CA Coastal Act over CA Housing Laws as noted in "Kalnel Gardens, LLC v. City of Los Angeles". This case law data has already been provided to the City Council as part of Staff's housing discussions over the past few years. The staff report should have disclosed the above information, as it appears SB 330 is not a factor at Ponto.

13 2005-2010 Housing Element: As noted above the General Plan Land Use Element states the General Plan Land Use Plan is not effective until the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment is both approved by the City Council AND certified by the CA Coastal Commission. So, the Housing Element Cannot recognizes the proposed residential use change at Ponto until then. Also as noted before there were multiple documented fundamental ‘planning mistakes’ in public disclosure, participation and process that flawed the Housing Element. It should be noted that these flaws occurred during the time the CA Coastal Commission specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan due to those flaws. The now City acknowledged ‘planning mistakes’ at Ponto prevented Carlsbad citizens from providing informed participation during the Housing Element.

Also, it is unclear why the staff misrepresented the amount of housing proposed in the Housing Element on the Ponto Planning Area F site as “the Ponto site for high density residential use at a minimum density of 20 dwellings per acre (128 units minimum)”; as this is not true. The City’s General Plan promises only the minimum 15 dwelling units/acre for the R-23 Land Use designation. See the “Ponto” unit capacity table below from the City of Carlsbad General Plan Housing Element Table B-1 on page B-2 that lists 98 dwellings for the site on the east side of Ponto Road and 11 optional dwellings on the west side of Ponto Road for 109 total units for both sites, v. the 128 units mentioned by staff. Not sure why staff misrepresented the density by 17 to 30%.

2007 Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan: As noted several times above there were fundamental public disclosure and participation flaws with this plan. It was rejected by the CA Coastal Commission in 2010 in part for those reasons. These flaws are confirmed by the City’s own data as a result of multiple Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests. This should be disclosed to the City Council and citizens.

14 2015 General Plan Update: As noted several times above there were also fundamental public disclosure and participation flaws with this General Plan Update with regards to Ponto. These flaws are confirmed by the City’s own data as a result of multiple Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests. This should be disclosed to the City Council and citizens.

Citizens are asking the City Staff and City Council:

- for honesty; to fully and publicly recognize and disclose the past “planning mistakes” at Ponto, and fundamental flaws from the from those mistakes that prevented citizens from knowing about and participating in the planning process for Ponto.
- To keep the Existing LCP Land Use Plan at Ponto until a new open-honest and inclusive Community-based planning process can be achieved at Ponto.
- To be honest with respect to Park Serve Area and Equity issues at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad west of I-5 and the rail corridor.
- Consider the needs for inland South Carlsbad citizens, visitors and business to have their ONLY Coastal Park.

- Consider the larger regional Coastal Park need, and the forever 'buildout' Coastal Recreation needs for future generations.
 - To be true and honest in translating and implementing our Community Vision
2. The 2nd attachment to the 9/14/20 email to Carlsbad City Council, Housing-Parks-Planning Commissions & Housing Element Advisory Committee; & State of CA Coastal Commission, Parks, Housing & Community Development Department: Carlsbad City Council, Housing-Parks-Planning Commissions & Housing Element Advisory Committee; & State of CA Coastal Commission, Parks, Housing & Community Development Department was a 26-page document with a Subject line and submitted as official Citizen public input for the Housing Element & Parks Master Plan Updates, & Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment regarding 'Coastal Recreation' facts, needs, issues for Ponto Planning Area F and citywide. This document has been provided as Attachment #5.

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee Sep 22 2022 meeting; and for LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update - Parks & Open Space at Ponto-Coastal South Carlsbad

Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 11:34 AM

To: City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Tom Frank <Tom.Frank@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee Sep 22 2022 meeting; and for LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update - Parks & Open Space at Ponto-Coastal South Carlsbad

Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Beach Preservation and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

I was out this weekend so just had time to do a quick scan and noticed some obvious missing information and 'spin' in the staff 'report'. I hope the CTGMC can see this and the data 'cherry picking' and diversions to change subjects to "recreation land" and falsely try to count or hide Park shortfalls by trying to use other 'recreation' lands areas' as "Parks. Here is what I was able to quickly scan and note:

Citizen response and Input regarding 'Fact Sheet – Community Interest in Ponto Park'

Page

1 City falsely says "City can only acquire property from a willing seller" - this is false. The City can use legal powers emanate domain and condemnation to buy property for public purpose (Parks) unless the USA & California Constitutions have been amended to only allow acquisitions from 'willing sellers'. The Carlsbad City Council may have CHOSEEN to adopt a formal Policy/Law (or undisclosed and hidden vote) that is constraining their authority. However that City Council CHOICE does not mean the Council can CHOOSE otherwise and use legal powers emanate domain and condemnation to buy property for public purposes.

Ironically the City Council has in fact used these emanate domain and condemnation powers on behalf of the Aviara Master Plan Developer to force an "unwilling seller" to sell a sewer line easement to the City for the Aviara Master Plan Developer.

1 'Park funding only comes from the City's General Fund' - this is false. Recently the Federal government provided the City of Carlsbad \$ 3million to help fund Veterans Park. There are both Federal and State Grants and funding for Park acquisition. The City cites many other funding sources in its CIP, and like those other funding sources for Park acquisition, the City just does not list them. Also, the City has an Park land dedication Ordinance CMC 20.44 (per CA Quimby Act) that pre-dates growth management and requires developers to give the City Free land for use as a Park to meet the Park needs for that development. In fact 20.44 is where the 3 acre per 1,000 population Park Standard came from.

- 1 City fails to mention we have a 'willing seller' for 14.3 acres of vacant land at Ponto. The City cites \$35 million as the price of that land. The 2-part tax-payer Cost-benefit Analysis data files sent to you should be looked at as simply buying these 14.3 acres saves tax-payers millions and is a Better Park option. P4P can show the City and you how the City could buy this property with minimal added City tax-payer cost. There are Federal and State funding (like note above) for Park acquisition. Also ALL Developers are required to give parkland for free to the City under its Park land Dedication Ordinance 20.44 and about 1.76 acres of Ponto land would be given to the City for free to be used as a Park, or the developers would have to give the City money (pay a park-in-lieu-fee) that should be sufficient to buy 1.76 acres of Park land at Ponto.
- 1 City Budget funding is a yearly process, and future Budgets, and even most recent Council actions, will/have changed what was in prior Budgets. Buying Ponto Park actually saves tax-payer dollars as noted in the following bullets and in the 2 files sent to the CTGMC – “2022 General Comparative cost-benefits of Completing PCH-PCH Modification-Ponto Park part 1 of 2” & “City’s PCH area map w numbered notes of constraints – 2 of 2” data files. The data in these data files is from the City. As tax-payers the CTGMC should read these data files.
- 1 City wide approvals will also be needed for the "South Carlsbad Coastal Project (SCCP)" mentioned in the report. The SCCP is a \$135 million to \$150 million improvement to existing City Land and will require a City wide vote. Based on the known tax-payer Cost-Benefits of SCCP, it is not clear if votes will support this expenditure – particularly given the Citizen input the City obtained in the \$50,000 survey it conducted on the SCCP, and the Council deferring the SCCP for another year.
- 1 The staff report incompletely says 136 dwelling units are planned for one of the sites. But the report critically failed to disclose to you that Carlsbad’s General Plan Land Use Element page 2- specifically states Carlsbad’s General Plan is not adopted UNTIL the CA COASTAL COMMISIOSN (CCC) fully CERTIFIES the current City Proposed comprehensive Local Coastal Program Amendment (LCPA). The CCC will decide if to approve-deny-approve with modification the City Proposed LCPA in 2023. As provide the CTGMC the CCC has told the City ion 2016 & 2017 that based on the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost Visitor Accommodations the General Plan Land Use at Ponto may change. See the “Updated 2020 Dec 2 Planning Area F existing LCP-LUP & CCC direction to City” data file sent to the CTGMC. Read the CCC’s reasons for 2010 rejection of the Ponto Vision Plan that is the basis for the 2015 General Plan.
- 1 The 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact analysis did specifically cite both acres of land impacted and the type of land use that was impacted. I can send you the report if you want. I copied key acreage and land use from the SLR Analysis in the “Sea level rise and DUPA LUPA planned loss of Open Space at Ponto data file”. This data file also shows how the City falsely exempted Ponto developers from complying with the growth management 15% Useable Open Space Standard.
- 1 City says "South Carlsbad Coastal Project (SCCP) will Create 60 acres of available space" - this is false. The 60-acres of Space already exists. The City already owns this land. The SCCP is a \$70 million (for 1-mile Manzano to Island Way segment) + \$65 to \$80 million (for 2.3 mile Island Way to La Costa Ave segment) for a total \$135 million to \$150 million project that does not buy one single square foot of new City land. Much of the City's 60-acres is already environmentally constrained by protected Habitat so will not change anything and will continue to be unusable for people use as a Park. Parks are people and Not habitat and Projected Habitat is for plants and animal and Not people. The City knows that most of these existing City owned 60-acres is not useable for people and is too narrow to be a Park. The largest part of the 60-acres is at 'the dip' in the 1-mile Manzano to Island Way segment. We ask the CTGMC to ask staff to show you a map and acreage count of that Segment, and how much acreage is planned for 1) roadway-bikeway-sidewalk, 2) Habitat, 3) useable land for people; and 4) the area that will be lost due to Sea Level Rise for each of these 3. What land uses are lost from SLR? Ask to see the same data for the existing configuration for the segment. Compare the data. Compare the total segment acres with the total 60-acres. There is no secured funding for the \$135 to \$150 million SCCP. The City could buy

3+ Ponto Parks for the cost of rearranging exiting features and adding a sidewalk on existing City land. The only missing feature to Complete" PCH in the two segments (total 3.3 miles) are some missing sidewalks/ped paths.

Enhancements to make PCH better and safer for bikes is a very good idea, but seems like can be done within the existing PCH configuration at a fraction of the cost. See the tax-payer cost-benefit Part 1 of 2 and Part 2 of 2 SCCP/PCH Relocation data files. SCCP will also require a citizen vote to approve funds, I am also hearing that Carlsbad citizens are not that supportive of SCCP. So is the SCCP are secured funded and 'countable solution' to the documented Park deficit at Ponto & Coastal South Carlsbad?

- 2 City says 2,074-acres or 8% of Carlsbad is Park and recreation land (page 2-7 of General Plan). This should be itemized and mapped as the numbers likely include golf courses (mostly private) and maybe Lago land and some Lagoon waters. The City is trying to inaccurately try to use private Recreation land as a public Park. The CTGMC is supposed to compare Park Standard to Park Standards. The City's Park Standard is fairly poor relative to Encinitas and Oceanside and many other cities, so you are being diverted from that fact.
- 2 432.4-acres of exiting Park & 519.7-acres of final Park based on 7/26/22 CC vote. This data should closely match the City's General Plan Land Use data that is the data base used in the "2022 Coastal Recreation data file" sent to you. Of critical importance to the CTGMC is to note the City is apparently saying that they will only provide a final 519.7-acres of Park in City. Yet as the CTGMC knows the City CANNOT plan for Buildout or a final population. So as population continues to grow there will be less and less parkland per 1,000 population. See the "CTGMC key issues and suggestions 2022-8-8" data/suggestion file sent to you.
- 2 in Table 2 the City did not provide the Park Acres per 1,000 for the same City selected data set. Compare Park acres to Park acres. We provided the NRPA data in the "2022 Coastal Recreation data file" we provided the CTGMC. We also provided the even more comprehensive Trust for Public Land ParkScore data that also shows Carlsbad is below average. That more comprehensive data should be considered. See also Ponto park support letter from Trust for Public Land.

CTGMC, you have a heavy burden to set Carlsbad's Growth Management Program on a fair and sustainable course to accommodate unlimited future growth as required by the State of CA. This involves fixing past errors and fixing what was unfair and setting Standard that are continually adding more parks and Open Space as Carlsbad is forced to grow.

We provided you a "CTGMC key issues and suggestions 2022-8-8" data/suggestion file that I think could help you in looking at how to set new Standards for unlimited future growth.

Thank you and Aloha Aina,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 9:05 AM

To: 'City Clerk'; committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); 'Tom Frank' **Cc:** 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee Sep 22 2022 meeting; and for LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update - Parks & Open Space at Ponto-Coastal South Carlsbad

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Beach Preservation and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

We ask you to please consider this email and attachments in the Sept 22nd CTGMC and subsequent Land Use, Parks and Open Space discussions by the CTGMC, LCP Amendment, PCH Relocation project, Park Master Plan Update, and development proposals at Ponto.

As always, and as we have repeatedly asked for since our initial 2017 letter to the City Council, People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens asks for and are willing able to work with you to find the solutions for:

- the documented Park Inequity at Ponto & Coastal South Carlsbad,
- the documented missing Unconstrained Open Space at Ponto,
- the future loss of 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space (State beach and Campground) due to sea level rise,
- the needed upgrades to Carlsbad's Growth Management Program and Standards (and developer required land dedications and mitigations) to account for an Unlimited population and the need for Unlimited increases in Carlsbad Parks and Open Space to address those Unlimited populations so as to assure we maintain our quality of life,
- beneficial collaborations and donations, and
- the wiser use of tax-payer dollars to address tax-payer needs

The CTGMC and City Commission have an opportunity to do the right thing and correct the clear and obvious Park Inequity and Coastal land use Imbalance at Ponto & Coastal South Carlsbad. Please don't kick-the-can-down-the-road and fail to consider that data and your fellow Citizen desires for a better Carlsbad. P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Sincerely and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee Sep 22 2022 meeting; and for LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update - Parks & Open Space at Ponto-Coastal South Carlsbad

Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 11:34 AM

To: City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Tom Frank <Tom.Frank@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee Sep 22 2022 meeting; and for LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update - Parks & Open Space at Ponto-Coastal South Carlsbad

Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Beach Preservation and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

I was out this weekend so just had time to do a quick scan and noticed some obvious missing information and 'spin' in the staff 'report'. I hope the CTGMC can see this and the data 'cherry picking' and diversions to change subjects to "recreation land" and falsely try to count or hide Park shortfalls by trying to use other 'recreation' lands areas' as "Parks. Here is what I was able to quickly scan and note:

Citizen response and Input regarding 'Fact Sheet – Community Interest in Ponto Park'

Page

1 City falsely says "City can only acquire property from a willing seller" - this is false. The City can use legal powers emanate domain and condemnation to buy property for public purpose (Parks) unless the USA & California Constitutions have been amended to only allow acquisitions from 'willing sellers'. The Carlsbad City Council may have CHOSEEN to adopt a formal Policy/Law (or undisclosed and hidden vote) that is constraining their authority. However that City Council CHOICE does not mean the Council can CHOOSE otherwise and use legal powers emanate domain and condemnation to buy property for public purposes.

Ironically the City Council has in fact used these emanate domain and condemnation powers on behalf of the Aviara Master Plan Developer to force an "unwilling seller" to sell a sewer line easement to the City for the Aviara Master Plan Developer.

1 'Park funding only comes from the City's General Fund' - this is false. Recently the Federal government provided the City of Carlsbad \$ 3million to help fund Veterans Park. There are both Federal and State Grants and funding for Park acquisition. The City cites many other funding sources in its CIP, and like those other funding sources for Park acquisition, the City just does not list them. Also, the City has an Park land dedication Ordinance CMC 20.44 (per CA Quimby Act) that pre-dates growth management and requires developers to give the City Free land for use as a Park to meet the Park needs for that development. In fact 20.44 is where the 3 acre per 1,000 population Park Standard came from.

- 1 City fails to mention we have a 'willing seller' for 14.3 acres of vacant land at Ponto. The City cites \$35 million as the price of that land. The 2-part tax-payer Cost-benefit Analysis data files sent to you should be looked at as simply buying these 14.3 acres saves tax-payers millions and is a Better Park option. P4P can show the City and you how the City could buy this property with minimal added City tax-payer cost. There are Federal and State funding (like note above) for Park acquisition. Also ALL Developers are required to give parkland for free to the City under its Park land Dedication Ordinance 20.44 and about 1.76 acres of Ponto land would be given to the City for free to be used as a Park, or the developers would have to give the City money (pay a park-in-lieu-fee) that should be sufficient to buy 1.76 acres of Park land at Ponto.
- 1 City Budget funding is a yearly process, and future Budgets, and even most recent Council actions, will/have changed what was in prior Budgets. Buying Ponto Park actually saves tax-payer dollars as noted in the following bullets and in the 2 files sent to the CTGMC – “2022 General Comparative cost-benefits of Completing PCH-PCH Modification-Ponto Park part 1 of 2” & “City’s PCH area map w numbered notes of constraints – 2 of 2” data files. The data in these data files is from the City. As tax-payers the CTGMC should read these data files.
- 1 City wide approvals will also be needed for the "South Carlsbad Coastal Project (SCCP)" mentioned in the report. The SCCP is a \$135 million to \$150 million improvement to existing City Land and will require a City wide vote. Based on the known tax-payer Cost-Benefits of SCCP, it is not clear if votes will support this expenditure – particularly given the Citizen input the City obtained in the \$50,000 survey it conducted on the SCCP, and the Council deferring the SCCP for another year.
- 1 The staff report incompletely says 136 dwelling units are planned for one of the sites. But the report critically failed to disclose to you that Carlsbad’s General Plan Land Use Element page 2- specifically states Carlsbad’s General Plan is not adopted UNTIL the CA COASTAL COMMISSION (CCC) fully CERTIFIES the current City Proposed comprehensive Local Coastal Program Amendment (LCPA). The CCC will decide if to approve-deny-approve with modification the City Proposed LCPA in 2023. As provide the CTGMC the CCC has told the City in 2016 & 2017 that based on the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost Visitor Accommodations the General Plan Land Use at Ponto may change. See the “Updated 2020 Dec 2 Planning Area F existing LCP-LUP & CCC direction to City” data file sent to the CTGMC. Read the CCC’s reasons for 2010 rejection of the Ponto Vision Plan that is the basis for the 2015 General Plan.
- 1 The 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact analysis did specifically cite both acres of land impacted and the type of land use that was impacted. I can send you the report if you want. I copied key acreage and land use from the SLR Analysis in the “Sea level rise and DUPA LUPA planned loss of Open Space at Ponto data file”. This data file also shows how the City falsely exempted Ponto developers from complying with the growth management 15% Useable Open Space Standard.
- 1 City says "South Carlsbad Coastal Project (SCCP) will Create 60 acres of available space" - this is false. The 60-acres of Space already exists. The City already owns this land. The SCCP is a \$70 million (for 1-mile Manzano to Island Way segment) + \$65 to \$80 million (for 2.3 mile Island Way to La Costa Ave segment) for a total \$135 million to \$150 million project that does not buy one single square foot of new City land. Much of the City's 60-acres is already environmentally constrained by protected Habitat so will not change anything and will continue to be unusable for people use as a Park. Parks are people and Not habitat and Projected Habitat is for plants and animal and Not people. The City knows that most of these existing City owned 60-acres is not useable for people and is too narrow to be a Park. The largest part of the 60-acres is at 'the dip' in the 1-mile Manzano to Island Way segment. We ask the CTGMC to ask staff to show you a map and acreage count of that Segment, and how much acreage is planned for 1) roadway-bikeway-sidewalk, 2) Habitat, 3) useable land for people; and 4) the area that will be lost due to Sea Level Rise for each of these 3. What land uses are lost from SLR? Ask to see the same data for the existing configuration for the segment. Compare the data. Compare the total segment acres with the total 60-acres. There is no secured funding for the \$135 to \$150 million SCCP. The City could buy

3+ Ponto Parks for the cost of rearranging exiting features and adding a sidewalk on existing City land. The only missing feature to Complete" PCH in the two segments (total 3.3 miles) are some missing sidewalks/ped paths.

Enhancements to make PCH better and safer for bikes is a very good idea, but seems like can be done within the existing PCH configuration at a fraction of the cost. See the tax-payer cost-benefit Part 1 of 2 and Part 2 of 2 SCCP/PCH Relocation data files. SCCP will also require a citizen vote to approve funds, I am also hearing that Carlsbad citizens are not that supportive of SCCP. So is the SCCP are secured funded and 'countable solution' to the documented Park deficit at Ponto & Coastal South Carlsbad?

- 2 City says 2,074-acres or 8% of Carlsbad is Park and recreation land (page 2-7 of General Plan). This should be itemized and mapped as the numbers likely include golf courses (mostly private) and maybe Lago land and some Lagoon waters. The City is trying to inaccurately try to use private Recreation land as a public Park. The CTGMC is supposed to compare Park Standard to Park Standards. The City's Park Standard is fairly poor relative to Encinitas and Oceanside and many other cities, so you are being diverted from that fact.
- 2 432.4-acres of exiting Park & 519.7-acres of final Park based on 7/26/22 CC vote. This data should closely match the City's General Plan Land Use data that is the data base used in the "2022 Coastal Recreation data file" sent to you. Of critical importance to the CTGMC is to note the City is apparently saying that they will only provide a final 519.7-acres of Park in City. Yet as the CTGMC knows the City CANNOT plan for Buildout or a final population. So as population continues to grow there will be less and less parkland per 1,000 population. See the "CTGMC key issues and suggestions 2022-8-8" data/suggestion file sent to you.
- 2 in Table 2 the City did not provide the Park Acres per 1,000 for the same City selected data set. Compare Park acres to Park acres. We provided the NRPA data in the "2022 Coastal Recreation data file" we provided the CTGMC. We also provided the even more comprehensive Trust for Public Land ParkScore data that also shows Carlsbad is below average. That more comprehensive data should be considered. See also Ponto park support letter from Trust for Public Land.

CTGMC, you have a heavy burden to set Carlsbad's Growth Management Program on a fair and sustainable course to accommodate unlimited future growth as required by the State of CA. This involves fixing past errors and fixing what was unfair and setting Standard that are continually adding more parks and Open Space as Carlsbad is forced to grow.

We provided you a "CTGMC key issues and suggestions 2022-8-8" data/suggestion file that I think could help you in looking at how to set new Standards for unlimited future growth.

Thank you and Aloha Aina,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 9:05 AM

To: 'City Clerk'; committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); 'Tom Frank'

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee Sep 22 2022 meeting; and for LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update - Parks & Open Space at Ponto-Coastal South Carlsbad

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Beach Preservation and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

We ask you to please consider this email and attachments in the Sept 22nd CTGMC and subsequent Land Use, Parks and Open Space discussions by the CTGMC, LCP Amendment, PCH Relocation project, Park Master Plan Update, and development proposals at Ponto.

As always, and as we have repeatedly asked for since our initial 2017 letter to the City Council, People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens asks for and are willing able to work with you to find the solutions for:

- the documented Park Inequity at Ponto & Coastal South Carlsbad,
- the documented missing Unconstrained Open Space at Ponto,
- the future loss of 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space (State beach and Campground) due to sea level rise,
- the needed upgrades to Carlsbad's Growth Management Program and Standards (and developer required land dedications and mitigations) to account for an Unlimited population and the need for Unlimited increases in Carlsbad Parks and Open Space to address those Unlimited populations so as to assure we maintain our quality of life,
- beneficial collaborations and donations, and
- the wiser use of tax-payer dollars to address tax-payer needs

The CTGMC and City Commission have an opportunity to do the right thing and correct the clear and obvious Park Inequity and Coastal land use Imbalance at Ponto & Coastal South Carlsbad. Please don't kick-the-can-down-the-road and fail to consider that data and your fellow Citizen desires for a better Carlsbad. P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Sincerely and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Subject: Public Input for 2022-Oct CTGMC regarding the 9/22/22 meeting & to be provided to the Carlsbad City Council and Parks, Planning and Beach Preservation Commissions as citizen communications
Attachments: Updated 2020 Dec 2 - Planning Area F existing LCP-LUP & CCC direction.pdf; Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA planned loss of OS at Ponto - 2022 (2).pdf

Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, September 26, 2022 11:45 AM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public Input for 2022-Oct CTGMC regarding the 9/22/22 meeting & to be provided to the Carlsbad City Council and Parks, Planning and Beach Preservation Commissions as citizen communications

Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Planning and Beach Preservation Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

I apologize for the directness of this email; but standing up for truth and facts can only be done with directness. It is also important that the CA Coastal Commission knows if CA Coastal Act and Coastal Land Use issues are not being truthfully communicated by the City to Carlsbad Citizens.

The CTGMC is creating Council recommendations for new land use plans regarding Park and Open Space in CA Coastal Zone in Carlsbad.

Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Parks), protection of Coastal Habitats, and providing State Park Coastal Camping access are high-priorities of the CA Coastal Act; and are considered High-Priority land uses that need to forever adequately provided Carlsbad's Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment & in CTGMC's in creating new Park & Open Space Standards in Carlsbad's Coastal Zone.

I was deeply troubled that on 9/22/22 Jeff Graham, Carlsbad Community Development Director said what appears to be a misstatement of facts to the CTGMC regarding the current Local Coastal Program (LCP) and City Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment AND Jeff's failure to disclose the CA Coastal Commission's (CCC) very clear communication to the City on 2016-2017 on what is the current and possible land use plan for Ponto. Carlsbad's Ponto Vision Plan-General Plan-Master Plans-Zoning Codes are not valid/approved until the CA Coastal Commission Certifies them as being consistent with the CA Coastal Act and Policies. CA Coastal Act status is a primary land use fact and Carlsbad's General Plan clearly states this on page 2-7. Please Read the paragraph on General Plan page 2-7.

Jeff, as I heard it, made a false statement to the CTGMC that ALL the land use planning at Ponto Planning Area F was already completely done and no changes to can/need to be made. This is clearly false as the City is currently proposing an LCP Amendment to the CCC that includes significant changes to Ponto Planning Area F land use policy and zoning standards. Jeff is misrepresenting facts to Citizens, like what was done during the developers/City Ponto Vision Plan and General Plan Update. City staff misrepresentation of the facts to Citizens corrupts the Public Input Process, and in itself

is a violation of the CA Coastal Act. This misrepresentation of facts is why decision making at Ponto has been so messed up. The City by withholding key Ponto facts from Citizens seems to be trying to mislead Citizens so developer proposed land use changes can be pushed through. Over 50 Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and the data/lack of data the City provided seem to support this concern about honesty.

PLEASE READ the 2 Attached Data Files!

To refute Jeff's apparent inaccurate statement to the CTGMC on 9/22/22, The CA Coastal Commission has provided very clear communication to the City on the future potential Coastal land use plan at Ponto:

7/3/17 CCC letter to City of Carlsbad Staff on the City's proposed land use changes at Planning Area F. City Staff only for the 1st time provided this to City Council on 1/28/20:

"The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad. This is an issue that the San Pacifico HOA community group is raising in regards to the Shopoff/Ponto development proposal, and this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed."

8/16/2017 CCC email to Carlsbad Citizens said:

"The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City's Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City's land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area."

The CTGMC should not use false statements (9/22/22), excuses and dubious work-arounds to try to wiggle out of the responsibility to properly address the clear and obvious current higher-residential densities, and significant Park and Open Space shortfalls at Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad. The CTGMC, Carlsbad City Council and Parks, Planning & Beach Preservation Committees it seems have an ethical, moral and generational responsibility to correct the well documented Park & Open Space shortfalls (City's past land use planning & Growth Management Plan Standard mistakes) at Ponto, and Coastal land use plan for more loss of these land uses due to sea level rise.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, December 10, 2021 11:36 AM
To: 'City Clerk'
Cc: CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov; Carrie Boyle; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Ross, Toni@Coastal;
info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: FW: 12-13-2021 Special City Council Meeting Agenda

Dear City Council:

Since 2017 extensive Carlsbad Citizen input/desires (over 5,000 emails/petitions, and at many budget and Council meetings) to you has requested Ponto Park. That Citizen input/desires is based on City documented facts. Again, we ask

you to start considering the facts and the overwhelming Citizens' input/desires submitted to you over the past 4+ years. Attached are some of the relevant files we request you again receive as public input and read and consider on 12/13/21 regarding your CITY COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN.

Thank you and Happy Holidays,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad's DLCP-LUPA's projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto

Introduction:

Carlsbad first documented Sea Level Rise (SLR) and associated increases in coastal erosion in a December 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment (2017 SLR Assessment). Prior planning activities (2010 Ponto Vision Plan – rejected by CA Coastal Commission, and 2015 General Plan Update) did not consider SLR and how SLR would impact Coastal Open Space Land Use & CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto. The 2017 SLR Assessment shows Open Space land and Open Space Land Uses are almost exclusively impacted by SLR at Ponto & South Coastal Carlsbad. The 2017 SLF Assessment also shows significant LOSS of Open Space land acreage and Land Uses. Most all impacted Open Space Land Uses are CA Coastal Act "High-Priority Coastal Land Uses" – Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations. Existing Ponto Open Space Land Uses are already very congested (non-existent/narrow beach) and have very high, almost exclusionary, occupancy rates (Campground) due to existing population/visitor demands. Future population/visitor increases will make this demand situation worst. The significant permanent LOSS of existing Coastal Open Space land and Coastal Open Space Land Use (and land) due to SLR reduces existing supply and compounds Open Space congestion elsewhere. Prior Ponto planning did not consider, nor plan, for significant SLR and current/future "High-Priority" Coastal Open Space Land Use demands.

Open Space and City Park demand at Ponto:

Open Space at Ponto is primarily 'Constrained' as defined by the City's Growth Management Program (GMP), and cannot be counted in meeting the City's minimal 15% 'Unconstrained' GMP Open Space Standard. Per the GMP Open Space Standard, the developers of Ponto should have provided in their developments at least 30-acres of additional 'Unconstrained' GMP Open Space at Ponto. City GIS mapping data confirm 30-acres of GMP Standard Open Space is missing at Ponto (Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9).

The City of Carlsbad GIS Map on page 2 shows locations of Open Spaces at Ponto. This map and its corresponding tax parcel-based data file document Ponto's non-compliance with the GMP Open Space Standard. A summary of that City GIS data file is also on page 2. The City said Ponto's non-compliance with the GMP Open Space Standard was 'justified' by the City 'exempting' compliance with the Standard. The City 'justified' this 'exemption' for reasons that do not appear correct based on the City's GIS map and data on page 2, and by a review of 1986 aerial photography that shows most of Ponto as vacant land. The City in the Citywide Facilities Improvement Plan (CFIP) said 1) Ponto was already developed in 1986, or 2) Ponto in 1986 already provided 15% of the 'Unconstrained' land as GMP Standard Open Space. Both these 'justifications' for Ponto 'exemption' in the CFIP were not correct. The legality of the City 'exempting' Ponto developers from the GMP Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation.

The City proposes to continue to exempt future Ponto developers from providing the missing 30-acres of minimally required GMP Open Space, even though a change in Ponto Planning Area F land use from the current 'Non-Residential Reserve' Land Use requires comprehensive Amendment of the Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9 to account for a land use change. City exemption is subject of litigation.

Ponto (west of I-5 and South of Poinsettia Lane) currently has 1,025 homes that per Carlsbad's minimal Park Standard demand an 8-acre City Park. There is no City Park at Ponto. Coastal Southwest Carlsbad has an over 6.5 acre Park deficit that is being met 6-miles away in NW Carlsbad. Ponto is in the middle of 6-miles of Coastline without a City Coastal Park west of the rail corridor.



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara had the same lagoon waters.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were never required to comply with the 15% Standard Open Space is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the 15% Growth Management Standard Open Space at Ponto

472 Acres
(197 Acres)
 275 Acres
X 15%
 41 Acres
(11 Acres)
30 Acres

Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 Constrained land excluded from GMP Open Space
 Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required
 GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data
Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

Sea Level Rise impacts on Open Space and Open Space Land Use Planning at Ponto:

The City's 2015 General Plan Update did not factor in the impacts of Sea Level Rise (SLR) on Ponto's Open Space land. In December 2017 the City conducted the first Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=33958>. The 2017 SLR Assessment is an initial baseline analysis, but it shows significant SLR impacts on Ponto Open Space. More follow-up analysis is being conducted to incorporate newer knowledge on SLR projections and coastal land erosion accelerated by SLR. Follow-up analysis may likely show SLR impacts occurring sooner and more extreme.

Troublingly the 2017 SLR Assessment shows SLR actually significantly reducing or eliminating Open Space land at Ponto. SLR is projected to only impact and eliminate Open Space lands and Open Space Land Use at Ponto. The loss of Ponto Open Space land and Land Use being at the State Campground, Beaches, and Batiquitos Lagoon shoreline. The losses of these Open Space lands and land uses would progress over time, and be a permanent loss. The 2017 SLR Assessment provides two time frames near-term 2050 that match with the Carlsbad General Plan, and the longer-term 'the next General Plan Update' time frame of 2100. One can think of these timeframes as the lifetimes of our children and their children (2050), and the lifetimes of our Grandchildren and their children (2100). SLR impact on Coastal Land Use and Coastal Land Use planning is a perpetual (permanent) impact that carries over from one Local Coastal Program (LCP) and City General Plan (GP) to the next Updated LCP and GP.

Following (within quotation marks) are excerpts from Carlsbad's 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment:

[Italicized text within brackets] is added data based on review of aerial photo maps in the Assessment.

"Planning Zone 3 consists of the Southern Shoreline Planning Area and the Batiquitos Lagoon. Assets within this zone are vulnerable to inundation, coastal flooding and bluff erosion in both planning horizons (2050 and 2100). A summary of the vulnerability assessment rating is provided in Table 5. A discussion of the vulnerability and risk assessment is also provided for each asset category.

5.3.1. Beaches

Approximately 14 acres of beach area is projected to be impacted by inundation/erosion in 2050. ... Beaches in this planning area are backed by unarmored coastal bluffs. Sand derived from the natural erosion of the bluff as sea levels rise may be adequate to sustain beach widths, thus, beaches in this reach were assumed to have a moderate adaptive capacity. The overall vulnerability rating for beaches is moderate for 2050.

Vulnerability is rated moderate for the 2100 horizon due to the significant amount of erosion expected as the beaches are squeezed between rising sea levels and bluffs. Assuming the bluffs are unarmored in the future, sand derived from bluff erosion may sustain some level of beaches in this planning area. A complete loss of beaches poses a high risk to the city as the natural barrier from storm waves is lost as well as a reduction in beach access, recreation and the economic benefits the beaches provide.

5.3.3. State Parks

A majority of the South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds (separated into four parcels) were determined to be exposed to bluff erosion by the 2050 sea level rise scenario (moderate exposure). This resource is considered to have a high sensitivity since bluff erosion could significantly impair usage of the facilities. Though economic impacts to the physical structures within South Carlsbad State Beach would be relatively low, the loss of this park would be significant

since adequate space for the park to move inland is not available (low adaptive capacity). State parks was assigned a high vulnerability in the 2050 planning horizon. State park facilities are recognized as important assets to the city in terms of economic and recreation value as well as providing low-cost visitor serving amenities. This vulnerability poses a high risk to coastal access, recreation, and tourism opportunities in this planning area.

In 2100, bluff erosion of South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds become more severe and the South Ponto State Beach day-use area becomes exposed to coastal flooding during extreme events. The sensitivity of the South Ponto day-use area is low because impacts to usage will be temporary and no major damage to facilities would be anticipated. Vulnerability and risk to State Parks remains high by 2100 due to the impacts to South Carlsbad State Beach in combination with flooding impacts to South Ponto.

Table 5: Planning Zone 3 Vulnerability Assessment Summary [condensed & notated]:

| <u>Asset Category</u> | <u>Horizon [time]</u> | <u>Hazard Type</u> | <u>Impacted Assets</u> | <u>Vulnerability Rating</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Beaches | 2050 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 14 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 54 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| Public Access | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 6 access points 4,791 feet of trails | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 10 access points 14,049 feet of trails | Moderate |
| State Parks <i>[Campground - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations]</i> | 2050 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [<18 Acres] | High |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [>18 Acres] <i>[loss of over 50% of the campground & its Low-cost Visitor Accommodations, See Figure 5.]</i> | High |
| Transportation (Road, Bike, Pedestrian) | 2050 | Bluff Erosion | 1,383 linear feet | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 11,280 linear feet | High |
| Environmentally Sensitive Lands | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 572 acres | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 606 acres | High |




Figure 7: Southern Shoreline Planning Area – Year 2050






Figure 5: CoSMoS Bluff Erosion Projections by 2100
(CoSMoS-COAST 2015)

[Figure 5 show the loss of over 50% of the campground and campground sites with a minimal .2 meter Sea Level Rise (SLR), and potentially the entire campground (due to loss of access road) in 2 meter SLF.]”

Directions to analyze and correct current and future LOSS of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto

On July 3, 2017 the CA Coastal Commission provided direction to Carlsbad stating:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto ... area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad. ... this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”

Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests (PRR 2017-260, et. al.) confirmed Carlsbad’s Existing LCP and its Ponto specific existing LUP polices and Zoning regulations were never followed in the City’s prior Ponto planning activities (i.e. 2010 Ponto Vision Plan & 2015 General Plan Update). The projected SLR loss of recreation (beach) and low-cost visitor accommodations (campground) at Ponto should factor in this Existing LCP required analysis, and a LCP-LUP for Ponto and Ponto Planning Area F.

In a February 11, 2020 City Council Staff Report City Staff stated:

“On March 14, 2017, the City Council approved the General Plan Lawsuit Settlement Agreement (Agreement) between City of Carlsbad and North County Advocates (NCA). Section 4.3.15 of the Agreement requires the city to continue to consider and evaluate properties for potential acquisition of open space and use good faith efforts to acquire those properties.”

In 2020 NCA recommended the City acquire Ponto Planning Area F as Open Space. The status of City processing that recommendation is unclear. However the Lawsuit Settlement Agreement and NCA's recommendation to the City should also be considered in the required Existing LCP analysis.

Summary:

Tragically Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) is actually planning to both SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE Coastal Open Space acreage, and to eliminate 'High-Priority Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto due to SLR.

The Existing LCP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F to analyze the deficit of Coastal Open Space Land Use should factor in the currently planned LOSS of both Coastal Open Space acreage and Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto due to SLR. As a long-range Coastal Land Use Plan this required LCP analysis needs to also consider the concurrent future increases in both population and visitor demand for those LOST Coastal Open Space acres and Coastal Open Space Land Uses.

It is very troubling that demand for these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses is increasing at the same time the current (near/at capacity) supply of these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses is significantly decreasing due to SLR. Instead of planning for long-term sustainability of these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses for future generations there appears to be a plan to use SLR and inappropriate (lower-priority residential) Coastal Land Use planning to forever remove those CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses from Ponto. CA Coastal Act Policies to address these issues should be thoroughly considered.

2021-2 proposed Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) will likely result in City and CA Coastal Commission making updates to the 2015 General Plan, based on the existing Ponto Planning Area F LCP – LUP Policy requirements, Ponto Open Space issues, high-priority Coastal Land Use needs, and SLR issues not addressed in the 2015 General Plan.

City Staff's comparison of Ponto Planning Area F's existing v. Carlsbad proposed LCP LUP Policy below is not fully correct. The table below is from City of Carlsbad. The last paragraph of the Existing LCP notes "prior to any planning activity". **This "prior to any planning activity" was newer done as documented by official Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 2017-262, R000930-072419, R001280-021720, and R001281-02170.** So the City's "General Plan update" (of just the land use map) was done in violation of the Existing LCP LUP Policy – one of the City's Ponto planning mistakes. Citizens repeatedly asked in the above official Public Records Request to see the City's evidence of City compliance with Planning Area F's Existing LCP LUP Policy. The City responded with: "... you are asking the City to answer questions about information not found in the documents of existence provided. The City is unable to assist you in this manner. ... " There is no evidence that the City during both the Ponto Vision Plan and General Pan Update planning efforts informed Citizens of Planning Area F's Existing LCP LUP Policy. Hiding information prevented Citizens knowing about the policy and providing informed input. No evidence shows the City ever complied with the requirements of the Policy. The Ponto Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning efforts were thus flawed, and counter to the LCP and CA Coastal Act.

As noted in 1-5 below, the CCC has noted these mistakes dating back to 2010 with the "Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan" and 2015 General Plan map, and is seeking to correct them in the 2016 and 2017 communications to the City. Also some of the City's own documents verify these facts.

HOW THE EXISTING CITY OF CARLSBAD LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM (LCP) POLICIES ARE ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM UPDATE

| Row | EXISTING LCP POLICIES | HOW DRAFT LCP ADDRESSES EXISTING LCP POLICIES |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | WEST BATIQUITOS LAGOON/SAMMIS PROPERTIES SEGMENT | |
| 282 | <p>10. Planning Area F</p> <p>Planning Area F is located at the far northwest corner of the Master Plan area west of the AT&SF Railway right-of-way. This Planning Area has a gross area of 11 acres and a net developable area of 10.7 acres.</p> <p>Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area, for which land uses will be determined at a later date when more specific planning is carried out for areas west of the railroad right-of-way. A future Major Master Plan Amendment will be required prior to further development approvals for Planning Area F, and shall include an LCP Amendment with associated environmental review, if determined necessary.</p> <p>The intent of the NRR designation is not to limit the range of potential future uses entirely to non-residential, however, since the City's current general plan does not contain an "unplanned" designation, NRR was determined to be appropriate at this time. In the future, if the Local Coastal Program Amendment has not been processed, and the City develops an "unplanned" General Plan designation, then this site would likely be redesignated as "unplanned." Future uses could include, but are not limited to: commercial, residential, office, and other uses, subject to future review and approval.</p> <p>As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.</p> | <p>As part of the General Plan update, the Coastal Commission approved residential and general commercial land use designations on the LCP land use map.</p> <p>This policy is updated to be consistent with the land use map designations and the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan. See draft LCP policy LCP-2-P.20.A and B.</p> <p>Regarding the need for lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities west of the railroad, analysis and documentation will be provided in the staff report to the Planning Commission.</p> |

CCC direction on why Draft LCP description is not accurate:

During the Jan 28, 2020 City Council Meeting (item #14), Carlsbad City staff for the first time as a side-bar comment admitted the City made some 'Ponto planning errors' going back over 15 years. Those City planning errors were first called out when the CA Coastal Commission (CCC) denied Carlsbad's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (the referenced foundation for Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan Update) in

2010 in part due to the City's mistake. Following are 4 documents that conflict with the above City Staff interpretation of how the Draft LCP addresses Existing LCP Polies.

- 1) The CCC in denying in 2010 the Ponto Vision Plan (the foundation for Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan Update at Ponto) specifically said with direct reference to Ponto Planning Area F:

"Currently, this area [Planning Area F] has an Unplanned Area land use designation. In order to facilitate any type of development in this portion of the Ponto area, an LCP amendment modifying the land use will have to be brought forward to the Commission for review and approval."

"... the Commission would reject such proposed uses because there has been no evidence presented that would support the elimination of these [Planning Area F] areas for some lower cost overnight accommodations or public recreational amenities in the future. The Commission's past action of the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan specifically called for such an assessment, and none has been submitted to date. The concerns related to the lack of lower cost overnight accommodations in Area F (ref. Exhibit #7) are further discussed in the findings later."

"City is inadvertently sending a message to potential developers that 1) the identified development (townhouses) is the primary type of use the City will support, or 2) that development type is consistent with the current land use and zoning designations. Neither of those assumptions is correct. As the previously certified Poinsettia Shores Master Plan states, any type of development at this location would first require an LCP amendment to establish the land use and zoning, which would have to be certified by both the City and the Coastal Commission. Additionally, the Master Plan further states that some component of the development at this location must consider the need for the provision of lower cost accommodations or recreational facilities."

"While residential use is one of the land uses listed for this area in the Poinsettia Shores Specific Plan, it may not be the most appropriate designation. As previously stated, the project will at least need to consider the incorporation of some kind of lower cost accommodations, and any proposed zoning designation for the site will have to be found consistent with the policies contained in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan. Furthermore, the standard of review for any change to the current land use designation is the Coastal Act, and thus will also have to be found consistent with all its applicable policies."

Recently, the Commission has become concerned with the lack of lower-cost accommodations statewide. Thus, the establishment of a residential land use at this location may not be what is ultimately determined to be certified as consistent with the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, or the Coastal Act."

"B. High-Priority Uses - Lower Cost Visitor Accommodations in 'Area F': The Coastal Act has numerous policies promoting public access to the beach and state:

Section 30210 - In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and **recreational opportunities**

shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

Section 30213 - Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. **Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.** The commission shall not: (1) require that overnight room rentals be fixed at an amount certain for any privately owned and operated hotel, motel, or other similar visitor-serving facility located on either public or private lands; or (2) establish or approve any method for the identification of low or moderate income persons for the purpose of determining eligibility for overnight room rentals in any such facilities.

Section 30221 **Oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for in the area.**

Section 30222 - **The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry."**

"... in 1996, the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan was certified as part of the City's LCP, and replaced the [Visitor serving] land use designation as an "Unplanned Area." **In an attempt to maintain a lower-cost visitor-serving component at this location, the Commission, through a suggested modification, required language within the Master Plan that would serve to protect this type of use.** The language in the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, for this location, "Area F," included: **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad."**

"**The Ponto Beachfront area is an area that could be considered as a high-priority location for lower cost overnight accommodations.** While located across the street from a State Park (South Carlsbad State Park) containing camping facilities, **during peak summer months, the campground is consistently at capacity. ... If at any time in the future, this State Beach campground is converted to day use sites, the market and the need for low cost overnight accommodations will be significantly amplified. Thus the Vision Plan, as proposed by the City, cannot be found consistent with the Coastal Act."**

"H. Conclusions: ... **concerns regarding the determination of preferred land uses in an 'unplanned' area, the lack of provision of lower-cost accommodations and recreational uses, ... remain. All of these oversights could result in impacts to public access and recreation and other coastal resources and, therefore, the Vision Plan, as submitted, is therefore inconsistent with the Coastal Act, and therefore, shall be denied as submitted."**

- 2) Following is from a 7/3/17 CCC letter to City Staff on the City's proposed land use changes at Planning Area F. City Staff for the 1st time provided this to City Council on 1/28/20:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad. This is an issue that the San Pacifico HOA community group is raising in regards to the Shopoff/Ponto development proposal, and this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”

- 3) In 2017 after citizens received the City's reply to Public Records Request 2017-260, citizens meet with CCC staff to reconfirm the City failed since before 2010 to publicly disclose and comply with Planning Area F's LCP requirements. CCC Staff acknowledged the City has not yet complied with the LCP and in an 8/16/2017 email said:

“The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City's Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City's land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area.”

- 4) In 2016, the CCC told City that Carlsbad's proposed 2015 General Plan land use map could change based on the outcomes of both a Citywide Coastal Recreation needs Study, and also the specific Planning Area F LCP requirement to study Park needs at Ponto.
- 5) Currently and since 2016 the City acknowledged that the existing LCP, City and LCP Master Plan Zoning of “Non-Residential Reserve” land use needs to be changed by BOTH the City and CA Coastal Commission to only then allow any proposed development on Ponto Planning Area F. Also, since 1996 the Local Facilities Management Plan for Zone 9 (Ponto) has the planned land use and zoning of Ponto Planning Area F as “Non-Residential Reserve” that has no land use. The LFMP-Zone 9 must be amended to account for any City and CA Coastal Commission change from “Non-Residential Reserve” and address the land use impacts on all the Growth Management Program Facility

Standards in Zone9 such as the current Park deficit, and also the recently discovered false exemption of the Open Space Standard in Zone 9. The false exemption being that Zone 9 was not developed in 1986 nor have the land use changes since 1986 complied with the 15% 'unconstrained' Open Space Standard.

The City currently and since 2016 acknowledges the existing LCP, City and LCP Master Plan Zoning of "Non-Residential Reserve" land use of Ponto Planning Area F needs to be changed by BOTH the City and CA Coastal Commission as evidenced on page 14-15 of City's Planning Pending Applications as of November 2020 at <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=46332> as it shows:

"PONTO BEACHFRONT 12/20/2016

| <u>Legislative application</u> | <u>applied on</u> | <u>description</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| AMEND2017-0001 [LU Change] | 1/19/17 | LFMP AMENDMENT FOR ZONE 9 |
| LCPA2016-0002 [LCP Change] | 12/20/16 | USES PROPOSED FOR PLANNING AREA F |
| MP2016-0001 [Zone Change] | 12/20/16 | USES PROPOSED FOR PLANNING AREA F |

– Carlsbad City Planner = Goff"

The City is apparently failing to fully disclose to Citizens these facts and the City's prior "Ponto Planning Area F planning mistakes dating back over 10-years when the land was purchased by speculative investors.

For the City's and CA Coastal Commission's Public Participation process to function Carlsbad Citizens need to have these facts, so they are properly informed.

The overwhelming Citizen input on the need for and request the City provide Ponto Coastal Park comes from Citizens slowly in 2017 becoming aware of the City's prior Ponto Planning Area F planning mistakes and asking the City to acknowledge and correct those mistakes.

From: sherry zhang <szlif95@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 5, 2022 8:38 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: More Pickle all court needed

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

From: [Kyle Lancaster](#)
To: [Charlene Buckalew](#)
Cc: [Bonnie Elliott](#); [Mick Calarco](#); [Todd Reese](#)
Subject: FW: CTGMC 2022-10-12 meeting Public Input follow-up & Public input to Carlsbad LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update, & Growth Management Program Update — 10 minute Park standard & images of Park need at Ponto
Date: Thursday, October 13, 2022 8:14:21 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.emz](#)
[Images of Park need at Ponto - 2022-10-13.pdf](#)
[image002.emz](#)
[image004.png](#)
Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2022 7:25 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Donnell <Scott.Donnell@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: CTGMC 2022-10-12 meeting Public Input follow-up & Public input to Carlsbad LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update, & Growth Management Program Update — 10 minute Park standard & images of Park need at Ponto

Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad Council, Carlsbad Parks and Planning Commission, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Please include this email/attached images as public input to the Council and Citizen Committees/Commissions regarding the 10/12/22 CTGMC meeting, the City's proposed Park Master Plan Update, City's proposed Housing Element Land Use changes at Ponto – Ponto Site 18, and City's and CA Coastal Commission's consideration of the City's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.

Yesterday I made verbal public testimony on the fact that Carlsbad's children and their parents/grandparents at Ponto are forced to use the LOSAN Rail Corridor right-of-way and City and private streets as their playground and Park. Attached is the updated file of more images showing that condition including the family having to play ball in a Carlsbad City Street because there is no Ponto Park and Ponto developers were falsely exempted from providing 15% Useable Open Space as required by the Growth Management Open Space Standard and Ordinance.

The City of Carlsbad has declared a Public Emergency regarding pedestrian/bike/vehicle safety on Carlsbad roadways. Yet here are examples of Carlsbad's Ponto children/families forced to play in City Streets or along high-speed rail corridors because the City failed to provide both Required 15% Useable Open Space and a Park at Ponto. What is the CTGMC and City of Carlsbad doing regarding this situation? Will it take a Ponto child to hit (killed) by a car or train to open your eyes, open your minds, and open your hearts, to what the City needs to provide – Ponto Park and LFMP Zone 9 compliance with the Growth Management Open Space Standard?

The City of Carlsbad created the problem BECAUSE the City falsely exempted Ponto developers (LFMP Zone 9) from providing the 15% Useable Open Space required by Growth Management Standards, and the City choose to abandon common sense Park planning principles to say that Ponto's Park needs will be met over 6-miles away at Veterans Park. The City has now acknowledged (in their traffic/visitor estimates) that Veterans Park 'in fact' will not provide Park resources to children and families at Ponto and most other areas of the City. This relates to issues and 1st set of images sent to you in the June 27th email below.

City Council, Planning-Parks-Housing Commissions and CA Coastal Commission we hope the images give you a visual reference/understanding of some of the Park and Useable Open Space needs that have been communicated to you by over 5,000 citizen/visitor petitions, many hours verbal public input and many pages of documented data/facts. **Will it take a child getting killed by having to play in railroad corridors and streets to get your attention and get you to act for our future – our children and their children?**

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 12:27 PM
To: council@carlsbadca.gov; 'City Clerk'; 'Carrie Boyle'; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; Don Neu; Eric.lardy@carlsbadca.gov; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; 'Homer, Sean@Parks'; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: Public input to Carlsbad LCPA, Parks Master Plan Update, & Growth Management Program Update — 10 minute Park standard & images of Park need at Ponto

Dear Carlsbad Council, Carlsbad Parks and Planning Commission, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

We ask you to please consider this email, news article, images, and files and request this be distributed/documented as public input to the Carlsbad LCP Amendment, Park Master Plan Update, and Growth Management Program Update.

Please take a look at Coast News Article <https://thecoastnews.com/olympus-park-brings-encinitas->


[closer-to-ensuring-all-residents-live-within-a-10-minute-walk-to-a-park/](#) . The 10-minute walk to Park issue can be clearly seen in the attached images as Ponto citizens are forced to use narrow Railroad right-of-way or play in local streets as recreational space. Because Ponto is the last meaningful sized vacant Coastal land in South Carlsbad an informal Ponto Park has been created by citizens. Every day about 50-100 inland Carlsbad Citizens use now vacant Ponto land for dog walking and playing, and before the fences beach parking.

P4P has been documenting and communicating to the City that Carlsbad does not have a Park policy for 10-minute walk access to Parks like BOTH Encinitas & Oceanside; that Carlsbad's Park Acreage standard (3 parks acres per 1,000 population) is also 40% below the 5 park acres per 1,000 population BOTH Encinitas and Oceanside require of development and provide their Citizens; that Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps Ponto as an area Unserved by City parks and an area the City should look at to provide City Parks sufficient in size for the population Unserved, and that Ponto is at the center of a 6-mile long gap with no Coastal Park (between Moonlight & Cannon parks).

The Trust for Public Land cited in the article has already sent the City & CCC a letter of support for Ponto Park. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens also sent you comparison Park research using the National Recreation & Park Association data base, and a Coastal Recreation data file with important comparative Coastal Park data – such as that many of Carlsbad's Park acres are unusable as Parks – the acres inaccurately counted as Parks are in fact protected habitat that cannot be used by people, or are covered in parking lots. This makes Carlsbad's Actual Useable Park Acreage well below what the City accounts for as Park. We encourage the Citizens Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Council, Carlsbad Parks and Planning Commission, and CCC read and consider the Citizen input and data provided.

Lance

[The Coast News Group](#) = link to 10-minute walk to Park article



The Coast News Group

Your community. Your newspaper. Covers Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Del Mar, Carmel Valley, Rancho Santa Fe,

Escondido, San Marcos & Vista.

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Subject: Pickelball courts

From: Dan Traxler <dkt0005_98@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 9, 2022 3:00 PM
To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Subject: Pickelball courts

I would really like to recommend additional Pickleball courts at poinsettia park. Every single day the social group and the challenge court group has continuous lines of people to play starting from 8 AM to 10 PM every day. The tennis courts seem to always be available for play. The amount of participation in Pickelball is significantly more than the tennis. I would recommend to change one more court from the tennis court that's closest to the pickle ball courts. Make that court into 4 courts and make them the challenge courts and then the existing ones, all six be the social courts. Attached are pictures at 2 PM for example today.

Dan

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.







Subject: Pickleball courts

From: Terri Acker <terriacker54@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2022 6:02 PM
To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Pickleball courts

What seems to be the problem with your department?

Despite hundreds of people emailing you for MORE courts in the city for THE FASTEST growing sport in America, it seems to fall on deaf ears.

So many UNUSED tennis courts and over packed pickleball courts continues to be ignored.

What's it going to take to get you guys involved?

I for one, (and trust me I am NOT the only one) think maybe you need to resign so we can hire people who actually listen to the TAXPAYER as to what we would like to see happen, for the good of all of Carlsbad.

Terri Acker

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: aweaver4613 <aweaver4613@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 2:46 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Cc: Karen Goco
Subject: Additional pickleball courts in Carlsbad

Importance: High

Good afternoon Mick,

We are writing to place a request for additional public pickleball courts in Carlsbad. We frequent the "social courts" at Poinsettia and our pickleball time there is some of our favorite together time of the week. The games are fun and competitive (but not overly) and most of the people are really nice. In just a few weeks we have made lots of acquaintances.

That said, the word is out. Due to the limited options and the popularity of Poinsettia, it's quickly getting more and more crowded. Whenever I use the restrooms I check out the tennis courts. Not only are there always some courts available, but sometimes they are all open. At the same time the pickleball line might be 20+ paddles deep.

I don't want to remove tennis courts that are used consistently but it seems reasonable to balance the # of courts based on popularity.

Although I prefer the idea of permanent pball courts and have little doubt they'll be used around the clock, in the interest of time and \$, one option might be to add some portable nets (like at cottonwood in Encinitas). That way there's a potential overflow that could be set up quickly and inexpensively.

Thanks for your help!

Andy Weaver
Karen Goco

Dictated hands-free
Pardon any typos

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Public input to 12-13-22 Carlsbad Park Commission & Draft Local Coastal Program Update on Parks and recreation priorities to be discussed

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 12:36 PM

To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; Mike Sebahar <sebbiesixpack@att.net>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Subject: Public input to 12-13-22 Carlsbad Park Commission & Draft Local Coastal Program Update on Parks and recreation priorities to be discussed

Mick, Carlsbad Park Commission:

Thank you the Friday notice on the Monday meeting at the end of this email.

As noted in Kyle's February 13, 2020 email below the over public 5,000 petitions citing the need and citizen desire for Ponto Park was to be factored into the Park Master Plan Update. We wanted to confirm staff has incorporated that need and input into the staff suggested Draft Parks Master Plan Update? People for Ponto Citizens had hoped the Parks Department would have provided some more (than 3-day) advance notice to citizens on the extensive citizen input on Ponto Park, and more opportunity to review and provide comments. Particularly given the holidays.

The Current Park Master Plan already documents that Ponto is "Unserved by City Parks" and an area that the City should provide City Parks. City Local Coastal Land Use Policies for Ponto (Planning Area F) and Mello II Policies also require consideration of City Park facilities at Ponto.

We wanted to confirm with you that all the Carlsbad Citizen input on the need for and desire for a meaningful Ponto Park has been incorporated into the proposed Draft Park Master Plan, and that the Park Master Plan provides for correction for unfair distribution of Coastal Parks in Carlsbad consistent with good Park planning and City planning practices, the CA Coastal Act regarding distribution and allocation of Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) resources.

A confirmation from you regarding how staff incorporated and addressed the extensive citizen input on Ponto Park would be greatly appreciated, along with dates for other opportunities to comment, as many citizens will not be able to respond in the short time provided to review, particularly given the holidays.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

From: Kyle Lancaster [<mailto:Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2020 12:54 PM

To: Lance Schulte; info@peopleforponto.com; Matthew Hall; Council Internet Email; Scott Chadwick; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Mike Pacheco; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Don Neu; Gary Barberio

Cc: People for Ponto; Mick Calarco

Subject: RE: Develop Ponto Right - prior Ponto Coastal Park Support Letters and public comments to be included in Parks Master Plan public Comments

Lance-

I've consulted with the city attorney's representative on this matter. **She determined that the prior public input on the desire for a park at Ponto does not need to be resubmitted in order to be included in the public input process for the Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan Update. Rather, your email message below will serve as a cover sheet request for that prior public input to also be included as public input for the Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan Update.**

Thank you.

-Kyle



Kyle Lancaster, CPRP
Parks & Recreation Director
Parks & Recreation Department
City of Carlsbad
799 Pine Ave., Ste. 200
Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

760-434-2941 | 760-434-5088 fax | Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#)

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, February 6, 2020 6:25 PM

To: info@peopleforponto.com; Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>; Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>

Subject: RE: Develop Ponto Right - prior Ponto Coastal Park Support Letters and public comments to be included in Parks Master Plan public Comments

Importance: High

Dear City Council, Kyle Lancaster, Mike Pacheco, and Mick Calarco:

We would like to receive confirmation that all the People for Ponto and other public comments as part of the public comments submitted on the:

1. Shopoff developer proposed application to change the Local Coastal Program Land Use on Planning Area F at Ponto,
2. the City Staff's proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment to change the Land Use on Planning Area F for the developer

be included in the City's Park Master Plan Update. Can you please confirm all this prior citizen input is also included in the Parks Master Plan Update?

These prior public comments and requests to the City Council and Kyle Lancaster, parks Director directly relate to Park needs at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad, and the City's Planning Area F LCP LUP Requirements to consider a Public Park at the site. The public input is from over 2,500 citizen and public communications already sent to the City Council and City Staff (as noted in the above To address list). In addition to those 2,500 citizen and public communications over 90-pages of extensive public comments and data showing among other things the City's Park Master Plan's Park Service Area deficit (Park Service inequity) at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad, Park Acreage Deficit in South Carlsbad, the lack of any City Park West of I-5 and rail corridor in all South Carlsbad, CA Coastal Act policies and Coastal Recreation data/issues, along with other City policy and regulation supporting a Park at Ponto. All this prior public input should be included in the Parks Master Plan Update. Can you please confirm that that is the case? Or do we have to re-email all these prior public comments?

Thanks,
Lance
People for Ponto

One example of prior public comments submitted about Park deficits at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad and request for a City Park at Ponto:

From: info@peopleforponto.com [<mailto:info@peopleforponto.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 4:18 PM

To: Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov; CityCouncil@carlsbadcagov; Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov; Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov; Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov; info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Develop Ponto Right - Support Letter

Dear Mayor Hall, Carlsbad City Council, and California Coastal Commission:

I am informed that

1. Carlsbad must consider on Planning Area F at Ponto the need for a public park at Ponto as part of the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.
2. There is no public park at Ponto even though City Park Standards requires a minimum of 6.5 acres of parkland for Ponto.
3. There is a current 6.6 acre park deficit in Coastal Southwest quadrant of Carlsbad, (south of Palomar Airport Road and west of El Camino Real).
4. There are no Coastal Parks in all of South Carlsbad. 64,000 South Carlsbad citizens have no Coastal Park.
5. Ponto is at the center of a larger 6-mile stretch of coastline in that has no Coastal Parks.
6. Ponto has a city documented 30 acre open-space standard deficit that a Coastal Park would help resolves.
7. And most importantly, I am informed that the City is currently ignoring these issues and in the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment is proposing to eliminate the last opportunity to create a much needed Coastal Park at Ponto

Accordingly, I am requesting and making my position known that:

- I want the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment to provide for a Coastal Park at Ponto.
- I want the City to provide a true Citizen-based Park Planning process for Ponto.
- I want the City of Carlsbad to budget money in their capital improvement program to purchase Planning Area F and build a park at Ponto to serve residents and visitors alike.

- I want to preserve what little Coastal Open Space Carlsbad has remaining for future generations and our visitor industry.

I am not in favor of future residential development at Ponto, but think this last small amount of vacant Coastal land should be reserved for Coastal Recreation.

One of the reasons that this lovely community continues to attract residents and tourists is the beauty of our natural surroundings, including coastline , parks and open spaces. Residential development is highly desired.. but INLAND, please! Protect our Coastal open spaces, for our good, and our visitors, for now AND the future. Once we squander it, it cannot easily be reclaimed...

Thank you
Barbara M Kesten
bkesten01@gmail.com
7476 Capstan Drive

Date submitted: 1/28/2020 6:18:23 PM

From: City of Carlsbad [<mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com>] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 5:05 PM
To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Subject: 🙌 Parks and recreation priorities to be discussed 12/12

[View as Webpage](#)



On Monday city staff will provide an update on work completed to date on the new Parks & Recreation Master Plan with the Senior Commission and Parks & Recreation Commission. Information will include:

- A preview of the results of a citywide survey conducted by a third-party research company
- Assessments of the city's current recreation programs

This information builds on feedback gathered from the community about parks and recreation priorities and investments.

Monday, Dec. 12

City Council chamber

3 p.m. – [Senior Commission](#)

5:30 p.m. – [Parks & Recreation Commission](#)

You can watch the meetings live on the [City TV cable channel](#).

The [Parks & Recreation Master Plan](#) is a blueprint that will help guide priorities and investments in parks and recreation facilities and services for the next seven years. The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015, and the major projects have been completed. The updated plan will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A seven-year strategic action plan

This project started right before the COVID-19 pandemic, so it's taken longer than expected. For one thing, staff wanted to add another round of public input to see if anything major had changed as a result of the pandemic experience, once facilities were allowed to reopen. City staff are on track to present the draft master plan update to the City Council in early 2023.

Next steps

January/February 2023: Draft updated master plan presented to Senior and Parks & Recreation commissions and City Council

March/April 2023: Final updated master plan presented to the City Council for adoption

More information

- [Parks & Recreation Master Plan webpage](#)
- Mick Calarco, Recreation Services Manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 442-339-2859



Visit website

City of Carlsbad | 1200 Carlsbad Village Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](#)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by parksandrec@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Mark Remas <mremas@remasgrp.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 8:35 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Need More Pickleball Courts

I know you are aware of the need for more pickleball courts. As a long-term resident of Carlsbad (over 35 years) I would like to see action on opening multiple courts in Old Carlsbad as well as other areas of the city.

There is an urgent need.

Mark Remas, MA, CRC, ABVE
2757 Arland Rd.
Carlsbad, CA 92008
619-977-6733

The contents of this e-mail and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s), may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information, and is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. Sections 2510-2521. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution, copying, or storage of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender if you received this email in error.

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Subject: Public input to the next upcoming meetings of Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council and Parks and Planning Commissions - LCPA and Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates - Parks & Open Space

Attachments: CTGMC key issues and suggestions -2022-12-6.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 11:17 AM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input to the next upcoming meetings of Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council and Parks and Planning Commissions - LCPA and Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates - Parks & Open Space

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's 12/15/22 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 land use changes, and Local Coastal Program Amendments, and
4. as public input to the CCC on Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program, and
5. as public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

The initial version of attached file was sent to you 8/8/22. The attached updated file should replace that older file as there is new data on significant tax-payer cost savings from Pronto Park relative to PCH Relocation, and updated examples of how Coastal Open Space can be cost-effectively persevered and increased. Both Coastal Parks and Open Space are important Carlsbad and State of CA issues.

- Parks: Updated data shows that a 11.1 acre Ponto Park would now cost less \$20 million to buy and build. This is less than a City Pool Renovation. Carlsbad's Old City Council planned to spend \$65 to \$80 million in Carlsbad tax-payer dollars to address the Citywide need for a significant Coastal Park in South Carlsbad with a 2.3 mile PCH Relocation. The City identified in 2001 other pay-payer funds were highly unlikely. \$65 to \$80 million would only 'free-up' 15.8 acres of narrow PCH Median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 & #5"). As People for Ponto Citizens have been saying for years that Ponto Park is the better Park solution to the documented Coastal South Carlsbad Park needs – a citywide need. The CTGMC should include that citywide Park need and the logical, better and tax-payer responsible Ponto Park solution to that citywide Park need in your CTGMC recommendations to City Council.

- Open Space: Updated data shows how documented GM Open Space shortfalls can be properly and responsibly address in a collaborative citizen-based “Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan” approached. Also the need to maintain the 15% GM (Useable) Open Space Standard will be critical in the future to maintain Open Space and prevent future conversion of Open Space to residential land use as part of Housing Plan updates.

For the CTGMC; Parks and Open Space are the 2 most critical/special of 6 Key Growth Management Program Update Issues and Suggestions the CTGMC should take to properly address these 6 key Growth Management Issues.

- Please read the Updated data and Suggestions.
- Please responsibly address the Growth Management issues of a citywide Park need for Coastal South Carlsbad as listed in the attached Suggestions. Include a South Carlsbad Coastal Park in your recommendations to the City Council. Acknowledge Ponto Park as the best and most tax-payer efficient solution to address that documented citywide park need.
- Please in your recommendations to City Council retain and enforce the Open Space Standard, and fix past errors made in falsely exempting certain developers in certain areas in the City from complying with the Growth Management Open Space Standard that other developers in other areas are required to provide.

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Happy holidays and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Following are 6 key major Growth Management Standards issues of citywide relevance that the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee (CTGMC) needs to act on, and citizen “Suggestions to CTGMC” on how to honestly and responsibly act on these 6 key issues in the CTGMC’s recommendations to the New City Council. This Update includes new information (pp 5-6) on the improved affordability of Ponto Park, and on how GM Open Space shortfall can be repaired. We hope the CTGMC will act honestly to make recommendations that truly and responsibly address known documented shortfalls in both Parks and GM Open Space. Responsible recommendations by the CTGMC can provide a sustainable Quality of Life to future Carlsbad generations and visitors. Only you own your recommendations.

1. The State of CA is forcing Carlsbad and all cities/counties in CA to provide for unlimited or Infinite Population and Visitor growth. So there will be an Infinite population & visitor demands for Parks, Open Space, water, and demands on our roads/transportation systems, and other Growth Management (GM) Quality of Life facilities. These infinite increases in population and visitor demand will come from high density development that requires more public Parks and Open Space to balance the high-densities. **Carlsbad’s new GM Standards will have to provide for a system of Infinite proportional increases in the supply of Parklands, Open Spaces, water, transportation facility capacity, etc. or our Quality of Life will diminish.**
 - a. Suggestions to CTGMC:
 - i. Completely restructure the General Plan, Local Coastal Program and GM Program to clearly recognize these facts and State requirements to proportionately provide public facilities to maintain/improve Carlsbad GM Quality of Life Standards for this Infinite growth of Population and Visitor demands.
 - ii. **Being a Coastal city Carlsbad has an added responsibility to proportionately maintain/improve providing High-Priority Coastal land uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations) needed at a regional and statewide level to address visitor needs for Coastal Recreation, access, and affordable accommodations.** Carlsbad needs to work with the State of CA Coastal Commission to completely restructure Carlsbad’s Coastal Land Use Plan to addresses the State’s requirement to provide an Infinite amount high-priority Coastal land uses for those Infinite Population and Visitor demands.
 - iii. **Trying to ignore these Infinite demands for Carlsbad’s Quality of Life facilities – like Parks and Open Spaces is a path to disaster and the ultimate degradation of Carlsbad’s Quality of Life.**
2. **Carlsbad has a huge Jobs v. Housing supply imbalance – far too many jobs around the airport for our amount of housing. This creates negative and costly land use and transportation planning distortions that radiate from the Airport Central Jobs through Carlsbad in all directions.** CA Housing law penalizes unbalanced cities like Carlsbad by requiring more housing in Carlsbad to bring jobs/housing ratio into balance. Carlsbad can correct this imbalance by 1 of 2 ways: 1) greatly increase housing supply (and thus increase the need and City expense for more GM Quality of Life facilities), or 2) more logically and cost effectively greatly decrease the amount of Jobs land use, so Carlsbad’s housing supply is in balance with jobs. These jobs will move to surrounding Cities that have more housing than jobs. **Rebalancing by reducing jobs land use creates added benefits for Carlsbad and our region by reducing Carlsbad’s peak-hour job commute traffic volumes and**

vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and by reducing the costs Carlsbad (and other cities and the region) have to pay to accommodate inter-city commute traffic. If Carlsbad reduces jobs land use will also reduce the amount of housing the State of California and SANDAG requires Carlsbad provide in its Housing Element thus reducing forcing incompatible high-density development into established neighborhoods and pressure to convert useable GM Open Space lands to housing land use.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Carlsbad can logically and cost effectively balance Jobs/housing supply by updating Growth Management Policy to reduce jobs to be in balance with housing by changing some of Carlsbad's General Plan land use around the airport into several high-density residential mixed-use Villages.** The City has started some of this, but can expand this effort but has not planned creating mixed-use village environments. These high-density villages will reduce jobs and provide both high-quality and high-density (affordable) housing within walking/biking distance to the major job center and new neighborhood commercial and Park uses in the Villages.
- ii. Prioritize transportation investments in safe bike paths, walking paths between Carlsbad's Central Jobs Core around the airport and Carlsbad's housing, particularly strongly connecting these new high-density mixed-use villages with the Central Jobs Core.
- iii. Update General Plan land use and housing policy to reduce concentrations of higher-density housing except around the airport jobs core.
- iv. Recognize the central Airport jobs core is 'Carlsbad's New Urban Downtown and "Transect Plan" accordingly toward lower densities on the City periphery.

3. Although some very critical areas (such as the Coastal lands at Ponto) are still vacant and can be wisely used for critical GM Quality of Life needs, much of Carlsbad is largely developed.

Redevelopment of developed land will require creating increased supplies of Parkland, Open Spaces, transportation capacity, and other Quality of Life facilities.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Completely rethink all City planning on existing vacant lands to assure that remaining vacant land is planned and being used wisely and fairly distributed to address critical Quality of Life needs in those areas, and not squandered on redundant land use.** The location of vacant land to address critical Park & Open Space needs should be preserved with land use planning.
- ii. Work with the State and CA Coastal Commission to preserve our Finite vacant Coastal lands for High-Priority Coastal Land Uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations and services) for the Infinite population and visitor demands both internal and external to Carlsbad that are/will be placed on them.
- iii. Fully and at the very beginning of any Carlsbad General Plan, Local Coastal Program and Growth Management Program actions going forward fully disclose, map and require consideration of the impact of future sea level rise and coastal erosion on Coastal land acres and land uses. Carlsbad has lost and will accelerate losing acres of Coastal land and High-priority Coastal Land Uses. Carlsbad must know, see, and discuss these losses BEFORE making any land use decisions in Carlsbad's Coastal Zone and any vacant Coastal Land.

4. **Carlsbad General Plan & Growth Management Plan do not provide a fair distribution of adequately sized City Parks for all Carlsbad families.** Veterans Park is a classic example. What will

be the City's largest park is only about 1-mile away from three other major City Parks (Zone 5, and the future Robinson Ranch and Hub Parks). This is a poor and unfair distribution and a misallocation City Park land resources. Saying Veterans Park is 'the park to serve SW, SE, and NE Carlsbad families' (the overwhelming major/majority funders of veterans Park) when those families are upwards of 6-miles away on major commercial arterials that kids can't logically/safely use is false and unfair. Most all the funding (developer fees) to build Veterans Park come from the SW, SE and NW Carlsbad but those areas are denied the Park the paid for. Veterans Park is inaccessible by almost all its intended users except by driving their cars and then storing their cars in parking lots on Parkland thus making less park land available for actual park use – this makes little common sense and is a great waste of tax-payer funds. This is dysfunctional along with being very unfair to families in SW, SE and NE Quadrats that are denied park acres near their homes which they funded. **Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps 'Park Service' areas of existing known Park Inequity or Unfairness (dysfunction), to show where new City Park investments should be made (See City map image with notes below).**

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

The Trust for Public Land provides a Park-Score to compare both a City's amount of park acres and the 'fairness' of access (within a 10-minute walk) to parks. **Carlsbad is below national averages in both park acres and fair access to parks. Carlsbad is also well below what our adjacent Coastal cities of Encinitas and Oceanside provide. Carlsbad only requires 3 acres of Park land per 1,000 population, while Encinitas and Oceans require 5 acres - 67% more than Carlsbad – of parkland. Also, Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be within a 10-minute walk to their citizens and families. Carlsbad has no such requirement.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

Carlsbad should change its General Plan, Parks and Growth Management Standards and CMC 20.44 to:

- i. **Be Above Average Nationally in both providing park acreage and in locating adequate park acreage to be within a 10-minute walk to all neighborhoods.**
 - ii. **Raise its minimum park acreage standard to 5 acres per 1,000 population, versus the current low 3 acres per 1,000. Carlsbad should be at least as good as Encinitas and Oceanside in requiring 5 acres, not 40% below what our adjacent Cities require/provide.**
 - iii. **Raise its park location standard to require an adequately sized park be provided to serve the neighborhood population within a 10-minute walk for all neighborhoods.**
 - iv. **Prioritize City Policy and Park Budgets and investments to achieve park fairness in 'Park Unserved areas' identified by Carlsbad's Park Master Plan.**
 - v. **Per Carlsbad's Municipal Code Chapter 20.44- DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES to require developers in 'Park Unserved areas' and in areas that do not have an adequately sized (5 acres per 1,000 population) park within a 10-minute walk to provide their developments required Park land acre dedication in actual Park land within a 10-minute walk to their development.**
 - vi. **Update the City's Park-in-lieu fee to assure the fee is adequate to actually buy the amount of park land a developer is to provide within a 10-minute walk of their development. The City's current 'Park-in-lieu-fee' is far too low and inadequate to actually buy land in area surrounding the proposed development.**
 - vii. **Only allow developers to pay a Park-in-lieu-fee where there is an adequately sized park (provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk of their development, and growth management planned future development in that area will not require more park land to provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk.**
 - viii. Consider updating Park policy to provide more multi-use flexibility in park land acres and development on Parks. Many Carlsbad Park acres are developed/dedicated to a single-purpose use, and unavailable for other park uses.
 - ix. Consider eliminating car parking lots from land that can be counted as parkland; or by significantly limiting park land used for parking to around 5%.
 - x. **Eliminate the counting of 'GM Constrained and Unusable land' and Protected Endangered Species Habitat land as Park land. GM Constrained/Unusable lands are undevelopable. Protected Habitat lands are by definition not useable for development by people. Habitat is dedicated for plants and animals. Parks are open spaces dedicated intended for people. Parkland calculations should exclude Unusable lands and Protected Habitat lands and only count 100% people Useable land as Park land. Where Park land abuts Habitat land a sufficient buffer space shall be provided to prevent people mixing with animals (ex. Rattlesnakes, etc.) and animals from people (habitat disturbance or destruction). This buffer area should not be counted as Park or Habitat acres, but as natural/developed buffer open space acres, and can be counted as part of the City's 15% Growth Management 'Aesthetic open Space'.**
5. Carlsbad's Coast is the most, if not the most, important feature of Carlsbad; and is consistently identified by citizens and businesses and our Community Vision. **Carlsbad's Coastal Parks (west of the I-5 corridor) are grossly unfairly distributed. Carlsbad's Coastal Parks do not fairly match the**

locational needs of the population. North Carlsbad that is 38% of Carlsbad's population and has 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37+ acres in size. South Carlsbad that is 62% of Carlsbad's population has 0 [ZERO] Coastal Parks totaling 0 [ZERO] acres. Again, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps this citywide unfairness (dots show park locations and circles show the area served by each park) and says that the City should look at buying and building New Parks in these areas that are unserved by City Parks (are not covered by a circle). The GM Update should correct this citywide unfair distribution of City Parks by making plans for new Park purchases to create City Parks in these unserved areas of Park Inequity.

To address citywide Coastal Park unfairness the current City Council wants to spend \$60-85 million in Carlsbad tax-payer funds to Relocate 2.3 miles of constrained Pacific Coast Highway median to try to make some of the narrow PCH median 'useable' by people. 2001 and 2013 City PCH Relocation studies identified only a small amount of 'people-useable acres' would be created next to PCH. The \$60-85 million tax-payer cost (\$26-37 million per mile) does NOT add one single square foot of new City land, it only inefficiently rearranges a small amount PCH median. The City can most tax-payer cost effectively provide needed sidewalks and bike improvements along the outside edges of PCH without PCH Relocation. The City's 2001 PCH Relocation Financial Study and 2013 PCH Relocation Design both indicated minimal useable land could be achieved by Relocation, and that the very high tax-payer cost to do so would be very difficult to fund. The City has known for well over 20-years that PCH Relocation is a high-cost and a poor solution to address the Citywide Coastal Park unfairness in South Carlsbad.

However, a **better and far less costly solution to correct Citywide Coastal Park unfairness and provide a much needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park is to simply buy currently vacant land that is for sale.** The City did this (although the City actually bought existing homes) when it expanded Pine Park. **Carlsbad tax-payers have used the City's own data to compare the tax-payer Cost/Benefits of simply purchasing vacant land v. trying to rearrange existing City owned land at PCH. Simply buying vacant land saves tax-payers saves tax-payers over \$32.7 to \$7.7 million.** Please read the following data files:

- 2022-June General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, 2.3 miles of PCH Modification (Island Way to La Costa Ave.), and 14.3 acre Ponto Park (Kam Sang) to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto in South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2.
- City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input: Part 2 of 2
- The most recent (9/19/22) land sale of 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F was less than \$8 million (less than \$706,000 per acre).
- **Buying and developing this 11.1 acre Ponto Park would cost less than \$20 million assuming a 10% profit to the new land-owner, and \$1 million per acre park construction cost like our newest Buena Vista Reservoir Park.** The cost to help correct a Citywide Coastal Park unfairness by simply buying & building a much needed **11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park would cost tax-payers less than the recently approved Measure J City Monroe Street Pool Renovation.** Investing less than \$20 million (\$1.8 million per acre) to buy and build an 11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park is a great tax-payer value v. \$65-80 million in tax-payer funds to rearrange 15.8 acres of narrow strips of constrained PCH median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 &5") for some minimal people use at a tax-payer cost of \$4-5 million per acre. **The overall and per acre costs of buying/building Ponto Park are over 2 to 3 times better value for tax-payers than PCH Relocation/rearrangement.**

- The City Council could/can buy land for Open Space (Parks are the most useable of the City's 4 Open Space categories) under voter approved Prop C Open Space land acquisition authority. **The City has been advised to buy Ponto Park under Prop C per the City's settlement of a Growth Management law suit.**

The Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is clearly a citywide issue. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad as it is unfair to the vast majority of Carlsbad citizens and their families as 62% of Carlsbad is in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is unfair to our major Visitor serving industries (and tax generators) in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad are clearly inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act, Carlsbad's Community Vision, and common sense. The Coastal South Carlsbad Park Inequity is also unfair to North Carlsbad because South Carlsbad's Coastal Park demand is being forced into Coastal North Carlsbad and congesting those parks, and adding to Coastal North Carlsbad traffic and parking impacts. It also increases greenhouse gases and VMT as it forces longer vehicle trips.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F has a specific Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy that says The City of Carlsbad must for the Ponto Area LCP 'Consider and Document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and or Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations west of the railroad tracks (at Ponto) prior to any Land Use change. **The discussion of Parks by the CTGMC is such a situation that requires the CTGMC to consider this adopted LCP Land Use Policies. Official public records requests have shown the City never followed this LCP Land Use Policy Requirement during the 2005 Ponto Vision Plan and 2015 General Plan Update, and in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission rejected the Ponto Vision Plan and told the City in 2017 that that land uses at Ponto could change based on the need for Coastal Recreation and/or Low Cost Visitor Accommodations.** The Mello II LCP that covers most of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone also has Land Use Policy 6.2 for the City to consider a major park in the Batiquitos (Ponto/South Carlsbad) area. The City has only implemented 1/6 to 1/3 of this policy. **The CTGMC should fully evaluate the citywide/South Carlsbad and local Ponto need for Coastal Parks as required by the City's adopted LCPs and CA Coastal Act.**
- ii. Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan Update and Growth Management Plan (GMP) did not, and was not updated to, consider the 2017 Sea Level Rise (SLR) Impact report showing the loss/impact on 32+ acres of Carlsbad's Coastal Land Use acreage in South Carlsbad – primarily Open Space Land Use (beach and Campground). **Both the General Plan (and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan) and GMP should be updated to account for the loss and replacement of these 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Use due to SLR.** The updates and the CTGMC should use the newest CA Coastal Commission SLR Guidelines/science, not the old guidelines used in 2017. Carlsbad's LCP and CA Coastal Act Land Use Polies call for 'upland relocation' to replace the SLR loss of high-priority Coastal Land Uses.
- iii. **The availability over the past several years of the last two sufficiently sized vacant lands suitable for a Ponto/South Carlsbad Coastal Park is a citywide issue. If these last two vacant lands are lost to development forever future generations will have lost the last opportunity for the needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park.** The 5/3/22 Citizen requests for the City to jointly study acquisition of one or both these last vacant lands for a needed (and only possible) true and meaningful Coastal Park for

South Carlsbad should be recommended by the CTGMC. **The CTGMC should recommend Carlsbad’s GMP be updated to incorporate Parkland acquisition of these last opportunities to provide the needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad.**

6. Carlsbad Growth Management Open Space Standard is that 15% of all the Useable (unconstrained and fully buildable) areas is to be preserved as Useable Open Space, and that all the 25 Local Facility Management Plans (LFMP) show how that 15% is provided. The City says:

OPEN SPACE

A. Performance Standard

Fifteen percent of the total land area in the Local Facility Management Zone (LFMZ) exclusive of environmentally constrained non-developable land must be set aside for permanent open space and must be available concurrent with development.

Yet the City has mapped and documented that this 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard was not complied with. The City also acknowledges that without changes to current City planning the 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard will never be complied with. The City acknowledges that only 13% has/will under current plans ever be provided. This missing 2% equals 501 acers of lost GM Open Space the GMP promised citizens. **Carlsbad law the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90, and section ‘21.90.130 Implementation of facilities and improvements requirements’; provide guidance on how non-compliance with a Performance Standards is to be handled.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. Retain the GM Open Space Standard of 15% of all unconstrained and developable land is maintained as Open Space. If the City removes the Open Space Standard, it will allow and encourage land use changes to remove GM Open Space and replace with development.
- ii. **The CTGMC should make a recommendation that an inventory of all 25 LFMP Zones be conducted and an inventory of each LFMP Zones provision of at least 15% Useable Open Space shall be compiled. No LFMP Zone shall be allowed to be “exempt” from this inventory.** The City’s computerized GIS mapping system makes it easy and clear as shown in the following City GIS map for LFMP Zone 9 (aka Ponto).



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara includes the same lagoon.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were not required to comply with the 15% Useable Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the Growth Management Standard of 15% Useable Open Space at Ponto

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from Growth Management (GMP) Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data |

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

- iii. In instances like LFMP Zone 9 (above image) that clearly did not provide at least 15% Useable Open Space and/or were falsely “exempted” the CTGMC should recommend that a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** shall be developed that explores the GM Open Space use/reuse of City land, land use planning requirements, and/or possible acquisitions of remaining vacant land acres to make up for any shortfall in meeting the 15% Useable Open Space in that a Zone. An example of this in LFMP Zone 9 is that the City’s regional Rail Trail will convert 2-lanes of almost all of Avenida Encinas to wider buffered bike lanes and an adequate portion of the converted 2 vehicle lanes can be landscaped (v. just painting strips as a buffer) to provide a safer/better bike lane buffer within a GM compliant Open Space. 2 vehicle lanes in Windrose Circle could also be similarly landscaped and converted to GM complaint Open Space. This is just one example of a cost-effective means to add GM Open Space that developers were falsely allowed to remove.
- iv. A **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** should involve a Citizens Advisory Committee composed of citizens within the impacted Zone and appointed by the Council Members representing the Zone, and a representative of each vacant land owner over of over 1-acre in size.
- v. Consistent with the Growth Management Ordinance land use changes and development applications within a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** Zone shall be deferred until the applications can considered with (or after adoption of) a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan**.

From: K & P Bhavsar <yzx1admin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 2, 2023 10:51 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Support for More Pickleball Courts Please

Hi just showing support for more courts.

Thank you!

Jay Bhavsar

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Public input to the next and 12-13-22 Carlsbad Park Commission & Draft Local Coastal Program Update on 📧 Parks and recreation priorities to be discussed

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, January 2, 2023 7:58 AM

To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>;

'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>;

info@peopleforponto.com; 'Mike Sebahar' <sebbiesixpack@att.net>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Subject: Public input to the next and 12-13-22 Carlsbad Park Commission & Draft Local Coastal Program Update on

📧 Parks and recreation priorities to be discussed

Mick & Carlsbad Park Commission:

Happy Holidays and New Year.

Again thank you however in my email I asked – but did get a reply as to if City Staff will fully incorporate the extensive citizen input regarding Park Priorities and the demonstrated need for Ponto Park, and documented tax-payer cost efficiency (and far greater public benefits) of Ponto Park:

“As noted in Kyle’s February 13, 2020 email below the over public 5,000 petitions citing the need and citizen desire for Ponto Park was to be factored into the Park Master Plan Update. We wanted to confirm staff has incorporated that need and input into the staff suggested Draft Parks Master Plan Update? People for Ponto Citizens had hoped the Parks Department would have provided some more (than 3-day) advance notice to citizens on the extensive citizen input on Ponto Park, and more opportunity to review and provide comments. Particularly given the holidays.

The Current Park Master Plan already documents that Ponto is “Unserved by City Parks” and an area that the City should provide City Parks. City Local Coastal Land Use Policies for Ponto (Planning Area F) and Mello II Policies also require consideration of City Park facilities at Ponto.

We wanted to confirm with you that all the Carlsbad Citizen input on the need for and desire for a meaningful Ponto Park has been incorporated into the proposed Draft Park Master Plan, and that the Park Master Plan provides for correction for unfair distribution of Coastal Parks in Carlsbad consistent with good Park planning and City planning practices, the CA Coastal Act regarding distribution and allocation of Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) resources.

A confirmation from you regarding how staff incorporated and addressed the extensive citizen input on Ponto Park would be greatly appreciated, along with dates for other opportunities to comment, as many citizens will not be able to respond in the short time provided to review, particularly given the holidays”

Citizens want to make sure the City staff, City Commissions and City Council, and CA Coastal Commission are properly disclosing and considering public input on Park Priorities/Needs for Ponto Park (and documented tax-payer cost effectiveness) as evidenced in well over 5,000 petitions, many spoken comments and written data/public input submitted at Council, Budget, Growth Management Plan Update meetings that relate to Carlsbad Parks, and Coastal land use and budgets.

Citizen concern about the City accurately accounting for and considering public input (priorities) is documented in multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests that showed the City did NOT communicate to citizens fully and accurately the Coastal Park, Coastal Open Space, and sea level rise impacts on high-priority Coastal Park and Open Space issues; and also did NOT implement the Local Coastal Program Land Use (Coastal Recreation i.e. Public Park) Policy requirements (both PSMP/LCP and Mello II LCP Policies) during both the 2010 CCC rejected Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and the 2015 General Plan Update (that is not certified by the CCC as compliant with the CA Coastal Act).

The CCC also documented concerns to the City in 2010 rejecting the City's PBVVP in 2010 and in 2017 letters to the City.

Citizens are concerned the City's proposed Parks Master Plan Update process is failing to fully and accurately account for all the extensive citizen data and public input the City has received to date since 2017.

Can you please provide a clear reply as to if/how the City will be disclose, document, incorporate and consider the Ponto Park issues as noted in Kyle Lancaster's 2/13/20 email in the Park Master Plan considerations by Staff, Commissions and Council?

Please know People for Ponto citizens are concerned because they love Carlsbad and our CA Coast. They know high-priority Coastal Parks and Coastal Open Space are vital to Carlsbad's and California's future, particularly given increased population/visitor demand for these uses and the planned loss of these uses due to sea level rise and Coastal erosion.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

From: Mick Calarco [<mailto:Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>]

Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 6:01 PM

To: Lance Schulte

Cc: Council Internet Email; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal; info@peopleforponto.com; Mike Sebahar; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Subject: RE: Public input to 12-13-22 Carlsbad Park Commission & Draft Local Coastal Program Update on 🙌 Parks and recreation priorities to be discussed

Hello, Mr. Schulte:

The purpose of the Dec. 12 special meetings of the Senior and Parks & Recreation Commissions, is to provide an opportunity for city staff and our consultant to share a preview of the public input the city received from the statistically reliable survey (only, at this time) and introduce program classifications and lifecycles that staff identified during a portion of the recreation and adults 50+ program assessments.

The data presented will include the City of Carlsbad's demographics and recreation trends – as compared to nationwide trends; a preview of the results of the master plan's statistically reliable survey - distributed randomly to Carlsbad households; and the outcome of the general recreation program assessment, as well as the adults 50+ recreation program assessment.

The presentation will conclude with an outline of the next steps to completion of the master plan update. Staff and the lead consultant plan to return to the Senior Commission with a draft of the master plan update for review in early 2023 (an additional opportunity for public comment – per your email, below).

Staff's recommended commission action is, "Receive an informational report on a portion of the data compiled in preparation for the Parks & Recreation Department's Master Plan Update."

I hope this information is helpful. We look forward to perhaps seeing you on Monday.

Sincerely,

Mick



Mick Calarco
he/him/his
Recreation Services Manager
Parks & Recreation
Administration
City of Carlsbad
799 Pine Ave.
Suite 200
Carlsbad, CA 92008

www.carlsbadca.gov | mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov
442-339-2959 (office) | 442-224-2516 (mobile)

[Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Enews](#)

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 12:36 PM

To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; info@peopleforponto.com; Mike Sebahar <sebbiesixpack@att.net>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Subject: Public input to 12-13-22 Carlsbad Park Commission & Draft Local Coastal Program Update on 🙋 Parks and recreation priorities to be discussed

Mick, Carlsbad Park Commission:

Thank you the Friday notice on the Monday meeting at the end of this email.

As noted in Kyle's February 13, 2020 email below the over public 5,000 petitions citing the need and citizen desire for Ponto Park was to be factored into the Park Master Plan Update. We wanted to confirm staff has incorporated that need and input into the staff suggested Draft Parks Master Plan Update? People for Ponto Citizens had hoped the Parks Department would have provided some more (than 3-day) advance notice to citizens on the extensive citizen input on Ponto Park, and more opportunity to review and provide comments. Particularly given the holidays.

The Current Park Master Plan already documents that Ponto is "Unserved by City Parks" and an area that the City should provide City Parks. City Local Coastal Land Use Policies for Ponto (Planning Area F) and Mello II Policies also require consideration of City Park facilities at Ponto.

We wanted to confirm with you that all the Carlsbad Citizen input on the need for and desire for a meaningful Ponto Park has been incorporated into the proposed Draft Park Master Plan, and that the Park Master Plan provides for correction for unfair distribution of Coastal Parks in Carlsbad consistent with good Park planning and City planning practices, the CA Coastal Act regarding distribution and allocation of Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) resources.

A confirmation from you regarding how staff incorporated and addressed the extensive citizen input on Ponto Park would be greatly appreciated, along with dates for other opportunities to comment, as many citizens will not be able to respond in the short time provided to review, particularly given the holidays.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

From: Kyle Lancaster [<mailto:Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2020 12:54 PM

To: Lance Schulte; info@peopleforponto.com; Matthew Hall; Council Internet Email; Scott Chadwick; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Mike Pacheco; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Don Neu; Gary Barberio

Cc: People for Ponto; Mick Calarco

Subject: RE: Develop Ponto Right - prior Ponto Coastal Park Support Letters and public comments to be included in Parks Master Plan public Comments

Lance-

I've consulted with the city attorney's representative on this matter. **She determined that the prior public input on the desire for a park at Ponto does not need to be resubmitted in order to be included in the public input process for the Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan Update. Rather, your email message below will serve as a cover sheet request for that prior public input to also be included as public input for the Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan Update.**

Thank you.

-Kyle



Kyle Lancaster, CPRP
Parks & Recreation Director
Parks & Recreation Department
City of Carlsbad
799 Pine Ave., Ste. 200
Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

760-434-2941 | 760-434-5088 fax | Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#)

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, February 6, 2020 6:25 PM

To: info@peopleforponto.com; Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>; Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>

Subject: RE: Develop Ponto Right - prior Ponto Coastal Park Support Letters and public comments to be included in Parks Master Plan public Comments

Importance: High

Dear City Council, Kyle Lancaster, Mike Pacheco, and Mick Calarco:

We would like to receive confirmation that all the People for Ponto and other public comments as part of the public comments submitted on the:

1. Shopoff developer proposed application to change the Local Coastal Program Land Use on Planning Area F at Ponto,
2. the City Staff's proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment to change the Land Use on Planning Area F for the developer

be included in the City's Park Master Plan Update. Can you please confirm all this prior citizen input is also included in the Parks Master Plan Update?

These prior public comments and requests to the City Council and Kyle Lancaster, parks Director directly relate to Park needs at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad, and the City's Planning Area F LCP LUP Requirements to consider a Public Park at the site. The public input is from over 2,500 citizen and public communications already sent to the City Council and City Staff (as noted in the above To address list). In addition to those 2,500 citizen and public communications over 90-pages of extensive public comments and data showing among other things the City's Park Master Plan's Park Service Area deficit (Park Service inequity) at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad, Park Acreage Deficit in South Carlsbad, the lack of any City Park West of I-5 and rail corridor in all South Carlsbad, CA Coastal Act policies and Coastal Recreation data/issues, along with other City policy and regulation supporting a Park at Ponto. All this prior public input should be included in the Parks Master Plan Update. Can you please confirm that that is the case? Or do we have to re-email all these prior public comments?

Thanks,
Lance
People for Ponto

One example of prior public comments submitted about Park deficits at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad and request for a City Park at Ponto:

From: info@peopleforponto.com [<mailto:info@peopleforponto.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 4:18 PM

To: Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov; CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov; Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov; Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov; Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov; info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Develop Ponto Right - Support Letter

Dear Mayor Hall, Carlsbad City Council, and California Coastal Commission:

I am informed that

1. Carlsbad must consider on Planning Area F at Ponto the need for a public park at Ponto as part of the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.
2. There is no public park at Ponto even though City Park Standards requires a minimum of 6.5 acres of parkland for Ponto.
3. There is a current 6.6 acre park deficit in Coastal Southwest quadrant of Carlsbad, (south of Palomar Airport Road and west of El Camino Real).
4. There are no Coastal Parks in all of South Carlsbad. 64,000 South Carlsbad citizens have no Coastal Park.
5. Ponto is at the center of a larger 6-mile stretch of coastline in that has no Coastal Parks.
6. Ponto has a city documented 30 acre open-space standard deficit that a Coastal Park would help resolves.
7. And most importantly, I am informed that the City is currently ignoring these issues and in the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment is proposing to eliminate the last opportunity to create a much needed Coastal Park at Ponto

Accordingly, I am requesting and making my position known that:

- I want the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment to provide for a Coastal Park at Ponto.
- I want the City to provide a true Citizen-based Park Planning process for Ponto.
- I want the City of Carlsbad to budget money in their capital improvement program to purchase Planning Area F and build a park at Ponto to serve residents and visitors alike.
- I want to preserve what little Coastal Open Space Carlsbad has remaining for future generations and our visitor industry.

I am not in favor of future residential development at Ponto, but think this last small amount of vacant Coastal land should be reserved for Coastal Recreation.

One of the reasons that this lovely community continues to attract residents and tourists is the beauty of our natural surroundings, including coastline , parks and open spaces. Residential development is highly desired.. but INLAND, please! Protect our Coastal open spaces, for our good, and our visitors, for now AND the future. Once we squander it, it cannot easily be reclaimed...

Thank you

Barbara M Kesten

bkesten01@gmail.com

7476 Capstan Drive

Date submitted: 1/28/2020 6:18:23 PM

From: City of Carlsbad [<mailto:communications@carlsbadca.ccsend.com>] **On Behalf Of** City of Carlsbad

Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 5:05 PM

To: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net

Subject: 🙌 Parks and recreation priorities to be discussed 12/12

[View as Webpage](#)



On Monday city staff will provide an update on work completed to date on the new Parks & Recreation Master Plan with the Senior Commission and Parks & Recreation Commission. Information will include:

- A preview of the results of a citywide survey conducted by a third-party research company
- Assessments of the city's current recreation programs

This information builds on feedback gathered from the community about parks and recreation priorities and investments.

Monday, Dec. 12

City Council chamber

3 p.m. – [Senior Commission](#)

5:30 p.m. – [Parks & Recreation Commission](#)

You can watch the meetings live on the [City TV cable channel](#).

The [Parks & Recreation Master Plan](#) is a blueprint that will help guide priorities and investments in parks and recreation facilities and services for the next seven years. The city's existing Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed in 2015, and the major projects have been completed. The updated plan will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends
- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A seven-year strategic action plan

This project started right before the COVID-19 pandemic, so it's taken longer than expected. For one thing, staff wanted to add another round of public input to see if anything major had changed as a result of the pandemic experience, once facilities were allowed to reopen. City staff are on track to present the draft master plan update to the City Council in early 2023.

Next steps

January/February 2023: Draft updated master plan presented to Senior and Parks & Recreation commissions and City Council

March/April 2023: Final updated master plan presented to the City Council for adoption

More information

- [Parks & Recreation Master Plan webpage](#)
- Mick Calarco, Recreation Services Manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 442-339-2859



Visit website

City of Carlsbad | 1200 Carlsbad Village Drive, Carlsbad, CA 92008

[Unsubscribe meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net](#)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by parksandrec@carlsbadca.gov

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Public input to the 1-16-22 Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and upcoming Carlsbad City Council and Parks and Planning Commissions - LCPA and Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates - Parks & Open Space

Attachments: History of Open Space at Ponto - 2022-1-26.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, January 23, 2023 12:39 PM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input to the 1-16-22 Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and upcoming Carlsbad City Council and Parks and Planning Commissions - LCPA and Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates - Parks & Open Space

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's 1/26/22 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 land use changes, and Local Coastal Program Amendments, and
4. as public input to the CCC on Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program, and
5. as public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

At the 1-11-22 CTGMC meeting questions logically arouse about how Ponto/LFMP-9 was falsely exempted from the Growth Management Open Space Standards in 1986 when the two adopted reasons for that exemption were not true per the City's Open Space map/data base, air-photos and development records, and the requirements of the Growth Management Ordinance and Open Space Standard. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have been bringing this up to the City since 2017 when we first had City data that showed the GM Open Space Standard exemption was incorrect. Attached is some more detailed data that provides a History of Open Space at Ponto – 2022-1-26. There are more details and interesting bits of information, but the attached provides the basics on the History and also offers some critical historical context for the CTGMC, Carlsbad Commissions, City Council and Carlsbad Citizens to consider. I hope this is helpful.

The History of Ponto Open Space and historical context fits into the 'CTGMP Key Issues and Suggestions – 2022-12-6' file and email to you on 8/8/22 and 12/13/22 that provides a time-tested, logical, legal, tax-payer saving approach to dealing with the missing Ponto Open Space and need for a significant Coastal Park at Ponto to serve Ponto and South Carlsbad and relieve Coastal Park pressures on North Carlsbad.

Please know People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens deeply care and love Carlsbad. We bring the data and requests to you because we care. You have received well over 5,000 People for Ponto petitions regarding Ponto Park and Open Space. During the CTGMC meetings many have spoken and submitted in favor of the issues identified in the People for Ponto petitions. I may have missed it but do not recall any Carlsbad citizen speak/submit to the CTGMC in opposition to what People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have provided you. As representative of the Citizens of Carlsbad we ask you honestly represent the Carlsbad Citizen desires so overwhelming expressed to you.

Thank you, and with Aloha Aina for Carlsbad,
Lance


CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

History of the false exemption of the Growth Management Open Space Standard provided Ponto developers in Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9 (LFMP-9):

The history of how required Growth Management Open Space (i.e. unconstrained/developable land) that should have been dedicated Open Space was, and is now being proposed to be, inappropriately converted to Residential land use by a Perpetuating a False Exemption of the Open Space Standard provided Ponto Developers. This False Exemption needs correction and restitution. Ponto's False Exemption of the Open Space Standard and the 'amendment shell-game' GM Open Space history is a critical warning sign to the **Carlsbad Tomorrow** Growth Management Committee, Planning Commission and City Council. Ponto is a critical warning that a strong, accountable and accurate Open Space Standard needs to be established for **Carlsbad Tomorrow**, AND a Growth Management Open Space restitution plan needs to be established and funded that corrects the False Exemption for Ponto Developers. If Ponto Developers were required like other similar developers at the time (Aviara and Poinsettia Shores, "urbanizing La Costa Zones 11 & 12, etc.) to provide the required Growth Management Open Space some of the critical Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues and extensive Carlsbad Citizen needs/demands/desires at Ponto could likely have already been addressed.

How citizens found out about the False Exemption provided Ponto Developers:

In 2017 for the 1st time the city provided the GIS maps/data base accounting of Open Space in the City. The City did this a part of settlement to a North County Advocates citizens' lawsuit. The City Open Space maps/data base allowed Carlsbad Citizens for the 1st time the ability to see and confirm what Open Space was produced by Growth Management (GM). The City's Open Space map/data based for Ponto (LFMP-9) documented that about 30-acres of GM Open Space was missing (see; Carlsbad Official Public Records Request - PRR 2017-164). As required by GM, and as Staff has said, to count as GM Open Space it must be dedicated and 'unconstrained/developable land' to meet the GM Open Space Standard. Being able to see for the 1st time the missing GM Open Space was one of the key awakenings that started People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens. Below is the City's Open Space Map for LFMP-9, with notes. We have the City's parcel-based Open Space data base that confirms all the numerical data in the notes.



**City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9)
Open Space:**

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara had the same lagoon waters.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were never required to comply with the 15% Standard Open Space is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map


City GIS map data summary of the 15% Growth Management Standard Open Space at Ponto


| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from GMP Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data |
| | 73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |

So were did the missing GM Open Space go?

In early 1985 prior to the Ponto's developer (SAMMIS) annexing Ponto into the City of Carlsbad, San Diego County's LAFCO (local agency formation commission) General Planned and pre-zoned, Ponto's Batiqitos Lagoon waters and the lagoon bluff slopes as Open Space. This Open Space was "Constrained Open Space" – State jurisdictional waters, and steep slopes with Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) habitat. These already pre-zoned constrained/non-developable Open Spaces were accounted for as part of the City's 25% pre-Growth Management Plan Open Space, and per Growth Management can't be counted in meeting the 15% Growth Management Open Space Standard. The pre-zoned Open Space is shown in the City's Open Space map and properly marked as "Preservation of Natural Resources" Open Space land. This already pre-zoned Constrained (non-developable, aka 'Preservation of Natural Resources') Open Space land at Ponto was documented in the proposed SAMMIS Batiqitos Lagoon Educational Park (BLEP) Master Plan MP-175 as Areas N, O, and P in the Land Use Summary below.

On Oct, 1 1985 Carlsbad approved SAMIS's Master Plan and EIR to develop Ponto. SAMIS's BLEP Master Plan MP-175. Following are BLEP MP-175's General Plan & Land Use Summary maps:





**CONCEPTUAL LAND USE PLAN
BATIQUITOS LAGOON EDUCATIONAL PARK
SAMMIS PROPERTIES**

The BLEP MP-175 did include a variety of GM compliant Open Space.

- 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use that was playfields and Coastal Recreation site for MP-175 and South Carlsbad. This is a Critical GM Open Space that was never dedicated.
- A minimum 30' wide landscaped Open Space on both sides of Windrose Circle that circled the Area P. Windrose Circle was bordered on each side by 30' of landscaped Open Space.
- Additional minimum 30' wide landscaped setbacks between buildings in Area A
- 2.8 acres of private recreation open space for the maximum amount of residential units
- 45' to 50' landscaped setbacks from the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff edge (this was later developed with Residential land use in some areas of Ponto).
- 75' landscaped separation between Areas C and D
- 70' landscaped separation between Areas D and E
- 25' landscaped setback along Avenida Encinas for Area E
- 30' to 80' landscape setback between Lakeshore Gardens and Area F
- 25' landscaped setback along Avenida Encinas for Area F
- 50' landscaped setback between Areas F and I
- 75' landscaped separation between Areas G and H
- 50' to 80' landscape setback for Area I between Lakeshore Gardens and between Area F

So, prior to Ponto being annexed into the City of Carlsbad in the mid-1980's and prior to Growth Management the Batiquitos Lagoon and lagoons bluff slopes (constrained and unusable due to habitat and slope constraints) were already pre-zoned Open Space and General Planned as Constrained Habitat Open Space. This constrained Open Space did not and cannot meet the 15% GM Open Space Standard.

In 1986 Citizens voted for the City's version of Growth Management that included a New Standard for Useable Open Space. The new standard was that 15% of all unconstrained useable/developable land within a Local Facility Management Zone was to be dedicated as Open Space. Once the vote was in the City adopted the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 of Carlsbad's Municipal Code (City Council Ordinance No. 9791. (Ord. 9829 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9808 § 1, 1986)).

In adopting the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90.010 the Council Clearly stated:

(b) The city council of the city has determined **despite previous city council actions**, including but not limited to, amendments to the land use, housing, and parks and recreation elements of the general plan, amendments to city council Policy No. 17, adoption of traffic impact fees, and modification of park dedication and improvement requirements, that the demand for facilities and improvements has outpaced the supply resulting in shortages in public facilities and improvements, including, but not limited to, streets, **parks, open space**, schools, libraries, drainage facilities and general governmental facilities. **The city council has further determined that these shortages are detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Carlsbad.**

(c) This chapter is adopted to ensure the implementation of the policies stated in subsection (a), to eliminate the shortages identified in subsection (b), **to ensure that no development occurs without providing for adequate facilities and improvements, ..."**

The Citizens and Council recognized that prior City plans were not adequate to address the current (and future) needs for facilities. Upon adoption of the New Growth Management Standards certain facilities were already below-Standard simply based on the existing development and population. Growth Management required additional facilities simply to bring the then current development/population up to the New Minimum Standards. I am personally familiar with 3 GM Standards in LFMP-6 (old La Costa) that I worked on – Library, Fire, and Park where already below-Standard i.e. existing development/population in Old La Costa required more facilities to meet the new Growth Management Standards. We worked to provide these new facilities for the existing development/population (i.e. fix the Standard deficits) and then to also plan even more additional facilities at a ratio that met the New Standards for the additional future development in Old La Costa. I can provide you some interesting stories on that.

I also recall working on the surrounding La Costa LRMP Zones 11 & 12 that Like Ponto/FMP-9 were considered "Cat II: Urbanizing" yet Unlike Ponto/LFMP-9 LFMP Zone 11 & 12 were not falsely exempted

for the GMP Open Space Standard and had to provide the GM Open Space Standard of 15% of the unconstrained/developable lands as dedicated Useable Open Space.

The Citizens vote on Proposition E and the subsequent Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 are the rules on which the Growth Management Plans (both Citywide and 25 Local Facility Plans) are required to follow.

To create the Citywide and the Local plans (Zones 1-6) for the largely developed areas the City needed to temporarily pause development activity to allow time for city staff to Draft the Growth Management Plan (my work as a city planner at the time was re-directed to draft growth management plans). So the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90.030, established a Temporary Development Moratorium to pause development processing activity while the Growth Management Plan was being Drafted. Following is that language of 21.90.030. Notes are shown as italicized text within *[example]*:

“21.90.030 General prohibition—Exceptions.

(a) Unless exempted by the provisions of this chapter, **no application for any building permit or development permit shall be accepted, processed or approved until a city-wide facilities and improvements plan has been adopted and a local facilities management plan for the applicable local facilities management zone has been submitted and approved according to this chapter.** *[Clearly indicates the exemptions in 21.90.030 are only from the temporary development moratorium created by 21.90.]*

(b) No zone change, general plan amendment, master plan amendment or specific plan amendment which would increase the residential density or development intensity established by the general plan in effect on the effective date of this chapter shall be approved unless an amendment to the citywide facilities management plan and the applicable local facilities management plan has first been approved. *[FYI, this provision of 21.90.030 has direct implications with respect of currently City/developer proposed General Plan/Zoning code/Local Coastal Program Amendments now being pursued by the City at Ponto Planning Area F and Ponto Site 18. The City did not and has not yet amended the CFMP and LFMP-9 to increase the City/developer proposed residential density or development intensity at Ponto]*

(c) The classes of projects or permits listed in this subsection shall be exempt from the provisions of subsection (a). Development permits and building permits for these projects shall be subject to any fees established pursuant to the city-wide facilities and improvement plan and any applicable local facilities management plan. *[Then lists various exemptions from the temporary development processing/building permit moratorium in 21.90. The BLEP MP's exemption from the temporary moratorium is (g)]*

(g) The city council may authorize the processing of and decision making on building permits and development permits for a project with a master plan approved before July 20, 1986, subject to the following restrictions *[this only applies to the “approved before July 20, 1986” BLEP MP, and NOT to any subsequent Master Plan Amendment]:*

- (1) The city council finds that the **facilities and improvements required by the master plan are sufficient to meet the needs created by the project and that the master plan developer has agreed to install those facilities and improvements to the satisfaction of the city council.** *[The Ponto developer needed to provide the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use and install the GM compliant Open Space required in the 1986 MP175 but did not]*
- (2) The master plan developer shall agree in writing that all facilities and improvement requirements, including, but not limited to, the payment of fees established by the city-wide facilities and management plan and the applicable local facilities management plan shall be applicable to development within the master plan area and that the master plan developer shall comply with those plans. *[this required the LFMP-9/BLEP MP to have 1) already been fully developed or 2) have already have dedicated 15% of the LFMP-9 as Growth Management compliant Open Space (i.e. Unconstrained and developable) to qualify for the Open Space exemption later falsely noted in the city-wide facilities and management plan. As clearly documented the BLEP MP did not meet the requirements to qualify for Open Space Standard Exemption in the city-wide facilities and management plan. The section also requires “all facilities” (including Open Space) requirements in the Citywide Growth Management Standard to apply to BLEP MP, not provide a means for a false exemption of the Open Space Standard]*
- (3) The master plan establishes an educational park and **all uses within the park comprise an integral part of the educational facility.** *[“all uses” including the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use and all the other GM compliant Open Spaces are an integral part. However the 12.8 acre open space land use was never built and the BLEP MP GM compliant Open Space never dedicated.]*
- (4) **Building permits for the one hundred twenty-nine [129] unit residential portion of Phase I of the project may be approved provided the applicant has provided written evidence that an educational entity will occupy Phase I of the project** which the city council finds is satisfactory and consistent with the goals and intent of the approved master plan. *[Clearly indicates the 21.90.030 exemption is only for building permits for Phase I of the BLEP MP. Of the 129 units only the 75 unit Rosalena development applied for and received building permits under this exemption. There are some very interesting issues related to this Rosalena Phase I development relative to GM complaint Open Space along the bluff edge that can be expanded on later if the CTGMC has questions.]*
- (5) Prior to the approval of the final map for Phase I the master plan developer shall have agreed to participate in the restoration of a significant lagoon and wetland resource area and made any dedications of property necessary to accomplish the restoration. *[Again clearly notes the exemption only allows a final map for Phase I to be processed. The “lagoon and wetland resource area” are part of the same constrained/undevelopable lands already pre-zoned prior to the BLEP MP being incorporated into the City of Carlsbad]*

The Aviara Master Plan (directly adjacent and east of Ponto) and was also being developed at the same time as Ponto/BLEP MP. 21.90.030 also provided the Aviara Master Plan a similar exemption (h) and similar lagoon related quid-pro-quo for that exemption. But Aviara did not receive a GM Open Space Standard Exemption. :

“(iv) Prior to any processing on the [Aviara] master plan the applicant shall grant an easement over the property necessary for the lagoon restoration and the right-of-way necessary for the widening of La Costa Avenue and its intersection with El Camino Real. (Ord. NS-63 § 1, 1989; Ord. 9837 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9808 § 1, 1986)”

Some City staff have incorrectly stated to the City Council that they believe 21.90.030 exempts Ponto/LFMP-9 from the Growth Management Ordinance/Program or Growth Management Open Space Standard. RESOLUTION NO. 8666- A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CARLSBAD, CALIFORNIA APPROVING TWO AGREEMENTS FOR BATIQUITOS LAGOON EDUCATIONAL PARK also shows the 21.90.030 exemption was only for development permits during the temporary building moratorium.

In 1986 the City falsely exempted in the Citywide Facilities Plan all Ponto developers from providing 15% of their useable/developable land as GM required Open Space. The City’s documented/adopted rationale in the Citywide Plan was that Ponto/LFMP-9 was 1) in 1986 already developed, or 2) in 1986 the developer had already met the GM Open Space Standard by having already dedicated 15% of the useable land as Open Space. Both situations were/are false. Any air photo map or even the 1986 LFMP-9 clearly states Ponto was NOT developed in 1986, as only the Lakeshore Gardens existed and the Ralphs Center was just starting construction. Also the City’s GIS Open Space mapping (see above) shows that SAMMIS the Ponto developer (BLEP Master Plan MP-175) in 1986 had Not dedicated as Open Space 15% of the useable land as Growth Management compliant Open Space as shown/described in the BLEP MP (i.e. the 12.8 Acre Recreation Commercial site and all the landscaped open space setbacks required in the BLEP MP-175. If that 15% was dedicated in 1986 it would show-up on the City’s inventory of Dedicated Open Space now. So how did this occur?

How Ponto’s planned GM Open Space was eliminated and replaced with Residential land use:

In late 1980’s SAMMIS the BLEP MP-175 developer started building the 75-home Rosalena Development as the first part of Phase I of the BLEP MP. The City (based on my recollection was very desirous to develop the BLEP MP) and required special time limits on the BLEP MP to actually advance building the ‘Educational Park’ with all the “initiated” land uses (including GM compliant Open Space) within a certain period of time. SAMMIS was having financial issues and difficulty delivering the BLEP MP land uses. Amendments (A, B, and C) to BLEP MP reflected on these difficulties:

- MP 175(A) to allow minor accessory structures within the rear yards of all Phase I single family lots located in Planning Area “C”. *[This is the Rosalena development that was part of Phase I for BLEP MP. This amendment has implications on the landscaped Open Space setback along the Batiquitos Lagoon bluff top, and the required Coastal access trail required by the Coastal*

Development Permit for Rosalena. This is an interesting history that can be explained later if the CTGMC would like.]

- MP 175(B) to realign Carlsbad Blvd., between North Batiquitos Lagoon and west of I-5 to accommodate the Sammis Development was WITHDRAWN January 12, 1990, and
- MP 175(C) a request for 5-year extension of time for Master Plan approval related to educational uses on this project was Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 2841, April 19, 1989 and approved City Council Ordinance No. NS-83, September 5, 1990.

SAMMIS went bankrupt around 1990 and Kaiza Development purchased the BLEP MP. Kaiza completed the Rosalena development started by SAMMIS. Kaiza then sought to completely change the planned land uses on all the remaining unconstrained/developable land in the BLEP MP.

General Plan and Master Plan Amendments eliminated/reduced BLEP's Growth Management compliant Open Space and replace with Residential uses in the "amended" Poinsettia Shores Master Plan:


When Kaiza acquired the BLEP MP-175 and its vacant land only the State Campground, Lakeshore Gardens, Ralphs Center, and now Rosalena were approved/existing developments at Ponto. Kaiza proposed a Master Plan Amendment to delete the BLEP MP-175 and all its developable land uses, except for the only portion of Phase I developed – the 75 unit Rosalena subdivision. The pre-BLEP MP pre-zoned (and General Planned) constrained/undevelopable Lagoon waters and lagoon bluff Open Spaces and the CA Coastal Act (LCP) required bluff top setbacks were the only Open Spaces retained in Kaiza's proposed General Plan land use and Master Plan Amendments.

Most all of the BLEP MP-175 (and Ponto/LFMP-9) land area was still undeveloped at the time Kaiza proposed changing all the General Plan land uses at Ponto and eliminating the usable Open Space in BLEP MP.

Kaiza's General Plan land use and Master Plan 'Amendments' made radical land use changes that converted some critical Useable GM Open Space to residential land use and also reduced some GM Open Space provided in BLEP MP. Following is Kaiza's Amended General Plan land use map and bullet summary of the major Open Space changes without getting into a very detailed forensic analysis:

- Eliminated the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use.
- Eliminated the minimum 30' wide landscaped Open Space on both sides of Windrose Circle for the large unbuilt portions of Windrose Circle
- Reduced by 10' the landscaped Open Space on the smaller built portion of Windrose Circle
- Eliminated on 40.3 acres the additional minimum 30' wide landscaped setbacks between buildings
- Reduced BLEP's 2.8 acres of private recreation open space to 2.3 acres
- Except for the Rosalena (BLEP Area C) and (PSMP Area J), maintained the 45' to 50' landscaped setbacks from the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff edge
- Eliminated the 75' landscaped separation between BLEP MP Areas C and D

- Eliminated the 70' landscaped separation between BLEP MP Areas D and E
- Maintained the 25' landscaped setback along Avenida Encinas. [However new Master Plan Amendments MP-175L propose reducing the setback to 10' on the undeveloped frontage of Avenida between PCH and the railroad tracks]
- Placed a road in most of the 80' landscape setback between Lakeshore Gardens
- Eliminated the 50' landscaped setback between BLEP MP Areas F and I
- Eliminated the 75' landscaped separation between BLEP MP Areas G and H
- Added a 20' wide by 1,000' long landscaped strip for an HOA trail



Kaiza's Master Plan Amendment MP 175 (D) eliminated the 12.8 acre Open Space land use (with an associated General Plan Amendment to add more residential land use) and reduced the other useable Open Spaces required in the BLEP MP. When the 1994 Kaiza MP 175 (D) General Plan Amendments were proposed, it seemed they voided the '1986 GM Open Space exemption' that was clearly specific only to the 1986 BLEP MP land uses and regulation. Although this was a false exemption, the exemption only applied to the complete/integrated land use and open space provided in the 1986 BLEP MP. The 1986 exemption specific to BLEP MP could not apply to a different and later 1994 General Plan land use plan that eliminated the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial (Open Space) site to add residential land use

and that also reduced the GM compliant Open Space provided in the 1986 BLEP MP. 21.90.030(b) notes that:

“(b) No zone change, general plan amendment, master plan amendment or specific plan amendment which would increase the residential density or development intensity established by the general plan in effect on the effective date of this chapter shall be approved unless an amendment to the citywide facilities management plan and the applicable local facilities management plan has first been approved.”

The 1994 Kaiza General Plan land use and Master Plan (MP 175(D)) Amendments removed 12.8 acres of Recreation Commercial (GM compliant Open Space) to add residential land use. This violated 21.90.030(b) by doing so without a first providing a Citywide Facilities Plan Amendment that analyzed the actual amount of GM compliant Open Space being proposed in the 1994 Kaiza MP 175(D) relative to the 1986 BLEP MP on which the 1986 GM Open Space exemption for LFMP-9 was based. MP 175(D) is noted in the MP as follows:

- “MP 175 (D) Kaiza Poinsettia Master Plan To **replace educational uses with residential land uses** And rename to Poinsettia Shores Master Plan (was) Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 3552, November 3, 1993, Approved City Council Ordinance No. NS-266, January 18, 1994.”

Kaiza’s MP 175(D) inaccurately and bizarrely claimed BLEP MP’s prior false exemption from the GM Open Space Standard as the justification that Kaiza’s new 1994 Open Space land use changes that seem to reduce the amount of GM complaint Open Space in the 1986 BLEP MP are also exempt from the GM Open Space Standard. **Kaiza’s MP 175(D) claims the pre-Growth Management and pre-BLEP MP Constrained/Undevelopable lagoon waters and bluff habitat that per the 15% Growth Management Open Space Standard CAN NOT be counted as meeting the 15% GM Open Space Standard can be magically counted as meeting the 15% GM Open Space Standard. The GM Open Space Standard specifically states that only Unconstrained/Developable lands CAN BE counted as meeting the GM Open Space Standard.** The stated principles of Growth Management, the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 and the Growth Management Open Space Standard DO NOT allow a developer or the City to count already documented Constrained and unbuildable habitat (and water) as Unconstrained and developable land. You can’t just turn ‘an apple into a banana by saying it’, or turn ‘Constrained/Undevelopable land into Unconstrained/Developable land by just saying it.

Compliance with the law in this Open Space issue is a part of a current lawsuit by North County Advocates a group of Citizens watchdogs. The City has unsuccessfully tried to diminish this lawsuit. A judge/jury will determine the outcome.

Additional MP 175 Amendments have been proposed by and approved to further modify land use and regulatory limitations at Ponto. These include:

- MP 175(E) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, Redefinition of minor amendment to provide a flexible regulatory procedure to encourage creative and imaginative planning of coordinated communities, WITHDRAWN November 1, 1994

- MP 175(F) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan minor amendment to actualize off-site option for provision of 90 affordable housing dwelling units, Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 3774, April 19, 1995
- MP 175(G) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan minor amendment to adopt Coastal Commission Suggested modifications, Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 3922, June 5, 1996 Approved City Council July 16, 1996, NS-367
- MP 175(H) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan - major amendment FOR HOTEL AND TIMESHARE USES, WITHDRAWN January 16, 2003
- MP 175(I) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – Rosalena Trail Amendment, WITHDRAWN January 8, 2002
- MP 175(J) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – major amendment for Carlsbad Coast Residential project to allow RM land use on Poinsettia Shores, WITHDRAWN January 8, 2002
- MP 175 (K) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – Ponto Area Specific Plan Mixed use consisting of residential, commercial and retail uses, WITHDRAWN August 19, 2004
- MP 175(L) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – Major amendment for commercial and residential development on Planning Area F, Still being proposed by developers and being processed by the City.

The false exemption for the BLEP MP based LFMP-9 should never have occurred. However, completely eliminating BLEP MP’s OpenSpace land use (12.8 acre Recreation Commercial) and reducing BLEP MP’s required Open Space while at the same time claiming the false BLEP MP Open Space Exemption is a violation of common sense, 21.90, and the very founding principles Growth Management.

The CA Coastal Commission in MP 175 (G) in part recognized the elimination of the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use and maybe some of the Open Space land use changes and added the following land use regulations for 11.1 acre Planning Area F in the Carlsbad’s Local Coastal Program LCP). The LCP as per State Law and referenced in Carlsbad’s General Plan is the controlling land use regulation over the General Plan, Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and in the Coastal Zone:

“PLANNING AREA F: Planning Area F is located at the far northwest corner of the Master Plan area west of the AT&SF Railway right-of-way. This Planning Area has a gross area of 11 acres and a net developable area of 10.7 acres. Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an “unplanned” area, for which land uses will be determined at a later date when more specific planning is carried out for areas west of the railroad right-of-way. A future Major Master Plan Amendment will be required prior to further development approvals for Planning Area F, and shall include an LCP Amendment with associated environmental review, if determined necessary.

The intent of the NRR designation is not to limit the range of potential future uses entirely to nonresidential, however, since the City's current general plan does not contain an “unplanned” designation, NRR was determined to be appropriate at this time. In the future, if the Local Coastal Program Amendment has not been processed, and the City develops an “unplanned”

General Plan designation, then this site would likely be redesignated as “unplanned.” Future uses could include, but are not limited to: commercial, residential, office, and other uses, subject to future review and approval.

As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.”

In 2010 the CA Coastal Commission in 2010 rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan on which MP 175(K) was based. MP 175(K) was withdrawn.

On July 3, 2017 the CA Coastal Commission provided direction to the City of Carlsbad regarding MP 175(G), Carlsbad’s 2015 General Plan Update, Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment Land Use Plan (LUP) . CA Coastal Commission wrote to the City the following. Notes on the context of communication are in bracketed italics *[example]*:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto ... area. For example, **Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad. ...** this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. *[the discussion of the need for the City to conduct a citywide analysis of the location and amount of these uses in the Coastal Zone to assure the City General Plan within the Coastal Zone is providing the adequate amounts and locations of these land uses to fulfill the long-term population/visitor needs for these uses according to the CA Coastal Act]* **If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”**

In 2017 the City conducted the first Sea Level Rise (SLR) Vulnerability Assessment <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=33958> . That first initial analysis, shows significant SLR impacts that will reduce existing Ponto Open Space - the State beach and Campground and along the Batiquitos Lagoon. The City identified SLR impacts on Ponto Open Space are summarized in the next section of this history.

In 2023 the CA Coastal Commission will consider the data and public input and decide the appropriate land use for 11.1 acre Planning Area F based the CA Coastal Act and Coastal Act land use policies.

You can determine the Open Space and Park Quality of Life Standards that will be applied to this and other future land uses.

[City assessment of Sea Level Rise impacts on reducing Ponto Open Space](#)

The City's 2017 SLR assessment shows SLR will significantly reduce or eliminate only existing Open Space land at Ponto. The City's assessment quantifies the sporadic/episodic loss of Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad Open Space land and land uses being at the State Campground, Beaches, and Batiquitos Lagoon shoreline – about 32 acres by the year 2100, this would be an average loss of 17,000 square feet of Open Space per year. Following (within quotation marks) is a description, quantification and images of the City's projected loss of Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad Open Space land and land use due to SLR. *[Italicized text within brackets]* is added data based on review of aerial photo maps in the Assessment.

“Planning Zone 3 consists of the Southern Shoreline Planning Area and the Batiquitos Lagoon. Assets within this zone are vulnerable to inundation, coastal flooding and bluff erosion in both planning horizons (2050 and 2100). A summary of the vulnerability assessment rating is provided in Table 5. A discussion of the vulnerability and risk assessment is also provided for each asset category.

5.3.1. Beaches

Approximately 14 acres of beach area is projected to be impacted by inundation/erosion in 2050. ... Beaches in this planning area are backed by unarmored coastal bluffs. Sand derived from the natural erosion of the bluff as sea levels rise may be adequate to sustain beach widths, thus, beaches in this reach were assumed to have a moderate adaptive capacity. The overall vulnerability rating for beaches is moderate for 2050.

Vulnerability is rated moderate for the 2100 horizon due to the significant amount of erosion expected as the beaches are squeezed between rising sea levels and bluffs. Assuming the bluffs are unarmored in the future, sand derived from bluff erosion may sustain some level of beaches in this planning area. A complete loss of beaches poses a high risk to the city as the natural barrier from storm waves is lost as well as a reduction in beach access, recreation and the economic benefits the beaches provide.

5.3.3. State Parks

A majority of the South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds (separated into four parcels) were determined to be exposed to bluff erosion by the 2050 sea level rise scenario (moderate exposure). This resource is considered to have a high sensitivity since bluff erosion could significantly impair usage of the facilities. Though economic impacts to the physical structures within South Carlsbad State Beach would be relatively low, the loss of this park would be significant since adequate space for the park to move inland is not available (low adaptive capacity). State parks was assigned a high vulnerability in the 2050 planning horizon. State park facilities are recognized as important assets to the city in terms of economic and recreation value as well as providing low-cost visitor serving amenities. This vulnerability poses a high risk to coastal access, recreation, and tourism opportunities in this planning area.

In 2100, bluff erosion of South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds become more severe and the South Ponto State Beach day-use area becomes exposed to coastal flooding during extreme events. The sensitivity of the South Ponto day-use area is low because impacts to usage will be temporary and no major damage to facilities would be anticipated. Vulnerability and risk to State

Parks remains high by 2100 due to the impacts to South Carlsbad State Beach in combination with flooding impacts to South Ponto.

Table 5: Planning Zone 3 Vulnerability Assessment Summary [condensed & notated]:

| Asset | Horizon | | | Vulnerability |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <u>Category</u> | <u>[time]</u> | <u>Hazard Type</u> | <u>Impacted Assets</u> | <u>Rating</u> |
| Beaches | 2050 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 14 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 54 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| Public Access | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 6 access points 4,791 feet of trails | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 10 access points 14,049 feet of trails | Moderate |
| State Parks | 2050 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [<18 Acres] | High |
| [Campground - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations] | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [>18 Acres] <i>[loss of over 50% of the campground & its Low-cost Visitor Accommodations,</i> | High |
| <i>See Figure 5.]</i> | | | | |
| Transportation (Road, Bike, Pedestrian) | 2050 | Bluff Erosion | 1,383 linear feet | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 11,280 linear feet | High |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------|----------------------|-----------|----------|
| Environmentally Sensitive Lands | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 572 acres | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 606 acres | High |




Figure 7: Southern Shoreline Planning Area – Year 2050





Figure 5: CoSMoS Bluff Erosion Projections by 2100
(CoSMoS-COAST 2015)

[Figure 5 show the loss of over 50% of the campground and campground sites with a minimal .2 meter Sea Level Rise (SLR), and potentially the entire campground (due to loss of access road) in 2 meter SLF.]”

This 2017 SLR data and quantified losses of Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad Open Space land and land uses was not considered in the City’s rejected (by CCC) Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan. The Ponto Vision Plan is the basis for the City’s 2015 General Plan Update that is now being proposed in the City’s Local Coastal Program Amendment now before the CA Coastal Commission.

Summary:

LFPM-9 was clearly not developed in 1986, and did not then or now dedicate 15% of the unconstrained/developable land as Open Space as required by the Growth Management Open Space Standard. These two reasons for the City to “exempt” LFMP-9 from Open Space Standard were/are False. Saying Constrained/undevelopable land can be counted as Unconstrained/developable land is also false and clearly not allowed according to the Growth Management Ordinance, Standards, principles, and common-sense honesty to Carlsbad Citizens. LFMP-9, as the City’s own maps/data base show is clearly missing 30-acres of GM Open Space. In addition in 2017 we learned that Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad will lose about 32 acres of existing Open Space due to SLF.

Closing thoughts:

Growth Management is based on the type/amount/location of General Plan land use designations, the development potential of those land use designations in creating the demand for the type/amount/location of facilities, and supply of the type/amount/distribution of facilities – like Open Space and Parks. If the type/amount/location of supply of facilities does not meet the demand for those facilities then growth management fails and Quality of Life is reduced.

Quality of Life Standards are used to assure supply and demand for facilities is properly balanced with respect to type/amount/location.

Ponto is clearly unbalanced. The Ponto Census Tract is at a 40% higher population density than the rest of Carlsbad, yet is Ponto is NOT meeting the Open Space Standard and has NO Park (see City Open Space maps and Park Master Plan). Ponto and all South Carlsbad have higher population demand for Parks and Open Space facilities yet Ponto (that is the only place to provide Coastal Park and Open Space needs for South Carlsbad) has lower or none of those two most critical GM Facilities needed to balance and mitigate the 40% higher population density at Ponto and also the higher residential density in South Carlsbad.

Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad also have additional State and regional responsibilities to provide Coastal Recreation and Open Space for populations of people and visitors from outside of Ponto and Carlsbad.

This failure to honestly and adequately balance the type/amount/location higher population density by providing higher levels of Parks and Open Space in those areas will lead to a slow and but eventual reduction of the Quality of Life for those areas.

Common sense and the Carlsbad's Growth Management law say if you change the land use (like what was done and is still being proposed at Ponto) you change the type/amount/location of potential development and population and the Growth Management impacts. Land use changes require and honest/accurate/balanced update to Citywide and Local Growth Management Plans to accurately reflect those changes and provide an updated plan to provide facilities that meet the Standards for those land use changes. This is the fundamental heart of any Growth Management.

The Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and City Commissions and Council are all now facing the same issues and responsibility that we faced in the 1980's at the beginning of Growth Management. We established New Quality of Life Standards – for Open Space and Parks – that required New investments in Parks and Open Space by both the City and developers.


Open Space and Parks have always been identified as most critical for Carlsbad's quality of life. The Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and City Commissions and Council, and Carlsbad Citizens are all at a critical crossroad.

- Do we, or don't we, enforce and set new standards that achieve the quality of life we desire?
- Do we or don't we, fix existing past errors and below desired standard situations?
- Do we or don't we, roll-up our sleeves a work together to a better Quality of Life?

As a long-time Carlsbad Citizen I am extremely disappointed by some who say we can't fulfill our Community Vision, we can't fix things, can't make things better, and can't add more Parks and Useable Open Space. This can't attitude is not out Community Vision. We can and we did before, and we can do it again and better.

Great cities for hundreds of years have Upgraded their Quality of Life Facility Standards, made and implemented/funded facilities to fix things up to those Standards. A City is just like a business or person - If you don't improve you decline. Examples of Upgrading and funding to New Parks and Open Space are many but include – Carlsbad's Buena Vista Reservoir Park, additions to Pine Park, Village H Park, and Aura Circle Open Space acquisition; and SDSU's major new Park at the redeveloped Qualcomm Stadium site.

Now like at the beginning of Carlsbad Growth Management the City can “despite previous city council actions” make improvements to its Growth Management and Quality of Life Standards to address past and future needs. Following illustrates existing R-23 (up to 23 dwellings per acre) development in Carlsbad – most of our future residential development will be required to be like this or more dense.



High-density housing can be great, but it requires MORE Parks and MORE useable Open Space within walking distance to balance the density and provide large places for families and kids to really play. In Carlsbad's high-density residential future with no backyards and stacked flat multi-family homes the need for both more Parks and Useable Open Space is much greater than in 1980's.

The time to fix the Parks and Useable Open Space problems at Ponto (LFMP-9) is now. Already Ponto is developed at a density that is 40% great than the rest of Carlsbad. New proposed and even higher-density developments (developer driven Amendments) propose to make Ponto even more dense, yet there are not Parks at Ponto and Ponto is missing 30-acres of Useable Open Space past developers should have provided.

A doable, time-tested, accountable, tax-payer saving, strongly citizen desired, accountable, and honest way to fix this was presented to you in 8/8/22 and 12/27/22 emails with attached "CTGMP Key Issues and Suggestions – 2022-12-6". Over 5,000 petitions expressing the need to fix the Park and Open Space problems at Ponto have been sent to the City and the City should have provided these to you in considering Park and Open Space issues.

Ponto Park and Open Space needs your help fixing NOW. If not Carlsbad Tomorrow will be less than it is today, and tragically will have failed our Community Vision.

Subject: 1-26-23 CTGMC mtg - CA State law on Park land dedication and fees - 5 acre per 1,000 population
Attachments: image003.emz

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 2:22 PM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: 1-26-23 CTGMC mtg - CA State law on Park land dedication and fees - 5 acre per 1,000 population

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's 1/26/22 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 land use changes, and Local Coastal Program Amendments, and
4. as public input to the CCC on Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program, and
5. as public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

At the 1-11-22 CTGMC meeting comments are what is the State Park Land Dedication Standard. This Standard (the Qumby Act) defines under that Ca Subdivision code how much land a city in the State of CA can require or developers to provide a city for park land. I recall the It was apparently incorrectly mentioned as 3 acres of Park land per 1,000 population was the State Standard, where as it is up to 5 acres per 1,000 population. Following is a link to the CA Qumby Act and the citation that 5 acres per 1,000 population can be required of new development.

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/taftca/latest/taft_ca/0-0-0-12312

"10-11-6: LAND DEDICATION AND FEE DETERMINATIONS: (C) The amount of land to be dedicated shall be based on the number of units in the subdivision multiplied by the number of persons per dwelling (as determined pursuant to subsection (B) of this section) **multiplied by five (5) acres per one thousand (1,000) city inhabitants (section 66477 of the subdivision map act)**"

I hope this data clears up confusion on how many acres of Park land Carlsbad can require of new development. It seems prudent to require developers provide the maximum amount of Park land per State law and not less, and most particularly in areas of Carlsbad that have no accessible Park within a 10-minute walk.

Thank you, and with Aloha Aina for Carlsbad,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 1:39 PM
To: committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: 1-26-23 CTGMC mtg - public input on Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance and City losses

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Housing and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Please again consider this email and attachment on 1/26/23.

This may clear up some what appeared to be a miscommunication by staff on 1/11/23 that appeared to say that the developer can decide how to comply with the Park Dedication Ordinance (Dedicate land or pay an in-lieu-of-dedication fee). This is not correct. Per 21.44 a develop may propose, but it is the City that decides how and where the Park land required is to be provided. Per 21.44.040 & 21.44.050 of the City's Park Dedication Ordinance Clearly states it is the City "decision making body" for the development proposal, i.e. Planning Commission or City Council, that decides is Park land is required or a commensurate Park in lieu fee will be required from the developer. In almost all instances Park land in the area (aka 10-minutewalk) of the development is better as that is where the development's Park land demand is created and where additional Park land supply should be created.

I hope this email and data helps the CTGMC in address the critical Park Land needs in various areas of Carlsbad, and this Ponto Site 18 example provides actual data using a currently proposed project in an area Carlsbad's Park Master Plan (current but soon to be changed) indicates is 'unserved by parks' and should be an area where new parks should be provided.

Please note in this Ponto Site 18 example there IS vacant land (about 1 acre) left-over after the development that the developer could dedicate to the City for the developer's Park Land dedication requirement. The CTGMC would be thoughtful to include in your Standard recommendations to include strong policy requirements to get Park land v. fees in areas needing Parks.

Thank you,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:39 AM
To: committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: public input on Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance and City losses

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Housing and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Please consider this data file and public input email/attachment in the CTGMC, Housing Element and Parks Master Plan Updates, Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, and the Ponto Site 18 proposed land use changes and development application.

'Example of Carlsbad's Park-in-lieu Fee failing to actually provide the required Parkland or improvements

The example is for Ponto Site 18 one of the City's proposed General Plan & Local Coastal Program land use changes to provide RHNA required housing sites for the years 2021-2029. Ponto Site 18 is the Ponto Storage site and surrounding lots. Ponto Site 18's map and City description is provided on pages 4-5 below.

The example shows Carlsbad loses significant amounts of money, and more critically loses precious and irreplaceable Parkland that developers are required to provide for free. These City losses are absorbed by current and future Carlsbad tax-payers. For the relatively small 5 acre and 86 dwelling unit Ponto Site 18 proposal the loss to Carlsbad is \$ 1.084 million in lost parkland value. Below is the spreadsheet calculation of that loss.

Beyond showing a typical over \$ 1 million loss per 86 dwellings, there is added concern for the CTGMC in that this example is a proposed Carlsbad General Plan & Local Coastal Program Land Use Change to try to accommodate the years 2021-2029 the RHNA requirement to add/increase Residential use. Every 8 years we are/will be changing our General Plan land use to add more high-density housing and increasing City Park demand particularly for areas developed more densely.

If these higher-density projects do not dedicate actual City Park within walking distance not only is Carlsbad loosing over \$1 million per 86 dwellings, we are losing free and easy opportunities to get City Parkland dedicated for free per CMC 20.44, and will slowly be degrading our Quality of Life in these areas and also Citywide.

Calculation of Ponto Site 18 Parkland dedication requirement and City losses from the Park-in-lieu Fee:

| Ponto Site 18 - Fenton proposed development's Park land dedication requirement | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | https://library.qcode.us/lib/carlsbad_ca/pub/municipal_code/item/title_20-chapter_20_44 |
| US Census data | https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlsbadcitycalifornia/POP060210#POP060210 |
| Carlsbad Park Dedication Requirement is 3 acres of land per 1,000 population of the proposed development. Population of proposed development is based on population per household based on latest US Census data 2020 US Census data is 2.64 people per household | |
| FYI, Carlsbad 3 acres /1,000 is comparatively very low both locally and nationally. And there is no 'walkably requirement'. 5 acres /1,000 population is what Encinitas and Oceanside require along with a 10-minute walk location requirement. | |
| Fenton owns almost 6 acres of land in Site 18, 4.64 acres of which they want to develop now, and the other 1+ acre part they want to develop later. on the 4.64 acre site change VC-Visitor Commercial/R-15 (15 dwellings per acre) General Plan land use and Zoning to 100% residential and develop at 19.125 dwellings per acre on 4.64 acres. On the 1+ acre site, instead of providing their required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between PCH & Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. Instead of providing the required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between Pecha and Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. | |
| Site 18 (Fenton) development proposal for the 4.64 acre portion is development of 86 household units (over 19 dwelling units per acre in higher occupancy units than typical) consisting of: | |
| 8 | 2-bedroom homes = 9% of total units proposed |
| 40 | 3-bedroom homes = 47% of total units proposed |
| 38 | 4-bedroom homes = 44% of total units proposed |
| 86 | 100% |
| Fenton is proposing 91% of the project with 3 or 4 bedrooms so the project will have higher occupancy, and likely more children, per housing unit than the Citywide average of 2.64 people per housing unit | |
| Fenton Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | |
| calculation | 86 DU of Fenton proposed development |
| X | 2.64 average population per DU per 2020 US Census |
| - | 227 estimated population of Fenton project |
| / | 1,000 population that needs 3 acres of Park land per CMC 20.44 |
| - | 0.22704 percentage of 3 acres of Park land required for 227 people |
| X | 3 acres of Park land required per 1,000 people |
| - | 0.68112 acres of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| X | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| - | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| | 1 acre of Fenton's unused vacant 'ice plant lots' between PCH & Ponto Drive that can provide Fenton's Park land requirement |
| \$ | 398,696 per City Master Fee Schedule. Consistent with what Fenton said was would be the 'Park-in-lieu Fee for their 86 DU project |
| \$ | 50 Estimated SF cost Fenton paid for Ponto Site 18 or S 2.18 million per acre |
| \$ | 1,483,479 cost of 29,670 SF of Ponto Site 18 land to satisfy Fenton's Park land requirement |
| for the Ponto Site 18 5-acre 86 dwelling unit land use change and development proposal: | |
| \$ | (1,064,783) Dollars the City is losing in Park land value and not receiving in its Park-In-lieu Fee, so this is a gift to the developer |
| | -73% % of lost Park land value City is losing and not receiving in its PIL Fee, so this is a City gift to the developer |
| \$ | 1,000,000 per acre cost to develop a Park like Buena Vista Reservoir Park |
| | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| \$ | 22.96 Cost per sq. ft. |
| | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| \$ | 681,120 Cost to develop Fenton's 29,670sq. ft. of Park Land Dedication as a Park |
| \$ | (282,424) Dollars City loses from Park-In-lieu Fees not even being adequate to cover Actual Minimal Park Development Costs |

Following this calculation:

- on page 3-4 are the relevant excerpts of Carlsbad's Dedication of Land for Recreational Purposes Ordinance 20.44, and
- on page 5-6 is the City's map and description of the proposed Ponto Site 18 land use change

20.44 Dedication of Land for Recreational Facilities

20.44.010 Purpose.

This chapter is enacted pursuant to the authority granted by Section 66477 of the Government Code of the State of California. The park and recreational facilities for which dedication of land and/or payment of a fee is required by this chapter are in accordance with the recreational element of the general plan of the City of Carlsbad. (Ord. 9614 § 1, 1982; Ord. 9190 § 2)

20.44.040 Standards and formula for dedication of land.

If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that a park or recreational facility is to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents of the subdivision, the subdivider shall, at the time of the filing of the final or parcel map, dedicate land for such facility pursuant to the following standards and formula:

The formula for determining acreage to be dedicated shall be as follows:

Average no. of persons per dwelling unit (based on most recent federal census)

x

3 park acres per 1,000 population

x

Total number of dwelling units

The total number of dwelling units shall be the number permitted by the city on the property in the subdivision at the time the final map or parcel map is filed for approval, less any existing residential units in single-family detached or duplex dwellings. The park land dedication requirement will be reviewed annually effective July 1, and adjusted as necessary by resolution of the city council to reflect the latest federal census data. (Ord. CS-192 § 49, 2012; Ord. CS-162 § 1, 2011; Ord. NS-757 § 1, 2005; Ord. NS-588 § 1, 2001; Ord. 9831 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9770 § 1, 1985; Ord. 9724 § 1, 1984; Ord. 9644 § 1, 1982; Ord.

20.44.050 Standards for fees in lieu of land dedication.

A. If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that there is no park or recreational facility to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision, the subdivider shall, in lieu of dedicating land, pay a fee equal to the value of the land prescribed for dedication in Section 20.44.040 and in an amount determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 20.44.080.

B. If the proposed subdivision contains 50 parcels or less, only the payment of fees shall be required except that when a condominium project, stock cooperative, or community apartment project exceeds 50 dwelling units, dedication of land may be required notwithstanding that the number of parcels may be less than 50.

20.44.060 Determination of land or fee.

A. Whether the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map requires land dedication or elects to accept payment of a fee in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, shall be determined by the decision-making authority at the time of approval of the tentative map or tentative parcel map. In making that determination, the decision-making authority shall consider the following:

- 1 Park and recreation element of the general plan;
- 2 Topography, geology, access and location of land in the subdivision available for dedication;
- 3 Size and shape of the subdivision and land available for dedication;
- 4 The feasibility of dedication;
- 5 Availability of previously acquired park property.

B. The determination of the city council as to whether land shall be dedicated, or whether a

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is a group of eight vacant and underutilized properties in the Ponto area, located south of the Cape Rey Carlsbad Beach hotel and east of Carlsbad Boulevard. The site is bisected by Ponto Drive. North of Ponto Drive are three underutilized parcels containing a mini storage, miscellaneous buildings and other storage uses on nearly five acres. To the south, across Ponto Drive, is a cluster of five small vacant properties total just over an acre.

Site topography is generally flat. Some of the parcels may be constrained due to environmentally sensitive habitat. One parcel is alongside the railroad corridor. All the parcels are located outside the McClellan-Palomar Airport flight path.

The site does not include a vacant 11-acre parcel along either side of Ponto Drive and fronting Avenida Encinas. The parcel is commonly referred to as "Planning Area F."

SITE FEATURES

- Vacant/underutilized
- Utilities accessible
- In the Coastal Zone
- Site constraints

SITE OPPORTUNITY

The site consists of a mix of residential and non-residential land use designations. Two of the eight parcels have a split land use designation of VC (Visitor Commercial) and R-15 (11.5 to 15 dwelling units per acre, or du/ac). The one parcel alongside the railroad corridor is designated R-15. The R-15 designation often applies to small lot single family or detached or attached condominium development. The cluster of five vacant parcels south of Ponto Drive is designated GC (General Commercial). General Commercial permits a broad range of commercial uses. It also permits properties to be developed in a mixed-use format, with limited residential above first floor commercial.

Staff has received a letter from one property owner expressing support for higher density.



Upper area proposed for land use change & higher density

Part of Lower area can (should) be dedicated to provided needed parkland

Except for the VC-designated portion of the two parcels, which is not anticipated to change, the redesignation of all parcels to R-23 is contemplated. R-23 is a residential designation the state identifies as suitable for moderate income households. The R-23 designation would permit a density range of 19 to 23 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). This density is typical of two- and three-story apartment and condominium developments.

To change any designation, amendments to the General Plan, Local Coastal Program, zoning, Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, and the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan would be required. These amendments would require City Council and California Coastal Commission approval.

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Parcels Numbers | 216-010-01, 216-010-02, 216-010-03, 216-010-04, 216-010-05, 214-160-25, 214-160-28, 214-171-11 | GMP Quadrant | Southwest |
| Ownership | Private (separate ownership) | Parcel Size | Approximately 6 acres (all parcels) |
| Current General Plan Designations | R-15 (Residential 8-15 du/ac), VC (Visitor Commercial)/R-15, GC (General Commercial) | Proposed General Plan Designation | R-23 (Residential, 19 to 23 du/ac)* <i>*The VC designation, which applies to two properties, is not anticipated to change and would remain in the same location.</i> |
| Current Residential Opportunity | Approximately 44 units (based on the existing R-15 designation and limited residential permitted on GC-designated properties) | Proposed Residential Opportunity | Approximately 90 units (at 19 du/ac)* <i>*No yield is determined from portions of property designated VC.</i> |
| Income category of units (based on minimum density) | Moderate | | |

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Sincerely and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: 1-26-23 CTGMC mtg - public input on Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance and City losses
Attachments: image001.emz; Example of Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance - Ponto Site 18 - 2022 Sep.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 1:39 PM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: 1-26-23 CTGMC mtg - public input on Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance and City losses

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Housing and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Please again consider this email and attachment on 1/26/23.

This may clear up some what appeared to be a miscommunication by staff on 1/11/23 that appeared to say that the developer can decide how to comply with the Park Dedication Ordinance (Dedicate land or pay an in-lieu-of-dedication fee). This is not correct. Per 21.44 a developer may propose, but it is the City that decides how and where the Park land required is to be provided. Per 21.44.040 & 21.44.050 of the City's Park Dedication Ordinance Clearly states it is the City "decision making body" for the development proposal, i.e. Planning Commission or City Council, that decides if Park land is required or a commensurate Park in lieu fee will be required from the developer. In almost all instances Park land in the area (aka 10-minutewalk) of the development is better as that is where the development's Park land demand is created and where additional Park land supply should be created.

I hope this email and data helps the CTGMC in address the critical Park Land needs in various areas of Carlsbad, and this Ponto Site 18 example provides actual data using a currently proposed project in an area Carlsbad's Park Master Plan (current but soon to be changed) indicates is 'unserved by parks' and should be an area where new parks should be provided.

Please note in this Ponto Site 18 example there IS vacant land (about 1 acre) left-over after the development that the developer could dedicate to the City for the developer's Park Land dedication requirement. The CTGMC would be thoughtful to include in your Standard recommendations to include strong policy requirements to get Park land v. fees in areas needing Parks.

Thank you,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:39 AM

To: committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle

(carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov)

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: public input on Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance and City losses

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Housing and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Please consider this data file and public input email/attachment in the CTGMC, Housing Element and Parks Master Plan Updates, Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, and the Ponto Site 18 proposed land use changes and development application.

'Example of Carlsbad's Park-in-lieu Fee failing to actually provide the required Parkland or improvements

The example is for Ponto Site 18 one of the City's proposed General Plan & Local Coastal Program land use changes to provide RHNA required housing sites for the years 2021-2029. Ponto Site 18 is the Ponto Storage site and surrounding lots. Ponto Site 18's map and City description is provided on pages 4-5 below.

The example shows Carlsbad loses significant amounts of money, and more critically loses precious and irreplaceable Parkland that developers are required to provide for free. These City losses are absorbed by current and future Carlsbad tax-payers. For the relatively small 5 acre and 86 dwelling unit Ponto Site 18 proposal the loss to Carlsbad is \$ 1.084 million in lost parkland value. Below is the spreadsheet calculation of that loss.

Beyond showing a typical over \$ 1 million loss per 86 dwellings, there is added concern for the CTGMC in that this example is a proposed Carlsbad General Plan & Local Coastal Program Land Use Change to try to accommodate the years 2021-2029 the RHNA requirement to add/increase Residential use. Every 8 years we are/will be changing our General Plan land use to add more high-density housing and increasing City Park demand particularly for areas developed more densely.

If these higher-density projects do not dedicate actual City Park within walking distance not only is Carlsbad losing over \$1 million per 86 dwellings, we are losing free and easy opportunities to get City Parkland dedicated for free per CMC 20.44, and will slowly be degrading our Quality of Life in these areas and also Citywide.

Calculation of Ponto Site 18 Parkland dedication requirement and City losses from the Park-in-lieu Fee:

| Ponto Site 18 - Fenton proposed development's Park land dedication requirement | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | https://library.qcode.us/lib/carlsbad_ca/pub/municipal_code/item/title_20-chapter_20_44 |
| US Census data | https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlsbadcitycalifornia/POP060210#POP060210 |
| Carlsbad Park Dedication Requirement is 3 acres of land per 1,000 population of the proposed development. Population of proposed development is based on population per household based on latest US Census data 2020 US Census data is 2.64 people per household | |
| FYI, Carlsbad 3 acres /1,000 is comparatively very low both locally and nationally. And there is no 'walkably requirement'. 5 acres /1,000 population is what Encinitas and Oceanside require along with a 10-minute walk location requirement. | |
| Fenton owns almost 6 acres of land in Site 18, 4.64 acres of which they want to develop now, and the other 1+ acre part they want to develop later. on the 4.64 acre site change VC-Visitor Commercial/R-15 (15 dwellings per acre) General Plan land use and Zoning to 100% residential and develop at 19.125 dwellings per acre on 4.64 acres. On the 1+ acre site, instead of providing their required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between PCH & Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. Instead of providing the required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between Pecha and Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. | |
| Site 18 (Fenton) development proposal for the 4.64 acre portion is development of 86 household units (over 19 dwelling units per acre in higher occupancy units than typical) consisting of: | |
| 8 | 2-bedroom homes = 9% of total units proposed |
| 40 | 3-bedroom homes = 47% of total units proposed |
| 38 | 4-bedroom homes = 44% of total units proposed |
| 86 | 100% |
| Fenton is proposing 91% of the project with 3 or 4 bedrooms so the project will have higher occupancy, and likely more children, per housing unit than the Citywide average of 2.64 people per housing unit | |
| Fenton Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | |
| calculation | 86 DU of Fenton proposed development |
| X | 2.64 average population per DU per 2020 US Census |
| - | 227 estimated population of Fenton project |
| / | 1,000 population that needs 3 acres of Park land per CMC 20.44 |
| - | 0.22704 percentage of 3 acres of Park land required for 227 people |
| X | 3 acres of Park land required per 1,000 people |
| - | 0.68112 acres of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| X | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| - | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| | 1 acre of Fenton's unused vacant 'ice plant lots' between PCH & Ponto Drive that can provide Fenton's Park land requirement |
| \$ | 398,696 per City Master Fee Schedule. Consistent with what Fenton said was would be the 'Park-in-lieu Fee for their 86 DU project |
| \$ | 50 Estimated SF cost Fenton paid for Ponto Site 18 or S 2.18 million per acre |
| \$ | 1,483,479 cost of 29,670 SF of Ponto Site 18 land to satisfy Fenton's Park land requirement |
| for the Ponto Site 18 5-acre 86 dwelling unit land use change and development proposal: | |
| \$ | (1,064,783) Dollars the City is losing in Park land value and not receiving in its Park-In-lieu Fee, so this is a gift to the developer |
| | -73% % of lost Park land value City is losing and not receiving in its PIL Fee, so this is a City gift to the developer |
| \$ | 1,000,000 per acre cost to develop a Park like Buena Vista Reservoir Park |
| | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| \$ | 22.96 Cost per sq. ft. |
| | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| \$ | 681,120 Cost to develop Fenton's 29,670 sq. ft. of Park Land Dedication as a Park |
| \$ (282,424) Dollars City loses from Park-In-lieu Fees not even being adequate to cover Actual Minimal Park Development Costs | |

Following this calculation:

- on page 3-4 are the relevant excerpts of Carlsbad's Dedication of Land for Recreational Purposes Ordinance 20.44, and
- on page 5-6 is the City's map and description of the proposed Ponto Site 18 land use change

20.44 Dedication of Land for Recreational Facilities

20.44.010 Purpose.

This chapter is enacted pursuant to the authority granted by Section 66477 of the Government Code of the State of California. The park and recreational facilities for which dedication of land and/or payment of a fee is required by this chapter are in accordance with the recreational element of the general plan of the City of Carlsbad. (Ord. 9614 § 1, 1982; Ord. 9190 § 2)

20.44.040 Standards and formula for dedication of land.

If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that a park or recreational facility is to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents of the subdivision, the subdivider shall, at the time of the filing of the final or parcel map, dedicate land for such facility pursuant to the following standards and formula:

The formula for determining acreage to be dedicated shall be as follows:

Average no. of persons per dwelling unit (based on most recent federal census)

x

3 park acres per 1,000 population

x

Total number of dwelling units

The total number of dwelling units shall be the number permitted by the city on the property in the subdivision at the time the final map or parcel map is filed for approval, less any existing residential units in single-family detached or duplex dwellings. The park land dedication requirement will be reviewed annually effective July 1, and adjusted as necessary by resolution of the city council to reflect the latest federal census data. (Ord. CS-192 § 49, 2012; Ord. CS-162 § 1, 2011; Ord. NS-757 § 1, 2005; Ord. NS-588 § 1, 2001; Ord. 9831 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9770 § 1, 1985; Ord. 9724 § 1, 1984; Ord. 9644 § 1, 1982; Ord.

20.44.050 Standards for fees in lieu of land dedication.

A. If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that there is no park or recreational facility to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision, the subdivider shall, in lieu of dedicating land, pay a fee equal to the value of the land prescribed for dedication in Section 20.44.040 and in an amount determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 20.44.080.

B. If the proposed subdivision contains 50 parcels or less, only the payment of fees shall be required except that when a condominium project, stock cooperative, or community apartment project exceeds 50 dwelling units, dedication of land may be required notwithstanding that the number of parcels may be less than 50.

20.44.060 Determination of land or fee.

A. Whether the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map requires land dedication or elects to accept payment of a fee in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, shall be determined by the decision-making authority at the time of approval of the tentative map or tentative parcel map. In making that determination, the decision-making authority shall consider the following:

- 1 Park and recreation element of the general plan;
- 2 Topography, geology, access and location of land in the subdivision available for dedication;
- 3 Size and shape of the subdivision and land available for dedication;
- 4 The feasibility of dedication;
- 5 Availability of previously acquired park property.

B. The determination of the city council as to whether land shall be dedicated, or whether a

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is a group of eight vacant and underutilized properties in the Ponto area, located south of the Cape Rey Carlsbad Beach hotel and east of Carlsbad Boulevard. The site is bisected by Ponto Drive. North of Ponto Drive are three underutilized parcels containing a mini storage, miscellaneous buildings and other storage uses on nearly five acres. To the south, across Ponto Drive, is a cluster of five small vacant properties total just over an acre.

Site topography is generally flat. Some of the parcels may be constrained due to environmentally sensitive habitat. One parcel is alongside the railroad corridor. All the parcels are located outside the McClellan-Palomar Airport flight path.

The site does not include a vacant 11-acre parcel along either side of Ponto Drive and fronting Avenida Encinas. The parcel is commonly referred to as "Planning Area F."

SITE FEATURES

- Vacant/underutilized
- Utilities accessible
- In the Coastal Zone
- Site constraints

SITE OPPORTUNITY

The site consists of a mix of residential and non-residential land use designations. Two of the eight parcels have a split land use designation of VC (Visitor Commercial) and R-15 (11.5 to 15 dwelling units per acre, or du/ac). The one parcel alongside the railroad corridor is designated R-15. The R-15 designation often applies to small lot single family or detached or attached condominium development. The cluster of five vacant parcels south of Ponto Drive is designated GC (General Commercial). General Commercial permits a broad range of commercial uses. It also permits properties to be developed in a mixed-use format, with limited residential above first floor commercial.

Staff has received a letter from one property owner expressing support for higher density.



Upper area proposed for land use change & higher density

Part of Lower area can (should) be dedicated to provided needed parkland

Except for the VC-designated portion of the two parcels, which is not anticipated to change, the redesignation of all parcels to R-23 is contemplated. R-23 is a residential designation the state identifies as suitable for moderate income households. The R-23 designation would permit a density range of 19 to 23 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). This density is typical of two- and three-story apartment and condominium developments.

To change any designation, amendments to the General Plan, Local Coastal Program, zoning, Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, and the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan would be required. These amendments would require City Council and California Coastal Commission approval.

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Parcels Numbers | 216-010-01, 216-010-02, 216-010-03, 216-010-04, 216-010-05, 214-160-25, 214-160-28, 214-171-11 | GMP Quadrant | Southwest |
| Ownership | Private (separate ownership) | Parcel Size | Approximately 6 acres (all parcels) |
| Current General Plan Designations | R-15 (Residential 8-15 du/ac), VC (Visitor Commercial)/R-15, GC (General Commercial) | Proposed General Plan Designation | R-23 (Residential, 19 to 23 du/ac)* <i>*The VC designation, which applies to two properties, is not anticipated to change and would remain in the same location.</i> |
| Current Residential Opportunity | Approximately 44 units (based on the existing R-15 designation and limited residential permitted on GC-designated properties) | Proposed Residential Opportunity | Approximately 90 units (at 19 du/ac)* <i>*No yield is determined from portions of property designated VC.</i> |
| Income category of units (based on minimum density) | Moderate | | |

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Sincerely and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Example of Carlsbad's Park-in-lieu Fee failing to actually provide the required Parkland or improvements

The example is for Ponto Site 18 one of the City's proposed General Plan & Local Coastal Program land use changes to provide RHNA required housing sites for the years 2021-2029. Ponto Site 18 is the Ponto Storage site and surrounding lots. Ponto Site 18's map and City description is provided on pages 4-5 below.

The example shows Carlsbad loses significant amounts of money, and more critically loses precious and irreplaceable Parkland that developers are required to provide for free. These City losses are absorbed by current and future Carlsbad tax-payers. For the relatively small 5 acre and 86 dwelling unit Ponto Site 18 proposal the loss to Carlsbad is \$ 1.084 million in lost parkland value. Below is the spreadsheet calculation of that loss.

Beyond showing a typical over \$ 1 million loss per 86 dwellings, there is added concern for the CTGMC in that this example is a proposed Carlsbad General Plan & Local Coastal Program Land Use Change to try to accommodate the years 2021-2029 the RHNA requirement to add/increase Residential use. Every 8 years we are/will be changing our General Plan land use to add more high-density housing and increasing City Park demand particularly for areas developed more densely.

If these higher-density projects do not dedicate actual City Park within walking distance not only is Carlsbad losing over \$1 million per 86 dwellings, we are losing free and easy opportunities to get City Parkland dedicated for free per CMC 20.44, and will slowly be degrading our Quality of Life in these areas and also Citywide.

Calculation of Ponto Site 18 Parkland dedication requirement and City losses from the Park-in-lieu Fee:

| Ponto Site 18 - Fenton proposed development's Park land dedication requirement | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | https://library.qcode.us/lib/carlsbad_ca/pub/municipal_code/item/title_20-chapter_20_44 |
| US Census data | https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlsbadcitycalifornia/POP060210#POP060210 |
| Carlsbad Park Dedication Requirement is 3 acres of land per 1,000 population of the proposed development. Population of proposed development is based on population per household based on latest US Census data 2020 US Census data is 2.64 people per household | |
| FYI, Carlsbad 3 acres /1,000 is comparatively very low both locally and nationally. And there is no 'walkably requirement'. 5 acres /1,000 population is what Encinitas and Oceanside require along with a 10-minute walk location requirement. | |
| Fenton owns almost 6 acres of land in Site 18, 4.64 acres of which they want to develop now, and the other 1+ acre part they want to develop later. on the 4.64 acre site change VC-Visitor Commercial/R-15 (15 dwellings per acre) General Plan land use and Zoning to 100% residential and develop at 19.125 dwellings per acre on 4.64 acres. On the 1+ acre site, instead of providing their required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between PCH & Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. Instead of providing the required Park Land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between Pecha and Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. | |
| Site 18 (Fenton) development proposal for the 4.64 acre portion is development of 86 household units (over 19 dwelling units per acre in in higher occupancy units than typical) consisting of: | |
| 8 | 2-bedroom homes = 9% of total units proposed |
| 40 | 3-bedroom homes = 47% of total units proposed |
| 38 | 4-bedroom homes = 44% of total units proposed |
| 86 | 100% |
| Fenton is proposing 91% of the project with 3 or 4 bedrooms so the project will have higher occupancy, and likely more children, per housing unit than the Citywide average of 2.64 people per housing unit | |
| <u>Fenton Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44</u> | |
| <u>calculation</u> | 86 DU of Fenton proposed development |
| X | 2.64 average population per DU per 2020 US Census |
| = | 227 estimated population of Fenton project |
| / | 1,000 population that needs 3 acres of Park land per CMC 20.44 |
| = | 0.22704 percentage of 3 acres of Park land required for 227 people |
| X | 3 acres of Park land required per 1,000 people |
| = | 0.68112 acres of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| X | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| = | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| 1 acre of Fenton's unused vacant 'ice plant lots' between PCH & Ponto Drive that can provide Fenton's Park land requirement | |
| \$ 398,696 | per City Master Fee Schedule. Consistent with what Fenton said was would be the 'Park-in-lieu Fee for their 86 DU project |
| \$ 50 | Estimated SF cost Fenton paid for Ponto Site 18 or \$ 2.18 million per acre |
| \$ 1,483,479 | cost of 29,670 SF of Ponto Site 18 land to satisfy Fenton's Park land requirement |
| for the Ponto Site 18 5-acre 86 dwelling unit land use change and development proposal: | |
| \$ (1,084,783) Dollars the City is loosing in Park land value and not receiving in its Park-in-lieu Fee, so this is a gift to the developer | |
| -73% % of lost Park land value City is loosing and not receiving in its PIL Fee, so this is a City gift to the developer | |
| \$ 1,000,000 | per acre cost to develop a Park like Buena Vista Reservoir Park |
| 43,560 | square feet per acre |
| \$ 22.96 | Cost per sq. ft. |
| 29,670 | square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| \$ 681,120 | Cost to develop Fenton's 29,670 sq. ft. of Park Land Dedication as a Park |
| \$ (282,424) Dollars City looses from Park-in-lieu Fees not even being adequate to cover Actual Minimal Park Development Costs | |

Following this calculation:

- on page 3-4 are the relevant excerpts of Carlsbad's Dedication of Land for Recreational Purposes Ordinance 20.44, and
- on page 5-6 is the City's map and description of the proposed Ponto Site 18 land use change

20.44 Dedication of Land for Recreational Facilities

20.44.010 Purpose.

This chapter is enacted pursuant to the authority granted by Section 66477 of the Government Code of the State of California. The park and recreational facilities for which dedication of land and/or payment of a fee is required by this chapter are in accordance with the recreational element of the general plan of the City of Carlsbad. (Ord. 9614 § 1, 1982; Ord. 9190 § 2)

20.44.040 Standards and formula for dedication of land.

If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that a park or recreational facility is to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents of the subdivision, the subdivider shall, at the time of the filing of the final or parcel map, dedicate land for such facility pursuant to the following standards and formula:

The formula for determining acreage to be dedicated shall be as follows:

Average no. of persons per dwelling unit (based on most recent federal census)

x

3 park acres per 1,000 population

x

Total number of dwelling units

The total number of dwelling units shall be the number permitted by the city on the property in the subdivision at the time the final map or parcel map is filed for approval, less any existing residential units in single-family detached or duplex dwellings. The park land dedication requirement will be reviewed annually effective July 1, and adjusted as necessary by resolution of the city council to reflect the latest federal census data. (Ord. CS-192 § 49, 2012; Ord. CS-162 § 1, 2011; Ord. NS-757 § 1, 2005; Ord. NS-588 § 1, 2001; Ord. 9831 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9770 § 1, 1985; Ord. 9724 § 1, 1984; Ord. 9644 § 1, 1982; Ord.

20.44.050 Standards for fees in lieu of land dedication.

A. If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that there is no park or recreational facility to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision, the subdivider shall, in lieu of dedicating land, pay a fee equal to the value of the land prescribed for dedication in Section 20.44.040 and in an amount determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 20.44.080.

B. If the proposed subdivision contains 50 parcels or less, only the payment of fees shall be required except that when a condominium project, stock cooperative, or community apartment project exceeds 50 dwelling units, dedication of land may be required notwithstanding that the number of parcels may be less than 50.

20.44.060 Determination of land or fee.

A. Whether the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map requires land dedication or elects to accept payment of a fee in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, shall be determined by the decision-making authority at the time of approval of the tentative map or tentative parcel map. In making that determination, the decision-making authority shall consider the following:

- 1 Park and recreation element of the general plan;
- 2 Topography, geology, access and location of land in the subdivision available for dedication;
- 3 Size and shape of the subdivision and land available for dedication;
- 4 The feasibility of dedication;

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is a group of eight vacant and underutilized properties in the Ponto area, located south of the Cape Rey Carlsbad Beach hotel and east of Carlsbad Boulevard. The site is bisected by Ponto Drive. North of Ponto Drive are three underutilized parcels containing a mini storage, miscellaneous buildings and other storage uses on nearly five acres. To the south, across Ponto Drive, is a cluster of five small vacant properties total just over an acre.

Site topography is generally flat. Some of the parcels may be constrained due to environmentally sensitive habitat. One parcel is alongside the railroad corridor. All the parcels are located outside the McClellan-Palomar Airport flight path.

The site does not include a vacant 11-acre parcel along either side of Ponto Drive and fronting Avenida Encinas. The parcel is commonly referred to as "Planning Area F."

SITE FEATURES

- Vacant/underutilized
- Utilities accessible
- In the Coastal Zone
- Site constraints

SITE OPPORTUNITY

The site consists of a mix of residential and non-residential land use designations. Two of the eight parcels have a split land use designation of VC (Visitor Commercial) and R-15 (11.5 to 15 dwelling units per acre, or du/ac). The one parcel alongside the railroad corridor is designated R-15. The R-15 designation often applies to small lot single family or detached or attached condominium development. The cluster of five vacant parcels south of Ponto Drive is designated GC (General Commercial). General Commercial permits a broad range of commercial uses. It also permits properties to be developed in a mixed-use format, with limited residential above first floor commercial.

Staff has received a letter from one property owner expressing support for higher density.

Except for the VC-designated portion of the two parcels, which is not anticipated to change, the redesignation of all parcels to R-23 is contemplated. R-23 is a residential designation the state identifies as suitable for moderate income households. The R-23 designation would permit a density range of 19 to 23 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). This density is typical of two- and three-story apartment and condominium developments.

To change any designation, amendments to the General Plan, Local Coastal Program, zoning, Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, and the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan would be required. These amendments would require City Council and California Coastal Commission approval.



Upper area proposed for land use change & higher density

Part of Lower area can (should) be dedicated to provided needed parkland

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Parcels Numbers | 216-010-01, 216-010-02, 216-010-03, 216-010-04, 216-010-05, 214-160-25, 214-160-28, 214-171-11 | GMP Quadrant | Southwest |
| Ownership | Private (separate ownership) | Parcel Size | Approximately 6 acres (all parcels) |
| Current General Plan Designations | R-15 (Residential 8-15 du/ac), VC (Visitor Commercial)/R-15, GC (General Commercial) | Proposed General Plan Designation | R-23 (Residential, 19 to 23 du/ac)* <i>*The VC designation, which applies to two properties, is not anticipated to change and would remain in the same location.</i> |
| Current Residential Opportunity | Approximately 44 units (based on the existing R-15 designation and limited residential permitted on GC-designated properties) | Proposed Residential Opportunity | Approximately 90 units (at 19 du/ac)* <i>*No yield is determined from portions of property designated VC.</i> |
| Income category of units (based on minimum density) | Moderate | | |

From: Douglas Gore <douglasgore4@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 11:34 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Doug Gore Thoughts for Pickleball Courts
Attachments: Tennis Courts Converted to Pickleball Courts.pdf

Hi Mick,

Would you please give me a call when you get a chance as I would like to talk with you about things I have been hearing about the pickleball courts.

I really hope that you and or Parks and Recreation will talk/meet with me or other pickleball players before making a final decision on court design and conversion?


I have attached a PowerPoint with my thoughts about converting two Poinsettia tennis courts into 8 pickleball courts.

Look forward to hearing from you soon.


Cheers~
Doug
760-717-2286

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Aerial View of Poinsettia Park Tennis and Pickleball Courts




The two Southwest tennis courts would be the most logical choice for converting two tennis courts into eight pickleballs courts.




These two tennis courts have flat land on the North, West and South sides, and an existing concrete walkway on the South side; all the other tennis courts have slope issues. These courts are further away from residential homes, which will help minimize noise. It will be very easy to square the corners and put in access gates for each court, which will minimize interruptions when coming and going through the pickleball courts.

It would be more cost effective to change out all 4 corners and the 4 middle indentations/angles at the same time.




Two Tennis Courts Converted Into Eight Pickleball Courts



All the angles on the three tennis courts have been removed and straightened, creating a rectangle perimeter. The dimensions for each pickleball court are exactly the same size as the existing Poinsettia pickleball courts, minus the seating areas found on the West and East sides of the existing courts; there is no room for seating. No seating is needed if these courts are reservation only. People will arrive when it is their reservation time to play and leave when their time expires; no interruption of play.

Poinsettia tennis courts with angled corners converted to 4 pickleball courts

The existing tennis courts have angled corners, which reduces the overall pickleball playing area/footprint between the courts and at the baselines. The longitudinal dividing fence between the two courts leaves a very narrow distance of 3.5' between the court and fence; could be dangerous. Without court dividing fences, balls will constantly be going onto other courts, disrupting the games and possibly causing injury if someone was to step on a ball. Square corners will increase the overall footprint and pickleball playing area, which creates a safer playing area; see next slide.




Angle removed from existing tennis court.

Move the existing fence to square the corners, creates more distance at both baselines and increases the playable width on both sides of the courts.




2 Poinsettia tennis courts without angles, rectangle footprint maximizes useable playable space, 4 pickleball courts on 1 tennis court


Having a rectangle footprint without angles, will create the exact same footprint as the existing Poinsettia pickleball courts minus the seating areas on the West and East side of the courts; there is no room for seating next to the courts. Having square corners maximizes the playing area and allows for fencing between the courts; a safer playing experience.



Two Tennis Courts Converted Into Eight Pickleball Courts



Aerial View of Poinsettia Park Tennis and Pickleball Courts



Shade structure and benches are located between the courts. In order to place 4 pickleball courts on 1 tennis court, the bench seat and bench back will have to be removed on both sides to prevent injury as this would be located within the active playing area. Trash cans should be removed. For safety reasons, the fence should be extended through this area to prevent balls from going onto adjacent pickleball courts.



Heavy duty pickleball nets can be installed without having to drill into the existing concrete tennis floor; fast and easy installation.



**THESE NETS ARE USED ON ALL THE PICKLEBALL COURTS AT BOBBY RIGGS
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS**

MEETS THE USAPA & IFP PICKLEBALL NET SPECIFICATIONS

<https://bestpickleballnets.com>

Thoughts and Benefits for Additional Pickleball Courts at Poinsettia Park

- The city can leave the existing 6 Poinsettia pickleball courts open to the public; make 3 challenge and 3 social.
- Alga Norte charges a fee to swim and Leo Carrillo charges a fee for weddings.
- These new pickleball courts could be reservation only with an hourly fee.
- There are many benefits of reservations only:
 - Generates additional revenue for the city.
 - Carlsbad residents get a discount rate.
 - Angles removed from tennis courts, maximizes the useable footprint, 4 pickleball courts per tennis court. The pickleball courts will have the exact same dimensions as the existing pickleball courts, minus seating areas found on the West and South sides of the existing pickleball courts because there is no room for seating.
 - There is no need for seating areas (bleachers/benches) as people will just show-up when it is their reservation time to play.
 - Families and beginners want to play pickleball, they feel intimidated to play pickleball at Poinsettia Park. Players, beginners, and families, will pay to play, so they can play with players of their same skill level.
 - With most sports, teams/players practice 90% of the time and play 10% of the time. There are not enough pickleball courts, so people play pickleball 90% of the time and practice 10% of the time. Reservations will allow players a place to practice.
 - People don't want to stop playing after one game and wait 30-45 minutes to play again. People will pay to play, proven and supported by Bobby Riggs being sold out almost everyday from 8am until 9pm. Bobby Riggs converted *all* of their tennis courts into 22 pickleball courts. Saint Michaels is reservation only and it is completely booked everyday.
 - Reservations will be automated through a website/app, and managed by an outside entity, which will also setup and manage tournaments and league play. The city will not have to do anything except receive a deposit into the city's account.
 - Weekly Women and Men League play for different ages and skill levels can be held on these courts. Local tournaments, women's doubles, men's doubles, and mixed doubles can be held on these courts as well. These events will bring people into the city of Carlsbad and generate additional revenue. Melba Bishop in Oceanside has been doing this for years; generated enough money to build 3 new pickleball courts at no cost to the city.
 - Coaching and lessons can be held on specific day(s) and times; similar to the tennis courts.

Subject: Public Input re: Park at Ponto

From: J Cannon <blancofelis@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 1:57 PM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Subject: Public Input re: Park at Ponto

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I am delivering to the above addresses this email and attachment as public input for:

1. CTGMC's 1/26/23 meeting
2. The next Carlsbad Council meeting
3. The next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 land use changes, and Local Coastal Program Amendments
4. Public input to the CCC on Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program
5. Public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

Having just done a photo survey of the latest King Tides in Carlsbad--which is a preview of what our coast will look like as sea level rises in the near future--we won't have any beaches. This means that ANY coastal public open space will be crucial in maintaining Carlsbad's reputation as a great place to live, and as a destination for visitors. Ponto Park will be one of the last open spaces left in our 7-mile coastline where the public can enjoy seaside activities.

Our next generations will thank you for planning wisely for the future,

J Cannon

Carlsbad beach, 1/22/23, northernmost Ocean Street access.



Further north, same day, South Oceanside





CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Public input for Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - Carlsbad below national average and lowest So CA Coastal city in providing Parks within 10-minute walk
Attachments: Carlsbad is below National Average & worst of 24 SoCal Coastal cities in providing Parks in a 10-minute walk to residents.pdf; TPL Support for Ponto Park - 2022-3-11.pdf; CTGMC key issues and suggestions -2022-12-6.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2023 3:53 PM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input for Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - Carlsbad below national average and lowest So CA Coastal city in providing Parks within 10-minute walk

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Parks and Planning Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's February 2023 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, and Carlsbad's Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 planning and development applications, and
4. as public input to the CA Coastal Commission on Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

For years Carlsbad Citizens have told the City that there is a need for a Park at Ponto:

- to provide for documented Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) land use at Ponto,
- to correct for the conversion of a 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use to Residential use and the elimination of planned Coastal Open Space at Ponto,
- to correct the Carlsbad's Park Master Plan documented lack of Park Service at Ponto,
- to provide South Carlsbad (62% of Carlsbad's total population and the City's major Coastal visitor and transit occupancy tax generator) with their ONLY Coastal Park west of I-5. The City unfairly, and contrary to CA Coastal Act Policy disproportionately provides 10 parks totaling 37 acres west of I-5 in Coastal North Carlsbad for 38% of the population but 0 (zero) Coastal Parks and 0 (zero) Coastal park acres west of I-5 in Coastal South Carlsbad for 62% of the population,
- to provide for an existing 6.5 acre local Neighborhood (i.e. Special use area) Park need at Ponto, and
- to provide a City Park within a 10-minute walk for Ponto residents.

Failure to correct this documented City Park unfairness is very damaging to the citizens, City finances, South Carlsbad's and California's visitor industry. The Coastal Recreation data file sent to you earlier documents some of the key facts.

However, we conducted some additional Trust for Public Land 10-minute walk data collection that the City Council, CTGMC, Parks and Planning Commissions and CA Coastal Commission need to also consider. That data is below and in the attached file, and again with last year's Trust for Public Land Ponto Park support letter (again attached) that reflects

on Carlsbad poor performance relative to the 24 So Cal Coastal Cities (165 miles of coastline) from Malibu to the Mexican border in providing Parks within a 10-minute walk. The data and links to the data source is:

Carlsbad is 10% below the national average for cities & the worst of 24 Coastal So California cities - 165 miles of coastline - in providing Parks within a 10-minute walk to residents

The Trust for Public Land documents a city's 10-minute walk to Park at <https://www.tpl.org/parkserve>. The Average USA City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 55% of residents [10% above Carlsbad]. **Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 49.9% of residents [10% below National Average].** New York City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 99% of residents.

The Trust of Public Land submitted a letter to the City of Carlsbad, CA Coastal Commission, and CA State Park supporting Ponto Park

Carlsbad is the worst of 24 Southern CA Coastal cities (from Malibu south to Imperial Beach along 165 miles of coastline) in providing Parks within 10-minute walk to residents:

1. Palos Verdes Estates provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
2. El Segundo provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
3. Hermosa Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
4. Redondo Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 98% of residents
5. Manhattan Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 95% of residents
6. Del Mar provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 93% of residents
7. Dana Point provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 89% of residents
8. Huntington Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 85% of residents
9. Long Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 84% of residents
10. Laguna Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
11. Santa Monica provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
12. San Diego provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 81% of residents
13. Coronado provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
14. Newport Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
15. Imperial Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 74% of residents
16. Encinitas provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 68% of residents
17. Los Angeles provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
18. Solana Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
19. Oceanside provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 58% of residents
20. Seal Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 57% of residents
21. Malibu provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 53% of residents
22. San Clemente provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 52% of residents
23. Rancho Palos Verdes provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 50% of residents
24. **Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 49.9% of residents.**

Carlsbad is the lowest & most unfair to citizens of the 24 Southern California Coastal cities along 165 miles of coast from Malibu to Imperial Beach.

Source of data: Trust for Public land parkscores

Trust for Public Land's 10-minute walk to Park Maps/data:

Carlsbad = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0611194#reportTop>

Encinitas = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0622678>
Irvine = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0636770>

Please, Please, please, consider and discuss this data, and

1. Create a 10-minute walk to City Park Standard in the
 - a. Parks Master Plan,
 - b. Growth Management Plan Update, and
 - c. Local Coastal Program Update.
 2. Create a Park Policy that requires developers to dedicate Park Land (not pay Park-in-lieu-fees) in areas that do not a minimum of 3 acres of City Park for each in 1,000 population within a 10-minute walk of the developer's proposed development (see attached CTGMC Key Issues & Suggestions file for details and Open Space suggestions)
 3. Fix Coastal South Carlsbad's documented City Park inequity/unfairness with a significant and real Ponto Park
 4. Save tax-payers tens of millions in dollars by cost effectively purchasing vacant land at Ponto for a Park, v. trying to maybe make a few bits of narrow PCH roadway median as a pseudo-park
- Do you want Carlsbad to be the worst city in Coastal Southern California in providing accessible Parks within a 10-minute walk to residents?
 - Do you want Carlsbad to fail to upgrade its park standards while other cities updated their park Standards and make their cities more desirable?
 - Do you want to undermine the quality of life for Carlsbad citizens and their children by not providing a park within a 10-minute walk to their home?
 - Do you want to force Carlsbad families to have to drive to park?
 - Do you want to slowly undermine a key visitor serving industry in South Carlsbad by not providing a significant and true and meaningful Coastal Park in South Carlsbad?
 - Do you want tax-payers to pay tens of millions more to try to maybe try to make a few narrow portions of PCH median useable to people?

Please take responsibility and full ownership of your decisions on these important issues and questions. The individual decisions you make will likely be the last ones made. Once vacant land like at Ponto is developed it will be forever lost to address the critical, well documented Park and Coastal Park needs at Ponto as overwhelmingly communicated by Carlsbad Citizens and visitor businesses, and other citizens.

Please be wise and think about the future your decisions will bring.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

PS: The initial version of the "CTGMC key issues and Suggestions 2022-12-6" file (attached) sent to you 8/8/22. The attached updated file should replace that older file as there is new data on significant tax-payer cost savings from Pronto Park relative to PCH Relocation, and updated examples of how Coastal Open Space can be cost-effectively persevered and increased. Both Coastal Parks and Open Space are important Carlsbad and State of CA issues.

- Parks: Updated data shows that a 11.1 acre Ponto Park would now cost less \$20 million to buy and build. This is less than a City Pool Renovation. Carlsbad's Old City Council planned to spend \$65 to \$80 million in Carlsbad tax-payer dollars to address the Citywide need for a significant Coastal Park in South Carlsbad with a 2.3 mile PCH Relocation. The City identified in 2001 other pay-payer funds were highly unlikely. \$65 to \$80 million would only 'free-up' 15.8 acres of narrow PCH Median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 & #5"). As People for Ponto Citizens have been saying for years that Ponto Park is the better Park solution to the

documented Coastal South Carlsbad Park needs – a citywide need. The CTGMC should include that citywide Park need and the logical, better and tax-payer responsible Ponto Park solution to that citywide Park need in your CTGMC recommendations to City Council.

- Open Space: Updated data shows how documented GM Open Space shortfalls can be properly and responsibly address in a collaborative citizen-based “Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan” approached. Also the need to maintain the 15% GM (Useable) Open Space Standard will be critical in the future to maintain Open Space and prevent future conversion of Open Space to residential land use as part of Housing Plan updates.

For the CTGMC; Parks and Open Space are the 2 most critical/special of 6 Key Growth Management Program Update Issues and Suggestions the CTGMC should take to properly address these 6 key Growth Management Issues.

- Please read the Updated data and Suggestions.
- Please responsibly address the Growth Management issues of a citywide Park need for Coastal South Carlsbad as listed in the attached Suggestions. Include a South Carlsbad Coastal Park in your recommendations to the City Council. Acknowledge Ponto Park as the best and most tax-payer efficient solution to address that documented citywide park need.
- Please in your recommendations to City Council retain and enforce the Open Space Standard, and fix past errors made in falsely exempting certain developers in certain areas in the City from complying with the Growth Management Open Space Standard that other developers in other areas are required to provide.

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Happy holidays and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Carlsbad is 10% below the national average for cities & the worst of 24 Coastal So California cities - 165 miles of coastline - in providing Parks within a 10-minute walk to residents

The Trust for Public Land documents a city's 10-minute walk to Park at <https://www.tpl.org/parkserve>
The Average USA City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 55% of residents [10% above Carlsbad].
Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 49.9% of residents [10% below National Average].
New York City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 99% of residents.

The Trust of Public Land submitted a letter to the City of Carlsbad, CA Coastal Commission, and CA State Park supporting Ponto Park

Carlsbad is the worst of 24 Southern CA Coastal cities (from Malibu south to Imperial Beach along 165 miles of coastline) in providing Parks within 10-minute walk to residents:

1. Palos Verdes Estates provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
2. El Segundo provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
3. Hermosa Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
4. Redondo Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 98% of residents
5. Manhattan Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 95% of residents
6. Del Mar provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 93% of residents
7. Dana Point provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 89% of residents
8. Huntington Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 85% of residents
9. Long Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 84% of residents
10. Laguna Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
11. Santa Monica provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
12. San Diego provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 81% of residents
13. Coronado provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
14. Newport Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
15. Imperial Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 74% of residents
16. Encinitas provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 68% of residents
17. Los Angeles provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
18. Solana Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
19. Oceanside provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 58% of residents
20. Seal Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 57% of residents
21. Malibu provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 53% of residents
22. San Clemente provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 52% of residents
23. Rancho Palos Verdes provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 50% of residents
24. **Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 49.9% of residents.**

Carlsbad is the lowest & most unfair to citizens of the 24 Southern California Coastal cities along 165 miles of coast from Malibu to Imperial Beach.

Source of data: Trust for Public land parkscores

Trust for Pulic Land's 10-minute walk to Park Maps/data:

Carlsbad = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0611194#reportTop>

Encinitas = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0622678>

Irvine = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0636770>

Following are 6 key major Growth Management Standards issues of citywide relevance that the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee (CTGMC) needs to act on, and citizen “Suggestions to CTGMC” on how to honestly and responsibly act on these 6 key issues in the CTGMC’s recommendations to the New City Council. This Update includes new information (pp 5-6) on the improved affordability of Ponto Park, and on how GM Open Space shortfall can be repaired. We hope the CTGMC will act honestly to make recommendations that truly and responsibly address known documented shortfalls in both Parks and GM Open Space. Responsible recommendations by the CTGMC can provide a sustainable Quality of Life to future Carlsbad generations and visitors. Only you own your recommendations.

1. The State of CA is forcing Carlsbad and all cities/counties in CA to provide for unlimited or Infinite Population and Visitor growth. So there will be an Infinite population & visitor demands for Parks, Open Space, water, and demands on our roads/transportation systems, and other Growth Management (GM) Quality of Life facilities. These infinite increases in population and visitor demand will come from high density development that requires more public Parks and Open Space to balance the high-densities. **Carlsbad’s new GM Standards will have to provide for a system of Infinite proportional increases in the supply of Parklands, Open Spaces, water, transportation facility capacity, etc. or our Quality of Life will diminish.**
 - a. Suggestions to CTGMC:
 - i. Completely restructure the General Plan, Local Coastal Program and GM Program to clearly recognize these facts and State requirements to proportionately provide public facilities to maintain/improve Carlsbad GM Quality of Life Standards for this Infinite growth of Population and Visitor demands.
 - ii. **Being a Coastal city Carlsbad has an added responsibility to proportionately maintain/improve providing High-Priority Coastal land uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations) needed at a regional and statewide level to address visitor needs for Coastal Recreation, access, and affordable accommodations.** Carlsbad needs to work with the State of CA Coastal Commission to completely restructure Carlsbad’s Coastal Land Use Plan to addresses the State’s requirement to provide an Infinite amount high-priority Coastal land uses for those Infinite Population and Visitor demands.
 - iii. **Trying to ignore these Infinite demands for Carlsbad’s Quality of Life facilities – like Parks and Open Spaces is a path to disaster and the ultimate degradation of Carlsbad’s Quality of Life.**
2. **Carlsbad has a huge Jobs v. Housing supply imbalance – far too many jobs around the airport for our amount of housing. This creates negative and costly land use and transportation planning distortions that radiate from the Airport Central Jobs through Carlsbad in all directions.** CA Housing law penalizes unbalanced cities like Carlsbad by requiring more housing in Carlsbad to bring jobs/housing ratio into balance. Carlsbad can correct this imbalance by 1 of 2 ways: 1) greatly increase housing supply (and thus increase the need and City expense for more GM Quality of Life facilities), or 2) more logically and cost effectively greatly decrease the amount of Jobs land use, so Carlsbad’s housing supply is in balance with jobs. These jobs will move to surrounding Cities that have more housing than jobs. **Rebalancing by reducing jobs land use creates added benefits for Carlsbad and our region by reducing Carlsbad’s peak-hour job commute traffic volumes and**

vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and by reducing the costs Carlsbad (and other cities and the region) have to pay to accommodate inter-city commute traffic. If Carlsbad reduces jobs land use will also reduce the amount of housing the State of California and SANDAG requires Carlsbad provide in its Housing Element thus reducing forcing incompatible high-density development into established neighborhoods and pressure to convert useable GM Open Space lands to housing land use.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Carlsbad can logically and cost effectively balance Jobs/housing supply by updating Growth Management Policy to reduce jobs to be in balance with housing by changing some of Carlsbad's General Plan land use around the airport into several high-density residential mixed-use Villages.** The City has started some of this, but can expand this effort but has not planned creating mixed-use village environments. These high-density villages will reduce jobs and provide both high-quality and high-density (affordable) housing within walking/biking distance to the major job center and new neighborhood commercial and Park uses in the Villages.
- ii. Prioritize transportation investments in safe bike paths, walking paths between Carlsbad's Central Jobs Core around the airport and Carlsbad's housing, particularly strongly connecting these new high-density mixed-use villages with the Central Jobs Core.
- iii. Update General Plan land use and housing policy to reduce concentrations of higher-density housing except around the airport jobs core.
- iv. Recognize the central Airport jobs core is 'Carlsbad's New Urban Downtown and "Transect Plan" accordingly toward lower densities on the City periphery.

3. Although some very critical areas (such as the Coastal lands at Ponto) are still vacant and can be wisely used for critical GM Quality of Life needs, much of Carlsbad is largely developed.

Redevelopment of developed land will require creating increased supplies of Parkland, Open Spaces, transportation capacity, and other Quality of Life facilities.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Completely rethink all City planning on existing vacant lands to assure that remaining vacant land is planned and being used wisely and fairly distributed to address critical Quality of Life needs in those areas, and not squandered on redundant land use.** The location of vacant land to address critical Park & Open Space needs should be preserved with land use planning.
- ii. Work with the State and CA Coastal Commission to preserve our Finite vacant Coastal lands for High-Priority Coastal Land Uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations and services) for the Infinite population and visitor demands both internal and external to Carlsbad that are/will be placed on them.
- iii. Fully and at the very beginning of any Carlsbad General Plan, Local Coastal Program and Growth Management Program actions going forward fully disclose, map and require consideration of the impact of future sea level rise and coastal erosion on Coastal land acres and land uses. Carlsbad has lost and will accelerate losing acres of Coastal land and High-priority Coastal Land Uses. Carlsbad must know, see, and discuss these losses BEFORE making any land use decisions in Carlsbad's Coastal Zone and any vacant Coastal Land.

4. **Carlsbad General Plan & Growth Management Plan do not provide a fair distribution of adequately sized City Parks for all Carlsbad families.** Veterans Park is a classic example. What will

be the City's largest park is only about 1-mile away from three other major City Parks (Zone 5, and the future Robinson Ranch and Hub Parks). This is a poor and unfair distribution and a misallocation City Park land resources. Saying Veterans Park is 'the park to serve SW, SE, and NE Carlsbad families' (the overwhelming major/majority funders of veterans Park) when those families are upwards of 6-miles away on major commercial arterials that kids can't logically/safely use is false and unfair. Most all the funding (developer fees) to build Veterans Park come from the SW, SE and NW Carlsbad but those areas are denied the Park the paid for. Veterans Park is inaccessible by almost all its intended users except by driving their cars and then storing their cars in parking lots on Parkland thus making less park land available for actual park use – this makes little common sense and is a great waste of tax-payer funds. This is dysfunctional along with being very unfair to families in SW, SE and NE Quadrats that are denied park acres near their homes which they funded. **Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps 'Park Service' areas of existing known Park Inequity or Unfairness (dysfunction), to show where new City Park investments should be made (See City map image with notes below).**

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

The Trust for Public Land provides a Park-Score to compare both a City's amount of park acres and the 'fairness' of access (within a 10-minute walk) to parks. **Carlsbad is below national averages in both park acres and fair access to parks. Carlsbad is also well below what our adjacent Coastal cities of Encinitas and Oceanside provide. Carlsbad only requires 3 acres of Park land per 1,000 population, while Encinitas and Oceans require 5 acres - 67% more than Carlsbad – of parkland. Also, Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be within a 10-minute walk to their citizens and families. Carlsbad has no such requirement.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

Carlsbad should change its General Plan, Parks and Growth Management Standards and CMC 20.44 to:

- i. **Be Above Average Nationally in both providing park acreage and in locating adequate park acreage to be within a 10-minute walk to all neighborhoods.**
 - ii. **Raise its minimum park acreage standard to 5 acres per 1,000 population, versus the current low 3 acres per 1,000. Carlsbad should be at least as good as Encinitas and Oceanside in requiring 5 acres, not 40% below what our adjacent Cities require/provide.**
 - iii. **Raise its park location standard to require an adequately sized park be provided to serve the neighborhood population within a 10-minute walk for all neighborhoods.**
 - iv. **Prioritize City Policy and Park Budgets and investments to achieve park fairness in 'Park Unserved areas' identified by Carlsbad's Park Master Plan.**
 - v. **Per Carlsbad's Municipal Code Chapter 20.44- DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES to require developers in 'Park Unserved areas' and in areas that do not have an adequately sized (5 acres per 1,000 population) park within a 10-minute walk to provide their developments required Park land acre dedication in actual Park land within a 10-minute walk to their development.**
 - vi. **Update the City's Park-in-lieu fee to assure the fee is adequate to actually buy the amount of park land a developer is to provide within a 10-minute walk of their development. The City's current 'Park-in-lieu-fee' is far too low and inadequate to actually buy land in area surrounding the proposed development.**
 - vii. **Only allow developers to pay a Park-in-lieu-fee where there is an adequately sized park (provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk of their development, and growth management planned future development in that area will not require more park land to provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk.**
 - viii. Consider updating Park policy to provide more multi-use flexibility in park land acres and development on Parks. Many Carlsbad Park acres are developed/dedicated to a single-purpose use, and unavailable for other park uses.
 - ix. Consider eliminating car parking lots from land that can be counted as parkland; or by significantly limiting park land used for parking to around 5%.
 - x. **Eliminate the counting of 'GM Constrained and Unusable land' and Protected Endangered Species Habitat land as Park land. GM Constrained/Unusable lands are undevelopable. Protected Habitat lands are by definition not useable for development by people. Habitat is dedicated for plants and animals. Parks are open spaces dedicated intended for people. Parkland calculations should exclude Unusable lands and Protected Habitat lands and only count 100% people Useable land as Park land. Where Park land abuts Habitat land a sufficient buffer space shall be provided to prevent people mixing with animals (ex. Rattlesnakes, etc.) and animals from people (habitat disturbance or destruction). This buffer area should not be counted as Park or Habitat acres, but as natural/developed buffer open space acres, and can be counted as part of the City's 15% Growth Management 'Aesthetic open Space'.**
5. Carlsbad's Coast is the most, if not the most, important feature of Carlsbad; and is consistently identified by citizens and businesses and our Community Vision. **Carlsbad's Coastal Parks (west of the I-5 corridor) are grossly unfairly distributed. Carlsbad's Coastal Parks do not fairly match the**

locational needs of the population. North Carlsbad that is 38% of Carlsbad's population and has 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37+ acres in size. South Carlsbad that is 62% of Carlsbad's population has 0 [ZERO] Coastal Parks totaling 0 [ZERO] acres. Again, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps this citywide unfairness (dots show park locations and circles show the area served by each park) and says that the City should look at buying and building New Parks in these areas that are unserved by City Parks (are not covered by a circle). The GM Update should correct this citywide unfair distribution of City Parks by making plans for new Park purchases to create City Parks in these unserved areas of Park Inequity.

To address citywide Coastal Park unfairness the current City Council wants to spend \$60-85 million in Carlsbad tax-payer funds to Relocate 2.3 miles of constrained Pacific Coast Highway median to try to make some of the narrow PCH median 'useable' by people. 2001 and 2013 City PCH Relocation studies identified only a small amount of 'people-useable acres' would be created next to PCH. The \$60-85 million tax-payer cost (\$26-37 million per mile) does NOT add one single square foot of new City land, it only inefficiently rearranges a small amount PCH median. The City can most tax-payer cost effectively provide needed sidewalks and bike improvements along the outside edges of PCH without PCH Relocation. The City's 2001 PCH Relocation Financial Study and 2013 PCH Relocation Design both indicated minimal useable land could be achieved by Relocation, and that the very high tax-payer cost to do so would be very difficult to fund. The City has known for well over 20-years that PCH Relocation is a high-cost and a poor solution to address the Citywide Coastal Park unfairness in South Carlsbad.

However, a **better and far less costly solution to correct Citywide Coastal Park unfairness and provide a much needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park is to simply buy currently vacant land that is for sale.** The City did this (although the City actually bought existing homes) when it expanded Pine Park. **Carlsbad tax-payers have used the City's own data to compare the tax-payer Cost/Benefits of simply purchasing vacant land v. trying to rearrange existing City owned land at PCH. Simply buying vacant land saves tax-payers saves tax-payers over \$32.7 to \$7.7 million.** Please read the following data files:

- 2022-June General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, 2.3 miles of PCH Modification (Island Way to La Costa Ave.), and 14.3 acre Ponto Park (Kam Sang) to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto in South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2.
- City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input: Part 2 of 2
- The most recent (9/19/22) land sale of 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F was less than \$8 million (less than \$706,000 per acre).
- **Buying and developing this 11.1 acre Ponto Park would cost less than \$20 million assuming a 10% profit to the new land-owner, and \$1 million per acre park construction cost like our newest Buena Vista Reservoir Park.** The cost to help correct a Citywide Coastal Park unfairness by simply buying & building a much needed **11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park would cost tax-payers less than the recently approved Measure J City Monroe Street Pool Renovation.** Investing less than \$20 million (\$1.8 million per acre) to buy and build an 11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park is a great tax-payer value v. \$65-80 million in tax-payer funds to rearrange 15.8 acres of narrow strips of constrained PCH median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 &5") for some minimal people use at a tax-payer cost of \$4-5 million per acre. **The overall and per acre costs of buying/building Ponto Park are over 2 to 3 times better value for tax-payers than PCH Relocation/rearrangement.**

- The City Council could/can buy land for Open Space (Parks are the most useable of the City's 4 Open Space categories) under voter approved Prop C Open Space land acquisition authority. **The City has been advised to buy Ponto Park under Prop C per the City's settlement of a Growth Management law suit.**

The Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is clearly a citywide issue. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad as it is unfair to the vast majority of Carlsbad citizens and their families as 62% of Carlsbad is in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is unfair to our major Visitor serving industries (and tax generators) in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad are clearly inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act, Carlsbad's Community Vision, and common sense. The Coastal South Carlsbad Park Inequity is also unfair to North Carlsbad because South Carlsbad's Coastal Park demand is being forced into Coastal North Carlsbad and congesting those parks, and adding to Coastal North Carlsbad traffic and parking impacts. It also increases greenhouse gases and VMT as it forces longer vehicle trips.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F has a specific Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy that says The City of Carlsbad must for the Ponto Area LCP 'Consider and Document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and or Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations west of the railroad tracks (at Ponto) prior to any Land Use change. **The discussion of Parks by the CTGMC is such a situation that requires the CTGMC to consider this adopted LCP Land Use Policies. Official public records requests have shown the City never followed this LCP Land Use Policy Requirement during the 2005 Ponto Vision Plan and 2015 General Plan Update, and in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission rejected the Ponto Vision Plan and told the City in 2017 that that land uses at Ponto could change based on the need for Coastal Recreation and/or Low Cost Visitor Accommodations.** The Mello II LCP that covers most of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone also has Land Use Policy 6.2 for the City to consider a major park in the Batiquitos (Ponto/South Carlsbad) area. The City has only implemented 1/6 to 1/3 of this policy. **The CTGMC should fully evaluate the citywide/South Carlsbad and local Ponto need for Coastal Parks as required by the City's adopted LCPs and CA Coastal Act.**
- ii. Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan Update and Growth Management Plan (GMP) did not, and was not updated to, consider the 2017 Sea Level Rise (SLR) Impact report showing the loss/impact on 32+ acres of Carlsbad's Coastal Land Use acreage in South Carlsbad – primarily Open Space Land Use (beach and Campground). **Both the General Plan (and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan) and GMP should be updated to account for the loss and replacement of these 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Use due to SLR.** The updates and the CTGMC should use the newest CA Coastal Commission SLR Guidelines/science, not the old guidelines used in 2017. Carlsbad's LCP and CA Coastal Act Land Use Polies call for 'upland relocation' to replace the SLR loss of high-priority Coastal Land Uses.
- iii. **The availability over the past several years of the last two sufficiently sized vacant lands suitable for a Ponto/South Carlsbad Coastal Park is a citywide issue. If these last two vacant lands are lost to development forever future generations will have lost the last opportunity for the needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park.** The 5/3/22 Citizen requests for the City to jointly study acquisition of one or both these last vacant lands for a needed (and only possible) true and meaningful Coastal Park for

South Carlsbad should be recommended by the CTGMC. **The CTGMC should recommend Carlsbad’s GMP be updated to incorporate Parkland acquisition of these last opportunities to provide the needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad.**

6. Carlsbad Growth Management Open Space Standard is that 15% of all the Useable (unconstrained and fully buildable) areas is to be preserved as Useable Open Space, and that all the 25 Local Facility Management Plans (LFMP) show how that 15% is provided. The City says:

OPEN SPACE


A. Performance Standard

Fifteen percent of the total land area in the Local Facility Management Zone (LFMZ) exclusive of environmentally constrained non-developable land must be set aside for permanent open space and must be available concurrent with development.

Yet the City has mapped and documented that this 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard was not complied with. The City also acknowledges that without changes to current City planning the 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard will never be complied with. The City acknowledges that only 13% has/will under current plans ever be provided. This missing 2% equals 501 acers of lost GM Open Space the GMP promised citizens. **Carlsbad law the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90, and section ‘21.90.130 Implementation of facilities and improvements requirements’; provide guidance on how non-compliance with a Performance Standards is to be handled.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. Retain the GM Open Space Standard of 15% of all unconstrained and developable land is maintained as Open Space. If the City removes the Open Space Standard, it will allow and encourage land use changes to remove GM Open Space and replace with development.
- ii. **The CTGMC should make a recommendation that an inventory of all 25 LFMP Zones be conducted and an inventory of each LFMP Zones provision of at least 15% Useable Open Space shall be compiled. No LFMP Zone shall be allowed to be “exempt” from this inventory.** The City’s computerized GIS mapping system makes it easy and clear as shown in the following City GIS map for LFMP Zone 9 (aka Ponto).



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara includes the same lagoon.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were not required to comply with the 15% Useable Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the Growth Management Standard of 15% Useable Open Space at Ponto

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from Growth Management (GMP) Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data |

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

- iii. In instances like LFMP Zone 9 (above image) that clearly did not provide at least 15% Useable Open Space and/or were falsely “exempted” the CTGMC should recommend that a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** shall be developed that explores the GM Open Space use/reuse of City land, land use planning requirements, and/or possible acquisitions of remaining vacant land acres to make up for any shortfall in meeting the 15% Useable Open Space in that a Zone. An example of this in LFMP Zone 9 is that the City’s regional Rail Trail will convert 2-lanes of almost all of Avenida Encinas to wider buffered bike lanes and an adequate portion of the converted 2 vehicle lanes can be landscaped (v. just painting strips as a buffer) to provide a safer/better bike lane buffer within a GM compliant Open Space. 2 vehicle lanes in Windrose Circle could also be similarly landscaped and converted to GM complaint Open Space. This is just one example of a cost-effective means to add GM Open Space that developers were falsely allowed to remove.
- iv. A **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** should involve a Citizens Advisory Committee composed of citizens within the impacted Zone and appointed by the Council Members representing the Zone, and a representative of each vacant land owner over of over 1-acre in size.
- v. Consistent with the Growth Management Ordinance land use changes and development applications within a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** Zone shall be deferred until the applications can considered with (or after adoption of) a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan**.



March 11th, 2022

Carlsbad City Council
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Re: Support creation of Ponto Park – a needed park for South Carlsbad

Dear Mayor Hall,

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is strongly supporting the efforts of 'People for Ponto' and thousands of Carlsbad residents to build Ponto Park in the 11-acre coastal parcel known as 'Planning Area F' in South Carlsbad. For over 40-years TPL has been designing and building parks in California and although we have world-class parks and beaches, the fact remains 3.2 million Californians don't have access to a park, and some of those Californians are residents of South Carlsbad. While the National Recreation and Park Association calls for 10-acres of park lands per 1000 residents as standard metric for healthy and vibrant cities, Carlsbad has a comparatively and relatively low park standard of only 3-acres/1,000 population and no requirement to provide accessible parks within walking distance.

And according to our own Trust for Public Land 2020-21 'City Parkscore', Carlsbad is also below national averages both providing park land acreage and in providing residents a park within a 10-minute walk.

The City of Carlsbad's Park Master Plan on pages 86-89 documents park service and park equity/inequity. Carlsbad's Park Master Plan documents that Ponto area has no park and all of South Carlsbad (over 61% of the entire city population) has no Coastal Park while . Carlsbad provides 10 City Coastal Parks (totaling over 35-acres) in North Carlsbad, while South Carlsbad has no coastal parks to serve the 64,000 residents, many of which are children. Ponto Park at 11-acre Planning Area F is the last remaining reasonable bit of vacant and currently unplanned Coastal land to provide a Coastal Park for South Carlsbad. Ponto Park would also be in the middle of a 6-mile long section of North San Diego County coastline without Coastal Park, and would help address a regional need for a Coastal Park for these 6-miles of coastline.

The CA Coastal Act has numerous policies that support the creation of Ponto Park and Coastal Recreation land use. The City of Carlsbad's history of following these CA Coastal Act policies now and over the past 40-years in its Local Coastal Program should be considered now in the City's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment. Over the past 40-years Carlsbad and California residents have forever

lost numerous opportunities to create vital Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation for our growing population.

In addition to the clear need for coastal parks in South Carlsbad, the citizens are overwhelmingly supporting the creation of Ponto Park in Planning area F. As you know during the past 2-years during the City Budget and Local Coastal Program Amendment processes, residents strongly demonstrated their desire that the City Council purchase and build Ponto Park. In 2019, 2020 and 2021 over 90% of citizen input expressed need was for Ponto Park, along with extensive verbal and written citizen testimony.

As COVID-19 vividly pointed out, parks are not an amenity, but a key component to human physical and mental health. Parks also provide environmental benefits and contribute to cleaner air and water, climate adaptation and social cohesion. TPL think you have a great opportunity to address equity and access to park space and improving the lives of thousands of Carlsbad residents and strongly urge you to support the building of Ponto Park for families and community.

Sincerely,

Rico Mastrodonato
Government Relations Director

Subject: Develop Ponto Right - prior Ponto Coastal Park Support Letters and public comments to be included in Parks Master Plan public Comments

From: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>

Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2020 12:54 PM

To: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>; info@peopleforponto.com; Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Praher@coastal.ca.gov; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>; Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>

Subject: RE: Develop Ponto Right - prior Ponto Coastal Park Support Letters and public comments to be included in Parks Master Plan public Comments

Lance-

I've consulted with the city attorney's representative on this matter. She determined that the prior public input on the desire for a park at Ponto does not need to be resubmitted in order to be included in the public input process for the Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan Update. Rather, your email message below will serve as a cover sheet request for that prior public input to also be included as public input for the Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan Update.

Thank you.

-Kyle



Kyle Lancaster, CPRP
Parks & Recreation Director
Parks & Recreation Department
City of Carlsbad
799 Pine Ave., Ste. 200
Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

760-434-2941 | 760-434-5088 fax | Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#)

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, February 6, 2020 6:25 PM

To: info@peopleforponto.com; Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; Mike Pacheco

<Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov;

Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: People for Ponto <info@peopleforponto.com>; Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>

Subject: RE: Develop Ponto Right - prior Ponto Coastal Park Support Letters and public comments to be included in Parks Master Plan public Comments

Importance: High

Dear City Council, Kyle Lancaster, Mike Pacheco, and Mick Calarco:

We would like to receive confirmation that all the People for Ponto and other public comments as part of the public comments submitted on the:

1. Shopoff developer proposed application to change the Local Coastal Program Land Use on Planning Area F at Ponto,
2. the City Staff's proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment to change the Land Use on Planning Area F for the developer

be included in the City's Park Master Plan Update. Can you please confirm all this prior citizen input is also included in the Parks Master Plan Update?

These prior public comments and requests to the City Council and Kyle Lancaster, parks Director directly relate to Park needs at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad, and the City's Planning Area F LCP LUP Requirements to consider a Public Park at the site. The public input is from over 2,500 citizen and public communications already sent to the City Council and City Staff (as noted in the above To address list). In addition to those 2,500 citizen and public communications over 90-pages of extensive public comments and data showing among other things the City's Park Master Plan's Park Service Area deficit (Park Service inequity) at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad, Park Acreage Deficit in South Carlsbad, the lack of any City Park West of I-5 and rail corridor in all South Carlsbad, CA Coastal Act policies and Coastal Recreation data/issues, along with other City policy and regulation supporting a Park at Ponto. All this prior public input should be included in the Parks Master Plan Update. Can you please confirm that that is the case? Or do we have to re-email all these prior public comments?

Thanks,
Lance
People for Ponto

One example of prior public comments submitted about Park deficits at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad and request for a City Park at Ponto:

From: info@peopleforponto.com [<mailto:info@peopleforponto.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 4:18 PM

To: Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov; CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov; Scott.Chadwick@carlsbadca.gov;
Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov; lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov; Kathleen@carlsbad.org; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov;
gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov;
Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov; info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Develop Ponto Right - Support Letter

Dear Mayor Hall, Carlsbad City Council, and California Coastal Commission:

I am informed that

1. Carlsbad must consider on Planning Area F at Ponto the need for a public park at Ponto as part of the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.
2. There is no public park at Ponto even though City Park Standards requires a minimum of 6.5 acres of parkland for Ponto.

3. There is a current 6.6 acre park deficit in Coastal Southwest quadrant of Carlsbad, (south of Palomar Airport Road and west of El Camino Real).
4. There are no Coastal Parks in all of South Carlsbad. 64,000 South Carlsbad citizens have no Coastal Park.
5. Ponto is at the center of a larger 6-mile stretch of coastline in that has no Coastal Parks.
6. Ponto has a city documented 30 acre open-space standard deficit that a Coastal Park would help resolves.
7. And most importantly, I am informed that the City is currently ignoring these issues and in the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment is proposing to eliminate the last opportunity to create a much needed Coastal Park at Ponto

Accordingly, I am requesting and making my position known that:

- I want the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment to provide for a Coastal Park at Ponto.
- I want the City to provide a true Citizen-based Park Planning process for Ponto.
- I want the City of Carlsbad to budget money in their capital improvement program to purchase Planning Area F and build a park at Ponto to serve residents and visitors alike.
- I want to preserve what little Coastal Open Space Carlsbad has remaining for future generations and our visitor industry.
- I am not in favor of future residential development at Ponto, but think this last small amount of vacant Coastal land should be reserved for Coastal Recreation.

One of the reasons that this lovely community continues to attract residents and tourists is the beauty of our natural surroundings, including coastline , parks and open spaces. Residential development is highly desired.. but INLAND, please! Protect our Coastal open spaces, for our good, and our visitors, for now AND the future. Once we squander it, it cannot easily be reclaimed...

Thank you
Barbara M Kesten
bkesten01@gmail.com
7476 Capstan Drive

Date submitted: 1/28/2020 6:18:23 PM

*This email was sent on behalf of the person named in this email using peopleforponto.com Please reply directly to the sender of the email as detailed within the email above.

If you'd like to unsubscribe and stop receiving these emails [click here](#).

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Public input to the 2-26-23 Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and upcoming Carlsbad City Council and Parks and Planning Commissions - LCPA and Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates - Parks & Open Space

Attachments: History of Open Space at Ponto - 2022-1-26.pdf; CTGMC key issues and suggestions -2022-12-6.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Saturday, February 18, 2023 9:11 AM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input to the 2-26-23 Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and upcoming Carlsbad City Council and Parks and Planning Commissions - LCPA and Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates - Parks & Open Space

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's 2/26/23 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 land use changes, and Local Coastal Program Amendments, and
4. as public input to the CCC on Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program, and
5. as public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

In reading through the 2/26/23 staff report and attachments to CTGMC on Open Space, the staff report did not include the attached data, like it included data from Mike Howes. Mike and I worked together at the City of Carlsbad at that time so have comparable knowledge, that I documented and shared in the attached files. This data should be presented just as Mike's information was presented.

Also, there are a few omissions in the staff report regarding Open Space in LFMP Zone 9 (BLEP MP that was never built) and relative to LFMP Zone 19 (Aviara Master Plan) in that both Zone 9 & 19 were about the same in terms of planning process in 1986 and in fact the 1986 Growth Management Ordinance 21.90.030(g) identifies both BLEP MP and Aviara MP as being exempt from the building permit moratorium. But Zone 19 the Aviara MP was required to provide 15% of Growth Management Open Space and Zone 9 the BLEP was NOT Required (aka exempted) from providing the required 15% GM Open Space. In 1996 developers and the City deleted/removed BLEP MP Open Space and replaced it with residential land use. But the 'GM Open Space exemption' was specifically only based on the BLEP MP land uses. Even though most of the Public Input to the CTGMC has been about Ponto Park and Open Space needs these critical Open Space facts were never discussed in the staff report, even though the documented evidence was provided to the City a month ago.

Ponto (LFMP Zone 9) developers were/are clearly falsely exempted from providing the required 15% GM Open Space, and the extensive Carlsbad Citizen outcry and petitions reflect this false exemption, that needs correction by the CTGMC and City Council. The facts on the ground, the City's Open Space maps, Parks Master Plan service area maps, the attached data all point to fact that Ponto is missing the 15% GM Open Space that the City should have required and provided. The impacts to current and future Carlsbad Citizens of this missing GM Open Space are real and will get worse as Carlsbad's population is required to increase. The CTGMC and City Council can fix this past mistake (as clearly documented in the attached 'History of Open Space at Ponto') and as outlined in the attached 'CTGMC key issues and suggestions' file. We can fix this and provide a fair Carlsbad Tomorrow.

Please care. Don't cover-up past mistakes. Do what is right and honest. Please work with your fellow citizens and acknowledge and fix the past Growth Management Open Space mistakes at Ponto, and also provide a much needed meaningful Ponto Park for South Carlsbad.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2023 12:39 PM
To: 'committee@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; 'Homer, Sean@Parks'; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; 'Carrie Boyle'; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal'; 'melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com'
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Public input to the 1-16-22 Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and upcoming Carlsbad City Council and Parks and Planning Commissions - LCPA and Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates - Parks & Open Space

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's 1/26/22 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 land use changes, and Local Coastal Program Amendments, and
4. as public input to the CCC on Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program, and
5. as public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

At the 1-11-22 CTGMC meeting questions logically arouse about how Ponto/LFMP-9 was falsely exempted from the Growth Management Open Space Standards in 1986 when the two adopted reasons for that exemption were not true per the City's Open Space map/data base, air-photos and development records, and the requirements of the Growth Management Ordinance and Open Space Standard. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have been bringing this up to the City since 2017 when we first had City data that showed the GM Open Space Standard exemption was incorrect. Attached is some more detailed data that provides a History of Open Space at Ponto – 2022-1-26. There are more details and interesting bits of information, but the attached provides the basics on the History and also offers some critical historical context for the CTGMC, Carlsbad Commissions, City Council and Carlsbad Citizens to consider. I hope this is helpful.

The History of Ponto Open Space and historical context fits into the 'CTGMP Key Issues and Suggestions – 2022-12-6' file and email to you on 8/8/22 and 12/13/22 that provides a time-tested, logical, legal, tax-payer saving approach to

dealing with the missing Ponto Open Space and need for a significant Coastal Park at Ponto to serve Ponto and South Carlsbad and relieve Coastal Park pressures on North Carlsbad.

Please know People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens deeply care and love Carlsbad. We bring the data and requests to you because we care. You have received well over 5,000 People for Ponto petitions regarding Ponto Park and Open Space. During the CTGMC meetings many have spoken and summited in favor of the issues identified in the People for Ponto petitions. I may have missed it but do not recall any Carlsbad citizen speak/submit to the CTGMC in opposition to what People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have provided you. As representative of the Citizens of Carlsbad we ask you honestly represent the Carlsbad Citizen desires so overwhelming expressed to you.

Thank you, and with Aloha Aina for Carlsbad,
Lance

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Following are 6 key major Growth Management Standards issues of citywide relevance that the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee (CTGMC) needs to act on, and citizen “Suggestions to CTGMC” on how to honestly and responsibly act on these 6 key issues in the CTGMC’s recommendations to the New City Council. This Update includes new information (pp 5-6) on the improved affordability of Ponto Park, and on how GM Open Space shortfall can be repaired. We hope the CTGMC will act honestly to make recommendations that truly and responsibly address known documented shortfalls in both Parks and GM Open Space. Responsible recommendations by the CTGMC can provide a sustainable Quality of Life to future Carlsbad generations and visitors. Only you own your recommendations.

1. The State of CA is forcing Carlsbad and all cities/counties in CA to provide for unlimited or Infinite Population and Visitor growth. So there will be an Infinite population & visitor demands for Parks, Open Space, water, and demands on our roads/transportation systems, and other Growth Management (GM) Quality of Life facilities. These infinite increases in population and visitor demand will come from high density development that requires more public Parks and Open Space to balance the high-densities. **Carlsbad’s new GM Standards will have to provide for a system of Infinite proportional increases in the supply of Parklands, Open Spaces, water, transportation facility capacity, etc. or our Quality of Life will diminish.**
 - a. Suggestions to CTGMC:
 - i. Completely restructure the General Plan, Local Coastal Program and GM Program to clearly recognize these facts and State requirements to proportionately provide public facilities to maintain/improve Carlsbad GM Quality of Life Standards for this Infinite growth of Population and Visitor demands.
 - ii. **Being a Coastal city Carlsbad has an added responsibility to proportionately maintain/improve providing High-Priority Coastal land uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations) needed at a regional and statewide level to address visitor needs for Coastal Recreation, access, and affordable accommodations.** Carlsbad needs to work with the State of CA Coastal Commission to completely restructure Carlsbad’s Coastal Land Use Plan to addresses the State’s requirement to provide an Infinite amount high-priority Coastal land uses for those Infinite Population and Visitor demands.
 - iii. **Trying to ignore these Infinite demands for Carlsbad’s Quality of Life facilities – like Parks and Open Spaces is a path to disaster and the ultimate degradation of Carlsbad’s Quality of Life.**
2. **Carlsbad has a huge Jobs v. Housing supply imbalance – far too many jobs around the airport for our amount of housing. This creates negative and costly land use and transportation planning distortions that radiate from the Airport Central Jobs through Carlsbad in all directions.** CA Housing law penalizes unbalanced cities like Carlsbad by requiring more housing in Carlsbad to bring jobs/housing ratio into balance. Carlsbad can correct this imbalance by 1 of 2 ways: 1) greatly increase housing supply (and thus increase the need and City expense for more GM Quality of Life facilities), or 2) more logically and cost effectively greatly decrease the amount of Jobs land use, so Carlsbad’s housing supply is in balance with jobs. These jobs will move to surrounding Cities that have more housing than jobs. **Rebalancing by reducing jobs land use creates added benefits for Carlsbad and our region by reducing Carlsbad’s peak-hour job commute traffic volumes and**

vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and by reducing the costs Carlsbad (and other cities and the region) have to pay to accommodate inter-city commute traffic. If Carlsbad reduces jobs land use will also reduce the amount of housing the State of California and SANDAG requires Carlsbad provide in its Housing Element thus reducing forcing incompatible high-density development into established neighborhoods and pressure to convert useable GM Open Space lands to housing land use.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Carlsbad can logically and cost effectively balance Jobs/housing supply by updating Growth Management Policy to reduce jobs to be in balance with housing by changing some of Carlsbad's General Plan land use around the airport into several high-density residential mixed-use Villages.** The City has started some of this, but can expand this effort but has not planned creating mixed-use village environments. These high-density villages will reduce jobs and provide both high-quality and high-density (affordable) housing within walking/biking distance to the major job center and new neighborhood commercial and Park uses in the Villages.
- ii. Prioritize transportation investments in safe bike paths, walking paths between Carlsbad's Central Jobs Core around the airport and Carlsbad's housing, particularly strongly connecting these new high-density mixed-use villages with the Central Jobs Core.
- iii. Update General Plan land use and housing policy to reduce concentrations of higher-density housing except around the airport jobs core.
- iv. Recognize the central Airport jobs core is 'Carlsbad's New Urban Downtown and "Transect Plan" accordingly toward lower densities on the City periphery.

3. Although some very critical areas (such as the Coastal lands at Ponto) are still vacant and can be wisely used for critical GM Quality of Life needs, much of Carlsbad is largely developed.

Redevelopment of developed land will require creating increased supplies of Parkland, Open Spaces, transportation capacity, and other Quality of Life facilities.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Completely rethink all City planning on existing vacant lands to assure that remaining vacant land is planned and being used wisely and fairly distributed to address critical Quality of Life needs in those areas, and not squandered on redundant land use.** The location of vacant land to address critical Park & Open Space needs should be preserved with land use planning.
- ii. Work with the State and CA Coastal Commission to preserve our Finite vacant Coastal lands for High-Priority Coastal Land Uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations and services) for the Infinite population and visitor demands both internal and external to Carlsbad that are/will be placed on them.
- iii. Fully and at the very beginning of any Carlsbad General Plan, Local Coastal Program and Growth Management Program actions going forward fully disclose, map and require consideration of the impact of future sea level rise and coastal erosion on Coastal land acres and land uses. Carlsbad has lost and will accelerate losing acres of Coastal land and High-priority Coastal Land Uses. Carlsbad must know, see, and discuss these losses BEFORE making any land use decisions in Carlsbad's Coastal Zone and any vacant Coastal Land.

4. **Carlsbad General Plan & Growth Management Plan do not provide a fair distribution of adequately sized City Parks for all Carlsbad families.** Veterans Park is a classic example. What will

be the City's largest park is only about 1-mile away from three other major City Parks (Zone 5, and the future Robinson Ranch and Hub Parks). This is a poor and unfair distribution and a misallocation City Park land resources. Saying Veterans Park is 'the park to serve SW, SE, and NE Carlsbad families' (the overwhelming major/majority funders of veterans Park) when those families are upwards of 6-miles away on major commercial arterials that kids can't logically/safely use is false and unfair. Most all the funding (developer fees) to build Veterans Park come from the SW, SE and NW Carlsbad but those areas are denied the Park the paid for. Veterans Park is inaccessible by almost all its intended users except by driving their cars and then storing their cars in parking lots on Parkland thus making less park land available for actual park use – this makes little common sense and is a great waste of tax-payer funds. This is dysfunctional along with being very unfair to families in SW, SE and NE Quadrats that are denied park acres near their homes which they funded. **Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps 'Park Service' areas of existing known Park Inequity or Unfairness (dysfunction), to show where new City Park investments should be made (See City map image with notes below).**

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

The Trust for Public Land provides a Park-Score to compare both a City's amount of park acres and the 'fairness' of access (within a 10-minute walk) to parks. **Carlsbad is below national averages in both park acres and fair access to parks. Carlsbad is also well below what our adjacent Coastal cities of Encinitas and Oceanside provide. Carlsbad only requires 3 acres of Park land per 1,000 population, while Encinitas and Oceans require 5 acres - 67% more than Carlsbad – of parkland. Also, Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be within a 10-minute walk to their citizens and families. Carlsbad has no such requirement.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

Carlsbad should change its General Plan, Parks and Growth Management Standards and CMC 20.44 to:

- i. **Be Above Average Nationally in both providing park acreage and in locating adequate park acreage to be within a 10-minute walk to all neighborhoods.**
 - ii. **Raise its minimum park acreage standard to 5 acres per 1,000 population, versus the current low 3 acres per 1,000. Carlsbad should be at least as good as Encinitas and Oceanside in requiring 5 acres, not 40% below what our adjacent Cities require/provide.**
 - iii. **Raise its park location standard to require an adequately sized park be provided to serve the neighborhood population within a 10-minute walk for all neighborhoods.**
 - iv. **Prioritize City Policy and Park Budgets and investments to achieve park fairness in 'Park Unserved areas' identified by Carlsbad's Park Master Plan.**
 - v. **Per Carlsbad's Municipal Code Chapter 20.44- DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES to require developers in 'Park Unserved areas' and in areas that do not have an adequately sized (5 acres per 1,000 population) park within a 10-minute walk to provide their developments required Park land acre dedication in actual Park land within a 10-minute walk to their development.**
 - vi. **Update the City's Park-in-lieu fee to assure the fee is adequate to actually buy the amount of park land a developer is to provide within a 10-minute walk of their development. The City's current 'Park-in-lieu-fee' is far too low and inadequate to actually buy land in area surrounding the proposed development.**
 - vii. **Only allow developers to pay a Park-in-lieu-fee where there is an adequately sized park (provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk of their development, and growth management planned future development in that area will not require more park land to provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk.**
 - viii. Consider updating Park policy to provide more multi-use flexibility in park land acres and development on Parks. Many Carlsbad Park acres are developed/dedicated to a single-purpose use, and unavailable for other park uses.
 - ix. Consider eliminating car parking lots from land that can be counted as parkland; or by significantly limiting park land used for parking to around 5%.
 - x. **Eliminate the counting of 'GM Constrained and Unusable land' and Protected Endangered Species Habitat land as Park land. GM Constrained/Unusable lands are undevelopable. Protected Habitat lands are by definition not useable for development by people. Habitat is dedicated for plants and animals. Parks are open spaces dedicated intended for people. Parkland calculations should exclude Unusable lands and Protected Habitat lands and only count 100% people Useable land as Park land. Where Park land abuts Habitat land a sufficient buffer space shall be provided to prevent people mixing with animals (ex. Rattlesnakes, etc.) and animals from people (habitat disturbance or destruction). This buffer area should not be counted as Park or Habitat acres, but as natural/developed buffer open space acres, and can be counted as part of the City's 15% Growth Management 'Aesthetic open Space'.**
5. Carlsbad's Coast is the most, if not the most, important feature of Carlsbad; and is consistently identified by citizens and businesses and our Community Vision. **Carlsbad's Coastal Parks (west of the I-5 corridor) are grossly unfairly distributed. Carlsbad's Coastal Parks do not fairly match the**

locational needs of the population. North Carlsbad that is 38% of Carlsbad's population and has 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37+ acres in size. South Carlsbad that is 62% of Carlsbad's population has 0 [ZERO] Coastal Parks totaling 0 [ZERO] acres. Again, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps this citywide unfairness (dots show park locations and circles show the area served by each park) and says that the City should look at buying and building New Parks in these areas that are unserved by City Parks (are not covered by a circle). The GM Update should correct this citywide unfair distribution of City Parks by making plans for new Park purchases to create City Parks in these unserved areas of Park Inequity.

To address citywide Coastal Park unfairness the current City Council wants to spend \$60-85 million in Carlsbad tax-payer funds to Relocate 2.3 miles of constrained Pacific Coast Highway median to try to make some of the narrow PCH median 'useable' by people. 2001 and 2013 City PCH Relocation studies identified only a small amount of 'people-useable acres' would be created next to PCH. The \$60-85 million tax-payer cost (\$26-37 million per mile) does NOT add one single square foot of new City land, it only inefficiently rearranges a small amount PCH median. The City can most tax-payer cost effectively provide needed sidewalks and bike improvements along the outside edges of PCH without PCH Relocation. The City's 2001 PCH Relocation Financial Study and 2013 PCH Relocation Design both indicated minimal useable land could be achieved by Relocation, and that the very high tax-payer cost to do so would be very difficult to fund. The City has known for well over 20-years that PCH Relocation is a high-cost and a poor solution to address the Citywide Coastal Park unfairness in South Carlsbad.

However, a **better and far less costly solution to correct Citywide Coastal Park unfairness and provide a much needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park is to simply buy currently vacant land that is for sale.** The City did this (although the City actually bought existing homes) when it expanded Pine Park. **Carlsbad tax-payers have used the City's own data to compare the tax-payer Cost/Benefits of simply purchasing vacant land v. trying to rearrange existing City owned land at PCH. Simply buying vacant land saves tax-payers saves tax-payers over \$32.7 to \$7.7 million.** Please read the following data files:

- 2022-June General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, 2.3 miles of PCH Modification (Island Way to La Costa Ave.), and 14.3 acre Ponto Park (Kam Sang) to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto in South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2.
- City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input: Part 2 of 2
- The most recent (9/19/22) land sale of 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F was less than \$8 million (less than \$706,000 per acre).
- **Buying and developing this 11.1 acre Ponto Park would cost less than \$20 million assuming a 10% profit to the new land-owner, and \$1 million per acre park construction cost like our newest Buena Vista Reservoir Park.** The cost to help correct a Citywide Coastal Park unfairness by simply buying & building a much needed **11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park would cost tax-payers less than the recently approved Measure J City Monroe Street Pool Renovation.** Investing less than \$20 million (\$1.8 million per acre) to buy and build an 11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park is a great tax-payer value v. \$65-80 million in tax-payer funds to rearrange 15.8 acres of narrow strips of constrained PCH median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 &5") for some minimal people use at a tax-payer cost of \$4-5 million per acre. **The overall and per acre costs of buying/building Ponto Park are over 2 to 3 times better value for tax-payers than PCH Relocation/rearrangement.**

- The City Council could/can buy land for Open Space (Parks are the most useable of the City's 4 Open Space categories) under voter approved Prop C Open Space land acquisition authority. **The City has been advised to buy Ponto Park under Prop C per the City's settlement of a Growth Management law suit.**

The Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is clearly a citywide issue. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad as it is unfair to the vast majority of Carlsbad citizens and their families as 62% of Carlsbad is in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is unfair to our major Visitor serving industries (and tax generators) in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad are clearly inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act, Carlsbad's Community Vision, and common sense. The Coastal South Carlsbad Park Inequity is also unfair to North Carlsbad because South Carlsbad's Coastal Park demand is being forced into Coastal North Carlsbad and congesting those parks, and adding to Coastal North Carlsbad traffic and parking impacts. It also increases greenhouse gases and VMT as it forces longer vehicle trips.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F has a specific Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy that says The City of Carlsbad must for the Ponto Area LCP 'Consider and Document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and or Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations west of the railroad tracks (at Ponto) prior to any Land Use change. **The discussion of Parks by the CTGMC is such a situation that requires the CTGMC to consider this adopted LCP Land Use Policies. Official public records requests have shown the City never followed this LCP Land Use Policy Requirement during the 2005 Ponto Vision Plan and 2015 General Plan Update, and in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission rejected the Ponto Vision Plan and told the City in 2017 that that land uses at Ponto could change based on the need for Coastal Recreation and/or Low Cost Visitor Accommodations.** The Mello II LCP that covers most of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone also has Land Use Policy 6.2 for the City to consider a major park in the Batiquitos (Ponto/South Carlsbad) area. The City has only implemented 1/6 to 1/3 of this policy. **The CTGMC should fully evaluate the citywide/South Carlsbad and local Ponto need for Coastal Parks as required by the City's adopted LCPs and CA Coastal Act.**
- ii. Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan Update and Growth Management Plan (GMP) did not, and was not updated to, consider the 2017 Sea Level Rise (SLR) Impact report showing the loss/impact on 32+ acres of Carlsbad's Coastal Land Use acreage in South Carlsbad – primarily Open Space Land Use (beach and Campground). **Both the General Plan (and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan) and GMP should be updated to account for the loss and replacement of these 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Use due to SLR.** The updates and the CTGMC should use the newest CA Coastal Commission SLR Guidelines/science, not the old guidelines used in 2017. Carlsbad's LCP and CA Coastal Act Land Use Polies call for 'upland relocation' to replace the SLR loss of high-priority Coastal Land Uses.
- iii. **The availability over the past several years of the last two sufficiently sized vacant lands suitable for a Ponto/South Carlsbad Coastal Park is a citywide issue. If these last two vacant lands are lost to development forever future generations will have lost the last opportunity for the needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park.** The 5/3/22 Citizen requests for the City to jointly study acquisition of one or both these last vacant lands for a needed (and only possible) true and meaningful Coastal Park for

South Carlsbad should be recommended by the CTGMC. **The CTGMC should recommend Carlsbad’s GMP be updated to incorporate Parkland acquisition of these last opportunities to provide the needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad.**

6. Carlsbad Growth Management Open Space Standard is that 15% of all the Useable (unconstrained and fully buildable) areas is to be preserved as Useable Open Space, and that all the 25 Local Facility Management Plans (LFMP) show how that 15% is provided. The City says:

OPEN SPACE

A. Performance Standard

Fifteen percent of the total land area in the Local Facility Management Zone (LFMZ) exclusive of environmentally constrained non-developable land must be set aside for permanent open space and must be available concurrent with development.

Yet the City has mapped and documented that this 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard was not complied with. The City also acknowledges that without changes to current City planning the 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard will never be complied with. The City acknowledges that only 13% has/will under current plans ever be provided. This missing 2% equals 501 acers of lost GM Open Space the GMP promised citizens. **Carlsbad law the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90, and section ‘21.90.130 Implementation of facilities and improvements requirements’; provide guidance on how non-compliance with a Performance Standards is to be handled.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. Retain the GM Open Space Standard of 15% of all unconstrained and developable land is maintained as Open Space. If the City removes the Open Space Standard, it will allow and encourage land use changes to remove GM Open Space and replace with development.
- ii. **The CTGMC should make a recommendation that an inventory of all 25 LFMP Zones be conducted and an inventory of each LFMP Zones provision of at least 15% Useable Open Space shall be compiled. No LFMP Zone shall be allowed to be “exempt” from this inventory.** The City’s computerized GIS mapping system makes it easy and clear as shown in the following City GIS map for LFMP Zone 9 (aka Ponto).



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara includes the same lagoon.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were not required to comply with the 15% Useable Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the Growth Management Standard of 15% Useable Open Space at Ponto

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from Growth Management (GMP) Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data |

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]


- iii. In instances like LFMP Zone 9 (above image) that clearly did not provide at least 15% Useable Open Space and/or were falsely “exempted” the CTGMC should recommend that a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** shall be developed that explores the GM Open Space use/reuse of City land, land use planning requirements, and/or possible acquisitions of remaining vacant land acres to make up for any shortfall in meeting the 15% Useable Open Space in that a Zone. An example of this in LFMP Zone 9 is that the City’s regional Rail Trail will convert 2-lanes of almost all of Avenida Encinas to wider buffered bike lanes and an adequate portion of the converted 2 vehicle lanes can be landscaped (v. just painting strips as a buffer) to provide a safer/better bike lane buffer within a GM compliant Open Space. 2 vehicle lanes in Windrose Circle could also be similarly landscaped and converted to GM complaint Open Space. This is just one example of a cost-effective means to add GM Open Space that developers were falsely allowed to remove.
- iv. A **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** should involve a Citizens Advisory Committee composed of citizens within the impacted Zone and appointed by the Council Members representing the Zone, and a representative of each vacant land owner over of over 1-acre in size.
- v. Consistent with the Growth Management Ordinance land use changes and development applications within a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** Zone shall be deferred until the applications can considered with (or after adoption of) a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan**.

History of the false exemption of the Growth Management Open Space Standard provided Ponto developers in Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9 (LFMP-9):

The history of how required Growth Management Open Space (i.e. unconstrained/developable land) that should have been dedicated Open Space was, and is now being proposed to be, inappropriately converted to Residential land use by a Perpetuating a False Exemption of the Open Space Standard provided Ponto Developers. This False Exemption needs correction and restitution. Ponto's False Exemption of the Open Space Standard and the 'amendment shell-game' GM Open Space history is a critical warning sign to the **Carlsbad Tomorrow** Growth Management Committee, Planning Commission and City Council. Ponto is a critical warning that a strong, accountable and accurate Open Space Standard needs to be established for **Carlsbad Tomorrow**, AND a Growth Management Open Space restitution plan needs to be established and funded that corrects the False Exemption for Ponto Developers. If Ponto Developers were required like other similar developers at the time (Aviara and Poinsettia Shores, "urbanizing La Costa Zones 11 & 12, etc.) to provide the required Growth Management Open Space some of the critical Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues and extensive Carlsbad Citizen needs/demands/desires at Ponto could likely have already been addressed.

How citizens found out about the False Exemption provided Ponto Developers:

In 2017 for the 1st time the city provided the GIS maps/data base accounting of Open Space in the City. The City did this a part of settlement to a North County Advocates citizens' lawsuit. The City Open Space maps/data base allowed Carlsbad Citizens for the 1st time the ability to see and confirm what Open Space was produced by Growth Management (GM). The City's Open Space map/data based for Ponto (LFMP-9) documented that about 30-acres of GM Open Space was missing (see; Carlsbad Official Public Records Request - PRR 2017-164). As required by GM, and as Staff has said, to count as GM Open Space it must be dedicated and 'unconstrained/developable land' to meet the GM Open Space Standard. Being able to see for the 1st time the missing GM Open Space was one of the key awakenings that started People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens. Below is the City's Open Space Map for LFMP-9, with notes. We have the City's parcel-based Open Space data base that confirms all the numerical data in the notes.



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara had the same lagoon waters.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were never required to comply with the 15% Standard Open Space is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map


City GIS map data summary of the 15% Growth Management Standard Open Space at Ponto


| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from GMP Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data |
| | 73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |

So were did the missing GM Open Space go?

In early 1985 prior to the Ponto's developer (SAMMIS) annexing Ponto into the City of Carlsbad, San Diego County's LAFCO (local agency formation commission) General Planned and pre-zoned, Ponto's Batiqitos Lagoon waters and the lagoon bluff slopes as Open Space. This Open Space was "Constrained Open Space" – State jurisdictional waters, and steep slopes with Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) habitat. These already pre-zoned constrained/non-developable Open Spaces were accounted for as part of the City's 25% pre-Growth Management Plan Open Space, and per Growth Management can't be counted in meeting the 15% Growth Management Open Space Standard. The pre-zoned Open Space is shown in the City's Open Space map and properly marked as "Preservation of Natural Resources" Open Space land. This already pre-zoned Constrained (non-developable, aka 'Preservation of Natural Resources') Open Space land at Ponto was documented in the proposed SAMMIS Batiqitos Lagoon Educational Park (BLEP) Master Plan MP-175 as Areas N, O, and P in the Land Use Summary below.

On Oct, 1 1985 Carlsbad approved SAMIS's Master Plan and EIR to develop Ponto. SAMIS's BLEP Master Plan MP-175. Following are BLEP MP-175's General Plan & Land Use Summary maps:





**CONCEPTUAL LAND USE PLAN
BATIQUITOS LAGOON EDUCATIONAL PARK**
SAMMIS PROPERTIES

The BLEP MP-175 did include a variety of GM compliant Open Space.

- 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use that was playfields and Coastal Recreation site for MP-175 and South Carlsbad. This is a Critical GM Open Space that was never dedicated.
- A minimum 30' wide landscaped Open Space on both sides of Windrose Circle that circled the Area P. Windrose Circle was bordered on each side by 30' of landscaped Open Space.
- Additional minimum 30' wide landscaped setbacks between buildings in Area A
- 2.8 acres of private recreation open space for the maximum amount of residential units
- 45' to 50' landscaped setbacks from the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff edge (this was later developed with Residential land use in some areas of Ponto).
- 75' landscaped separation between Areas C and D
- 70' landscaped separation between Areas D and E
- 25' landscaped setback along Avenida Encinas for Area E
- 30' to 80' landscape setback between Lakeshore Gardens and Area F
- 25' landscaped setback along Avenida Encinas for Area F
- 50' landscaped setback between Areas F and I
- 75' landscaped separation between Areas G and H
- 50' to 80' landscape setback for Area I between Lakeshore Gardens and between Area F

So, prior to Ponto being annexed into the City of Carlsbad in the mid-1980's and prior to Growth Management the Batiquitos Lagoon and lagoons bluff slopes (constrained and unusable due to habitat and slope constraints) were already pre-zoned Open Space and General Planned as Constrained Habitat Open Space. This constrained Open Space did not and cannot meet the 15% GM Open Space Standard.

In 1986 Citizens voted for the City's version of Growth Management that included a New Standard for Useable Open Space. The new standard was that 15% of all unconstrained useable/developable land within a Local Facility Management Zone was to be dedicated as Open Space. Once the vote was in the City adopted the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 of Carlsbad's Municipal Code (City Council Ordinance No. 9791. (Ord. 9829 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9808 § 1, 1986)).

In adopting the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90.010 the Council Clearly stated:

(b) The city council of the city has determined **despite previous city council actions**, including but not limited to, amendments to the land use, housing, and parks and recreation elements of the general plan, amendments to city council Policy No. 17, adoption of traffic impact fees, and modification of park dedication and improvement requirements, that the demand for facilities and improvements has outpaced the supply resulting in shortages in public facilities and improvements, including, but not limited to, streets, **parks, open space**, schools, libraries, drainage facilities and general governmental facilities. **The city council has further determined that these shortages are detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Carlsbad.**

(c) This chapter is adopted to ensure the implementation of the policies stated in subsection (a), to eliminate the shortages identified in subsection (b), **to ensure that no development occurs without providing for adequate facilities and improvements, ..."**

The Citizens and Council recognized that prior City plans were not adequate to address the current (and future) needs for facilities. Upon adoption of the New Growth Management Standards certain facilities were already below-Standard simply based on the existing development and population. Growth Management required additional facilities simply to bring the then current development/population up to the New Minimum Standards. I am personally familiar with 3 GM Standards in LFMP-6 (old La Costa) that I worked on – Library, Fire, and Park where already below-Standard i.e. existing development/population in Old La Costa required more facilities to meet the new Growth Management Standards. We worked to provide these new facilities for the existing development/population (i.e. fix the Standard deficits) and then to also plan even more additional facilities at a ratio that met the New Standards for the additional future development in Old La Costa. I can provide you some interesting stories on that.

I also recall working on the surrounding La Costa LRMP Zones 11 & 12 that Like Ponto/FMP-9 were considered "Cat II: Urbanizing" yet Unlike Ponto/LFMP-9 LFMP Zone 11 & 12 were not falsely exempted

for the GMP Open Space Standard and had to provide the GM Open Space Standard of 15% of the unconstrained/developable lands as dedicated Useable Open Space.

The Citizens vote on Proposition E and the subsequent Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 are the rules on which the Growth Management Plans (both Citywide and 25 Local Facility Plans) are required to follow.

To create the Citywide and the Local plans (Zones 1-6) for the largely developed areas the City needed to temporarily pause development activity to allow time for city staff to Draft the Growth Management Plan (my work as a city planner at the time was re-directed to draft growth management plans). So the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90.030, established a Temporary Development Moratorium to pause development processing activity while the Growth Management Plan was being Drafted. Following is that language of 21.90.030. Notes are shown as italicized text within *[example]*:

“21.90.030 General prohibition—Exceptions.

(a) Unless exempted by the provisions of this chapter, **no application for any building permit or development permit shall be accepted, processed or approved until a city-wide facilities and improvements plan has been adopted and a local facilities management plan for the applicable local facilities management zone has been submitted and approved according to this chapter.** *[Clearly indicates the exemptions in 21.90.030 are only from the temporary development moratorium created by 21.90.]*

(b) No zone change, general plan amendment, master plan amendment or specific plan amendment which would increase the residential density or development intensity established by the general plan in effect on the effective date of this chapter shall be approved unless an amendment to the citywide facilities management plan and the applicable local facilities management plan has first been approved. *[FYI, this provision of 21.90.030 has direct implications with respect of currently City/developer proposed General Plan/Zoning code/Local Coastal Program Amendments now being pursued by the City at Ponto Planning Area F and Ponto Site 18. The City did not and has not yet amended the CFMP and LFMP-9 to increase the City/developer proposed residential density or development intensity at Ponto]*

(c) The classes of projects or permits listed in this subsection shall be exempt from the provisions of subsection (a). Development permits and building permits for these projects shall be subject to any fees established pursuant to the city-wide facilities and improvement plan and any applicable local facilities management plan. *[Then lists various exemptions from the temporary development processing/building permit moratorium in 21.90. The BLEP MP's exemption from the temporary moratorium is (g)]*

(g) The city council may authorize the processing of and decision making on building permits and development permits for a project with a master plan approved before July 20, 1986, subject to the following restrictions *[this only applies to the “approved before July 20, 1986” BLEP MP, and NOT to any subsequent Master Plan Amendment]:*

- (1) The city council finds that the **facilities and improvements required by the master plan are sufficient to meet the needs created by the project and that the master plan developer has agreed to install those facilities and improvements to the satisfaction of the city council.** *[The Ponto developer needed to provide the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use and install the GM compliant Open Space required in the 1986 MP175 but did not]*
- (2) The master plan developer shall agree in writing that all facilities and improvement requirements, including, but not limited to, the payment of fees established by the city-wide facilities and management plan and the applicable local facilities management plan shall be applicable to development within the master plan area and that the master plan developer shall comply with those plans. *[this required the LFMP-9/BLEP MP to have 1) already been fully developed or 2) have already have dedicated 15% of the LFMP-9 as Growth Management compliant Open Space (i.e. Unconstrained and developable) to qualify for the Open Space exemption later falsely noted in the city-wide facilities and management plan. As clearly documented the BLEP MP did not meet the requirements to qualify for Open Space Standard Exemption in the city-wide facilities and management plan. The section also requires “all facilities” (including Open Space) requirements in the Citywide Growth Management Standard to apply to BLEP MP, not provide a means for a false exemption of the Open Space Standard]*
- (3) The master plan establishes an educational park and **all uses within the park comprise an integral part of the educational facility.** *[“all uses” including the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use and all the other GM compliant Open Spaces are an integral part. However the 12.8 acre open space land use was never built and the BLEP MP GM compliant Open Space never dedicated.]*
- (4) **Building permits for the one hundred twenty-nine [129] unit residential portion of Phase I of the project may be approved provided the applicant has provided written evidence that an educational entity will occupy Phase I of the project** which the city council finds is satisfactory and consistent with the goals and intent of the approved master plan. *[Clearly indicates the 21.90.030 exemption is only for building permits for Phase I of the BLEP MP. Of the 129 units only the 75 unit Rosalena development applied for and received building permits under this exemption. There are some very interesting issues related to this Rosalena Phase I development relative to GM complaint Open Space along the bluff edge that can be expanded on later if the CTGMC has questions.]*
- (5) Prior to the approval of the final map for Phase I the master plan developer shall have agreed to participate in the restoration of a significant lagoon and wetland resource area and made any dedications of property necessary to accomplish the restoration. *[Again clearly notes the exemption only allows a final map for Phase I to be processed. The “lagoon and wetland resource area” are part of the same constrained/undevelopable lands already pre-zoned prior to the BLEP MP being incorporated into the City of Carlsbad]*

The Aviara Master Plan (directly adjacent and east of Ponto) and was also being developed at the same time as Ponto/BLEP MP. 21.90.030 also provided the Aviara Master Plan a similar exemption (h) and similar lagoon related quid-pro-quo for that exemption. But Aviara did not receive a GM Open Space Standard Exemption. :

“(iv) Prior to any processing on the [Aviara] master plan the applicant shall grant an easement over the property necessary for the lagoon restoration and the right-of-way necessary for the widening of La Costa Avenue and its intersection with El Camino Real. (Ord. NS-63 § 1, 1989; Ord. 9837 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9808 § 1, 1986)”

Some City staff have incorrectly stated to the City Council that they believe 21.90.030 exempts Ponto/LFMP-9 from the Growth Management Ordinance/Program or Growth Management Open Space Standard. RESOLUTION NO. 8666- A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CARLSBAD, CALIFORNIA APPROVING TWO AGREEMENTS FOR BATIQUITOS LAGOON EDUCATIONAL PARK also shows the 21.90.030 exemption was only for development permits during the temporary building moratorium.

In 1986 the City falsely exempted in the Citywide Facilities Plan all Ponto developers from providing 15% of their useable/developable land as GM required Open Space. The City’s documented/adopted rationale in the Citywide Plan was that Ponto/LFMP-9 was 1) in 1986 already developed, or 2) in 1986 the developer had already met the GM Open Space Standard by having already dedicated 15% of the useable land as Open Space. Both situations were/are false. Any air photo map or even the 1986 LFMP-9 clearly states Ponto was NOT developed in 1986, as only the Lakeshore Gardens existed and the Ralphs Center was just starting construction. Also the City’s GIS Open Space mapping (see above) shows that SAMMIS the Ponto developer (BLEP Master Plan MP-175) in 1986 had Not dedicated as Open Space 15% of the useable land as Growth Management compliant Open Space as shown/described in the BLEP MP (i.e. the 12.8 Acre Recreation Commercial site and all the landscaped open space setbacks required in the BLEP MP-175. If that 15% was dedicated in 1986 it would show-up on the City’s inventory of Dedicated Open Space now. So how did this occur?

How Ponto’s planned GM Open Space was eliminated and replaced with Residential land use:

In late 1980’s SAMMIS the BLEP MP-175 developer started building the 75-home Rosalena Development as the first part of Phase I of the BLEP MP. The City (based on my recollection was very desirous to develop the BLEP MP) and required special time limits on the BLEP MP to actually advance building the ‘Educational Park’ with all the “initiated” land uses (including GM compliant Open Space) within a certain period of time. SAMMIS was having financial issues and difficulty delivering the BLEP MP land uses. Amendments (A, B, and C) to BLEP MP reflected on these difficulties:

- MP 175(A) to allow minor accessory structures within the rear yards of all Phase I single family lots located in Planning Area “C”. *[This is the Rosalena development that was part of Phase I for BLEP MP. This amendment has implications on the landscaped Open Space setback along the Batiquitos Lagoon bluff top, and the required Coastal access trail required by the Coastal*

Development Permit for Rosalena. This is an interesting history that can be explained later if the CTGMC would like.]

- MP 175(B) to realign Carlsbad Blvd., between North Batiquitos Lagoon and west of I-5 to accommodate the Sammis Development was WITHDRAWN January 12, 1990, and
- MP 175(C) a request for 5-year extension of time for Master Plan approval related to educational uses on this project was Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 2841, April 19, 1989 and approved City Council Ordinance No. NS-83, September 5, 1990.

SAMMIS went bankrupt around 1990 and Kaiza Development purchased the BLEP MP. Kaiza completed the Rosalena development started by SAMMIS. Kaiza then sought to completely change the planned land uses on all the remaining unconstrained/developable land in the BLEP MP.

General Plan and Master Plan Amendments eliminated/reduced BLEP's Growth Management compliant Open Space and replace with Residential uses in the "amended" Poinsettia Shores Master Plan:


When Kaiza acquired the BLEP MP-175 and its vacant land only the State Campground, Lakeshore Gardens, Ralphs Center, and now Rosalena were approved/existing developments at Ponto. Kaiza proposed a Master Plan Amendment to delete the BLEP MP-175 and all its developable land uses, except for the only portion of Phase I developed – the 75 unit Rosalena subdivision. The pre-BLEP MP pre-zoned (and General Planned) constrained/undevelopable Lagoon waters and lagoon bluff Open Spaces and the CA Coastal Act (LCP) required bluff top setbacks were the only Open Spaces retained in Kaiza's proposed General Plan land use and Master Plan Amendments.

Most all of the BLEP MP-175 (and Ponto/LFMP-9) land area was still undeveloped at the time Kaiza proposed changing all the General Plan land uses at Ponto and eliminating the usable Open Space in BLEP MP.

Kaiza's General Plan land use and Master Plan 'Amendments' made radical land use changes that converted some critical Useable GM Open Space to residential land use and also reduced some GM Open Space provided in BLEP MP. Following is Kaiza's Amended General Plan land use map and bullet summary of the major Open Space changes without getting into a very detailed forensic analysis:

- Eliminated the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use.
- Eliminated the minimum 30' wide landscaped Open Space on both sides of Windrose Circle for the large unbuilt portions of Windrose Circle
- Reduced by 10' the landscaped Open Space on the smaller built portion of Windrose Circle
- Eliminated on 40.3 acres the additional minimum 30' wide landscaped setbacks between buildings
- Reduced BLEP's 2.8 acres of private recreation open space to 2.3 acres
- Except for the Rosalena (BLEP Area C) and (PSMP Area J), maintained the 45' to 50' landscaped setbacks from the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff edge
- Eliminated the 75' landscaped separation between BLEP MP Areas C and D

- Eliminated the 70' landscaped separation between BLEP MP Areas D and E
- Maintained the 25' landscaped setback along Avenida Encinas. [However new Master Plan Amendments MP-175L propose reducing the setback to 10' on the undeveloped frontage of Avenida between PCH and the railroad tracks]
- Placed a road in most of the 80' landscape setback between Lakeshore Gardens
- Eliminated the 50' landscaped setback between BLEP MP Areas F and I
- Eliminated the 75' landscaped separation between BLEP MP Areas G and H
- Added a 20' wide by 1,000' long landscaped strip for an HOA trail



Kaiza's Master Plan Amendment MP 175 (D) eliminated the 12.8 acre Open Space land use (with an associated General Plan Amendment to add more residential land use) and reduced the other useable Open Spaces required in the BLEP MP. When the 1994 Kaiza MP 175 (D) General Plan Amendments were proposed, it seemed they voided the '1986 GM Open Space exemption' that was clearly specific only to the 1986 BLEP MP land uses and regulation. Although this was a false exemption, the exemption only applied to the complete/integrated land use and open space provided in the 1986 BLEP MP. The 1986 exemption specific to BLEP MP could not apply to a different and later 1994 General Plan land use plan that eliminated the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial (Open Space) site to add residential land use

and that also reduced the GM compliant Open Space provided in the 1986 BLEP MP. 21.90.030(b) notes that:

“(b) No zone change, general plan amendment, master plan amendment or specific plan amendment which would increase the residential density or development intensity established by the general plan in effect on the effective date of this chapter shall be approved unless an amendment to the citywide facilities management plan and the applicable local facilities management plan has first been approved.”

The 1994 Kaiza General Plan land use and Master Plan (MP 175(D)) Amendments removed 12.8 acres of Recreation Commercial (GM compliant Open Space) to add residential land use. This violated 21.90.030(b) by doing so without a first providing a Citywide Facilities Plan Amendment that analyzed the actual amount of GM compliant Open Space being proposed in the 1994 Kaiza MP 175(D) relative to the 1986 BLEP MP on which the 1986 GM Open Space exemption for LFMP-9 was based. MP 175(D) is noted in the MP as follows:

- “MP 175 (D) Kaiza Poinsettia Master Plan To **replace educational uses with residential land uses** And rename to Poinsettia Shores Master Plan (was) Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 3552, November 3, 1993, Approved City Council Ordinance No. NS-266, January 18, 1994.”

Kaiza’s MP 175(D) inaccurately and bizarrely claimed BLEP MP’s prior false exemption from the GM Open Space Standard as the justification that Kaiza’s new 1994 Open Space land use changes that seem to reduce the amount of GM complaint Open Space in the 1986 BLEP MP are also exempt from the GM Open Space Standard. **Kaiza’s MP 175(D) claims the pre-Growth Management and pre-BLEP MP Constrained/Undevelopable lagoon waters and bluff habitat that per the 15% Growth Management Open Space Standard CAN NOT be counted as meeting the 15% GM Open Space Standard can be magically counted as meeting the 15% GM Open Space Standard. The GM Open Space Standard specifically states that only Unconstrained/Developable lands CAN BE counted as meeting the GM Open Space Standard.** The stated principles of Growth Management, the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 and the Growth Management Open Space Standard DO NOT allow a developer or the City to count already documented Constrained and unbuildable habitat (and water) as Unconstrained and developable land. You can’t just turn ‘an apple into a banana by saying it’, or turn ‘Constrained/Undevelopable land into Unconstrained/Developable land by just saying it.

Compliance with the law in this Open Space issue is a part of a current lawsuit by North County Advocates a group of Citizens watchdogs. The City has unsuccessfully tried to diminish this lawsuit. A judge/jury will determine the outcome.

Additional MP 175 Amendments have been proposed by and approved to further modify land use and regulatory limitations at Ponto. These include:

- MP 175(E) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, Redefinition of minor amendment to provide a flexible regulatory procedure to encourage creative and imaginative planning of coordinated communities, WITHDRAWN November 1, 1994

- MP 175(F) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan minor amendment to actualize off-site option for provision of 90 affordable housing dwelling units, Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 3774, April 19, 1995
- MP 175(G) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan minor amendment to adopt Coastal Commission Suggested modifications, Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 3922, June 5, 1996 Approved City Council July 16, 1996, NS-367
- MP 175(H) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan - major amendment FOR HOTEL AND TIMESHARE USES, WITHDRAWN January 16, 2003
- MP 175(I) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – Rosalena Trail Amendment, WITHDRAWN January 8, 2002
- MP 175(J) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – major amendment for Carlsbad Coast Residential project to allow RM land use on Poinsettia Shores, WITHDRAWN January 8, 2002
- MP 175 (K) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – Ponto Area Specific Plan Mixed use consisting of residential, commercial and retail uses, WITHDRAWN August 19, 2004
- MP 175(L) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – Major amendment for commercial and residential development on Planning Area F, Still being proposed by developers and being processed by the City.

The false exemption for the BLEP MP based LFMP-9 should never have occurred. However, completely eliminating BLEP MP’s OpenSpace land use (12.8 acre Recreation Commercial) and reducing BLEP MP’s required Open Space while at the same time claiming the false BLEP MP Open Space Exemption is a violation of common sense, 21.90, and the very founding principles Growth Management.

The CA Coastal Commission in MP 175 (G) in part recognized the elimination of the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use and maybe some of the Open Space land use changes and added the following land use regulations for 11.1 acre Planning Area F in the Carlsbad’s Local Coastal Program LCP). The LCP as per State Law and referenced in Carlsbad’s General Plan is the controlling land use regulation over the General Plan, Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and in the Coastal Zone:

“PLANNING AREA F: Planning Area F is located at the far northwest corner of the Master Plan area west of the AT&SF Railway right-of-way. This Planning Area has a gross area of 11 acres and a net developable area of 10.7 acres. Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an “unplanned” area, for which land uses will be determined at a later date when more specific planning is carried out for areas west of the railroad right-of-way. A future Major Master Plan Amendment will be required prior to further development approvals for Planning Area F, and shall include an LCP Amendment with associated environmental review, if determined necessary.

The intent of the NRR designation is not to limit the range of potential future uses entirely to nonresidential, however, since the City's current general plan does not contain an “unplanned” designation, NRR was determined to be appropriate at this time. In the future, if the Local Coastal Program Amendment has not been processed, and the City develops an “unplanned”

General Plan designation, then this site would likely be redesignated as “unplanned.” Future uses could include, but are not limited to: commercial, residential, office, and other uses, subject to future review and approval.

As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.”

In 2010 the CA Coastal Commission in 2010 rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan on which MP 175(K) was based. MP 175(K) was withdrawn.

On July 3, 2017 the CA Coastal Commission provided direction to the City of Carlsbad regarding MP 175(G), Carlsbad’s 2015 General Plan Update, Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment Land Use Plan (LUP) . CA Coastal Commission wrote to the City the following. Notes on the context of communication are in bracketed italics *[example]*:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto ... area. For example, **Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad. ...** this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. *[the discussion of the need for the City to conduct a citywide analysis of the location and amount of these uses in the Coastal Zone to assure the City General Plan within the Coastal Zone is providing the adequate amounts and locations of these land uses to fulfill the long-term population/visitor needs for these uses according to the CA Coastal Act]* **If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”**

In 2017 the City conducted the first Sea Level Rise (SLR) Vulnerability Assessment <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=33958> . That first initial analysis, shows significant SLR impacts that will reduce existing Ponto Open Space - the State beach and Campground and along the Batiquitos Lagoon. The City identified SLR impacts on Ponto Open Space are summarized in the next section of this history.

In 2023 the CA Coastal Commission will consider the data and public input and decide the appropriate land use for 11.1 acre Planning Area F based the CA Coastal Act and Coastal Act land use policies.

You can determine the Open Space and Park Quality of Life Standards that will be applied to this and other future land uses.

[City assessment of Sea Level Rise impacts on reducing Ponto Open Space](#)

The City's 2017 SLR assessment shows SLR will significantly reduce or eliminate only existing Open Space land at Ponto. The City's assessment quantifies the sporadic/episodic loss of Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad Open Space land and land uses being at the State Campground, Beaches, and Batiquitos Lagoon shoreline – about 32 acres by the year 2100, this would be an average loss of 17,000 square feet of Open Space per year. Following (within quotation marks) is a description, quantification and images of the City's projected loss of Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad Open Space land and land use due to SLR. *[Italicized text within brackets]* is added data based on review of aerial photo maps in the Assessment.

“Planning Zone 3 consists of the Southern Shoreline Planning Area and the Batiquitos Lagoon. Assets within this zone are vulnerable to inundation, coastal flooding and bluff erosion in both planning horizons (2050 and 2100). A summary of the vulnerability assessment rating is provided in Table 5. A discussion of the vulnerability and risk assessment is also provided for each asset category.

5.3.1. Beaches

Approximately 14 acres of beach area is projected to be impacted by inundation/erosion in 2050. ... Beaches in this planning area are backed by unarmored coastal bluffs. Sand derived from the natural erosion of the bluff as sea levels rise may be adequate to sustain beach widths, thus, beaches in this reach were assumed to have a moderate adaptive capacity. The overall vulnerability rating for beaches is moderate for 2050.

Vulnerability is rated moderate for the 2100 horizon due to the significant amount of erosion expected as the beaches are squeezed between rising sea levels and bluffs. Assuming the bluffs are unarmored in the future, sand derived from bluff erosion may sustain some level of beaches in this planning area. A complete loss of beaches poses a high risk to the city as the natural barrier from storm waves is lost as well as a reduction in beach access, recreation and the economic benefits the beaches provide.

5.3.3. State Parks

A majority of the South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds (separated into four parcels) were determined to be exposed to bluff erosion by the 2050 sea level rise scenario (moderate exposure). This resource is considered to have a high sensitivity since bluff erosion could significantly impair usage of the facilities. Though economic impacts to the physical structures within South Carlsbad State Beach would be relatively low, the loss of this park would be significant since adequate space for the park to move inland is not available (low adaptive capacity). State parks was assigned a high vulnerability in the 2050 planning horizon. State park facilities are recognized as important assets to the city in terms of economic and recreation value as well as providing low-cost visitor serving amenities. This vulnerability poses a high risk to coastal access, recreation, and tourism opportunities in this planning area.

In 2100, bluff erosion of South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds become more severe and the South Ponto State Beach day-use area becomes exposed to coastal flooding during extreme events. The sensitivity of the South Ponto day-use area is low because impacts to usage will be temporary and no major damage to facilities would be anticipated. Vulnerability and risk to State

Parks remains high by 2100 due to the impacts to South Carlsbad State Beach in combination with flooding impacts to South Ponto.

Table 5: Planning Zone 3 Vulnerability Assessment Summary [condensed & notated]:

| Asset | Horizon | | | Vulnerability |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <u>Category</u> | <u>[time]</u> | <u>Hazard Type</u> | <u>Impacted Assets</u> | <u>Rating</u> |
| Beaches | 2050 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 14 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 54 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| Public Access | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 6 access points 4,791 feet of trails | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 10 access points 14,049 feet of trails | Moderate |
| State Parks | 2050 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [<18 Acres] | High |
| [Campground - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations] | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [>18 Acres] <i>[loss of over 50% of the campground & its Low-cost Visitor Accommodations,</i> | High |
| <i>See Figure 5.]</i> | | | | |
| Transportation (Road, Bike, Pedestrian) | 2050 | Bluff Erosion | 1,383 linear feet | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 11,280 linear feet | High |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------|----------------------|-----------|----------|
| Environmentally Sensitive Lands | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 572 acres | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 606 acres | High |




Figure 7: Southern Shoreline Planning Area – Year 2050





Figure 5: CoSMoS Bluff Erosion Projections by 2100
(CoSMoS-COAST 2015)

[Figure 5 show the loss of over 50% of the campground and campground sites with a minimal .2 meter Sea Level Rise (SLR), and potentially the entire campground (due to loss of access road) in 2 meter SLF.]”

This 2017 SLR data and quantified losses of Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad Open Space land and land uses was not considered in the City’s rejected (by CCC) Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan. The Ponto Vision Plan is the basis for the City’s 2015 General Plan Update that is now being proposed in the City’s Local Coastal Program Amendment now before the CA Coastal Commission.

Summary:

LFPM-9 was clearly not developed in 1986, and did not then or now dedicate 15% of the unconstrained/developable land as Open Space as required by the Growth Management Open Space Standard. These two reasons for the City to “exempt” LFMP-9 from Open Space Standard were/are False. Saying Constrained/undevelopable land can be counted as Unconstrained/developable land is also false and clearly not allowed according to the Growth Management Ordinance, Standards, principles, and common-sense honesty to Carlsbad Citizens. LFMP-9, as the City’s own maps/data base show is clearly missing 30-acres of GM Open Space. In addition in 2017 we learned that Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad will lose about 32 acres of existing Open Space due to SLF.

Closing thoughts:

Growth Management is based on the type/amount/location of General Plan land use designations, the development potential of those land use designations in creating the demand for the type/amount/location of facilities, and supply of the type/amount/distribution of facilities – like Open Space and Parks. If the type/amount/location of supply of facilities does not meet the demand for those facilities then growth management fails and Quality of Life is reduced.

Quality of Life Standards are used to assure supply and demand for facilities is properly balanced with respect to type/amount/location.

Ponto is clearly unbalanced. The Ponto Census Tract is at a 40% higher population density than the rest of Carlsbad, yet is Ponto is NOT meeting the Open Space Standard and has NO Park (see City Open Space maps and Park Master Plan). Ponto and all South Carlsbad have higher population demand for Parks and Open Space facilities yet Ponto (that is the only place to provide Coastal Park and Open Space needs for South Carlsbad) has lower or none of those two most critical GM Facilities needed to balance and mitigate the 40% higher population density at Ponto and also the higher residential density in South Carlsbad.

Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad also have additional State and regional responsibilities to provide Coastal Recreation and Open Space for populations of people and visitors from outside of Ponto and Carlsbad.

This failure to honestly and adequately balance the type/amount/location higher population density by providing higher levels of Parks and Open Space in those areas will lead to a slow and but eventual reduction of the Quality of Life for those areas.

Common sense and the Carlsbad's Growth Management law say if you change the land use (like what was done and is still being proposed at Ponto) you change the type/amount/location of potential development and population and the Growth Management impacts. Land use changes require and honest/accurate/balanced update to Citywide and Local Growth Management Plans to accurately reflect those changes and provide an updated plan to provide facilities that meet the Standards for those land use changes. This is the fundamental heart of any Growth Management.

The Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and City Commissions and Council are all now facing the same issues and responsibility that we faced in the 1980's at the beginning of Growth Management. We established New Quality of Life Standards – for Open Space and Parks – that required New investments in Parks and Open Space by both the City and developers.


Open Space and Parks have always been identified as most critical for Carlsbad's quality of life. The Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and City Commissions and Council, and Carlsbad Citizens are all at a critical crossroad.

- Do we, or don't we, enforce and set new standards that achieve the quality of life we desire?
- Do we or don't we, fix existing past errors and below desired standard situations?
- Do we or don't we, roll-up our sleeves a work together to a better Quality of Life?

As a long-time Carlsbad Citizen I am extremely disappointed by some who say we can't fulfill our Community Vision, we can't fix things, can't make things better, and can't add more Parks and Useable Open Space. This can't attitude is not out Community Vision. We can and we did before, and we can do it again and better.

Great cities for hundreds of years have Upgraded their Quality of Life Facility Standards, made and implemented/funded facilities to fix things up to those Standards. A City is just like a business or person - If you don't improve you decline. Examples of Upgrading and funding to New Parks and Open Space are many but include – Carlsbad's Buena Vista Reservoir Park, additions to Pine Park, Village H Park, and Aura Circle Open Space acquisition; and SDSU's major new Park at the redeveloped Qualcomm Stadium site.

Now like at the beginning of Carlsbad Growth Management the City can “despite previous city council actions” make improvements to its Growth Management and Quality of Life Standards to address past and future needs. Following illustrates existing R-23 (up to 23 dwellings per acre) development in Carlsbad – most of our future residential development will be required to be like this or more dense.



High-density housing can be great, but it requires MORE Parks and MORE useable Open Space within walking distance to balance the density and provide large places for families and kids to really play. In Carlsbad's high-density residential future with no backyards and stacked flat multi-family homes the need for both more Parks and Useable Open Space is much greater than in 1980's.

The time to fix the Parks and Useable Open Space problems at Ponto (LFMP-9) is now. Already Ponto is developed at a density that is 40% great than the rest of Carlsbad. New proposed and even higher-density developments (developer driven Amendments) propose to make Ponto even more dense, yet there are not Parks at Ponto and Ponto is missing 30-acres of Useable Open Space past developers should have provided.

A doable, time-tested, accountable, tax-payer saving, strongly citizen desired, accountable, and honest way to fix this was presented to you in 8/8/22 and 12/27/22 emails with attached "CTGMP Key Issues and Suggestions – 2022-12-6". Over 5,000 petitions expressing the need to fix the Park and Open Space problems at Ponto have been sent to the City and the City should have provided these to you in considering Park and Open Space issues.

Ponto Park and Open Space needs your help fixing NOW. If not Carlsbad Tomorrow will be less than it is today, and tragically will have failed our Community Vision.

Subject: Public input for Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - number of hotel rooms per mile of coastline for Carlsbad and comparable cities
Attachments: SAG-Tourism-Industry-Study-Report-FINAL-012815.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, February 19, 2023 3:32 PM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: RE: Public input for Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - number of hotel rooms per mile of coastline for Carlsbad and comparable cities

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Parks and Planning Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's February 2023 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, and Carlsbad's Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 planning and development applications, and
4. as public input to the CA Coastal Commission on Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

The CTGMC discussed the need to consider the impacts that Carlsbad visitors (i.e. hotel guests) have on City Parks and how that relates to the length of coastline. Staff did not provide the CTGMC that data so using data from the City's January 2015 Tourism Industry Study of 'comparable cities' the following data table below provides that information as of January 2015. Also included in the Parkserve Park Accessibility data from Trust for Public Land.

The 'comparable city' data show Carlsbad provides (in 2015) the 2nd highest amount of hotel rooms per mile of coastline, and the lowest park accessibility (for residents). The hotel room data could be updated to 2023, and GIS mapping could include park accessibility data for all land in a city so as to include non-residential hotel land uses.

Further research to address the CTGMC questions would be done to compare the amount of City Parkland each of the 'Carlsbad comparable cities' provide as their developer required acre of parkland (3 to 5 acres) relative to hotel rooms.

All this data has important relevance to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment, Park Master Plan Update, Parkland Dedication 'In-lieu-fee' Update, and Carlsbad's Park amenity offering for hotel guests. Attached is Carlsbad's 2015 Tourism Industry Study for reference. The Study also documents Accommodation costs and key amenities desired by guests.

I hope the data is helpful.

Lance Schulte

| 2015 City of Carlsbad data on 'comparable city' hotel rooms - number of rooms per mile of coastline - Park accessibility | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Jan-15 | | Jan-15 | rank | % of City residents within a 10-minute walk of a Park | rank | |
| | hotel rooms | miles of coastline | hotel rooms per mile of coastline | 1 = highest 8 = lowest | | 1 = highest 8 = lowest | notes |
| Carlsbad | 4,399 | 6 | 733 | 2 | 49.9% | 8 | |
| Del Mar | 994 | 2 | 297 | 5 | 98% | 1 | |
| Laguna Beach | 1,165 | 7 | 166 | 7 | 82% | 4 | |
| Newport Beach | 3,201 | 10 | 320 | 4 | 76% | 7 | |
| Huntington Beach | 2,070 | 8.5 | 244 | 6 | 85% | 3 | |
| Santa Monica | 3,567 | 3 | 1,189 | 1 | 82% | 4 | |
| Santa Barbara | 3,534 | 6 | 589 | 3 | 76% | 6 | |
| Monterrey County | 6,114 | 99 | 62 | 8 | 88% | 2 | no TPL Parkserve data at County level, but City of Monterrey data is pro |
| data sources: | | | | | | | |
| City of Carlsbad, Tourism Industry Study, January 2015 | | | | | | | |
| CCC Coastline data | | | | | | | |
| Trust for Public Land, Parkserve database | | | | | | | |

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2023 3:53 PM
To: 'committee@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; 'Homer, Sean@Parks'; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; 'Carrie Boyle'; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal'; 'melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com'
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Public input for Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - Carlsbad below national average and lowest So CA Coastal city in providing Parks within 10-minute walk

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Parks and Planning Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's February 2023 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, and Carlsbad's Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 planning and development applications, and
4. as public input to the CA Coastal Commission on Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

For years Carlsbad Citizens have told the City that there is a need for a Park at Ponto:

- to provide for documented Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) land use at Ponto,
- to correct for the conversion of a 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use to Residential use and the elimination of planned Coastal Open Space at Ponto,
- to correct the Carlsbad's Park Master Plan documented lack of Park Service at Ponto,
- to provide South Carlsbad (62% of Carlsbad's total population and the City's major Coastal visitor and transit occupancy tax generator) with their ONLY Coastal Park west of I-5. The City unfairly, and contrary to CA Coastal Act Policy disproportionately provides 10 parks totaling 37 acres west of I-5 in Coastal North Carlsbad for 38% of the population but 0 (zero) Coastal Parks and 0 (zero) Coastal park acres west of I-5 in Coastal South Carlsbad for 62% of the population,
- to provide for an existing 6.5 acre local Neighborhood (i.e. Special use area) Park need at Ponto, and
- to provide a City Park within a 10-minute walk for Ponto residents.

Failure to correct this documented City Park unfairness is very damaging to the citizens, City finances, South Carlsbad's and California's visitor industry. The Coastal Recreation data file sent to you earlier documents some of the key facts.

However, we conducted some additional Trust for Public Land 10-minute walk data collection that the City Council, CTGMC, Parks and Planning Commissions and CA Coastal Commission need to also consider. That data is below and in the attached file, and again with last year's Trust for Public Land Ponto Park support letter (again attached) that reflects on Carlsbad poor performance relative to the 24 So Cal Coastal Cities (165 miles of coastline) from Malibu to the Mexican border in providing Parks within a 10-minute walk. The data and links to the data source is:

Carlsbad is 10% below the national average for cities & the worst of 24 Coastal So California cities - 165 miles of coastline - in providing Parks within a 10-minute walk to residents

The Trust for Public Land documents a city's 10-minute walk to Park at <https://www.tpl.org/parkserve>. The Average USA City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 55% of residents [10% above Carlsbad]. **Carlsbad** provides Parks within 10-minute walk to **49.9% of residents [10% below National Average]**. New York City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 99% of residents.

The Trust of Public Land submitted a letter to the City of Carlsbad, CA Coastal Commission, and CA State Park supporting Ponto Park

Carlsbad is the worst of 24 Southern CA Coastal cities (from Malibu south to Imperial Beach along 165 miles of coastline) in providing Parks within 10-minute walk to residents:

1. Palos Verdes Estates provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
2. El Segundo provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
3. Hermosa Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
4. Redondo Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 98% of residents
5. Manhattan Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 95% of residents
6. Del Mar provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 93% of residents
7. Dana Point provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 89% of residents
8. Huntington Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 85% of residents
9. Long Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 84% of residents
10. Laguna Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
11. Santa Monica provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
12. San Diego provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 81% of residents
13. Coronado provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
14. Newport Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
15. Imperial Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 74% of residents
16. Encinitas provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 68% of residents
17. Los Angeles provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
18. Solana Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
19. Oceanside provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 58% of residents
20. Seal Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 57% of residents
21. Malibu provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 53% of residents
22. San Clemente provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 52% of residents
23. Rancho Palos Verdes provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 50% of residents
24. **Carlsbad** provides Parks within 10-minute walk to **49.9% of residents.**

Carlsbad is the lowest & most unfair to citizens of the 24 Southern California Coastal cities along 165 miles of coast from Malibu to Imperial Beach.

Source of data: Trust for Public land parkscores

Trust for Public Land's 10-minute walk to Park Maps/data:

Carlsbad = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0611194#reportTop>

Encinitas = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0622678>

Irvine = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0636770>

Please, Please, please, consider and discuss this data, and

1. Create a 10-minute walk to City Park Standard in the
 - a. Parks Master Plan,
 - b. Growth Management Plan Update, and
 - c. Local Coastal Program Update.
 2. Create a Park Policy that requires developers to dedicate Park Land (not pay Park-in-lieu-fees) in areas that do not a minimum of 3 acers of City Park for each in 1,000 population within a 10-minute walk of the developer's proposed development (see attached CTGMC Key Issues & Suggestions file for details and Open Space suggestions)
 3. Fix Coastal South Carlsbad's documented City Park inequity/unfairness with a significant and real Ponto Park
 4. Save tax-payers tens of millions in dollars by cost effectively purchasing vacant land at Ponto for a Park, v. trying to maybe make a few bits of narrow PCH roadway median as a pseudo-park
- Do you want Carlsbad to be the worst city in Coastal Southern California in providing accessible Parks within a 10-minute walk to residents?
 - Do you want Carlsbad to fail to upgrade its park standards while other cities updated their park Standards and make their cities more desirable?
 - Do you want to undermine the quality of life for Carlsbad citizens and their children by not providing a park within a 10-minute walk to their home?
 - Do you want to force Carlsbad families to have to drive to park?
 - Do you want to slowly undermine a key visitor serving industry in South Carlsbad by not providing a significant and true and meaningful Coastal Park in South Carlsbad?
 - Do you want tax-payers to pay tens of millions more to try to maybe try to make a few narrow portions of PCH median useable to people?

Please take responsibility and full ownership of your decisions on these important issues and questions. The individual decisions you make will likely be the last ones made. Once vacant land like at Ponto is developed it will be forever lost to address the critical, well documented Park and Coastal Park needs at Ponto as overwhelmingly communicated by Carlsbad Citizens and visitor businesses, and other citizens.

Please be wise and think about the future your decisions will bring.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

PS: The initial version of the "CTGMC key issues and Suggestions 2022-12-6" file (attached) sent to you 8/8/22. The attached updated file should replace that older file as there is new data on significant tax-payer cost savings from Pronto Park relative to PCH Relocation, and updated examples of how Coastal Open Space can be cost-effectively persevered and increased. Both Coastal Parks and Open Space are important Carlsbad and State of CA issues.

- Parks: Updated data shows that a 11.1 acre Ponto Park would now cost less \$20 million to buy and build. This is less than a City Pool Renovation. Carlsbad’s Old City Council planned to spend \$65 to \$80 million in Carlsbad tax-payer dollars to address the Citywide need for a significant Coastal Park in South Carlsbad with a 2.3 mile PCH Relocation. The City identified in 2001 other pay-payer funds were highly unlikely. \$65 to \$80 million would only ‘free-up’ 15.8 acres of narrow PCH Median (City documented “Surplus Land Area #4 & #5”). As People for Ponto Citizens have been saying for years that Ponto Park is the better Park solution to the documented Coastal South Carlsbad Park needs – a citywide need. The CTGMC should include that citywide Park need and the logical, better and tax-payer responsible Ponto Park solution to that citywide Park need in your CTGMC recommendations to City Council.
- Open Space: Updated data shows how documented GM Open Space shortfalls can be properly and responsibly address in a collaborative citizen-based “Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan” approached. Also the need to maintain the 15% GM (Useable) Open Space Standard will be critical in the future to maintain Open Space and prevent future conversion of Open Space to residential land use as part of Housing Plan updates.

For the CTGMC; Parks and Open Space are the 2 most critical/special of 6 Key Growth Management Program Update Issues and Suggestions the CTGMC should take to properly address these 6 key Growth Management Issues.

- Please read the Updated data and Suggestions.
- Please responsibly address the Growth Management issues of a citywide Park need for Coastal South Carlsbad as listed in the attached Suggestions. Include a South Carlsbad Coastal Park in your recommendations to the City Council. Acknowledge Ponto Park as the best and most tax-payer efficient solution to address that documented citywide park need.
- Please in your recommendations to City Council retain and enforce the Open Space Standard, and fix past errors made in falsely exempting certain developers in certain areas in the City from complying with the Growth Management Open Space Standard that other developers in other areas are required to provide.

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Happy holidays and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

**Tourism Industry Study
Prepared for the City of Carlsbad**



*In collaboration with Carlsbad Tourism Business Improvement District
January 2015*

StrategicAdvisoryGroup

Table of Contents

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Executive Summary | 4 |
| The State of the Carlsbad Tourism Economy | 7 |
| Stakeholder Immersion – Focus Groups | 11 |
| Stakeholder Survey | 12 |
| Regional Industry Stakeholder Survey | 16 |
| Benchmarking | 18 |
| Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis | 39 |
| Research Plan – Recommendation..... | 53 |
| Leisure Sales and Marketing – A New Direction | 54 |
| Public Relations | 60 |
| Group Sales and Marketing..... | 62 |
| Carlsbad Conference Center | 68 |
| Event Development..... | 70 |
| The Carlsbad Experience | 72 |
| Governance | 81 |
| Budget | 86 |
| Funding..... | 92 |
| Conclusion | 96 |
| Recommendation Matrix | 98 |
| Addendum..... | i |

Introduction

Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) in conjunction with the City of Carlsbad, Carlsbad Tourism Business Improvement District (CTBID) and tourism industry stakeholders has completed an eight-month collaborative process that has included extensive research, ongoing input and collaboration, and a review of current practices. We have created a series of recommendations that have been developed from competitive destination research, collaboration with Carlsbad stakeholders, consumer research, Industry best practices and SAG's overall experience. SAG has presented draft recommendations to key tourism stakeholders and the CTBID Board of Directors to gain additional insight prior to drafting this report.

Stakeholder Communication and Involvement

SAG would like to thank all of the participants in this study. The input and support that has been shown throughout this process has demonstrated a high degree of interest and willingness to be involved going forward. In particular, SAG would like to thank Christina Vincent (City of Carlsbad) and Sam Ross (Visit Carlsbad) for their involvement. A steering committee was formed to monitor the overall progress of the study and SAG would like to thank Hector Becerra, Nancy Nayudu, and Vikram Sood who participated with Ms. Vincent and Mr. Ross in over 25 weekly calls during the past eight months.

SAG also spoke to current contracted vendors of Visit Carlsbad to understand their approach and gain their insight. SAG would like to thank Mindgruve, DCI Group and Resonate for their time and insight.


June 9, 2014

Tourism Industry Study - Stakeholder Update

Carlsbad Tourism Industry Stakeholders,

This is the first edition in a series of monthly updates you will receive as the Tourism Industry Study evolves. As vested members of the industry we want to keep you informed on the process as we study the tourism and hospitality landscape and hear your thoughts throughout the next few months. Below you will find information regarding our current efforts through research, stakeholder sessions, and additional conversations with individuals like yourself.

Stakeholder Sessions

SAG visited and met with over 20 individuals from different industries to learn about the current situation. There was feedback from those conversations was incredibly insightful. Conversations will follow up phone calls and a survey of the industry and local trends. SAG developed an initial Survey of Stakeholder conversations.

Stakeholders also provided valuable insight into the current situation of direct competitive destinations as well as group market trends, benchmarking research. We will look at resources, marketing, and competitive destinations and their respective tourism offerings.

SAG has created a supplemental stakeholder survey for the stakeholder sessions. The survey is based on initial research and stakeholder input and focus groups. We encourage your feedback and participation. (Survey Link: Carlsbad Stakeholder Survey)

Research

SAG reviewed previously completed Visitor Profile Studies, Annual Reports, survey research, marketing and branding documents, and additional past tourism information to understand previous efforts in the Carlsbad market. SAG reviewed past research and current property amenities. We have a foundation of understanding into the demographics in this market and who has historically been visiting Carlsbad. SAG's foundation of understanding includes where they have historically come from and how they arrive in market.

We are building a Carlsbad-wide template with inventory, amenities, etc. for comparison with other destinations. SAG has begun the comparison for benchmarking research based on stakeholder input of competitive destinations. We are reviewing those competitive destinations and their organizations. SAG will be breaking out organizational assets, budgets, spending on marketing and promotional material, etc. to contribute to our comparison and eventual Strategic Action Plan to better compete locally, regionally and nationally.

PRIZM

SAG proposed to take a deeper look into the current visitor to the Carlsbad market and with support from the City and the industry we are moving forward. The PRIZM Study is an important part of this overall study to determine which segments should be our future target market. PRIZM will allow us to build a profile of past visitors. We will be reviewing the most recent data. Each segment will have its own respective guest profiles. This report will highlight potential market segments. PRIZM results will allow us to evaluate the characteristics of these new segments.

Our goal is 100% participation from accommodation properties. The more valuable the results and more information we receive, the more valuable the results and more information we receive. Please submit the PRIZM by July 15, 2014.

Next Steps

In the coming weeks SAG will be continuing to work on the following:

- SAG will continue to have conversations with stakeholders
 - Additional stakeholder conversations
 - Retail

Timeline

As SAG continues to work through this study we would like to have further conversations with you as stakeholders in the industry. You will receive updates similar to this one each month with progress and opportunities to get involved further. We value your opinions, feelings and your experiences here. Please do not hesitate to send us an email or give us a call, our contact information is below.

| Description | Month | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | April | May | June | July | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar |
| Immersion | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| External Analysis | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Destination Comparison | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Carlsbad Tourism Analysis | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strategic Action Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Report on Analysis | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft Final Report | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presentation & Recommendations | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| We're Not Done Yet | | | | | | | | | | | | |

We Are Here!

The above timeline shows our current progress and path through this Tourism Industry Study.

Thank You

We appreciate your time and interest in the Tourism Industry Study and thank you for participating thus far. We are excited to continue working with you all and moving a beautiful destination like Carlsbad into the future. Again, we encourage fluid dialogue and would love to hear from you as we move forward. Please feel free to contact us with additional information.

Sample Monthly Stakeholder Update
Eight monthly updates were sent to a broad spectrum of stakeholders.

SAG produced monthly progress updates that were circulated to over 75 stakeholders through email correspondence. The purpose of this communication was to provide information on the progress of the study and gain additional feedback throughout. The email updates were opened and read by nearly 50% of the targeted audience on a consistent basis. There were follow up comments and input from stakeholders throughout the study process, which provided important insight and feedback.

The overall communication plan was successfully completed and proved to be very beneficial in maintaining contact and gaining insight throughout the process.

Ongoing Communication must continue

The ongoing dialogue and reporting to the tourism industry and broader business community must continue as part of the successful implementation of the recommendations. SAG encountered many stakeholders who were not well informed about current activities and results. SAG recommends that electronic updates with newly recommended metrics for results continue to be distributed monthly. The communication should also include brief updates on the implementation of the approved recommendations. The monthly communication should be formatted to be reviewed in three to five minutes by the recipient.

In total, the study process included over 175 “points of contact” between focus groups, surveys, one-on-one interviews, group meetings, and draft presentations. This process has ensured that all interested parties have had the opportunity to give input and share perspectives. This input has been valuable and has helped craft the overall recommendations.

Opportunity for Transformation

The recommendations in this report create a foundation for the transformation of the tourism sales and marketing efforts as well as an approach to future tourism product development. The process has uncovered opportunities to focus future efforts and monitor results. This approach will create an ongoing platform to continue to refine, monitor and evolve tourism efforts in the future. Recommendations are throughout the document and consolidated in the conclusion of this report.

Executive Summary

SAG has completed an extensive analysis that has included internal and external research and input from the City of Carlsbad, CTBID, Visit Carlsbad, and numerous tourism stakeholders. This process has uncovered many recommendations that are detailed in the full report and summarized in the Executive Summary.

SAG would like to thank everyone who has been involved in the collaborative process throughout the past eight months. The level of interest and support for the future of tourism in Carlsbad is outstanding. This creates a solid foundation for the effective implementation of the approved recommendations.

Overall, SAG recommends a significant transformation in the direction of tourism for Carlsbad. There is an opportunity to focus future tourism efforts in a manner that will impact results and utilize resources in areas where there is a clear need to drive demand. In conjunction with this, SAG has recommended items to be considered to enhance the Carlsbad tourism experience in the future.

A successful tourism sales and marketing effort must have accountability and measurement built in as a fundamental practice. SAG has recommended a plan to ensure these characteristics begin immediately upon adoption of the recommendations. Initial goals have been presented in collaboration with industry stakeholders, CTBID and Visit Carlsbad. An effective measurement plan involves the tourism industry as well as Visit Carlsbad and will require ongoing collaboration.

The following list is an overview of the recommendations contained in this report. The subsequent sections in the report will describe these recommendations in more detail as well as describe implementation strategies.

Re-Focus a Majority of the Tourism Resources on Impacting the Shoulder Season

Carlsbad enjoys strong tourist demand over the summer months. June, July, and August consistently produce hotel occupancies over 80% and the average daily hotel rate continues to grow over this period. SAG recommends shifting sales and marketing resources to measurable group and leisure efforts focused on increasing demand from September through March.

Reallocate Marketing Resources – Group vs. Leisure Transient

The current funding allocation of sales and marketing resources from Visit Carlsbad focuses 90% of the overall resources on increasing awareness in the individual travel leisure market. The recommended approach will include the development of an effective group sales and marketing effort, as well as developing a more targeted approach with individual leisure travel.

Develop a Highly Targeted Approach for Leisure Sales and Marketing

The combination of available research coupled with the outcome of the Nielsen lifestyle research creates an opportunity to focus on market segments that have shown interest in Carlsbad during the shoulder periods (September through March). SAG recommends utilizing a direct marketing approach to increase awareness and drive conversion of overnight stays from these markets.

Institute a New Approach to Measurement and Reporting

It is recommended that there is a new approach to tracking and reporting tourism results in the future. This includes a broader stakeholder report that will track quantitative results on a monthly basis and how the overall performance compares to annually approved goals.

Refocus Target Markets for Leisure travel

SAG has evaluated current online data, past visitor profile studies, as well as completed an analysis of over 50,000 hotel guest records to determine the market segments that present the highest potential for Carlsbad's future leisure sales and marketing efforts. The research has indicated that there is a significant difference in who has shown interest in Carlsbad during the shoulder periods (September through March) and the highly occupied summer months. This underscores the need to focus on those segments where Carlsbad can build increased visitor activity during the times of year that warrant proactive efforts.

In summary, the segment (called "Uppercrust" by Nielsen) that surfaced in the analysis can be characterized as higher income (over \$100,000), over 55 years old, and without kids in the house. The top three Shoulder Season markets are outlined in this report. This research and data creates an opportunity to target this segment with specific offers as recommended earlier.

Create and Implement a new Group Sales and Marketing Effort

With 287,000 square feet of meeting space in Carlsbad and after receiving consistent stakeholder feedback, SAG has conducted an analysis of a national meetings database and determined that there is an opportunity to develop a group sales and marketing plan to increase awareness and develop new business for Carlsbad.

Create a Unified Approach to Governance

The current governance model that encompasses two governing boards of directors for the CTBID and Visit Carlsbad can be more efficient and effective. The recommendation is to create a singular governing board that will provide the oversight and guidance for both CTBID and Visit Carlsbad. In conjunction with this, the formation of active committees to oversee the group sales and leisure sales and marketing efforts will help support the implementation of the recommendations in these areas.

Funding

The benchmarking data indicated Carlsbad ranked very low in amount of tourism dollars expended based on the overall size of the tourism industry in comparison with cities of similar size and quality. The opportunity exists to bring additional industry partners into the funding model over time. The restaurant industry is a natural partner due to the direct benefit it receives from successful tourism marketing.

SAG recommends a performance-based approach to expending future transient occupancy tax (TOT) dollars for use on tourism marketing efforts. The other recommended opportunity is to increase the current fees that are paid for the CTBID in conjunction with industry support of the future direction.

The overall approach of the report recommendations creates an effective platform for determining the return on investment for future expenditures.

The Carlsbad Experience

The quantitative and qualitative research reinforced the challenge of increasing awareness and interest in the balance of tourism opportunities in Carlsbad beyond LEGOLAND and the beach. The current and proposed retail development will greatly improve the Carlsbad shopping experience. SAG has evaluated other potential investments to enhance the Carlsbad experience. Investments in the Carlsbad Aqua Hedionda Lagoon, transportation, a new approach to beach camping, and a conference/event center are

highlighted in this report. An increased collaboration with the Carlsbad Village is recommended. This will highlight current events as well as maximize the opportunities to leverage marketing efforts and support future funding and capital plans.

Conclusion

The collaborative and research-based approach that we have employed in this process has uncovered many exciting opportunities for the future of tourism in Carlsbad. The recommendations that are contained in this report can be achieved within the current resources that are available. This does not include the resources needed to impact the tourism assets outlined in the report. The need for additional funding will increase awareness of the destination and the conversion of new business for Carlsbad.

The key stakeholders including the City of Carlsbad, CTBID, Visit Carlsbad and the tourism industry have demonstrated interest in transforming the future approach to tourism. The recommendations contained in this report create the roadmap to increasing the overall effectiveness of future efforts.

SAG recommends the approval and adoption of the recommendations contained in this report.

The State of the Carlsbad Tourism Economy

SAG has reviewed the current tourism economy to understand current trends and determine opportunities for future growth. Tourism is a major economic driver for the City of Carlsbad and benefits multiple industries and attractions within the City. In 2013, Carlsbad saw nearly 3 million tourists, according to an annual survey of visitors to San Diego County completed by CIC Research Inc. This is a 10% increase over 2011 generating millions of dollars in spending and revenue for the City.


The following is an overview of key indicators of the Carlsbad Tourism Economy:

Current Target Market:

Families with children under 12 years old with a median household income of \$79,800. This determination was made based on the results of past visitor profile studies. These were findings based on a year round aggregate of Carlsbad visitors. SAG has conducted research to distinguish future target markets for different times of year. This will be reviewed later in this report.

Occupancy


Carlsbad is seeing an increase in annual occupancy. The chart below shows the trends of occupancy growth over the past five years. The year-to-date occupancy for Carlsbad is 68%. While the trends are positive, this demonstrates that there is opportunity to improve year-round occupancy. The occupancy during summer months is 87% and only 62% in the shoulder season according to 2014 occupancy reports tracked by Visit Carlsbad. This indicates an opportunity for growth. The focus of recommendations contained in this report is on increasing visitation during non-summer periods.



Source: Visit Carlsbad

*Data for 2014 only through September


The chart below shows last fiscal year(FY) 2014 in green and the beginning of FY 2015 in blue. Carlsbad’s monthly occupancy trends are rising each year respectively each month.



*Carlsbad FY2015 (blue) – data only through September 2014


Seasonality

Carlsbad experiences a high Summer Season and a lower Shoulder Season for hotel and visitor demand. High season, summer, begins after Easter, typically in May and continues through August. During these months, Carlsbad’s hotels experience high demand and high occupancy. Conversely, the Shoulder Season months of September through March experience much lower demand and therefore lower occupancy. The need period for hotels and for the City is the Shoulder Season of September through March. The chart below illustrates the Shoulder Season that must be a focus of future tourism efforts.




Transient Occupancy Tax Collection

The Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue has steadily increased since Fiscal Year 2009-2010. Year over Year the average increase is about 15% in TOT revenue. Last Fiscal Year (2013-2014) the City of Carlsbad collected \$17,453,760 in TOT and is on pace to beat that number in the current fiscal year (2014-2015). All of the TOT revenue collected by the City goes into the City’s General Fund and does not resupply the tourism effort. The TOT revenue accounts for 7% of the City of Carlsbad’s annual revenue, which is projected to increase in FY 2014-2015. The opening of the LEGOLAND hotel in spring 2013 provided a new demand generator, which helped increase occupancy and overall tax collection. The growth of the TOT presents an opportunity for future tourism funding. This is reviewed later in the report.



Recent Growth

The chart below highlights the growth of TOT revenue over the past six years, in spite of coming out of the Great Recession (Dec. 2007 – June 2009). It is important to note that during this time revenues quickly rebounded and grew 34%. This trend opens the possibility of using TOT as a vehicle to increase tourism marketing resources in the future.



Tourism Spending

Carlsbad’s local economy benefits from tourism direct spending in the City at restaurants, shops, hotels, amenities, and attractions year round. In the last Visitor Profile Study, conducted by the San Diego Tourism Authority in 2013, it was determined the average spend per person, per day was \$328 and the average visitor group size was 3.1 people. Based on the Visit Carlsbad website statistics, the most frequent visitors to the Carlsbad website had a household income of \$150,000+ with children; significantly different from \$77,000 according to the Visitor Profile Study in 2013. In addition, most visitors are staying overnight for an average of two nights.

With the recent uptick in the economy and strengthened recovery from the recession, SAG would estimate that the tourism economy in Carlsbad is poised to grow stronger in time with a focused marketing effort.

Stakeholder Immersion – Focus Groups

Stakeholder Involvement

SAG engaged over 100 tourism, business and regional stakeholders invested in Carlsbad during this process. SAG held three in-person focus groups, conducted dozens of one-on-one phone interviews, distributed monthly stakeholder updates via email to 75 stakeholders, and conducted two targeted surveys for feedback and perception of Carlsbad as a tourism destination.

The Good News

Stakeholders in Carlsbad are engaged and interested in the future of the City and the tourism market. The feedback we received repeated several themes around inclusion in future planning, target markets, and interest in development and funding. The responses demonstrated that a stakeholder-supported approach will garner stronger participation and involvement. This is a critical ingredient in the successful implementation of the final recommendations.

The Important News

Stakeholders firmly believe the marketing efforts need to be reevaluated and refocused. SAG spent time on this topic with stakeholders and with Mindgruve as well as DCI, both marketing and public relations partners of Visit Carlsbad, to understand the current efforts, targets, and goals. More detail is provided in the Leisure Sales & Marketing section of this report as well as the Public Relations section. Stakeholders also believe that the tourism efforts are underfunded and would support new funding initiatives if they had the opportunity to review and contribute to a new plan.

Stakeholder comments around interest in the tourism plan and future funding:

“The importance of tourism marketing should be embraced by entities and businesses that benefit from tourism dollars. It is a fact that Carlsbad does have competitors and those competitors that have a city who embraces destination marketing will be the big winners.”

“We would want to see other organizations joining in and see a better return on investment.”

“It would depend on the funding models, but we support a greater level of funding.”

“I would have to see the plan first and it would need to be presented to the appropriate channels.”


“I believe there is an opportunity to create a platform for increased funding.”

These comments show that the stakeholders are engaged and interested in growing tourism in Carlsbad, and most importantly, being a part of the planning process. The comments above also point out a reluctance to increase their financial participation until a new direction is implemented. Carlsbad has a unique opportunity with a majority of stakeholders willing to come to the table to plan together for the future of the destination.

Stakeholder Survey


SAG conducted a quantitative survey and reached out to over 75 Carlsbad tourism stakeholders. Stakeholders are made up of people that have knowledge of the tourism industry through hotel properties, restaurants, amenities, or civic engagement. There was a 30% response rate, which provided a representative sample. The following is a recap of the responses to the survey.

Stakeholders believe Carlsbad is a true destination worthy of its own brand and marketing efforts.



Stakeholders also felt that the current Visitor Profile Study supported information should not necessarily remain as Carlsbad’s primary target market. The stakeholders indicated an interest in evaluating which markets would impact the shoulder periods.

Currently, Carlsbad is targeting families with children under 12 years old and stakeholders believe there is more out there for this destination as 55% of respondents want to pursue “new and different opportunities” for Carlsbad. The chart below depicts the strong opinion that there is a need to diversify future marketing efforts.



Regional Targets

SAG also asked stakeholders about regional targets and what areas they thought should be pursued to increase tourism results. According to the survey, stakeholders felt that the following locations were the top priorities for regional marketing:

- Southern California (drive in)
- Northern California
- Arizona and Mountain States
- Mexico

There was consistent feedback and survey responses that supported the “drive in” Southern California market was the highest priority. According to the latest Visitor Profile Study conducted by the SDTA, nearly 70% of the current visitors are driving to Carlsbad.

In addition to these four core areas, stakeholders also felt that there were new opportunities in a geographically larger space including Texas, Colorado, Washington, Nevada, and Utah.



The current geographical markets and stakeholder suggested markets are depicted above.

Gold – Current Markets

Blue – Stakeholder Suggestions


Target Market Segment

Stakeholders expressed strong interest in finding new target markets, as 55% of respondents said “let’s find new and different opportunities in addition to this market.” Stakeholders were asked to suggest target market segments they believed were opportunities for Carlsbad above and beyond the current target of families with children under 12. Stakeholders suggested multiple new target market segments. Repeated suggestions included the theme of childless households including older and younger demographics. Specific groups included: retirees, young couples, business travelers, groups and conventions.




Attractions

Carlsbad has a multitude of attractions and entertainment options for visitors coming to the area. Stakeholders were asked to rank the attractions that came out of the focus groups. The results indicated that LEGOLAND and the Beach are Carlsbad’s top attractions according to hospitality and tourism stakeholders. Golf rounded out the top three, followed by recreational activities, shopping, watersports and relaxation and wellness. This response indicated an opportunity to develop new experiences and or potentially enhance current Carlsbad visitor options.



Marketing


Carlsbad is currently utilizing digital media, social media and email marketing as the primary vehicles to promote the destination. Carlsbad’s tourism and hospitality stakeholders reiterated that choice and expressed a high level of support for digital media marketing and well as social media and public relations through editorial content. This effort is reinforced by the 2013 SDTA Visitor Profile Study, which states that 85% of those surveyed utilized the internet as their information source for travel to Carlsbad.



Over 80% of the stakeholders rated Digital Media as an important vehicle in future tourism marketing efforts.

Funding

Stakeholders felt strongly that the level of funding for marketing Carlsbad as a destination is not enough to compete in the Southern California tourism marketplace. Currently Visit Carlsbad has a budget of \$755,500 for Fiscal Year 2015. Over 85% of the tourism industry in Carlsbad want to see more funding for marketing and of those, over 50% would support a new model for marketing financially if they could be involved in the process. This is a further indication of the strong level of stakeholders' desired engagement in planning for Visit Carlsbad's future. The additional message was the interest in a new plan as part of the support for more funding.



Almost 85% of the stakeholder respondents felt there was a need for more funding.

Stakeholder Feedback Conclusions

Based on the tourism industry stakeholders' feedback in focus groups, phone calls and the survey, SAG has drawn the following conclusions:

1. Carlsbad's tourism stakeholders are engaged and have strong interest in planning for the destination's future.
2. Stakeholders have appreciated the regular communication and updates SAG has provided and would like to see ongoing effective communication continue.
3. Stakeholders believe Carlsbad is a true destination with valuable assets to promote.
4. Smart development and growth were important topics for stakeholders who felt there could potentially be too much hotel inventory in the market already.
5. Stakeholders felt the purpose of Visit Carlsbad should extend past broad awareness and move in the direction of measurable increased conversion.
6. Stakeholders want to see increased reporting from Visit Carlsbad on tracking marketing efforts through conversion.
7. Some stakeholders were concerned with the overall ability of all constituents to implement and execute a new plan.

Stakeholder participation in this study has demonstrated an interest in engagement in the future. There is an understanding that their participation in the implementation of a new direction is critical for its success.


Regional Industry Stakeholder Survey

SAG created a regional perception survey to better understand the broader business community's thoughts and perceptions of Carlsbad as a tourism destination within the greater Southern California area. The regional stakeholders gave valuable feedback on how the perception of Carlsbad currently is positioned and how that could be enhanced.

Regional stakeholders felt informed only 50% of the time about tourism events and activities going on within the destination. Most of these stakeholders are getting their information from email subscription updates and word of mouth as well as social media and informational City signage. This group also felt there could be more done to keep them informed through increased direct mail and increased use of social media.


Regional stakeholders also have a strong influence on groups who visit Carlsbad and over 80% of respondents had referred business to stay in Carlsbad. Regional stakeholders had positive things to say about Carlsbad and their referrals received strong positive feedback about their stays.

Regional stakeholders ranked Carlsbad's assets and attractions differently than the industry stakeholders, most notably golf fell from 3rd to 8th. This tells us that while Carlsbad has golf opportunities, there is enough competition in the market that it is not a top of mind attraction to recommend the destination as one of the top three primary strengths.



Referral Platforms

Regional stakeholders also utilized multiple sources when looking into and/or booking hotel reservations for their groups. Most used individual property websites and third party search engines i.e. Kayak, Priceline, Expedia, etc. Only 14% used Visit Carlsbad’s website to get information. This was an indication of the variety of options available when making a hotel reservation and the potential to raise awareness of the Visit Carlsbad booking engine.



Regional stakeholders provided insight into how the destination could be enhanced through additional attractions and amenities. Themes from regional stakeholder feedback included dining and entertainment, recreation, wine and beer tours and sports tournaments. Additional comments included:

- “more music concerts”
- “upgrade the theatres for top entertainment”
- “easier access for food along the beach”
- “meeting space in one location for more than 1,500 people”

Regional Stakeholder Feedback Conclusions:

The regional group surveyed perceived Carlsbad as a Southern California beach destination and is interested in continuing to refer business to the area. They are looking for ways to engage with their clients and improve Carlsbad’s visibility among its competition and provide an enhanced experience for their visitors. Regional stakeholders were also very interested in future development decisions and believe there is a way to work together for the future of Carlsbad as a destination.

Benchmarking

SAG reviewed with stakeholders, City staff, CTBID, Visit Carlsbad staff, and others the competitive and comparable destinations to profile and study during this process. The goal was to use a sampling of destinations, which are competitors of Carlsbad and have similarities in their visitor experience.

SAG studied the following destinations for the Tourism Industry Study:

1. Newport Beach
2. Huntington Beach
3. Laguna Beach
4. Santa Monica
5. Santa Barbara
6. Monterey County
7. Del Mar
8. Coronado
9. Oceanside

SAG researched these destinations and gathered data on the DMO in the following criteria:

- Destination Property Mix
- Number of hotel rooms by type
- Annual average hotel occupancy rate and TOT Revenue
- Tourism marketing spending
- Return on Investment from tourism marketing spending
- Target markets and market segmentation
- Destination assets
- Funding
- Budgets

SAG's approach to gathering data included interviewing the respective DMO's, reviewing annual reports, Smith Travel Research reports and researching available data and reports.

On the following pages SAG has created the destination profiles of each competitive destination.

Destination Profile: Newport Beach



Visit Newport Beach

Visit Newport Beach is a DMO under contract by the City of Newport Beach. It is a membership-based organization operating within a Business Improvement District with 19 staff members and 23 board of directors representing hotels, restaurants, resorts, marketing & travel firms, entertainment, and fashion.

Annual DMO Revenue:

FY 15: \$4,350,841*

*Projected

Annual Budget:

FY 15: \$3,332,841

Budget : Rooms Ratio

About \$1,388.10

TOT Annual Collection:

\$16,400,000 - 2013

Budget Breakdown

Not provided

Leisure Research

- 79.2% of survey respondents who visited in last 2 years visited for leisure. Of those 52.3% came for vacation and 26.9% came to visit friends and family. 10.8% came for personal reasons and 7.7% came for business.
- The average survey respondent stayed 3.7 days and 3.2 nights in Newport Beach. Markets from a greater distance stay up to a week.
- During their ideal trip to Newport Beach, respondents would most likely stay in commercial lodging, such as a hotel (61.4%) or resort hotel (37.7%). 39.2 percent would stay overnight in a motel (23.9%) or inn (15.3%).

Funding Structure

Visit Newport Beach is funded primarily by the city through Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT), as well as through a Tourism Business Improvement District (TBID) and private sector membership dues from the hospitality industry or other related businesses.

Funding Sources

- TOT – 10% (City collection rate)
- TBID – 2% assessment
- Membership dues

Visitor Services

Includes a Visitor Center with visitor guides, maps, directions, and information on activities and attractions in Newport Beach.

Online Service

Includes digital visitor guide, online maps, and a mobile app. There is also a booking engine for hotels, attractions, flights, and car services. Listings by multiple areas of interest, holidays, and regions. Custom group packages are available upon inquiry.

Target Audiences

The demographic profile of Newport's domestic traveler:

- They primarily reside in state (75%)
- Affluent (49% have an annual household income of over 75K)
- Mature (56% are over 45 years old)
- Married (68%)
- White or Asian
- Over one in four of these travelers have children living at home (26%).

Visit Newport Beach Group Sales Efforts

Budget Overview

Forecasted Revenue:

\$3,057,283

Operating Expenses:

\$1,392,585

Advertising:

\$279,312

Conference/Group Sales:

\$1,366,800

Research:

\$18,586

Strategy

- Recruit experienced sales manager with contacts in the region
- Work with TBID hotels to create equal opportunities to host events and showcase hotels
- Rolling out of new conference service “tier” structure, which differentiates the service level for each incoming group, which will actively engage each client at least 13 months before their group, arrives to Newport Beach.
- Develop advertising and promotional campaigns that are on brand and are integrated with the other marketing disciplines in order to encourage submission of RFPs and convert RFPs into confirmed bookings.

Destination Profile: Huntington Beach



Visit Huntington Beach

Visit Huntington Beach (Huntington Beach Marketing and Visitors Bureau) is a private, non-profit, non-membership, mutual benefit corporation. Visit Huntington Beach is composed of 19 Board of Directors representing, hotels, event planning, music, transportation and the Chamber of Commerce, in addition to 9 regular staff members. Huntington Beach's tagline "Surf City USA" has a strong focus on surfing, sports and an active lifestyle.

Budget Overview

Annual DMO Revenue:

FY13: \$2,283,000

Annual Budget:

FY13: \$2,535,000

Budget : Rooms Ratio

About \$1,304

Annual TOT Collection

\$7,700,000 - 2013

Budget Breakdown

| Revenues | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Tourism Occupancy Tax | \$763,000 |
| Hotel/Motel Business Improvement District | \$1,519,000 |
| Website/Interest/Other | \$1,000 |
| TOTAL REVENUE | \$2,283,000 |

| Expenses | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Media Advertising | \$397,000 |
| Printed Marketing Collateral | \$131,000 |
| Collateral Distribution | \$36,000 |
| Public Relations | \$246,000 |
| Travel Trade | \$64,000 |
| Website | \$141,000 |
| Event Hosting | \$4,000 |
| Local Partner/Community/Other | \$55,000 |
| Familiarization Tours/Site Visits | \$28,000 |
| Film & Sports Commissions | \$23,000 |
| Trade Shows & Travel | \$140,000 |
| Salaries & Benefits | \$994,000 |
| Administration | \$276,000 |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | \$2,535,000 |

Funding Structure

The City of Huntington Beach funds the Marketing and visitors Bureau with 2% of Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT).

Funding Sources

- TOT – 10% (City collection rate)
- BID – 1% assessment

Visitor Services

New welcome center at International Surfing Museum. The Visitor Information Kiosk is staffed by paid employees of Visit Huntington Beach and offers the following amenities:

- Huntington Beach Visitor Guides and Maps
- Huntington Beach Dining Guides
- Downtown Huntington Beach Historical Walking Tour
- City Beach Map
- Downtown Huntington Beach maps in French, German, Japanese and Spanish
- Huntington Beach monthly event calendars and upcoming event flyers
- Coupons for local businesses and attractions
- Transportation information
- Restaurant and shopping recommendations
- Southern California attraction information

Online Services Include

- Surf Report, social media, blog, virtual tour, listings, visitors guide, newsletter, maps, booking engine for hotels, events, and packages, weather, and additional languages.

Target Audiences

- Regional Targets: California affluent families with teenagers
- International marketing to UK, Ireland, Germany, Switzerland, Canada, Austria, Australia, and New Zealand.
- Staff attends domestic trade shows and events for support.

Destination Profile: Laguna Beach



Visit Laguna Beach

Visit Laguna Beach (VLB) is a private, non-profit, member/partner industry association. VLB has a partnership organization structure. Basic partnerships are complimentary for visitor-serving Laguna Beach businesses; however, there are also paid tiered partnership levels based on marketing goals and objectives.

Staffing includes 5 members and 9 Board of Directors representing private hotels, resorts, and hospitality services.

Budget Overview

Annual DMO Revenue:

FY13: \$5,761,200

Annual Budget:

FY13: \$1,520,000

Budget: Rooms Ratio


About \$1,169

Annual TOT Collection:


\$8,537,100 - 2013

Budget Breakdown

2013 Revenue Distribution



2013 Expense Distribution



Funding Structure

VLB receives its funding from the Business Improvement District (BID). The BID charges a 2% hotel tax and VLB receives half of that, or 1%. This makes up 80% of VLB revenue. *VLB does not receive TOT collected by the City.*

Funding Sources

- BID – 2% assessment

Visitor Services

Includes Visitors center, mobile app, calendar of events, highlighted attractions, trip planner, blog and online booking engine provided by Travelocity for hotels, flights, and rentals.

California Welcome centers, John Wayne Airport, Disneyland Hotel, and car rental companies distribute VLB official visitors guides, dining guides, maps, and menu books.


TOT Revenue Growth

In FY 2011-12, transient occupancy tax revenue increased 11% compared to the year before and last year (FY 2012-13) it is expected to grow another 5.6%.

Target Audiences

Almost all efforts are focus on Leisure Services. New partnership with Orange County Visitors Association to "reach the highly-affluent China market." Orange County offices in Beijing and Shanghai are now stocked with Laguna Beach information.

2013 Advertising/Promotional Expenditures



Destination Profile: Santa Monica



Santa Monica Convention & Visitors Bureau

The SMCVB is a private, non-profit, non-member corporation. There are 14 staff members and a various number of employees at 4 visitor centers. The Board of Directors is made of 11 professionals who represent hotels, restaurants, marketing & brokerage firms, and the City of Santa Monica.

Budget Overview

Annual DMO Revenue:

Estimated \$5,600,000*

**SMCVB did not provide the DMO revenue. Figure above is estimated based on 2012/2013 City budget data and approval of the SMTMD in 2012.*

Annual Budget:

FY13: \$2,600,000

Budget: Rooms Ratio

About \$696.12

Annual TOT Revenue:

TOT: \$42,300,000

Budget Breakdown

Not provided

Leisure Research

- 7,298,857 visitors in 2013.
- Average length of stay: 1.56 days.
- Total annual visitor spending: \$1.63 Billion
 - 574 Million on shopping/gifts
 - 345 Million on lodging
 - 340 Million on meals
- Hotel tax revenue to city: \$42.3 Million
- Santa Monica jobs supported by tourism: 12,908

Funding Structure

The SMCVB is funded by TOT collected by the City and the Tourism Marketing District fund the SMCVB. Funding Sources

- TOT – 14% (City collection rate)
- BID – \$2 for rooms rented at \$100 - \$200
– \$3 for rooms rented at \$200 - \$300
– \$4 for rooms rented at \$300 - \$400

Visitor Services

Includes a Visitor Center with visitor guides, maps, directions, and information on activities and attractions in Santa Monica.

Online Services

Includes digital visitor guide, online maps, and e-newsletters. There is also a booking engine for hotels, attractions, flights, and car services.

Visitor Profile 2013

- 53% International
- 32% U.S. Resident (Non-California)
- 14% California Resident
- 64% Visit for Leisure
- Median Household Income: \$86,500
- Average daily visitor spending per person: \$143

Marketing Efforts

- \$2.6 million marketing budget
 - Focus on international travelers, who accounted for 63 percent of the \$1.53 billion spent by visitors to Santa Monica in 2012.
- Targets a specific type of traveler who is comfortable getting around by foot, bike or public transit and who is, in general, drawn to Santa Monica's healthy lifestyle.
- Primarily digital marketing efforts domestically.
- Hired full time reps in Australia, Brazil and England.

Santa Monica Group Sales Efforts

Services Available:

- Personalized Meeting Planners
- Hotel Suggestions
- Group Dining Leads
- Team-building
- Event Planning
- Group volleyball tournaments, bike tours, etc.
- Request for publications

Strategy

- The SMCVB strongly focuses on Leisure Sales
- Most Group Sales are handled via inquiry over the phone or an online RFP

| Meeting Planner Fact Sheet | |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Sales Tax | 9.25% |
| Room Tax | 14% |
| No. of Hotels | 36 |
| No. of Hotels with Meeting Space | 14 |
| No. of Hotel Rooms | 3,735 |
| No. of Restaurants | 428 |
| Average Room Rate | \$240 |
| Largest Event Space | Barker Hangar (36,000 sq ft) |
| Average Daytime Temp in Summer | 75-85 ° |
| Average Daytime Temp in Winter | 65-75 ° |
| Distance from Downtown Los Angeles | 13 miles (21 km) |
| Travel Time to Downtown Los Angeles | 30 minutes |
| Distance from LAX | 8 miles (13 km) |
| Travel Time to LAX | 30 minutes |
| Average Taxi Fare from LAX to Santa Monica | \$35 North of I-10 \$30 South of I-10 |
| Average Bus Fare from LAX to Santa Monica | \$1 |
| Average Shuttle Fare from LAX to Santa Monica | \$20-\$30 |
| Nearest Golf Course | Penmar Golf Course (2 miles/3.2 km) |

Destination Profile: Santa Barbara



Visit Santa Barbara (VSB)

VSB is governed by the Santa Barbara City Council, which is composed of a Mayor and six Council Members. VSB is membership-based. Members receive benefits such as website and publication promotion, referrals, access to VSB member networking events, newsletters, and access to national & local market research.

Budget Overview

Annual DMO Revenue:

Figures not provided

Annual Budget:

Adopted FY14: \$4,000,000

Budget: Rooms:

\$153.38

Annual TOT Revenue:

\$16,821,995 – 2013

Budget Breakdown

Not provided

Funding Structure

Visit Santa Barbara is funded through an annual contract with the City and through a BID.

Funding Sources

- TOT – 12% (City collection rate)
- BID – \$0.50 rooms rented at less than \$100
– \$1 for rooms rented at \$100 - \$150
– \$1.50 for rooms rented at \$150 - \$200
– \$2 for rooms rented at \$200 or more

Visitor Services

Includes a Visitor Center with visitor guides, maps, directions, various brochures, and travel listings.

Online Services

Includes digital visitor guide, e-newsletters, a calendar of events, special offers, easy to success social media, referrals, and membership login. Booking engine for hotels, resorts, and campgrounds.

Visitor Profile

About 2,000 collected surveys showed the below information:

- Female (58%)
- Caucasian (72%)
- Married (53%)
- Mid-life (avg. age 48 years).
- The average household income is \$119,428.
- The Los Angeles - Riverside - Orange County metropolitan statistical area (MSA) is by far the largest feeder market for tourism to the Santa Barbara South Coast (50% of all respondents),
- Followed by the San Francisco - Oakland - San Jose MSA (8%).
- 4 percent of visitors reside in the San Diego MSA.

Destination Profile: Monterey County



Monterey County Convention & Visitors Bureau

The Monterey County CVB is governed by a Board of Directors (30), an Executive Committee (5) and other committees to aid in sales and marketing initiatives for the destination. Membership includes businesses in the lodging, hospitality, entertainment and recreation industries.

Budget Overview

Annual Revenue:

FY12-13: \$6,002,342

Annual Budget:

FY23-13: \$5,152,450

Budget: Rooms Ratio:

About \$429

Annual TOT Revenue:

\$40,000,000 – 2013

Budget Breakdown

| Monterey County CVB 2013-2014 Budget REVENUE | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Jurisdiction Revenue | |
| Monterey County | 998,728 |
| City of Monterey | 992,179 |
| City of Carmel-by-the-Sea | 125,987 |
| City of Pacific Grove | 83,228 |
| City of Seaside | 61,188 |
| City of Marina | 42,000 |
| City of Salinas | 47,799 |
| Sand City | 2,000 |
| City of Del Rey Oaks | 1,000 |
| Sub Total | \$2,354,109 |
| TID/HID Revenue | |
| Monterey County | 778,983 |
| City of Monterey | 1,897,413 |
| City of Carmel-by-the-Sea | 263,224 |
| City of Salinas | 170,881 |
| City of Seaside | 214,221 |
| City of Pacific Grove | 193,145 |
| City of Marina | 139,262 |
| Sub-Total TID/HID | \$3,657,128 |
| Private Revenue | \$302,370 |
| TOTAL REVENUE | \$6,313,607 |

Funding Structure

The MCCVB is funded through a partnership with Monterey County and the listed in the below chart.

Funding Sources

- TOT – 10.5% (County collection rate)
- BID/HID – 1% assessment per participating jurisdiction
- Membership dues

Visitor Services

Includes brochures, maps, and a TV slideshow.

Online Services

Extensive social media integration, listings, hotel booking engine, calendar of events, blog, digital travel guide, photos, videos, desktop wallpapers, webcams and an eNewsletter.

| Monterey County CVB 2013-2014 Budget EXPENSE | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Marketing Communications | 3,339,442 |
| Brand Launch | 1,500,000 |
| Media Relations | 200,000 |
| Talent & Marketing Initiatives | 1,519,942 |
| Group Sales | 2,368,152 |
| Trade Shows & Mission | 265,000 |
| Client Events | 115,000 |
| Trade Media | 500,000 |
| FAMs & Sponsorships | 135,000 |
| Third Party Partnerships | 130,000 |
| Sales Initiatives & Talent | 1,223,152 |
| Membership | 107,288 |
| Visitor Services | 438,236 |
| Administration | 799,803 |
| TOTAL EXPENSE | \$7,052,921 |

Monterey County Group Sales Efforts

Group Sales Info Points – Facilities

- Monterey hotel owners approved a plan to tax themselves to pay for the \$32M renovation of the Monterey Conference Center (MCC).
- MCC has 41K sq. ft. meeting space & can hold 1,700 guests.
- 28 Golf Courses
- Also hosts: 8K sq.ft. Sunset Center
- 32K sq.ft. Fair & Event Center
- 13K sq.ft. Salinas Sports Complex.

Group Sales Partnership Initiatives 2014

Monterey has always benefited from a high level of collaboration with community stakeholders. In the coming year collaboration will advance exponentially through:

- Introduction of the Monterey Room Night Index (RNI), an industry trend-setting measurement tool
- Involvement in sales program development, execution and evaluation from RNI participants
- Yielding Return on Experience (ROE) with the creation of the Strategic Client Services team which will utilize the power of extraordinary service as a competitive differentiator
- Focused development of partnerships with third party companies such as HelmsBriscoe and ConferenceDirect.

Budget

| Monterey County CVB Goals by fiscal-year end (June 30, 2014) GROUP SALES GOALS | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| New Business Leads | 460 |
| Room Night Index | 100% |
| RevPAR | Third in Comp Set |
| Marketing/Communications | |
| Unaided Brand Awareness | 82% |
| Intent to Visit | 32% |
| Advertising Effectiveness | 3.8 Score |
| Earned Media | \$34,500,000 |
| Facebook Fans | 43,750 |
| Twitter Followers | 9,775 |
| Website | |
| Website Visits | 1,114,9092 |
| Page Impressions | 4,011,372 |
| Referrals to Stakeholder Pages | 328,224 |
| Visitor Database | 40,820 |
| Membership | |
| Member Retention | 85% |
| Visitor Services | |
| Visitor Center Inquiries | 123,000 |

Destination Profile: Del Mar



Del Mar Tourism Business Improvement District (TBID)

The TBID is composed of 5 Board Members, all representing hotels. In the last two years the public and stakeholders in Del Mar have become frustrated and have demanded additional transparency in the organization. “Dream Del Mar” was recently created out of the TBID and launched a new website.

Budget Overview

Annual Revenue:

Figure not provided

Annual Budget:

FY 13: \$ \$185,000

Budget: Rooms Ratio

About \$678

Annual TOT Revenue:

\$1,934,020 - 2013

Budget Breakdown

Not provided

Group Sales Efforts

According to the website Dream Del Mar is focused on group meetings and events. They leverage the San Diego airport and ability to be in and out of the big city quickly

They promote six hotels with meeting space. Specifics of those properties are not listed on the organization’s website.

Structure

Del Mar mandates a 1% assessment on overnight stays at lodging facilities within the district’s boundaries.

Funding Sources

- BID – 1% assessment

Organization Stats:

Dream Del Mar recently launched marketing and branding campaign along with new tourism website in May 2013. Del Mar “Your California Dream” campaign launched in April 2013. City Council and stakeholders have been dissatisfied with reporting from the organization.

According to recent articles the City’s tourism efforts include the below:

- \$213,000 for efforts including marketing, web development, photography, direct mail and administrative costs.
- About \$30,000 is set aside for streetscape

Destination Profile: Coronado



Coronado Tourism Improvement District (CTID)

The CTID was established to fund, implement and measure strategies that promote Coronado as a year-round destination for visitors from across the bridge and across the country. Specifically, the CTID works to improve occupancy in Coronado hotels and as a by-product, the vitality of our community. Off-season growth is the primary focus of the Advisory Board.

Budget Overview

Annual Revenue:

FY13: \$546,530

Annual Budget:

FY14: \$545,000

Budget: Rooms Ratio

About \$230

Annual TOT Revenue:

\$10,366,000 - 2013

Budget Breakdown

Not provided in full

- \$196,674 national advertising budget

Funding Structure

The CTID is funded by a .5% guest assessment at hotels with over ninety (90) rooms. No funding comes from the City of Coronado, local businesses, residents or the State of California. The CTID does not fundraise, pursue grants or accept donations. Funding Sources

- BID – 0.5% assessment

Visitor Services

Includes:

- Visitor Center
- Digital Visitor Guide
- Online Map
- Mobile App.

Partnership

The \$328,000 partnership with San Diego Tourism Authority in FY13 has resulted in:

- \$138,843 in added-value (bonus) media from precise negotiation
- 266 million impressions obtained from hosting press and media outreach
- 339,413 page views from media campaigns (first 9 months of partnership)

Target Audiences

Leisure guests typically between 25-54 in age

- Average household income of \$110,000 or more
- Residing in LA, Orange County, Phoenix and San Diego
- Mostly available to visit Coronado outside of summer
- Guests with an appreciation for resort accommodations



Destination Profile: Oceanside

Visit Oceanside

Visit Oceanside is a membership-based destination marketing organization. Staffing includes 4 Members on the Executive Committee representing major hotels. Board of Directors represent LEGOLAND, resorts, restaurants, and the City of Oceanside. There are also 7 Community Liaisons.

Budget Overview

Annual Revenue:
FY12-13: \$691,800

Annual Budget:
FY12-13: \$691,800

Budget: Rooms Ratio
About \$370

Annual TOT Revenue:
\$4,100,000 – 2012

Budget Breakdown
Percentages provided in chart below

Funding Structure

Visit Oceanside is primarily funded through the Oceanside Tourism Marketing District and through annual membership fees from \$330-\$5,000. Visit Oceanside does not receive any of the TOT collected by the City.

Funding Sources

- BID – 1.5% assessment
- Membership dues

Visitor Services

California Welcome Center in Oceanside. State, regional, and local info available. Hotel reservations and discounts available.

Online Services


Includes blog, social media, visitors guide, calendar, and booking engine for lodging.

Target Audiences

- 6k+ citywide event nights generated last FY
- 200k expenses in ad campaigns and 60k in public relations FY13

Group Business Highlights


- Group Leads: 39
- Meeting & Event Leads: 17
- Groups Booked: 10
- Room Nights Generated (groups): 3,318
- Room Nights Generated (citywide events): 6,500



Benchmarking Results

After compiling all of the data in the profiles above, SAG compared all the information gathered to Visit Carlsbad. Below are charted examples of how Carlsbad compares to the competitive destinations studied. *Please note not all destinations provided information for each question and the charts below reflect the available data.

Of the comparable destinations, Carlsbad is a medium sized destination with 30+ properties in the market. Comparing the hotel properties that report to STR, Carlsbad is the fourth largest destination behind Monterey County, Santa Barbara and Santa Monica, respectively.




Class Definitions according to STR:


Market Class —Hotel classes are scaled through a method by which branded hotels are grouped based on the actual average room rates. Independent hotels are assigned a class based on the ADR, relative to that of the chain-affiliated hotels in its geographic proximity. The chain scale segments are:

- Luxury – example Ritz Carlton
- Upper Upscale – example Hilton
- Upscale – example Hyatt Place
- Upper Midscale – example Clarion
- Midscale – example La Quinta
- Economy – example Days Inn


SAG also found that more than half of Carlsbad’s properties are in the Upscale, Upper Upscale, and Luxury classification. This also indicated Carlsbad’s inventory is the third largest in the upscale market of destinations studied. The breadth of property types in Carlsbad creates an opportunity to confirm that the future marketing efforts are focused on a spectrum of market segments.




In looking at destinations as a whole, SAG found that Carlsbad has more hotel rooms than most comparable and competitive destinations. Currently, Carlsbad has 4,057 rooms in the market with 3,994 of properties that report to STR. In the next year, Carlsbad will have three new hotels in the market bringing the total to 4,399 rooms in the City. This number makes it the second largest destination in terms of hotel rooms in the competitive set.




Budgets and funding are critical components for Destination Management Organizations (DMO)s to make an impactful difference in marketing the destination. While the size and scale of the operation and destination all vary and impact the budget number, SAG decided to look at the budgets side by side. While this is not an apples to apples comparison, it does begin to exhibit, based on the charts above, how under-funded Visit Carlsbad is as a marketing organization. Carlsbad has the third smallest DMO budget of the destinations studied.



In order to make a true comparison between budgets and levels of funding, SAG studied those budgets by contrasting how many hotel rooms are in each respective destination. This analysis provides insight to how the level of funding is allocated per room. In this regard, Carlsbad is spending the least amount per hotel room at \$174 per room.




As noted above, Carlsbad has the second largest inventory of hotel rooms of the destination locations studied. In comparing occupancy of competitive destinations, Carlsbad has the second lowest average annual occupancy rate at 68% compared to Laguna Beach, which is highest at 75% annually.




*Not all cities in the original research set were able to provide Average Annual Occupancy.

A key component of DMO revenue and sustainable funding is the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) leveraged on hotel room nights. This TOT is handled differently in each destination.

The first chart below illustrates the rate by which the City/County collects TOT per transient room.



The second chart below illustrates the level of support from the same TOT that the City/County is allocating back to the DMO. Competitive destinations receive between .5%-18% of the TOT collected by the City. Visit Carlsbad does not receive any TOT funding.



*TOT percentage varies annually. Figure above represents 2013 adopted budget percentage.

**Not all cities in the original research set were able to provide this data


SAG also studied hotel Revenue per Available Room (RevPAR) to create another comparison and measure how Carlsbad is doing based on those in the comparable set. Carlsbad averages \$113 in RevPAR compared to its competitors who average close to \$160 or better year round. The gap in comparable RevPAR is an indicator of the potential to increase overall visitors as well as the hotel rates through targeted marketing designed to increase demand in the shoulder periods. If Carlsbad was to achieve the average RevPar for the competitive set (\$166) that would represent a 47% increase or over \$8 million in increased TOT. SAG has laid out goals for growth in the funding section of this report.



*Source DMO provided data

**Not all cities in the original research set were able to provide hotel RevPAR.

SAG reviewed destinations by their current business mix of transient and group segments. Of the destinations studied, the largest destination group mix by percentage was Newport Beach at 63% transient and 37% group and the smallest was Oceanside at 80-20% respectively. Carlsbad fell in line with the majority of the competition at 75% transient and 25% group. However, it is important to note that these numbers are not currently tracked by Visit Carlsbad. The Carlsbad number was determined based on Visit Carlsbad and hotel industry feedback.



*Carlsbad’s numbers are estimated based on monthly data provided by Visit Carlsbad.

Conclusion – Benchmarking

Carlsbad is situated in a very competitive market. All of the destinations studied are comparable and competitive because they are coastal, California beach destinations, mostly suburban and within a 2-3 hours drive of a major California city. All of the destinations studied have a significant share of the California tourism market and are becoming increasingly popular. Carlsbad competes directly with these cities and is positioned to improve its share of the tourism market based on the benchmarking research completed.

The destinations studied all experience a similar seasonal swing between the summer and non-summer months. The destinations respective marketing organizations are all thinking critically about how to improve return, reach more visitors and connect with new target markets. SAG compared destinations on key areas and points of comparison for Visit Carlsbad and believes that Carlsbad has an opportunity to improve its position in the market.

Overall, Carlsbad is a medium-sized destination with a year-round population of about 110,000 within 40 square miles of the City. The City’s tourism assets include the 7 miles of coastline, which welcomes over 2 million visitors each year. Of the competitive destinations, Carlsbad is one of the largest in terms


of year-round population and square miles. The competing cities were typically between 10-20 square miles and had a smaller year-round population. In the competing destinations' DMO websites, a reoccurring theme of community was expressed, as the marketing organization believes these residents are important aspects of why tourists repeatedly visit these destinations. With a smaller community, this is more manageable, however, SAG found that the connection to the community above and beyond the stakeholders was important to the competition.

Of the competitive destinations studied, Carlsbad is the third lowest DMO in terms of overall funding. Carlsbad is also the destination with the second highest number of hotel rooms at 4,392 (including the three new properties coming into the market). The only destination with more hotel rooms is Monterey County, with over 6,000 rooms and includes over eight contributing municipalities. These statistics were important in comparing the level of funding for each hotel room. In making a clear comparison, SAG created ratios for the total budget of each destination and the number of hotel rooms in each respective destination. This comparison shows that Carlsbad has the second lowest expenditure per hotel room at \$174. The highest expenditure per room is \$1,388 and the average among 10 competitors is \$659 per room. The differences in levels of funding reveals that not only do the competing destinations have a higher level of funding, but are drastically outspending Carlsbad on a per room basis.

A second key result from the benchmarking study is average annual occupancy. Carlsbad is currently averaging 68% percent occupied annually. Of five destinations, the annual average ranges from 67% to 75% occupied. Carlsbad is the second lowest above Monterey County. The highest average was 75% in Laguna Beach.

SAG also compared the Revenue Per Available Room (RevPAR) for these competitive destinations. Carlsbad's average RevPAR is \$113 and is the lowest of six competitive destinations. The average RevPAR among six destinations is \$166 and the highest RevPAR is \$221 in Laguna Beach. Carlsbad has a healthy mix of property types, however, as stated above it has more hotel rooms than much of the competition. This level of availability makes it important to create and cultivate demand from the market in order for the destination to see an increase in occupancy and RevPAR.

Two consistent differences in the structure of the competitive destinations versus Visit Carlsbad are both the way they are funded and the way they are governed. All of the competitive destinations receive a percentage of the TOT revenue to be funneled back into marketing the destination. The TOT funding in competitive destinations shows strong support for the organizations on behalf of the respective cities and allows the DMOs to compete on a higher level. The competitive destinations also have more than one source of funding. The other sources include assessments, business improvement districts, private revenue, event sales and membership dues. As shown in the above hotel RevPAR chart, Carlsbad's average annual RevPAR is \$113 compared to the average of \$166 across the competitive destinations. Carlsbad could attain the average annual RevPAR number over time with the recommended changes in the targeted marketing efforts addressed in the following sections. If Carlsbad set a target of reaching \$166 for the average annual RevPAR over 5 years (an increase of \$53 and 47%) it would increase the TOT collection to the City significantly. A 47% increase in TOT would be an additional \$8.4 million to the City, increasing the total TOT to \$26.4 million. The below chart illustrates the increases in both TOT (shown in orange) and the average annual RevPAR (shown in blue) over 5 years with a target of incrementally increasing both respectively by 6.6 percent annually.



If Carlsbad were to attain the average RevPAR of \$166, the TOT collection shown above supplies an additional \$8 million dollars to the City of Carlsbad. SAG believes this is attainable with the recommended shifts in targeted marketing and new market segments over the next five years. With these shifts the City of Carlsbad will see increased TOT collection, which could support new funding mechanisms for Visit Carlsbad and tourism product development.

In addition to being funded differently, many of the organizations are overseen by one board. In the event that there was additional funding from a BID or TID, the DMO did not report to that board and the budgeting was approved by the DMO board. In theory, this is similar to the Visit Carlsbad organization, however, SAG has found redundancies in the work done by the CTBID board and the Visit Carlsbad board. The most effective organizations have strong oversight by one streamlined process of governance. This is addressed later in the governance section of this report.

After completing in-depth research on these competitive destinations, SAG believes there is a strong opportunity for Carlsbad to grow in many categories and see a higher return for all stakeholders.

Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis

SAG partnered with Nielsen to conduct a Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis also known as a PRIZM analysis on recent Carlsbad hotel visitor data. Lifestyle Segmentation allows SAG to review the types of visitors who have recently stayed in Carlsbad. The data is run through Nielsen's consumer profile database and is broken down to understand consumer behaviors, income levels, travel habits and more. The insights gathered from this segmented data allowed SAG to understand the types of people who have visited and where they are coming from. This will inform future efforts and which segments will create the highest return for Carlsbad.

The Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis is broken out into 66 segments which are numbered according to socioeconomic rank (which takes into account characteristics such as income, education, occupation and home value) and are grouped into 11 Lifestage Groups and 14 Social Groups.

SAG collected hotel data from seven individual hotel properties and the Visit Carlsbad ARES booking engine, which included results from 25 properties. SAG would like to thank the Pelican Cove Inn, Carlsbad by the Sea Resort and the Grand Pacific Resorts properties for submitting data for this analysis. SAG collected over 50,000 anonymous hotel records sorted by property, address, zip code, date of stay and lead source. These categories were key to understanding what segments come to Carlsbad, when they come, and where they live. This data allows SAG to geocode and map potential segments, which are target markets for Carlsbad's future growth.

Visit Carlsbad is currently targeting its marketing effort to a specific segment of families with children 12 and under with a household income of around \$87,000. Utilizing the Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis, SAG was able to validate when these families are coming to Carlsbad and explore new opportunities.

It is important to note that this Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis did not include hotel records from the most family oriented hotel, LEGOLAND Resort. Also, Sheraton, Hilton properties, Omni and the Park Hyatt were unable to provide detailed hotel records. While the reporting would have been enhanced with data from these properties, SAG believes that the data gathered provided key insight because these properties are less family dominant, especially in the summer months. SAG also recommends that a lifestyle analysis be conducted on a biannual basis. This will create an opportunity for more participation in the future. The hotels that have participated will receive an individual report with their specific market segment breakdown. The following is a breakdown of the top market segments based on current visitation to Carlsbad. The names of each segment are provided by Neilson.

Top Carlsbad Segments

Families

SAG believes that the strongest segment of Carlsbad's visitor during the summer season is families with children, which is supported by the zip code data LEGOLAND was able to provide from LEGOLAND Resort. Family travel in Carlsbad is strong and SAG is confident that this market is returning each summer to enjoy the attractions and amenities of the destination. The following are descriptions of the

family segments that currently visit Carlsbad in the summer months. Please note that each segment that is listed is attached to a broader social and lifestage group. The detailed descriptions of these can be found in the appendix of this report.

Upward Bound

Upscale Middle Age with Children

More than any other segment, Upward Bound appears to be the home of those legendary Soccer Moms and Dads. In these small satellite cities, upscale families boast dual incomes, college degrees, and new split levels and colonials. Residents of Upward Bound tend to be kid obsessed, with heavy purchases of computers, action figures, dolls, board games bicycles and camping equipment.



Social Group: 08 – Second City Society

Lifestage Group: 05 – Young Accumulators

Demographic Traits

- Urbanicity: Second City
- Income: Upscale - Median HH Income \$86,901
- Income Producing Assets: High
- Age Range: 35-54
- Presence of Kids: Household with Kids
- Homeownership: Mostly Owners
- Employment Levels: Management
- Education Levels: College Graduate
- Ethnic Diversity: White, Asian, Hispanic, Mix

Lifestyle & Media Traits

- Order from zappos.com
- Vacation at national parks
- Read *Outside*
- Watch America’s Funniest Home Videos
- Drive Mazda SUV

Kids & Cul-de-sacs

Upper Mid Younger with Children

Upper-middle-class, suburban, married couples with children – that’s the skinny on Kids & Cul-de-sacs, an enviable lifestyle of large families in recently built subdivisions. With a high rate of Hispanic and Asian Americans, this segment is a refuge for college-educated, white-collar professionals with administrative jobs and upper-middle-class incomes. Their nexus of education, affluence and children translates to large outlays for child-centered products and services.



Social Group: 05 – The Affluentials

Lifestage Group: 05 – Young Accumulators

Demographic Traits

- Urbanicity: Suburban
- Income: Upper Mid – Median HH Income \$71,830
- Income Producing Assets: Above Average
- Age Range: 25-44
- Presence of Kids: Household with Kids
- Homeownership: Mostly Owners
- Employment Levels: Professional
- Education Level: College Graduate
- Ethnic Diversity: White, Black, Asian, Hispanic, Mix

Lifestyle & Media Traits

- Order from target.com
- Play fantasy sports
- Read *Parents Magazine*
- Watch X Games
- Drive Honda Odyssey

Non-Family Segments

SAG reviewed the highest indexing segments for both summer and Shoulder Seasons that were not families and not part of the current target market in order to determine viable opportunities for new targets. The data received on visitors who were already coming to Carlsbad is insightful as to who these visitors are and what aspects of their lives might fit Carlsbad in the future. The top non-family segments were a high percentage of the visitors during the shoulder periods. Below are the top non-family segments:

Upper Crust

Upper Crust

Wealthy Older without Children

The nation's most exclusive address, Upper Crust is the wealthiest lifestyle in America—a haven for empty-nesting couples over the age of 55. No segment has a higher concentration of residents earning over \$100,000 a year and possessing a postgraduate degree. And none has a more opulent standard of living.



Social Group: 04 – Elite Suburbs

Lifestage Group: 08 – Affluent Empty Nests

Demographic Traits

- Urbanicity: Suburban
- Income: Wealthy— Median HH Income \$110,117
- Income Producing Assets: Millionaires
- Age Range: 55+
- Presence of Kids: Household without Kids
- Homeownership: Home Owners
- Employment Levels: Professional
- Education Level: Graduate Plus
- Ethnic Diversity: White, Asian, Mix

Lifestyle & Media Traits

- Shop at Saks Fifth Avenue
- Vacation in Europe
- Read The Atlantic
- Watch Golf Channel
- Drive Lexus LS

The Upper Crust segment visits Carlsbad in both the Summer Season and the Shoulder Season of September to March. This segment was 20% of the Shoulder Season visitor compared to only 13% of those visiting in the Summer Season. This data shows that Carlsbad should be targeting non-family households over 55 years in age that are living in wealthy suburban areas. This empty nest segment enjoys recreational activities including golf and sightseeing. This segment has disposable income for high end shopping, fine dining and most importantly regular travel.

Movers & Shakers

Movers & Shakers

Wealthy Older without Children

Movers & Shakers is home to America's up-and-coming business class: a wealthy suburban world of dual-income couples who are highly educated, typically between the ages of 45 and 64, and without children. Given its high percentage of executives and white-collar professionals, there's a decided business bent to this segment: members of Movers & Shakers rank near the top for owning a small business and having a home office.



Social Group: 04 – Elite Suburbs

Lifestage Group: 01 – Midlife Success

Demographic Traits

- Urbanicity: Suburban
- Income: Wealthy– Median HH Income \$101,517
- Income Producing Assets: Elite
- Age Range: 45-64
- Presence of Kids: Household without Kids
- Homeownership: Mostly Owners
- Employment Levels: Management
- Education Level: Graduate Plus
- Ethnic Diversity: White, Asian, Mix

Lifestyle & Media Traits

- Shop at Nordstrom
- Play tennis
- Read Yoga Journal
- Watch NHL Games
- Drive Land Rover

The Movers & Shakers segment was prevalent in both the Summer Season and the Shoulder Season of September through March. The Movers & Shakers segment showed a strong presence in the Summer Season with 19% of the visitor mix compared to 3% in the Shoulder Season. This segment as described above is a wealthy, highly educated couple, without children. This segment is active, healthy and interested in recreational activities. This segment is also likely to have a high level disposable income because they are childless. The presence of this segment in the summer months also indicates an appreciation for quick getaways in a clean, safe, active destination like Carlsbad.

The Cosmopolitans

The Cosmopolitans

Upper Mid Older Mostly without Children

Educated, upper-midscale, and ethnically diverse, The Cosmopolitans are urbane couples in America's fast-growing cities. Concentrated in a handful of metros--such as Las Vegas, Miami, and Albuquerque--these households feature older, empty-nesting homeowners. A vibrant social scene surrounds their older homes and apartments, and residents love the nightlife and enjoy leisure-intensive lifestyles.



Social Group: 01 – Urban Uptown

Lifestage Group: 09 – Conservative Classics

Demographic Traits

- Urbanicity: Urban
- Income: Upper Mid– Median HH Income \$58,313
- Income Producing Assets: High
- Age Range: 55+
- Presence of Kids: Mostly without Kids
- Homeownership: Home Owners
- Employment Levels: White Collar, Mix
- Education Level: Graduate Plus
- Ethnic Diversity: White, Black, Asian, Hispanic Mix

Lifestyle & Media Traits

- Shop at Macy's
- Vacation abroad
- Read Audubon Magazine
- Watch Masterpiece
- Drive Lincoln Town Car Flex Fuel


The Cosmopolitan segment was prevalent in both the Summer Season and the Need Period. The Cosmopolitans made up 7% of the visitor mix in the Summer Season and 9% during the Shoulder period. This segment of empty-nesters has an upper to mid-level household income and live in more urban areas. This segment enjoys being able to up and go now that their children are out of the house. They are social couples who enjoy leisure activities. For Carlsbad, this market would enjoy the walking and hiking trails around the lagoon, yoga, stand-up paddle boarding, and golf. This is a potential growth market for Carlsbad.

Seasonal Segments Overview

SAG sorted the segmented data by month to determine which types of visitors were coming to Carlsbad during the Summer Season versus the Shoulder Season. SAG defined the Summer Season by May-August and the Shoulder Season by September-March. The results of this seasonal sorting indicates that there are distinct differences between those segments who travel to and have interest in Carlsbad in the summer and those who are visiting in the Shoulder Season. SAG has determined, based on these results that the marketing should be re-focused at these segments during the appropriate season.

Summer Season Segments

As mentioned above, SAG is confident that the segments including families with children 12 and under are a key component of Carlsbad’s summer visitor mix. Those segments are visiting attractions, buying packages, and frequenting family hot spots like LEGOLAND and the Beach. Of the data records SAG was able to segment, the top 15 Summer Season segments of Nielsen’s 66 segments accounted for 65% of the Summer Season visitor mix. It is also important to note that the second largest segments were households with no kids. This indicates an opportunity to diversify our summer information. The below chart shows the breakdown by percentage of the top 15 segments that visit Carlsbad in the Summer Season:




The top three segments for the summer were:

- **Kids and Cul-de-Sacs (20%)** – upper middle class families with children living in the suburbs. These families have a household median income of \$71,830 and the parents’ range in age from 25-44. The parents are college educated and hold professional positions. These families are in the “melting pot” category and are White, Black, Asian, Hispanic and Mixed. These families order on target.com, watch the X Games on TV and drive minivans like the Honda Odyssey.
- **Movers & Shakers (19%)** – wealthy, older households without kids living in the suburbs. These households are 45-64 with a median income of \$101,517. This segment is college educated carrying graduate degrees and holding management positions. They are mostly White and Asian. These households play tennis, shop at Nordstrom and drive higher end SUVs i.e., Land Rover.
- **Upper Crust (13%)** – significantly wealthy, older households without kids living in the suburbs. This segment is 55+ with a median household income of \$110,117 and classified by Nielsen as millionaires. These households are college educated with graduate degrees in upper management positions. They are mainly White. This segment shops at high end store like Saks Fifth Avenue, have vacationed in Europe, watch and play golf and drive luxury vehicles i.e., Lexus LS.

Shoulder Season Segments

SAG was able to sort the segments by the time of year they visited and determined that the Shoulder Season of September-March had distinct segments that visited Carlsbad. These segments differ from the segments above and also vary in percentage. These segments were typically households without children who have disposable income and enjoy recreation and leisure activities. These segments would likely be spa-goers, golfers, hikers, shoppers and diners. These segments have flexibility to travel at will and are comfortable enough to do so regularly. Of the data records SAG was able to segment, the top 15 Shoulder Season segments of Nielsen’s 66 segments, which accounted for 75% of the Shoulder Season visitor mix. The below chart shows the breakdown by percentage of the top 15 segments that visit Carlsbad in the Shoulder Season:



The top three segments in order were:

- **Upper Crust (20%)** – significantly wealthy, older households without kids living in the suburbs. This segment is 55+ with a median household income of \$110,117 and are classified by Nielsen as millionaires. These households are college educated with graduate degrees in upper management positions. They are mainly White. This segment shops at high-end stores like Saks Fifth Avenue, have vacationed in Europe, watch and play golf and drive luxury vehicles i.e., Lexus LS.
- **Money & Brains (12%)** – wealthy, older family mix within the household, living in urban areas. The older family mix means the children are mostly older teenage or college age dependents. The parents are 45-64 with a median household income of \$88,837 and are college educated in management positions. These households are classified as a “Melting Pot” and include White, Asian, Black, Hispanic and Mixed. This segment shops at stores like Banana Republic, travel for business occasionally, watch tennis and drive luxury SUVs i.e., Mercedes Benz E Class.
- **The Cosmopolitans (10%)** – wealthy, mid to older age range, mostly without kids living in urban areas. This segment is 55+ with a household income of \$58,313 working in white collar settings. This segment is classified as a “Melting Pot” and includes White, Asian, Black, Hispanic and Mixed. These households shop at Macy’s, have vacationed outside the US, watch Masterpiece Theatre and drive upper midclass vehicles i.e., Lincoln Town Car - Flex Fuel.


The results of this analysis support the shifting of resources to focus on the top segments that have been identified in this analysis. The opportunity is to increase Carlsbad’s share of these markets that have demonstrated interest in visiting in the shoulder periods.

Comparable Segmentation Research

SAG, in conjunction with Mindgruve, met and talked with the research firm Resonate which has been monitoring audiences visiting the Visit Carlsbad website during the summer campaign from April to September. SAG analyzed the data collected by Resonate through the pixels embedded in each page. These pixels allow Resonate to capture data on the individuals using visitcarlsbad.com.

Resonate Audience Insights:


Resonate’s data showed different segments of people were actively going to the Visit Carlsbad website during different times of the campaign. The campaign began April 1, 2014 and ran through September 18, 2014. Below is a snapshot of Income and Household data collected on people who visited the DMO website during the month of April:



This data shows the Insight Groups who visited the DMO website in the month of April were more affluent than the current target market. The current target market actually indexes in the sixth position. The visitors that indexed the highest are ranked in order by income and presence of children in the household below (all segments indexed above 100 showing strong presence):

1. \$150,000+ annual income with children – highest index - 279
2. \$150,000+ annual income without children – index - 276
3. \$50,000-74,000 annual income with children – index - 185
4. \$100,000-150,000 annual income without children – index - 169
5. \$100,000-150,000 annual income with children – index – 162

Below is a snapshot of Income and Household data collected on people who visited the Visit Carlsbad website between the months of June and August:



This data shows the users who visited the DMO website between the months of June to Augusts were more affluent than the current target market. This data captures the current target market as the


eighth highest indexing segment. This data also shows that there are additional segments actively interested in the Carlsbad product, which are viable targets. The visitors that indexed the highest are ranked in order by income and presence of children in the household below (all segments indexed above 100 showing strong presence):

1. \$150,000+ annual income with children – highest index
2. \$75,000 - \$100,000 annual income without children
3. \$100,000 - \$150,000 annual income with children
4. \$150,000+ annual income without children
5. \$100,000 - \$150,000 annual income without children

The current target market of Visit Carlsbad indexed in eighth place.

SAG compared the Resonate Audience Insight Groups data above to the Summer Season and Shoulder Season results from the Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis and developed the below profile. The charts below are the highest indexing segments for each respective season overlaid with the Resonate Audience Insight Groups.


Shoulder Season Segments & Audience Insights Groups



This overlay of the PRIZM results from the Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis with the Resonate Audience Insight data is an illustration of similar segments interest in the Carlsbad tourism product. During the Shoulder Season, the Upper Crust PRIZM segment indexes the highest and correlates directly to the Resonate Audience Insight data profiles of those visiting the website.

This validates further the need to refocus the marketing resources on the markets indicated in the Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis and reinforced with the Resonate data gathered from recent web activity.

Summer Season Top Segments & Audience Insight Data



During the Summer Season the overlap of the results shows that the PRIZM segments that had the strongest market-share in Carlsbad were also indexing the highest against the Resonate results from the Visit Carlsbad website. Kids & Cul-de-sacs had the highest market share during the summer season and matches directly with the top profile of the Resonate Audience Insights data.

Lifestyle Segmentation Analysis Conclusions

This comparable analysis confirms and supports SAG’s research and recommendation of a new direction in target markets. The overlapping data of specific segments clearly show a presence of new and different segments, which should be targets for future marketing initiatives. These segments are all affluent households with relatively high incomes. The key targets for the shoulder periods are households without children. This allows Carlsbad to diversify the tourism product and create specific experiences that these markets will enjoy. The overall focus on the shoulder periods combined with the results of the segmentation study creates a clear path for future marketing efforts.

Conclusion – Research

The research that was conducted by SAG provides the foundation for the recommendations contained in this report. It is clear that Carlsbad has an opportunity to improve its position in comparison to the destinations that were analyzed. Growth in the level of funding will increase Carlsbad’s ability to strengthen its position in the new target markets.

The segmentation research creates a clear path for future marketing. It is recommended that specific campaigns with relevant experiences and packages be created to drive more visitation from these market segments.

SAG Research



The above chart illustrates the multifaceted approach to research for this report. This approach has created broad based input and participation coupled with market and competitive destination analysis.

Research Plan – Recommendation

It is recommended that an annual research plan is developed as part of the overall tourism effort. The results of the research underscored the importance of an ongoing plan. A sustainable research plan will create research-based decision making for future marketing efforts. This investment can also be very valuable in refining future target markets. Research will give insight on the overall visitor experience in Carlsbad. The types of research that would be beneficial include:

Visitor Profile Study – Every Three Years

A visitor profile study is designed to gain information on visitors to Carlsbad as well as gain insight on the overall visitor experience. The current visitor profile study questions should be reviewed to ensure a more thorough understanding of the overall visitor experience in Carlsbad. The current visitor profile study focuses on key characteristics of the surveyed travelers but doesn't probe the level of satisfaction or additional experiences that a visitor is interested in. Another dimension of the visitor profile study must entail a comparison of the demographics of visitors based on the time of year they have visited Carlsbad.

Benchmarking Study – Biannually

The foundation for benchmarking that has been established with this process should be updated on a biannual basis. This could be accomplished internally and would evaluate the positioning of Carlsbad relative to the competitive set in a broad spectrum of areas. The benchmarking study could be conducted internally.

Target Audience Study – Biannually

This study would be a continuation of the research conducted for this study to utilize hotel and inquiry guest data to further refine the demographics and interests of targeted audiences. The results of the study conducted for this report have been informative. The goal would be to have a greater level of participation by Carlsbad Hotels in future studies. This will help understand the trends in market mix and whether there is an increase in targeted markets visitation of Carlsbad. The expense associated with this study can be reduced if the data from the analysis is reviewed and reported internally.

Meeting Planner Survey – Biannually

This study would focus on the desirability of Carlsbad as a meetings destination. The study would also focus on amenities and services that would enhance Carlsbad's competitiveness. SAG recommends conducting this study at the point that the implementation of the group sales plan is complete. This will help refine the messaging and approach of the group sales and marketing effort. The meeting planner survey will also give an indication of attendee trends by target group markets. Through the use of the Visit Carlsbad group database and MINT, this survey can be completed with minimal expense.

SAG has recommended an increase to the budget for research in order to create an ongoing research plan. The baseline that is created through consistent effective research will become the foundation for future marketing and advocacy.

Leisure Sales and Marketing – A New Direction

SAG has reviewed the current activities and resources dedicated to Individual Leisure Sales and Marketing. SAG has met with the current digital advertising agency and public relations firm. Mindgruve and DCI have provided helpful analysis and insight for this study. SAG has reviewed the most current marketing plans and reports that are generated from both firms.

In conjunction with the research conducted that has identified potential new target markets for Carlsbad to increase visitors during shoulder periods, SAG evaluated the current approach in leisure sales and marketing. The proposed restructuring of the overall budget and resources for the development of a new groups sales and marketing effort has an impact on the approach and resources dedicated to leisure marketing.

The more compelling purpose of re-evaluating the current approach is to have a more targeted approach with a viable mechanism of tracking the actual conversion of future marketing efforts into overnight visitors. The plethora of options that exist for consumers to book their travel makes this challenging, however it must be aggressively pursued to demonstrate return on investment (ROI) of future activities. The current key measurements of success are focused on increasing online activity and overall impressions for Carlsbad.

The following is an overview of the current approach to measurement:

Online/PR Activity Measures


The following are the listed performance measures from the most recent annual report for Visit Carlsbad.

- ❖ Google Analytics
 - Direct & referral traffic
 - Time on Website
 - Page Views
- ❖ Social Media
 - Total Likes, followers & video views
 - Social referral traffic to website
- ❖ Email Marketing
 - Open & Click through ratios
 - Subscriber database growth

The most recent report shows an increase in web traffic, an increase in social media followers, and other indicators of increased traffic due to the digital marketing efforts. The investment that has been made in online marketing has been successful in increasing overall activity and awareness of Carlsbad as a destination. The reports generated by DCI focus on overall impressions generated by the public relations efforts and determine the value of those impressions in advertising dollars. These results also demonstrate that the public relations efforts are driving increased awareness of Carlsbad as a destination.

Future Direction

SAG recommends refining the future focus and measurement to determine impact that sales and marketing efforts have had on driving room nights or incremental visitors to Carlsbad. The other measure would be on increasing awareness of Carlsbad with agreed-upon targeted markets.



The increased focus on targeted marketing with a collaborative effort to track results is an important new direction for Carlsbad leisure meeting efforts. The more focused effort has the potential to produce more impactful results in the timeframes that have been determined as a priority.

Direct Marketing

In conjunction with the outcome of the research on future target markets, SAG recommends shifting the current marketing approach from online advertising to a focused direct marketing approach. The benefit of this approach is the ability to create specific experiences designed to appeal to targeted audiences. This will include developing specific experiences and offers for the targeted market segments and utilizing e-marketing techniques to reach the desired audience. According to the 2013 SDTA Visitor Profile Study, 85% of the current visitors coming to Carlsbad are using the internet as their information source and are likely to be receptive to a targeted direct marketing approach.

The information gathered about the likes and interests of the targeted market segments create the opportunity to develop Carlsbad experiences that appeal to them. An example of this is the “Uppercrust” market segment that has shown a high interest in Carlsbad during the shoulder periods. They enjoy activities like golf and like to dine out. Carlsbad experiences would be developed with these components and sent directly to them through direct e-marketing.



Uppercrust

Tracking Room Nights – Leisure Sales and Marketing

SAG recognizes the challenge of tracking room nights that have been generated from leisure sales and marketing activities. The plethora of options that a potential visitor has to book a room in Carlsbad is vast. Many studies have indicated that only a small percentage of visitors will book a room through a Destination Marketing Organization website. The opportunity exists to more predominantly position the booking engine as a vehicle to buy specific offers and gain insight through this activity as to the

success of future direct marketing campaigns. The booking engine, powered by aRes, will be an indicator of the success of a campaign.

Online Hotel Referrals – Recent Activity

The following chart is a recent indicator of the number of monthly visitors to the Visit Carlsbad website that “clicked through” to specific Carlsbad hotels. The chart below indicates that there were 2,404 web users that have taken action to review and possibly book hotel rooms.

| Outbound Traffic Sent to Hotel Sites | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| | Hotel | Outbound Clicks |
| 1 | Ocean Villas | 172 |
| 2 | Beach Walk Villas | 169 |
| 3 | Seashore on the Sand | 169 |
| 4 | Oceanfront Carlsbad | 109 |
| 5 | Carlsbad Inn Beach Resort | 74 |
| 6 | Grand Pacific Palisades | 69 |
| 7 | Marbrisa Resort | 66 |
| 8 | LEGOLAND Hotel | 64 |
| 9 | Scandia Motel | 64 |
| 10 | Beach View Lodge | 63 |
| Total | | 2,404 |


SAG recommends that a system is designed through specific offers and collaboration with the individual hotel web analytics to determine how many Visit Carlsbad website users made reservations through the hotels’ online reservations platforms.

SAG discussed potential approaches with Mindgruve for the ability to track actual conversion from the Visit Carlsbad website. The following recommendation was developed in collaboration with Mindgruve.

It is recommended that current individual hotel Google analytics are evaluated to determine goal tracking around bookings. Filters can be created specific to Visit Carlsbad referring traffic to view the number of conversions. The hotels will need to give access to this data, but once set up, an automated report can be created that can detail specific results to the stakeholders.


Booking Engine

While a DMO booking engine is only one vehicle that a visitor can use to reserve hotel rooms in Carlsbad, the utilization can be an indicator of the success of a campaign or overall effort. Visit Carlsbad has contracted aRes Travel which supports the booking engine on the Visit Carlsbad website. The following is a breakdown of the hotel bookings made through the booking engine in 2014.



The total reservations that have been booked year to date is 186 and the total room nights are 424. This represents less than .001 percent of the unique visitors that have visited the website in 2014.

The following chart shows the past five years of room nights booked through the booking engine:



SAG recommends using the activity on the booking engine as a performance measure. A goal would be set annually to review growth in the booking engine activity. The recommended shift in marketing focus will position the booking engine more predominantly in the reservation process.

Package/Experience Sales

An active package sales component is an important aspect of an effective leisure sales and marketing plan. The data that has been supplied from the research gives an indication of the priority leisure markets and their interests. SAG recommends that packages are created that are focused on driving new targeted visitors during the shoulder periods. These packages can also be utilized directly by the hotels in their reservations platforms.

Year to date 2014 package sales are as follows:

| Package Name | # Sold | Total Amt | Room Nights | Tickets |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| The Ultimate LEGOLAND® Family Fun Vacation | 24 | \$22,161.63 | 63 | 108 |
| The Best of San Diego! Fabulous Four Combo Package | 2 | \$2,510.00 | 10 | 16 |
| Romance Package - Holiday Inn Express and Suites Carlsbad Beach | 1 | \$445.00 | 3 | 0 |
| Go Wild at the San Diego Zoo Safari Park - Holiday Inn Express and Suites Carlsbad Beach | 1 | \$1,272.65 | 5 | 4 |

There were 28 “trackable” packages sold in the first 10 months of 2014, which accounted for 81 hotel room nights. In combination with a newly focused direct marketing campaign, this number will grow in the future.

Deals Page

SAG also reviewed the “trackability” of the Deals Page on the Visit Carlsbad website and found that the click through rate (CTR) was low. During the 2014 calendar year the CTR for the deals page was .07% with the total page views at 648 and the total click throughs to the unique pages at only 51. This underscores the opportunity to monitor referral activity and adjust offerings on an on-going basis.



Visitor Services – Visitor Experience Sales and Service

Currently the Visit Carlsbad Information Center functions as an information and fulfillment operation for a visitor who walks in, calls in, or makes an online request for information. Year-to-date in 2014, the Visitor Services team has handled 8,360 inquiries. The Information Center has brochures from the attractions in Carlsbad and the San Diego region.



SAG recommends that the Visitor Information function evolve to Visitor Experience Sales and Service. The focus of this area will be to handle any inquiry as a “lead” and work closely with potential visitors to “convert” them to actual overnight visitors through directly booking future stays and packages. This will also be accomplished through referrals with follow up and confirmation. Destination software packages have the capability to support this type of effort. SAG has recommended the implementation of new software.

SAG recommends that goals are set for both inquiries and room night conversion from the Visitor Services efforts.

Goal Setting – Leisure Sales and Marketing

The overall recommendations for Leisure Sales and Marketing create the opportunity to set annual quantitative conversion goals. SAG has created preliminary goals for the first year of the new direction.

The following is a chart that depicts the components of annual goal tracking:

| Activity | FY2014 Actual | FY2015 Goal |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Package/Experience Sales | 81 | 1,100 |
| Booking Engine Hotel Bookings | 424 | 1,500 |
| Online Referral Room Nights | NA | 750 |
| Visitor Experience Sales and Service – Inquiries /Room Nights | NA | 250 |
| Total Room Night Goal – 2015 | | 3,600 |

The projected 3,600 new “trackable” room nights assumes the approval of the recommendations in February and the ability to have new targeted marketing efforts in full implementation by March 1st.

Public Relations

SAG had informational meetings with the current public relations contractor to understand the current activities. DCI was very informative and helpful in gaining an understanding of current activities.

The following is an illustration of the metrics that are currently used in measuring success and a sampling of the publications that are targeted for Carlsbad news.

| PUBLIC RELATIONS | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Total Impressions: | 37,465,502 |
| ✓ Broadcast Impressions: | 3,518,406 |
| ✓ Print Impressions: | 521,000 |
| ✓ Online Impressions: | 33,426,096 |
| ✓ Advertising Equivalency: | \$830,862 |
| ✓ Return-On-Investment: Ad Equiv/ (\$5,000 x 12) | 14:1 |
| Key Message Dissemination | |
| ✓ Carlsbad: California's Quintessential Oceanside Getaway | 3,019,491 |
| ✓ In Carlsbad, LEGOLAND Anchors A Week of Family Fun in SoCal | 9,262,408 |
| ✓ Carlsbad: Fostering Healthy Living Since 1882 | 28,023,050 |
| ✓ Carlsbad Woos Corporate Execs with Accessible, Pro Quality Golf | 14,050 |
| Call To Action Placement | |
| ✓ visitcarlsbad.com | 26,744,392 |
| ✓ 1-800-227-5722 | 102,028 |



The current four top line measures of success are:

1. Return on investment
 - a. Ad Equivalency / DCI Contract Amount
2. Circulation/Impressions
 - a. Verified circulation from media where PR efforts drove Carlsbad articles or features
3. Advertising Equivalency
 - a. The cost of the PR placements if they were to be purchased as advertising.
4. Call to Action
 - a. The level of activity driven from PR efforts on the Visit Carlsbad website.

The overarching goal of the current PR efforts is to increase awareness of Carlsbad nationally in a wide variety of travel related media, as well as general media. The illustration above shows the variety of media where Carlsbad has received publicity in conjunction with the current PR efforts.

SAG Recommendation – Focused Public Relations

In conjunction with the overall focus on key markets and with an emphasis on the shoulder periods, SAG recommends a focused approach to public relations. This will include gaining an understanding for the most effective vehicles to drive awareness to the target market segments. The Nielson Lifestyle Segmentation research indicates the most popular vehicles for reaching the key segments and with that information Visit Carlsbad can deploy public relations efforts in a targeted manner. This will contribute to a more focused plan going forward. The proposed budget has a smaller allocation for PR however a more targeted approach that will create more awareness in the top market segments.

Conclusion – Leisure Sales and Marketing

There is an opportunity to re-focus the future efforts in leisure sales and marketing for Carlsbad. The research has identified the top segments to pursue to increase shoulder period visitation. The development of Carlsbad experiences that will raise awareness and create specific options for the targeted market segments create an effective and measurable approach for the future.

The recommended refocused targeted approach will be effective in driving increased awareness to the targeted markets while resources are reallocated for the development of the group sales and marketing plan.

Group Sales and Marketing

The input received in the stakeholder focus groups as well as the review of competitive destinations mix of visitors uncovered the need to study the potential of conventions and meetings as a future target for tourism marketing. Currently, Visit Carlsbad utilizes empowerMINT (a subscription to the MINT database) to procure RFPs for group business through visitcarlsbad.com. Below are the 2014 leads generated through the Visit Carlsbad website:

2014 Visit Carlsbad Online RFP Group Statistics

Leads: 6

Number of Attendees: 305

SAG met with Visit Carlsbad's executive director along with the City's economic development manager and the Directors of Sales (DOSes) for the hotel properties that have larger amounts of meeting space in order to gain their insight on the potential of the group market and how tourism resources could be utilized most effectively. As is the overall recommended strategy of this report, the focus was to understand the current group sales efforts and the potential to focus future efforts on increasing the Shoulder Season visitation. The DOSes were very interested and supported a recommendation to work together on behalf of Visit Carlsbad to market the destination.

The following Carlsbad hotel leaders have participated in this process:

1. Vikram Sood, Hilton Oceanfront Resort & Spa
2. Julie Zahner, Sheraton Carlsbad Resort & Spa
3. Patsy Bock, Omni La Costa Resort & Spa
4. Jason McLaughlin, Park Hyatt Aviara Resort
5. Michael Swyney, Hilton Oceanfront Resort & Spa

The opportunity in creating a new group sales and marketing effort is to determine how to implement an approach that is complimentary to the current sales efforts of the individual hotels and resorts. SAG facilitated a discussion with the DOSes to determine how to create a new effort that was focused on raising awareness and bringing new groups that were not already being marketed and sold by Carlsbad hotels. This is a common concern for other destinations. The consensus was that the new group effort must be very open and transparent to allow for the oversight committee, in conjunction with Visit Carlsbad, to monitor and re-focus the business development efforts on a monthly basis. The recommendations in this area have been developed in conjunction with the participating DOSs.

The following are key components of the recommended new approach to attracting new group business to Carlsbad:

Oversight

An oversight committee will be formed as a committee of the Board of Directors. This committee will be made up of the hotels with meeting space which can provide expertise and support in the development of a successful group sales and marketing program. This committee would monitor progress on a monthly basis as well as review and recommend the group sales budget and goals. The level of engagement of this committee will have a direct impact on the success of the program. The goal is that this group sales initiative will be a collaborative process.

Goal Setting

The goal setting process will include initial research by the Visit Carlsbad Business Development Manager with review by the Executive Director. The goals will then be presented to the oversight committee for review and recommendation for the goals to be presented to the Visit Carlsbad Board of Directors and the TBID Board of Directors.



Metrics

The primary metric for success of the group sales effort is definite room nights booked as a result of the sales and marketing efforts. The tracking of these room nights will require collaboration between the hotels booking the groups and Visit Carlsbad. Other important metrics will include the number of qualified leads generated as well as the number of new customers that have come to Carlsbad to learn about the destination from a meetings standpoint.

Key Group Sales Metrics

- *Definite Room nights Booked*
- *Qualified Leads Generated*
- *New Customers coming to Carlsbad*

Staffing

The recommended approach to staffing is the hiring of a Business Development Manager as a full time employee of Visit Carlsbad. This position would report to the Executive Director and be responsible for the driving awareness of Carlsbad as a meetings destination and identifying new customers in identified markets to bring to Carlsbad.

The job functions of this position would include:

1. Researching and developing the list of top group markets for Carlsbad
2. Developing an annual plan for external marketing events
3. Prospecting for new clients who have potential for Carlsbad
4. Organizing Familiarization trips to bring new clients to Carlsbad
5. Creating and implementing an awareness plan, including direct marketing
6. Coordinating a targeted PR effort for the Group Market
7. Developing a group database for Visit Carlsbad
8. Developing a group “Brand” for Carlsbad
9. Developing an approach to present the group experience in Carlsbad through a virtual presentation
10. Developing a complete online space for meeting planners that will include tools and meeting space specifications for all Carlsbad meeting options

This position would have the title of “business development” to signify that the role would be to work on uncovering new customers for Carlsbad and then coordinating with the hotels for the actual closing and contracting of business. The position would be measured based on the number of groups that actually booked Carlsbad from the new sales and marketing efforts. This makes it very important that there is a coordinated approach to tracking the new customers and whether they held a meeting in Carlsbad.

Meetings that take place from Sunday through Wednesday during the previously mentioned shoulder period (September through March) will be a primary focus of this new effort.

Vertical Markets

SAG recommends that there is a facilitated session in conjunction with the sales department to finalize the top vertical markets for Carlsbad. The DOS’s have reviewed the current business mix and the following are the preliminary list of key group markets for Carlsbad:

1. Biotech
 - a. Medical device industry
 - b. Lifestyle companies
2. Sports business – examples: SKLZ*, Golf Manufacturing Companies
3. Retail – Corporate - example: Reef*
4. Incentive
 - a. Pharmaceutical
 - b. Financial
 - c. Insurance
 - d. C-level
5. Social, Military, Educational, Religious and Fraternal (SMERF)

6. Healthcare/Hospitals

**SAG understands that both SKLZ and Reef are current clients bringing group business to Carlsbad hotel properties. These companies are good examples of markets that work in Carlsbad.*

The importance of finalizing the top vertical markets is to give direction for the new sales efforts and where to focus resources.

Initial Demand Review

SAG conducted a search of the industry national meetings database (Mint) and found that there are 2,300 groups that have met in Southern California with a peak room night requirement of 25 – 500 rooms. This is an indicator of strong demand and opportunity for group business in Carlsbad.

Technology

It is also recommended that Visit Carlsbad obtain an effective Sales and Marketing software platform to support the new effort. The development of a database of contacts that have been identified as having potential for Carlsbad as well as the ability to develop targeted direct marketing programs are two examples of the benefit of an effective sales software platform. SAG has contacted an industry software supplier who has given a preliminary budget estimate that has been factored into the budget below.

SAG also recommends that Visit Carlsbad continue to be a subscriber to MINT. MINT is an industry driven database with over 40,000 meetings from 20,000 organizations. This will be an important tool to support the prospecting efforts. The cost for the subscription is \$5,000.

Budget

The following is an initial draft of the budget for the first year of the new Group Sales and Marketing effort:

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Staffing – Business Development Manager (total with benefits) | \$150,000 |
| Familiarization Trips (two trips annually) | \$20,000 |
| Sales Calls | \$15,000 |
| Technology/MINT | \$15,000 |
| Website Development | \$20,000 |
| Digital Sales Tools (photos, video) | \$20,000 |
| E-marketing | \$7,500 |
| Total | \$247,500 |

As noted in the introduction, this represents approximately 50% of the available budget dollars. It is recommended that this budget is finalized as part of the implementation plan.

Goals Setting

SAG has reviewed a preliminary approach to setting goals for the new sales and marketing effort. There will be a period of time needed for organizational items. The following is an approach to setting goals for the first full year of operation:

| Activity | Frequency | Desired result |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Familiarization Trips | 2 in the first year | 20 qualified new clients annually to attend |
| External Events/Shows | 1 in the first year | 15 new qualified clients annually |
| Business Development Activity | Ongoing throughout the year | 60 new qualified clients annually (5 per month) |
| Direct Marketing | 3 awareness campaigns annually | 30 new qualified clients annually |
| Total new qualified clients - first year: | | 125 |
| Total Room Nights Booked – first year: | | 1,875 |

Each client represents 150 total room nights on average.

The new qualified clients represent 18,750 new room nights.

The percentage of new clients who have been exposed to Carlsbad who will book in the first year is projected at 10%.

The first year of the new Sales and Marketing effort will generate 1,875 new room nights. This number will grow in future years as more qualified clients are added to the database and book meetings in the future.

Raising Awareness of Carlsbad as a Group Destination

Together with the business development recommendations, the new Group Sales and Marketing effort must focus on how to raise awareness of Carlsbad as a meetings destination. In conjunction with the identified markets that will produce the highest return, a focused plan must be finalized that will move Carlsbad to a group's destination of choice.


Components of the approach to increase awareness will include:

1. Social Media
 - a. The social media platforms can be used to target meeting planners.
2. Direct Marketing
 - a. The development of a qualified client database will create a platform for an ongoing direct marketing effort. A consistent effort will keep Carlsbad top of mind with targeted meeting planners.
 - b. The customers found in the MINT database should also receive a direct marketing piece re-introducing Carlsbad as a meetings destination.

SAG has conducted surveys of over 10,000 meeting planners and the most recent surveys point out the need to create meaningful attendee experiences. This includes the attendee understanding the “brand” of the destination and experiencing the unique attributes as part of the overall meeting plan. The further development of the Carlsbad brand and unique experience for the group market will be an integral part of the first year.

Group Demand for Carlsbad

SAG, in conjunction with Visit Carlsbad, conducted a search of the MINT database to gain a preliminary understanding of the group demand for Carlsbad. The parameters for the search were groups that needed 25 to 500 rooms on their “peak” night and had met in Southern California (and the central coast). The following chart shows the breakdown of the market segments of the groups that met these criteria as a result of the MINT search:



The breakdown of market segments demonstrates that many of the segments correspond to the segments identified by the hotel Directors of Sales who participated in the development of the Group Sale and Marketing Plan. The overall universe of 2,300 groups representing 4,000 meetings demonstrates a significant market for future meetings in Carlsbad.

Carlsbad Conference Center

There is an opportunity to explore the feasibility of a Conference Center being built in Carlsbad. There are many factors to consider in determining if a conference center would have an overall positive impact for Carlsbad. Those factors include the availability of a suitable site, a concentration of hotel rooms to create a viable room block within close proximity, sufficient demand, adequate funding and a viable ownership and operating model.

SAG conducted a search of meetings that had met in Southern California and required 500 to 1,000 hotel rooms simultaneously with an attendance of 800 to 2,000. These parameters were selected because these groups would need more than one hotel in Carlsbad and potentially a Conference Center for meeting space. The search produced over 750 groups, which indicates a large overall demand since the MINT database has relatively small percentage of the universe of meetings that would fall into this category.

*Large Group Demand
750 Groups identified in a national
meetings database*

The next steps are to determine if there are available viable sites and conduct a full feasibility study. It should be noted that there are a wide range of models and facilities that should be considered. A new facility could be developed that was flexible to handle multiple uses. This is important in attracting private investment. The feasibility study should take into account the combinations of uses from meetings and conferences to sporting activities and project the implications of different models.



Examples of multiuse facilities designed to host a wide range of events.

Conclusion - Group Sales and Marketing


The development of a new and effective group sales and marketing plan will require the collective input and oversight of the Board of Directors, a designated committee, and Visit Carlsbad. The opportunity to recruit a new staff member and finalize the overall parameters is important in ensuring that the efforts are complimentary to the current group sales efforts of the Carlsbad hotels.

With this in mind, SAG recommends the development of a group sales and marketing plan as outlined above. With a successful effort, the definite room night bookings will grow significantly as qualified client databases are created and developed.

Event Development

The development of events that will bring visitors to a destination during periods of softer demand is an important aspect of a tourism plan. There are three approaches to consider in the development of an overall event plan:

1. Are there current events that could develop into stronger tourism events with support and resources?
2. Are there events in other destinations that would be successful in Carlsbad? Can Carlsbad entice the event organizers to relocate or create a similar event in Carlsbad?
3. Should Carlsbad develop its own signature event to attract visitors? Could a new event that was unique to Carlsbad have a larger impact on the Carlsbad brand?



SAG recommends that all three approaches are used in developing an annual event plan. The current grant program that is administered by the CTBID Board of Directors should support a new overall approach to event development. Visit Carlsbad, in conjunction with the CTBID staff, would present a proposal annually that would encompass the overall approach to event development and how it supports the overall direction of the marketing plan.

The current events that are funded through the CTBID grant process are:

| | Date | Room nights generated | Attendance |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 2. Marathon | January 19, 2014 | 379 | 13,855 |
| 3. Carlsbad 5000 | March 29-30, 2014 | 2,686 | 7,333 |
| 4. Film Festival | September 18-21, 2014 | 75 (La Costa) | 4,500 |
| 5. Carlsbad Music Festival | September 19-21, 2014 | n/a | 3,500 |

Event Measurement and Reporting

It is critical to have a measurement and reporting plan for all events. This should include support for the event organizers in the best mechanisms to collect the data that is needed. SAG discussions with the CTBID staff indicated there was an opportunity to develop a consistent approach for the measurement requirements for events that receive support. SAG recommends the development of a required projection and measurement component as a requirement for all events receiving CTBID support.

Metrics would include:

1. Projected Attendance
2. Marketing Plan Metrics
 - a. Traditional Advertising Reach
 - b. Online activity
 - c. Social Media reach
3. Room Nights Generated – Tracking Method
4. Economic impact – (pre-approved formula)
 - a. Direct Spending
 - b. Tax Generation

The implementation of an event development plan will have quantitative goals. The data was not available for all of the currently funded events. This goal needs to be developed in conjunction with the overall annual goals.

In the area of larger event recruitment, a goal of one new large event every two years would be aggressive, yet achievable. SAG recommends establishing a goal for ongoing event development.

The Carlsbad Experience

The development and prioritization of the Carlsbad tourism product is an integral part of the long-term strategic plan. The following are recommendations related to opportunities to continue to develop and enhance the overall visitor experience in Carlsbad.


The results of the research highlighted the fact that after the beach and LEGOLAND, the recognition of other attractions or amenities dropped off significantly. The opportunity going forward is to determine the highest priorities and development of funding and recruitment plans.

The following are opportunities SAG recommends for future capital and marketing investment.

Transportation System

The development of a transportation system to connect key points of interest such as the Carlsbad Village, retail, and hotels would provide an opportunity for visitors to experience Carlsbad without driving and navigating parking. This system could be funded through multiple businesses and business districts.

Competitive destinations have launched and implemented shuttles and services for tourism purposes to accommodate visitors transportation needs. Santa Monica is a good example of a hotel-sponsored tourism shuttle that was launched in May of 2014. The Santa Monica shuttle is free to visitors and its route covers Downtown Santa Monica, the Santa Monica Pier, Main Street, and Montana Avenue areas and is available at select hotels. Pedestrians can flag down the vehicles to be transported within the service area. The service runs seven days a week from 11:30am until at least 8pm, later on weekends and for special events.



Carlsbad Lagoon – Agua Hedionda

The Agua Hedionda and neighboring lagoons create an opportunity for a new experience and are currently a fairly popular visitor experience. The below graphic delineates the different entities which currently have rights to areas of the Agua Hedionda Lagoon.



Based on research and stakeholder conversations, there are questions surrounding the rights and ownership of different parts of the Lagoon. Following is a description of each entity that operates on the lagoon and their rights to the space:

- **City of Carlsbad** – The City does not own the land or the water but has the right to grant permits for motorboat usage.
- **California Watersports** – California Watersports is a private operator who pays rent to a private landowner to maintain his business on private land along the lagoon. California Watersports also pays the City \$1.00 per boat launch for individual boats and personal watercrafts. California Watersports is considered a vendor of the City because of the existing agreement in place.
- **NRG (Power Company)** – NRG claims ownership of the surface of the water of the lagoon.
- **YMCA** – The YMCA entry point is on the north side of the middle section of the Lagoon. The YMCA leases the rights to use the Lagoon from the power company (NRG). It is understood that the YMCA lease is on an annual renewal with a 60-day notice. In previous years, the City used to lease the space from NRG and sublease to the YMCA. The current agreement is directly between NRG and the YMCA.
- **Hubbs Sea World Research Institute** – The Hubbs Sea World Research institute owns the land where the building is located and claims ownership of the surface of the water of the Lagoon.

- **Carlsbad Aquafarm** – the Carlsbad Aquafarm is a private company that cultivates Mediterranean Blue Mussels, Pacific Oysters and Ogo for sale to wholesalers and regional restaurants. The Aquafarm also raises different “live feed” for the aquaria trade industry.
- **Carlsbad Desalination Plant** – The Carlsbad Desalination Plant is owned, operated and maintained by Poseidon and will be operational in 2016. The site of the desalination plant is a 6-acre parcel in a portion of the site that leaves the majority of the EPS property open for potential recreational or redevelopment activity.

The entities described above own, lease, or have access to the Lagoon and are all separate from each other. The current organization of the Lagoon lacks continuity and oversight. The City has an opportunity to negotiate and/or increase oversight in certain areas to improve the Carlsbad experience when it comes to visitors of the Lagoon. SAG feels strongly that the Lagoon is a unique asset to the community and the tourism industry and the City is positioned to capitalize on this opportunity. SAG would recommend the following steps to improve the tourism product of the Agua Hedionda Lagoon:

1. Increase the parameters and quality requirements of the contract with California Watersports. The City collects revenue from the vendor and has an agreement with the operator although the lease is to a private landowner. At the next opportunity, the City should require higher quality standards of the operator in order to clean up the site and increase the quality of the patron experience. In conjunction with this, Visit Carlsbad would collaborate in the development of the annual marketing plan to include the overall approach to promoting the lagoon as a visitor experience. Visit Carlsbad would also proactively obtain visitor feedback to evaluate the quality of services.
2. Begin discussions with NRG and the YMCA about the current agreement and the best way for the City to make improvements for tourism and access for visitors. While the YMCA is an important community organization, they currently have sole rights to the middle section of the Lagoon, which is not maximizing the asset from the City’s perspective. Based on SAG’s research, the lease with NRG is year-to-year, which presents an opportunity to the City to get involved either directly with NRG or sublease from the YMCA.
3. Invest in a capital project on the Lagoon to increase the visitor experience. SAG conducted research and through stakeholder conversations, learned that the YMCA’s portion of the Lagoon is largely empty and presents an opportunity for an investment. SAG recommends completing further due diligence on the opportunity to invest in a capital project such as a Cable Wake Park (pictured below). A Cable Wake Park is a tow line operated by an electric motor on a series of towers. This creates a course that riders on wakeboards, wakeskates, waterskis, and wakesurfs follow on a tow line. The courses can be changed and updated to allow for different levels of difficulty. There are only seven Cable Wake Parks in California and none along the coast. Carlsbad is uniquely positioned to host a Cable Wake Park and would be the only coastal California destination to have an asset of this kind. An investment in a Cable Wake Park would also diversify the Carlsbad tourism product because the age range for riders is typically older than the current target market. The minimum age for riders at most Cable Wake Parks is 8 years old. Typically riders are in their teens and older.

The following images show a Cable Wake Park and how it could impact the Lagoon product:



Conference/Convention Center

As mentioned in the previous section, SAG recommends conducting a more in-depth feasibility study to determine the viability of a conference/event center for Carlsbad. The preliminary demand analysis demonstrated a potential groups market for a conference center. The feasibility study should include site selection, flexible uses and the range of ownership and management models. This study could be completed in a cost effective manner with support from Visit Carlsbad in demand validation.

Carlsbad Village

The Carlsbad Village provides a central business district for visitors staying in all areas of Carlsbad to enjoy. SAG has reviewed the current collaborative marketing between Visit Carlsbad and the Village. This was illustrated in the low referral numbers from the Visit Carlsbad website. There is an opportunity to fully integrate the collective marketing resources and activities.



One important note in reviewing feedback received by visitors and stakeholders is that Carlsbad Village is not mentioned often as an “attraction” when describing Carlsbad as a destination. This could be due to the ongoing need to expand the experiences as well as a lack of a cohesive marketing approach to increasing awareness and driving visitation.

SAG met with Urban Place Consulting to gain additional insight on current activities. The Village has had capital investment in streetscapes, way finding and lighting. They have also developed an active event schedule as a tool to increase visitation.

The recent plan developed for the Village included the intent to have an ongoing collaborative relationship with Visit Carlsbad. SAG recommends that this is established in the future. The collaboration should include the development of a joint marketing plan annually and involvement in

both organizations by the Executive Directors. This should include participation in both boards of directors.

The Village is also undertaking the challenge of gaining support and ultimately creating a PBID designed to produce an ongoing funding stream to support future economic development activity as well as marketing. The suggested budget for the Property-based Improvement District (PBID) should be reviewed and supported by the tourism industry after any suggestions are made for modifications.

In 2014, there were 100 total web referrals from the Visit Carlsbad website to the Carlsbad Village website. This is an indicator of a future opportunity to increase the collaboration and cross promotional opportunities.

In the area of product development, the current capital requests that will have the greatest impact on the visitor experience in the village should be a priority for advocacy support by Visit Carlsbad. These would include items that will improve the look and feel of the Village. The ongoing development of the Village creates a more viable Carlsbad experience for visitors

SAG also reviewed the potential of a transportation system that would connect the Carlsbad Village to retail opportunities as well as hotels and spas. There was support for this and an interest in being involved with the development of a plan.

SAG recommends the following

1. A more collaborative approach to marketing including the development of an annual marketing plan
2. A determination of which proposed capital projects warrant support and have the highest tourism value.
3. Review and support of the current proposed PBID based on agreed upon funding strategies
4. Participation in Visit Carlsbad and the Carlsbad Village Association board of directors by each organization.


Beach Camping

Beach Camping is a popular activity in Carlsbad with over 200 spaces available on a daily basis. The program is administered by the State of California with rates ranging from \$35 to \$50 per day with second and third vehicles at \$15 each for entry. The opportunity exists to add landscaping and/or create new standards on the types of vehicles that are allowed on the site. Currently, the state-operated park is open year-round and experiences a similar seasonal swing the Carlsbad hotel properties experience. Reservations for beach camping are made through ReserveAmerica.com and can be made up to seven months in advance. Reserve America lists the following state-approved vendors for RV delivery: Albert's RV, Luv 2 Camp, MLG Enterprises RV Rentals, and Travel Time RV.

The State of California limits the size of RV's and campers to 35 feet in length. Each campsite can hold up to three vehicles and eight people. During the peak beach camping season (March-November), campers are limited to seven consecutive nights and must vacate the park for 24 hours before returning for additional nights. During the off season, campers are limited to 14 consecutive nights before having to vacate the camp. The maximum stay for campers is 30 days annually.

As of December 2014, over 80% of the campsites available to book are sold out. Historically, the beach camping reservations from June-August will be sold out by March. The images below show the length of the beach camping sites and also how the sites look from the nearby hotel properties:





Beach Camping is a valuable asset to Carlsbad and also presents a different type of product for different segments of visitors not staying in the hotels. SAG understands that while it is valuable to the specific segments it could, at times, have negative implications on hospitality properties on the beach and the overall beach experience. The view from an oceanfront room is not what guests expect when paying for an oceanfront view. This could have an impact on rates and the percentage of return visitors. SAG recommends the City begin dialogue with the California Department of Recreation and Parks to understand the City's rights in increasing guests' requirements and the City's ability to plant taller privacy shrubs and hedges in order to differentiate the spaces and provide an added level of quality for the patrons of the camp and the patrons of oceanfront hotel properties. SAG also recommends the CTBID facilitate further discussions with the State of California to increase the quality of the beach camping product to convert some of the RV sites to rental safari tents, yurts, mini-cabins, or furnished AirStream "retro" RVs. Similar products are currently offered in Santa Barbara. Packages developed in concert with the state could include partnerships with area hotels for spa services, dining experiences, etc. to further increase the beach camping product.

The recommendations delineated above, in conjunction with the current retail projects that are under development, will continue to advance Carlsbad as a destination. SAG recommends adopting these recommendations and determining the steps needed to begin the respective processes.

Governance

SAG has researched and developed several governance models in tourism organizations nationally. The funding models as well as type of organization are practical factors in determining the most effective approach. There are key principles to consider in determining the most effective governance model. These include:

1. Governance and Accountability
2. Financial Oversight
3. Legal Compliance and Public Disclosure

Effective Governance and Accountability

The success of the proposed approach will depend on the level of accountability and effective oversight of the governing body. This includes engagement and involvement in setting annual measurable goals and monitoring results on a regular basis.

Effective governance also includes industry leaders committing to invest the time in providing support and guidance to the executive director. There have been many stakeholders who have expressed interest in the future of tourism in Carlsbad. The success of the implementation of the recommendations will also depend on the level of commitment from the tourism industry in accepting governance roles and actively participating.

Strong Financial Oversight

The fiscal oversight of the resources allocated to Carlsbad tourism is an area of focus in effective governance. This includes the compliance with General Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as well as instituting processes to evaluate the effectiveness of key expenditures. SAG's recommendations include significant re-allocation of resources with an emphasis on key metrics and a focus on monitoring quantitative results. The governing body must actively participate in the development of this approach to ensure success.

Legal Compliance and Public Disclosure

The area of legal compliance is generally overseen by a board and outside legal counsel working collaboratively with the City Attorney. The area of public disclosure includes the importance of communicating the results of the tourism efforts in a manner that is easily understood by a broad base of stakeholders. An effective governance model will monitor industry communications and solicit input on the overall effectiveness of this effort. The feedback that has been received in this process indicates a need to increase and focus future communication.

These areas point out the importance of an active and effective governance approach for the future of tourism. The current model creates a scenario where there are effectively two governing boards. Below are the current stated purposes of the CTBID and Visit Carlsbad:

Current stated purpose of the Carlsbad Tourism Business Improvement District (CTBID)

- *To administer marketing and visitor programs to promote the City of Carlsbad as a tourism visitor destination and to fund projects, programs, and activities, including appropriate administrative charges that benefit hotels within the boundaries of the District.*

Current stated purpose of Visit Carlsbad

- *The main purpose of the Carlsbad DMO is to execute an annual business plan on behalf of the City of Carlsbad Tourism Business Improvement District (CTBID). The DMO shall target commercial and leisure travelers and other potential hotel guests in order to stimulate demand of Carlsbad's hotel community and other services. This business will result in direct commercial benefit of the tourism community and will indirectly benefit the City of Carlsbad and its citizens. The DMO's vision for Carlsbad is to become a well-recognized travel destination in California and a preferred family destination in the Southern California Region.*

In review of these two statements above it is clear that the CTBID and Visit Carlsbad have very similar purposes. Both governing bodies are responsible for the oversight of Tourism Marketing for the City of Carlsbad. This includes the fact that both boards approve the annual marketing plan and budget for tourism expenditures.

Boards of Directors – CTBID and Visit Carlsbad

The following are current members of the CTBID Board:

- Hector Becerra, Holiday Inn Carlsbad by the Sea
- Bill Canepa, Hilton Garden Inn Carlsbad Beach*
- Larry Magor, Omni La Costa Resort and Spa*
- Kim Akers, West Inn and Suites*
- Nancy Nayudu, Pelican Cove Inn Bed & Breakfast
- Timothy Stripe, Grand Pacific Resorts*
- Vacant Position, Park Hyatt Aviara Hotel

Updated January 2015

The following are current members of Visit Carlsbad Board of Directors:

- Mike Swyney, Hilton Garden Inn Carlsbad Beach*
- Patsy Bock, Omni La Costa Spa and Resort*
- Julie Zahner, Sheraton Carlsbad Resort & Spa*
- Peter Kock, LEGOLAND California
- Jason McLaughlin, Park Hyatt Aviara Resort*
- Linda Hopkins, West Inn & Suites
- Janissa Reyes, Carlsbad Premium Outlets*


**Board members from the same organizations
Updated January 2015*

The composition of both Boards of Directors is primarily hotel industry leaders and those designated above are members who come from the same organization. This indicates a potential opportunity to create a singular governing body with committees that are focused on the key areas for Carlsbad tourism. This would concentrate the oversight of the key planning tools and overall accountability with one Board of Directors. This restructuring would also allow for industry leaders to focus on specific sales and marketing initiatives through a committee structure. In the proposed structure, the respective entities would remain separate, however they would have common oversight.


Another benefit of a streamlined governance model is the increased opportunity for the Visit Carlsbad staff and City staff to collaborate in supporting agreed upon tourism initiatives.

Four committees are recommended to focus on financial oversight, industry reporting and communication, leisure sales and marketing, and group sales and marketing.

Current Governance Model – Carlsbad Tourism



Recommended Future Carlsbad Tourism Governance Model



SAG recommends the implementation of the above illustrated governance model. This will streamline the oversight of tourism marketing activities and increase the opportunity for active involvement in key initiatives as part of effective implementation and on-going success.

Budget

The recommendations contained in this report relative to future sales and marketing initiatives can be implemented within the current resources of the CTBID and Visit Carlsbad. The proposed increases in funding create the opportunity to increase the penetration in targeted markets and develop a capital fund to support product and event development.

The following is an overview of the proposed budget that encompasses the sales and marketing recommendations

Highlights of these recommendations include:

Develop a Group Sales and Marketing Effort

The proposed budget takes into account the resources needed to develop a Group Sales and Marketing initiative. The approach creates an equal division of resources between Group Sales and Marketing and Leisure Sales and Marketing.

New Position – Business Development Manager

The proposed budget has an added senior position. The proposed Business Development Manager position is outlined in the groups sales and marketing section of the report. This senior level position would be responsible for the oversight and execution of the group sales and marketing plan as well as a focused approach to group business development.

Refocus of Leisure Sales and Marketing

The overall resources dedicated to Leisure Sales and Marketing have been reduced and refocused on direct marketing. There is an increase in resources tied to Direct Marketing and the creation of Carlsbad experiences and packages. There is a reduction in the resources allocated to awareness campaigns and a reallocation of resources tied to Search Engine Optimization and Social Media Management.

Targeted Public Relations Effort


The budget has been reduced and the recommendation is to focus all PR efforts in the vehicles that are effective with the targeted audiences in both the leisure and group sales efforts.


Research

The proposed budget has an increase in annual resources for research. This will enable Visit Carlsbad to refine target markets on an annual basis.

The chart below is a summary of the reallocations of the current Visit Carlsbad budget to support the implementation of the recommendations.

| Leisure – Interactive Marketing Breakdown | | | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| | Visit Carlsbad FY2015 | SAG Proposed | Variance |
| Leisure-Interactive Marketing | 331,609 | 182,000 | 149,609 |
| • Google (Paid Search) | 162,737 | 80,000 | 82,737 |
| • Display / Mobile (Paid Search) | 43,155 | | 43,155 |
| • Media Buying/Planning (Paid Search) | 30,555 | 15,000 | 15,555 |
| • SEO | 22,807 | 12,000 | 10,807 |
| • Email Marketing | 18,000 | 65,000 | -47,000 |
| • Social Media Management | 17,000 | 10,000 | 7,000 |







The charts above reflect the shift in focus for future Leisure Sales and Marketing. This reflects the shift to a direct marketing approach with a smaller budget that is focused on the shoulder periods.

Overall Sales and Marketing Expenditures

The following charts demonstrate the overall shift in resources from the current budget to a proposed reallocation of resources to support the overall recommendations





The charts above and the table below reflect the proposed shift in resources.

| Current FY15 Promotional Programs Breakdown | | SAG Proposed Promotional Programs Breakdown | |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Research | 8,000 | Research | 11,000 |
| Leisure -Interactive Marketing (Includes PR) | 412,609 | Leisure - Interactive Marketing (Includes PR) | 225,500 |
| Group Direct Sales (Earmarked) | 50,000 | Group Direct Sales** Includes Salary | 247,500 |
| Travel & Ent | 15,000 | Travel & Ent | 2,500 |
| Dues & Subscriptions | 5,000 | Dues & Subscriptions | 5,000 |
| Collateral Production & Fulfillment | 5,000 | Collateral Production & Fulfillment | 5,000 |
| Total | \$495,609 | Total | \$496,000 |

It reflects a 50/50 allocation of resources between the group and leisure group sales and marketing activities. SAG recommends this allocation in conjunction with stakeholder input and recommended shift in approach in Leisure Sales and Marketing.

Overall Current and Proposed Budget

The following reflects the current line item budget for Visit Carlsbad and the recommended reallocations to support the proposed new directions in leisure and group sales and marketing.



| | Adopted FY15 Budget | SAG Proposed Budget | SAG Variance to FY15 Budget Dollars Difference | SAG Variance to FY15 Budget Percent |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| INCOME | | | | |
| Public Sources | | | | |
| CTBID Revenues | 755,500 | 755,500 | 755,500 | |
| Private Source Income | | | | |
| Total Public Sources | 755,500 | 755,500 | 755,500 | |
| Carry Over from 2013 | | | | |
| TOTAL INCOME | 755,500 | 755,500 | 755,500 | |
| EXPENSE | | | | |
| Labor | | | | |
| Salaries | 189,817 | \$ 289,817 | \$ 100,000 | 35% |
| Payroll Taxes | 17,000 | 27,000 | | 37% |
| Works Comp | 4,000 | 6,100 | | 34% |
| Benefits | 23,000 | 37,500 | | 39% |
| Total Labor | 233,817 | \$ 360,417.00 | \$ 126,600 | 35% |
| Promotional Programs | | | | |
| Advertising & Production | 5,000 | \$ 5,000.00 | \$ - | 0% |
| Research | 8,000 | \$ 11,000.00 | \$ 3,000 | 27% |
| Leisure-Interactive Marketing | | | | |
| Google (Paid Search) | 162,737 | \$ 80,000.00 | \$ (82,737) | -103% |
| Display / Mobile (Paid Search) | 43,155 | \$ - | | |
| Media Buying/Planning (Paid Search) | 30,555 | \$ 15,000.00 | \$ (15,555) | -104% |
| SEO | 22,807 | \$ 12,000.00 | \$ (10,807) | -90% |
| Email Marketing | 18,000 | \$ 65,000.00 | \$ 47,000 | 72% |
| Social Media Management | 17,000 | \$ 10,000.00 | \$ (7,000) | -70% |
| Agency Fees | 37,355 | \$ 21,840.00 | \$ (15,515) | -71% |
| Group Direct Sales | 50,000 | \$ 92,500.00 | \$ 42,500 | 46% |
| Familiarization Trips (2 annually) | - | \$ 20,000.00 | \$ 20,000 | 100% |
| Sales Calls | - | \$ 15,000.00 | \$ 15,000 | 100% |
| Technology/MINT | - | \$ 10,000.00 | \$ 10,000 | 100% |
| Website Development | - | \$ 20,000.00 | \$ 20,000 | 100% |
| Digital Sales Tools | - | \$ 20,000.00 | \$ 20,000 | 100% |
| Emarketing | - | \$ 7,500.00 | \$ 7,500 | 100% |
| Outside Services-Public Relations | 70,000 | \$ 35,000.00 | \$ (35,000) | -100% |
| Public Relations Events | 6,500 | \$ 3,500.00 | \$ (3,000) | -86% |
| Travel & Entertainment | 15,000 | \$ 2,500.00 | \$ (12,500) | -500% |
| Dues & Subscription | 5,000 | \$ 5,000.00 | \$ - | 0% |
| Collateral Production & Fulfillment | 5,000 | \$ 5,000.00 | \$ - | 0% |
| Total Promotional Programs | 496,109 | \$ 363,340.00 | \$ (132,769) | -36.5% |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------------|------------|------|
| General Administration | | | | |
| Bank Charges | 1,000 | 1,000 | \$ - | 0% |
| Equipment Rental & Maintenance | 3,000 | 3,000 | \$ - | 0% |
| Facility Repair & Maintenance | 150 | 150 | \$ - | 0% |
| Insurance | 1,200 | 1,200 | \$ - | 0% |
| Grounds Maintenance | | | \$ - | |
| Office Supplies | 2,000 | 2,000 | \$ - | 0% |
| Postage | 974 | 974 | \$ - | 0% |
| Taxes | 150 | 150 | \$ - | 0% |
| Telephone | 5,000 | 7,500 | \$ 2,500 | 33% |
| Professional Services | 5,600 | 5,600 | \$ - | 0% |
| Volunteer Program | 1,000 | 1,000 | \$ - | 0% |
| Miscellaneous | 1,000 | 3,500 | \$ 2,500 | 71% |
| Utilities | 2,500 | 2,500 | \$ - | 0% |
| Computer Expense | 2,000 | 2,000 | \$ - | 0% |
| Total G&A | 25,574 | \$ 30,574.00 | \$ 5,000 | 16% |
| TOTAL EXPENSE | | | | |
| | 755,500 | \$ 754,331.00 | \$ (1,169) | 0.7% |

The proposed budget above includes the recommended changes in the leisure sales and marketing efforts as well as group sales and marketing. The proposed budget does not include capital/product recommendations from the previous sections including:

- Feasibility study for conference center
- Feasibility study for Lagoon improvements
- Implementation of beach camping improvements
- Any capital improvements related to product development

Funding


The results of the benchmarking research indicated that the level of funding for tourism marketing was low compared to other comparable destinations. The current visitor levels during the shoulder periods signify the importance of dedicated tourism resources in the future. The ratio of tourism dollars to hotel rooms was a key indicator as Carlsbad was the second lowest in the competitive set that was reviewed.

Another important outcome of the benchmarking study was the fact that Carlsbad was the only city with no TOT funding for tourism marketing.

SAG recommends taking a comprehensive approach to finalizing a new funding plan for the future of tourism. A combination of broad stakeholder involvement and a restructuring of the current approach to TOT funding is the foundation of the recommendation. The funding recommendations are predicated on the approval, adoption, and implementation of the stakeholder supported recommendations contained in this report. Without stakeholder support for future tourism efforts, SAG does not recommend instituting new funding strategies.

Currently the TOT percentage in Carlsbad is 10%. This provides an opportunity to potentially increase the TOT in Carlsbad for dedicated marketing and tourism product development efforts. The below charts, also included in the benchmarking section of this report, illustrate the competitive destinations' handling of TOT collection and distribution.

The chart below shows the TOT collection rate imposed on hotel rooms by the competitive city governments.




New Funding Approach Components

The following are viable components of a new approach to funding:

1. Transient Occupancy Tax Options

- a. Increase the current TOT rate charged to Carlsbad Hotels
 - i. In conjunction with a dedicated commitment to spend the incremental dollars on agreed upon marketing efforts as well as Tourism product development, the TOT rate can be increased to 12%. This will raise two to three million dollars annually. The review of competitive destinations indicates an opportunity to raise the TOT percentage collected without a significant impact on occupancy.

- b. Reallocate a portion of the Transient Occupancy Tax to Tourism Marketing
 - i. SAG recommends in addition that a portion of the current TOT is allocated to tourism marketing. The formula for this would expand and contract based on the overall TOT collected. This allocation would also be predicated on the achievement of agreed upon goals. This “pay for performance” approach will support the overall goal of supporting measurable tourism activities in the future. The below chart shows in ascending order the destinations that receive a percentage of the TOT funding.



SAG recommends that 10% of the TOT is allocated in the first year with an incentive plan in place that could increase this to 20%.

2. Create a larger “district” to include the Carlsbad restaurant industry

Restaurants in Carlsbad are beneficiaries of effective tourism marketing. They are featured in all of the tourism marketing materials and sales tax revenues show an increase in restaurant activity during times with strong visitor demand. The segments that have been identified in the lifestyle segment study are also inclined to dine out when they are traveling. The success of these targeted efforts will have a direct impact on the restaurant industry. The restaurants that

would be included in an expanded district would be those that are the most positively impacted by tourism efforts.

Similar DMOs have included restaurants and other industries to support the tourism organization. For example, Mammoth Lakes Tourism in California leverages the following assessments on non-hotel entities to support the tourism industry:



Also, Visit California applies an assessment to multiple industries that partner with the state organization. The current assessment rate for accommodations, restaurants, retailers, attractions, transportation companies and travel service providers that have gross California receipts of \$1 million or more is 0.065%, and is applied only to tourism-related revenues. SAG also recommends that additional industries are considered for inclusion in the CTBID in the future

3. Increase or modify the current CTBID fees

Feedback from the hotel community indicated little interest in increasing the current CTBID fees until an industry supported plan was adopted. In conjunction with the approval and adoption of the agreed upon recommendations, SAG recommends an increase of 50 cents per occupied room to begin in the fiscal year of 2016. The implementation of the recommendations would be well underway at this point.

Another option would be to modify the current CTBID format to a percentage of the participating hotel rate. This could potentially raise additional funds and reallocate funding based on the overall revenue generation.

SAG estimates that the combination of the recommended funding would raise between \$1.5 and 3 million dollars. With the new additional revenue raised, Visit Carlsbad's budget could increase to \$1,755,500 with an additional fund developed for future Carlsbad tourism product development. This would move Carlsbad to \$399 marketing dollars per hotel room.

The goal for increased funding is to create more frequency in impacting the targeted markets that have been identified through research and stakeholder input. The increased funding would warrant increasing the leisure and group room night goals. The other important opportunity would be to have more resources for recruiting or developing new signature events.

The development of a tourism capital development fund creates the opportunity to support projects including a new transportation system, the Carlsbad Village efforts, the feasibility study of the

conference center and enhancement to the lagoon experience. SAG recommends this from a portion of the fund raised with the above recommendations.



Return on Investment

The goal of an increased funding stream for Carlsbad’s tourism efforts is to create an increased, measurable return on investment. The new recommendations for future tourism marketing efforts will provide “trackable” data to determine the overall economic return. Based on a blended spending multiplier for a visitor to Carlsbad of \$328 per person*, the new recommended funding must generate an additional 3,050 visitors annually to “breakeven” on the new marketing expenses (assumes 1 million in new marketing revenue). Many destinations strive for 7 to 1 rate of return for dollars expended compared to direct spending generated. With that in mind, the newly funded tourism efforts would need to generate over 21,000 incremental visitors

* 2013 SDTA Visitor Profile

Conclusion


A comprehensive approach to gathering information, conducting extensive research and consistent stakeholder involvement has produced a new direction for tourism sales and marketing in Carlsbad. The direction that has been developed and recommended in this study process is designed to maximize the effectiveness of the current tourism resources and create a path for further investment. The interest in future increased investment will be validated by the intent to create a sales and marketing approach that is razor focused and highly measurable.

Carlsbad is a destination with many unique attributes that appeal to distinct audiences. The results of the market segment research in conjunction with Nielson and Resonate demonstrates the ability of Carlsbad to appeal to an upscale audience without kids as well as a family audience with kids who are interested in theme park type activities. The findings have uncovered an opportunity to focus on the upscale market segment and bring new visitors during the much needed shoulder periods.

The development of an aggressive and complimentary group sales and marketing plan will be another cornerstone of the direction. This plan has been developed in collaboration with the hotel community and is ready for implementation. This will take a few years to develop and can pay large dividends including validating the value of a new conference/event center for Carlsbad. The unique Carlsbad experience will provide a great differentiator for attracting group business.

First Year Goals – Raising Awareness

The combination of the proposed goals for room nights generated for the first year (3,600 leisure and 1,875 group) is 5,475 room nights. This equates to the “trackable” room nights for the first year that will include a significant amount of implementation activity. These numbers should grow significantly in future years as databases are developed and the marketing efforts produce higher conversion. The full development of these efforts should increase annual room night production by twenty to thirty percent. The below is an illustration of “trackable” new visitors to Carlsbad over 5 years and the estimated visitor spending based on the 2013 SDTA Visitor Profile Study, which equates to 32,857 new visitors and \$39.7 million in new spending.



It is important to note that the proposed efforts will also increase the awareness of Carlsbad with the targeted individual and group markets with consistent frequency and a customized message. This will influence visitation beyond the visitors that can be tracked directly.

The successful implementation of the recommendations contained in this report will take a broad base of support from the City of Carlsbad, CTBID, Visit Carlsbad and the tourism stakeholders. The development of the direction that is recommended has been created with on-going input. This will lead to consensus that will be the foundation of future success. The recommended governance model will provide consistent oversight coupled with active committee involvement. This will increase the efficiency of the implementation process.

A full assessment of the needs and roles of each of the above partners should be conducted in conjunction with the implementation process. A first step would be a structured longer session to review all of the recommendations and assess and define the roles and accountability of the above-mentioned stakeholders.

Strategic Advisory Group would again like to thank the individuals who committed time and gave important insight during this process. The high level of engagement provided critical guidance for this report and the final recommendations.

Recommendation Matrix

| Recommendation | Strategy | Report Pages | Tactic | Timeframe |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Communication</i> | | | | |
| Regular stakeholder communication | Keep stakeholders informed and part of the process. Allows for fluid communication to a large audience and provides transparency of the organization. | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly 1-2 page email outreach with updates and updates on metrics tracking. • Annual report on success measurements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediate |
| <i>Research</i> | | | | |
| Research plan | Budget resources to execute research initiatives. Continue to refine target marketing efforts. Determine success of on-going efforts | 54 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a Visitor Profile Study every three years • Conduct a benchmarking study biannually • Conduct a Target Audience Study biannually • Conduct a Meeting Planner Survey biannually | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve research plan for 2015-2016 fiscal year • Conduct first series of research plan accordingly |
| <i>Resources</i> | | | | |
| Refocus a majority of the tourism resources on impacting the Shoulder Season | Allocate more of the marketing budget for targeted Shoulder Season campaigns | 4, 8, 55-62 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm direction for Shoulder Season • Develop direct marketing campaigns for specific segments during the Shoulder Season • Measure success | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin to plan immediately • Budget approval 2015-2016 fiscal year |
| Reallocate marketing resources for group business | Utilize the current budget to support a group sales effort | 4, 63-70 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm/adopt group sales plan • Form the oversight committee • Set and agree upon goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin to plan immediately • Budget approval 2015-2016 fiscal year |

| <i>Measurement</i> | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Institute a new approach to measurement and reporting | Keep a broad base of stakeholders informed through a monthly report | 2, 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create/continue the monthly email report to stakeholders tracking quantitative success measures • Include room nights converted, packages sold • Include qualitative feedback on awareness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have agreed upon goals and metrics in place by 2015-2016 fiscal year • Have plan in place for adoption 2015-2016 fiscal year |
| <i>Leisure Sales and Marketing</i> | | | | |
| Develop a highly targeted approach for leisure sales and marketing | Utilize a direct marketing approach to new and expanded target markets for leisure travel | 4, 40-54, 55-62 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select and confirm top 5 new segments from Nielsen results to pursue for the first 1-3 years • Create specific experiences for the targeted market segments • Work closely with an e-marketing partner to develop a platform for implementation and creative support • Set and agree upon goals • Utilize new success measures to track progress | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decide on top segments immediately • Have plan approved for fiscal year 2015-2016 • Have creative partner in place for 2015-2016 fiscal year • Have implementation tools in place by August 2015 • Track success in the selected segments for years 1-3 • Reevaluate market segments after three years |
| Refocus target markets for leisure travel | Utilize the Nielsen segmentation results to target new markets that have already indicated presence in Carlsbad for tourism growth in Shoulder Season | 5, 40-54 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select and confirm top 5 new segments from Nielsen results to pursue for the first 1-3 years • Keep family-friendly attitude, but add targets direct marketing for these new segments • Track success in new markets | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decide on top segments immediately • Have plan approved for fiscal year 2015-2016 • Reevaluate target markets after three years |

| <i>Group Sales and Marketing</i> | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Create and implement a new group sales and marketing effort | Utilize MINT search results to target group business. Reallocate resources with measurement plan | 5, 63-70 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruit staff member • Approve a vertical market approach and establish targets • Obtain and implement a sales and marketing software platform • Execute a group destination awareness campaign • Complete a feasibility study on the possibility of adding a conference center for Carlsbad | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin recruiting staff member in July 2015 with new hire starting in August 2015 • Implement new plan September 2015 • Obtain software platform by January 2016 • Complete feasibility study on conference center by year 3 (2018-2019 fiscal year) |
| <i>Governance</i> | | | | |
| Create a unified approach to governance | Bring the CTBID and Visit Carlsbad boards together by creating a singular governing board with active committees | 5, 82-86 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform the necessary legal actions to change the bylaws of Visit Carlsbad and the CTBID to meet as one board • Create one mission on behalf of the organization to market the destination and drive revenue to the City • Create/elect one board of 7-10 people • Create four committees to form accountability measures and delegate responsibilities including: finance, communication and reporting, leisure sales and marketing and group sales and marketing committees. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring to City Council for review and adoption by March 2015 • City Council time to select board members and City Attorney to reevaluate the legal entity by budget approval period for 2015-2016 fiscal year • Have new board in place by July 2015 |

| <i>Funding</i> | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Implement a performance-based approach to new funding | Utilize TOT funds through an increase and reallocation. | 5, 92-94 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set and approve goals for TOT annual collection • Increase the current TOT to 12% • Allocate 10% of the current TOT collected to support tourism marketing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve funding increases by mid year 2016 |
| Create a larger district to include additional partners and increase funding | Involve restaurants and additional beneficiaries of tourism spending to include a tourism tax on sales | 5, 92-94 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop applicable partners for tourism funding, i.e., restaurants, retail and attractions • Begin with restaurants as first industry to be included • Create and approve percentage tax for relative partners | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners support by June 2015 • Implementation by 2016-2017 fiscal year |
| Increase the current fees for the CTBID | Incrementally add a small amount to the CTBID fees | 5, 92-94 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase current CTBID fees by \$0.50 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the \$0.50 increase should be in place by 2017-2018 fiscal year |

Tourism Product Development

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Create unique Carlsbad experiences</p> | <p>Invest in Carlsbad's assets to develop additional tourism experiences</p> | <p>5, 73-81</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement a transportation system to connect key points for tourists • Utilize the City's position to negotiate terms for rights to the Agua Hedionda Lagoon • Increase the parameters of the contract with California Watersports for higher quality standards • Negotiate terms with NRG and the YMCA for tourism access to the Lagoon • Invest in a capital project to increase the visitor experience • Develop a long-term partnership with the Carlsbad Village for increased marketing, and packaging and advocacy • Engage the California Department of Recreation and Parks to understand the City's rights in increasing requirements and adding privacy shrubs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have transportation system outlined and approved in 2015-2016 fiscal year with contractor in place by 2016-2017 • Have terms for rights to the Lagoon by City/Visit Carlsbad by fiscal year 2016-2017 • Invest in a feasibility study/RFP process for a capital project on the lagoon by fiscal year 2016-2017 • Solidify the Carlsbad Village as a partner in marketing and transportation by January 2016 • Finalize beach camping rights on City's behalf by January 2016 • Plan in place to augment the visibility issue of beach camping by 2016-2017 fiscal year • Implement beach camping augmentation in fiscal year 2016-2017 with completion prior to January 2017 |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Addendum

SAG would like to thank all of the properties and individuals in the City, hospitality and tourism industry staff who participated in this study.

Carlsbad City Council

Steve Sarkozy, City of Carlsbad

Kathy Dodson, City of Carlsbad

Christina Vincent, City of Carlsbad

Christie Marcella, City of Carlsbad

Kevin Pointer, City of Carlsbad

Cheryl Gerhardt, City of Carlsbad

Kim Akers, West Inn & Suites

Denise Chapman, Omni La Costa

Sam Ross, Visit Carlsbad

Tim Stripe, Grand Pacific Resorts

Renato Alesiani, Wave Crest Motels and Resorts

Vikram Sood, Hilton Oceanfront Randal Chapin,

Carlsbad Inn Beach Resort

Tom McMahon, Carlsbad Village Theater

Peder Norby, City of Carlsbad

Ryan Ross, North County Transit District

Nancy Nayudu, Pelican Cove Inn

Joli Hatch, Carlsbad Inn Beach Resort

Julie Zahner, Sheraton Carlsbad

Cheryl Landin, LEGOLAND California

Peter Ronchetti, LEGOLAND California

Peter Kock, LEGOLAND California

Valerie Barnes, LEGOLAND California

Jason Mclaughlin, Park Hyatt Aviara

Renier Milan, Beach Terrace Inn

Randy Chapin, Grand Pacific Resorts

Regie Brown, Hilton

Joe Anderson, Grand Pacific Resorts

Frank Idris, LEGOLAND Hotel

Ted Owen, Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce

Hector Becerra, Carlsbad by the Sea

Bill Canepa, Wave Crest Resorts

Celine Cendras, Henry Schein Ortho Organizers

Michael Collins, Zimmer Dental

Stephen Morisseau, GIA

Jim Caraccio, Logic PD

Tim Sinnott, Legend 3D

Josh Cantor, California Watersports

Gary Glaser, The Crossings

Terri Howard Mannes, Carlsbad Premium Outlets

Steve Gibson, Urban Place Consulting

Ashley Westman, Urban Place Consulting

Summer Season Top 15 PRIZM Segments

- **Kids and Cul-de-Sacs** – upper middle class families with children living in the suburbs. These families have a household median income of \$71,830 and the parents’ range in age from 25-44. The parents are college educated and hold professional positions. These families are in the “melting pot” category and are White, Black, Asian, Hispanic and Mixed. These families order on target.com, watch the X Games on TV and drive minivans like the Honda Odyssey.
- **Movers & Shakers** – wealthy, older households without kids living in the suburbs. These households are 45-64 with a median income of \$101,517. This segment is college educated carrying graduate degrees and holding management positions. They are mostly White and Asian. These households play tennis, shop at Nordstrom and drive higher end SUVs i.e., Land Rover.
- **Upper Crust**– significantly wealthy, older households without kids living in the suburbs. This segment is 55+ with a median household income of \$110,117 and are classified by Nielsen as millionaires. These households are college educated with graduate degrees in upper management positions. They are mainly White. This segment shops at high end store like Saks Fifth Avenue, have vacationed in Europe, watch and play golf and drive luxury vehicles i.e., Lexus LS.
- **The Cosmopolitans** – wealthy, mid to older age range, mostly without kids living in urban areas. This segment is 55+ with a household income of \$58,313 working in white-collar settings. This segment is classified as a “Melting Pot” and includes White, Asian, Black, Hispanic and Mixed. These households shop at Macy’s, have vacationed outside the US, watch Masterpiece Theatre and drive upper midclass vehicles i.e., Lincoln Town Car - Flex Fuel.
- **Money & Brains** – wealthy, older family mix within the household, living in urban areas. The older family mix means the children are mostly older teenage or college age dependents. The parents are 45-64 with a median household income of \$88,837 and are college educated in management positions. These households are classified as a “Melting Pot” and include White, Asian, Black, Hispanic and Mixed. This segment shops at stores like Banana Republic, travel for business occasionally, watch tennis and drive luxury SUVs i.e., Mercedes Benz E Class.
- **Home Sweet Home** – Widely scattered across the nation's suburbs, the residents of Home Sweet Home tend to be upper-middle-class married couples living in mid-sized homes without children. The adults in the segment, mostly under 55, have gone to college and hold professional and white-collar jobs. With their upper-middle-class incomes and small families, these folks have fashioned comfortable lifestyles, filling their homes with exercise equipment, TV sets, and pets. The Home Sweet Home Segment has a median household income of \$ 68,555 and is in the Melting Pot category made up of 5 White, Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicities. This segment shops from buy.com, download music from iTunes, watch shows like The Amazing Race, read Wired Magazine and drive middle class vehicles like the Mazda CX-7.

- **Middleburg Managers** - Middleburg Managers arose when empty nesters settled in satellite communities, which offered a lower cost of living and more relaxed pace. Today, segment residents tend to be middle class with solid white-collar jobs or comfortable retirements. In their older homes, they enjoy reading, playing musical instruments, indoor gardening, and refinishing furniture. This segment is upper middle class with a median household income of \$53,379. Middleburg Managers are mostly home owners without children. The main ethnicity in this segment is White and includes Black and Asian. Middleburg Managers shop at Pottery Barn, vacation on cruise lines, read Travel + Leisure, watch Washington Week and drive cars like the Hyundai Elantra Touring.
- **Traditional Times** - This segment is mostly middle-aged without children in the household. Traditional times are in the upper middleclass income level with a median household income of \$57,949. Traditional Times is the kind of lifestyle where small-town couples nearing retirement are beginning to enjoy their first empty-nest years. Typically in their fifties and older, these upper-middle-class Americans pursue a kind of granola-and-grits lifestyle. On their coffee tables are magazines with titles like Country Living and Country Home. But they're big travelers, especially in recreational vehicles and campers. This segment shops at Sam's Club, contribute to PBS, Read Southern Living, watch Antiques Roadshow and drive affordable cars i.e., Toyota Avalon.
- **New Empty Nests** - With their grown-up children recently out of the house, New Empty Nests is composed of upper-middle income older Americans who pursue active--and activist--lifestyles. Most residents are over 65 years old, but they show no interest in a rest-home retirement. This is the top-ranked segment for all-inclusive travel packages; the favorite destination is Europe. New Empty Nests are a mature segment, which is mostly White and retired with a median household income of \$71,212. This segment shops at T.J. Maxx, vacations for 2+ weeks a year, reads the Smithsonian magazine, watches golf, and drives luxury vehicles i.e., Cadillac sedan.
- **Bohemian Mix** - A collection of mobile urbanites, Bohemian Mix represents the nation's most liberal lifestyles. Its residents are an ethnically diverse, progressive mix of young singles, couples, and families ranging from students to professionals. In their funky row houses and apartments, Bohemian Mixers are the early adopters who are quick to check out the latest movie, nightclub, laptop, and microbrew. This upper middle class segment has a median household income of \$56,676 and mostly rent their homes or apartments. College graduates in professional positions, Bohemian Mix is in the Melting Pot category and have a race and ethnicity mix of 6 White, Black, Asian, Hispanic and mixed. This segment shops at the Gap, reads GQ, watches foreign films and drive vehicles like the Audi S4.
- **Gray Power** - Gray Power is a midscale mature segment in a household without children. The steady rise of older, healthier Americans over the past decade has produced one important by-product: middle-class, mostly home-owning suburbanites who are aging in place rather than moving to retirement communities. Gray Power reflects this trend, a segment of older, midscale singles and couples who live in quiet comfort. This segment is mostly White with a median household income of \$52,936. Gray Power shops at Lord & Taylor, read Barron's, own a stationary bike, watch Frontline and drive upscale vehicles like the Mercedes-Benz Sprinter.

- **New Homesteaders** - Young, upper-middle-class families seeking to escape suburban sprawl find refuge in New Homesteaders, a collection of small rustic townships filled with new ranches and Cape Cods. With decent-paying jobs in white and blue-collar industries, these dual-income couples have fashioned comfortable, child-centered lifestyles; their driveways are filled with campers and powerboats, their family rooms with PlayStations. This segment has a median household income of \$58,997 and is a white-collar employee. New Homesteaders are mostly white, black or mixed. They are child focused and drive affordable family friendly vehicles like this Kia Sedona.

Shoulder Season Top 15 Segments

- **Upper Crust** – significantly wealthy, older households without kids living in the suburbs. This segment is 55+ with a median household income of \$110,117 and are classified by Nielsen as millionaires. These households are college educated with graduate degrees in upper management positions. They are mainly White. This segment shops at high-end stores like Saks Fifth Avenue, have vacationed in Europe, watch and play golf and drive luxury vehicles i.e., Lexus LS.
- **Money & Brains** – wealthy, older family mix within the household, living in urban areas. The older family mix means the children are mostly older teenage or college age dependents. The parents are 45-64 with a median household income of \$88,837 and are college educated in management positions. These households are classified as a “Melting Pot” and include White, Asian, Black, Hispanic and Mixed. This segment shops at stores like Banana Republic, travel for business occasionally, watch tennis and drive luxury SUVs i.e., Mercedes Benz E Class.
- **The Cosmopolitans** – wealthy, mid to older age range, mostly without kids living in urban areas. This segment is 55+ with a household income of \$58,313 working in white-collar settings. This segment is classified as a “Melting Pot” and includes White, Asian, Black, Hispanic and Mixed. These households shop at Macy’s, have vacationed outside the US, watch Masterpiece Theatre and drive upper midclass vehicles i.e., Lincoln Town Car - Flex Fuel.
- **Middleburg Managers** - Middleburg Managers arose when empty nesters settled in satellite communities, which offered a lower cost of living and more relaxed pace. Today, segment residents tend to be middle class with solid white-collar jobs or comfortable retirements. In their older homes, they enjoy reading, playing musical instruments, indoor gardening, and refinishing furniture. This segment is upper middle class with a median household income of \$53,379. Middleburg Managers are mostly home owners without children. The main ethnicity in this segment is White and includes Black and Asian. Middleburg Managers shop at Pottery Barn, vacation on cruise lines, read Travel + Leisure, watch Washington Week and drive cars like the Hyundai Elantra Touring.
- **Traditional Times** – This segment is mostly middle-aged without children in the household. Traditional times are in the upper middleclass income level with a median household income of \$57,949. Traditional Times is the kind of lifestyle where small-town couples nearing retirement are beginning to enjoy their first empty-nest years. Typically in their fifties and older, these upper-middle-class Americans pursue a kind of granola-and-grits lifestyle. On their coffee tables are magazines with titles like Country Living and Country Home. But they’re big travelers, especially in recreational vehicles and campers. This segment shops at Sam’s Club, contribute to PBS, Read Southern Living, watch Antiques Roadshow and drive affordable cars i.e., Toyota Avalon.
- **Bohemian Mix** - A collection of mobile urbanites, Bohemian Mix represents the nation’s most liberal lifestyles. Its residents are an ethnically diverse, progressive mix of young singles, couples, and families ranging from students to professionals. In their funky row houses and apartments, Bohemian Mixers are the early adopters who are quick to check out the latest movie, nightclub, laptop, and microbrew. This upper middle class segment has a median household income of \$56,676 and mostly rent their homes or apartments.

College graduates in professional positions, Bohemian Mix is in the Melting Pot category and have a race and ethnicity mix of 6 White, Black, Asian, Hispanic and mixed. This segment shops at the Gap, reads GQ, watches foreign films and drive vehicles like the Audi S4.

- **Home Sweet Home** – Widely scattered across the nation's suburbs, the residents of Home Sweet Home tend to be upper-middle-class married couples living in mid-sized homes without children. The adults in the segment, mostly under 55, have gone to college and hold professional and white-collar jobs. With their upper-middle-class incomes and small families, these folks have fashioned comfortable lifestyles, filling their homes with exercise equipment, TV sets, and pets. The Home Sweet Home Segment has a median household income of \$ 68,555 and is in the Melting Pot category made up of 5 White, Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicities. This segment shops from buy.com, download music from iTunes, watch shows like The Amazing Race, read Wired Magazine and drive middle class vehicles like the Mazda CX-7.
- **Gray Power** – Gray Power is a midscale mature segment in a household without children. The steady rise of older, healthier Americans over the past decade has produced one important by-product: middle-class, mostly home-owning suburbanites who are aging in place rather than moving to retirement communities. Gray Power reflects this trend, a segment of older, midscale singles and couples who live in quiet comfort. This segment is mostly White with a median household income of \$52,936. Gray Power shops at Lord & Taylor, read Barron's, own a stationary bike, watch Frontline and drive upscale vehicles like the Mercedes-Benz Sprinter.
- **Green Belt Sports** - A segment of upscale exurban couples, Greenbelt Sports is known for its active lifestyle. Most of these older residents are married, college-educated, and own new homes. Few segments have higher rates for pursuing outdoor activities such as skiing, canoeing, backpacking, boating, and mountain biking than this one. The Green Belt Sports segment is an older household between 45-64 without children and a median household income of \$59,646. This segment has white-collar jobs and is has a racial and ethnic mix of White and Asian. Green Belt Sports orders from ebay.com, vacations in tropical destinations, read More magazine and watch hockey.
- **Country Casuals** - There's a laid-back atmosphere in Country Casuals, a collection of older, upscale households that have started to empty-nest. Most households boast two earners who have well-paying management jobs or own small businesses. Today, these Baby-Boom couples have the disposable income to enjoy traveling, owning timeshares, and going out to eat. Country Casuals are mostly White and older between 45-64 with a median household income of \$74,208 and in a household without kids. This segment shops at Eddie Bauer, buy collectibles, read Backpacker magazine, watch the Big Bang Theory and drive sports cars i.e. Corvette.
- **Movers & Shakers** – wealthy, older households without kids living in the suburbs. These households are 45-64 with a median income of \$101,517. This segment is college educated carrying graduate degrees and holding management positions. They are mostly White and Asian. These households play tennis, shop at Nordstrom and drive higher end SUVs i.e., Land Rover.
- **Young Influentials** – Once known as the home of the nation's yuppies, Young Influentials reflects the fading glow of acquisitive yuppiedom. Today, the segment is a common address for middle-class singles and couples who are more preoccupied with

balancing work and leisure pursuits and who live in apartment complexes surrounded by ball fields, health clubs, and casual-dining restaurants. This segment is classified as middle aged and is under 55 with a median household income of \$49,942. The racial and ethnic mix is White, Black, Asian and Hispanic. Young Influentials shop at Best Buy, play racquetball, read Details magazine, watch American Dad and drive affordable cars i.e. Mazda 3.

- **Blue Blood Estates** - Blue Blood Estates is a family portrait of suburban wealth, a place of million-dollar homes and manicured lawns, high-end cars and exclusive private clubs. The nation's second-wealthiest lifestyle is characterized by married couples with children, graduate degrees, a significant percentage of Asian Americans, and six-figure incomes earned by business executives, managers, and professionals. Blue Blood Estates are 45-64 with children and a median household income of \$119,595. This segment shops at Crate & Barrel, goes skiing, watch HBO and drive luxury vehicles i.e. Acura RL.
- **New Empty Nests** - With their grown-up children recently out of the house, New Empty Nests is composed of upper-middle income older Americans who pursue active--and activist--lifestyles. Most residents are over 65 years old, but they show no interest in a rest-home retirement. This is the top-ranked segment for all-inclusive travel packages; the favorite destination is Europe. New Empty Nests are a mature segment, which is mostly White and retired with a median household income of \$71,212. This segment shops at T.J. Maxx, vacations for 2+ weeks a year, reads the Smithsonian magazine, watches golf, and drives luxury vehicles i.e., Cadillac sedan.
- **Up-and-Comers** - Up-and-Comers is a stopover for younger, upper-midscale singles before they marry, have families, and establish more deskbound lifestyles. Found in second-tier cities, these mobile adults, mostly age 25 to 44, include a disproportionate number of recent college graduates who are into athletic activities, the latest technology, and nightlife entertainment. This segment has a racial and ethnic mix of White and Asian with a median household income of \$52,930. Up-and-Comers typically order from priceline.com, travel to South America, read Cigar Aficionado, watch South Park, and drive cars like the Nissan Altima Hybrid.

Subject: Public input to March 2023 Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee -Carlsbad City Council and Commisi0sns & CCC - Tax-payer savings and more benefits from Ponto Park data files

Attachments: Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2021-Oct Updated Public Comments - Coastal Recreation.pdf; Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA planned loss of OS at Ponto - 2022.pdf; 2022-June General Comparative cost-benifits of Completing PCH-PCH Modification-Ponto Park - Part 1 of 2.pdf; City's PCH area map w numbered notes of Constraints - 2 of 2.pdf; Carlsbad FY 2019-20 Budget Public Input Report - Summary analysis for Public Comments on Budget-DLCPA-PMU.pdf

Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, February 27, 2023 2:16 PM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Michele Hardy <Michele.Hardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Homer, Sean@Parks' <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal' <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input to March 2023 Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee -Carlsbad City Council and Commisi0sns & CCC - Tax-payer savings and more benefits from Ponto Park data files

Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Parks and Planning Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's March 2023 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, and Carlsbad's Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 planning and development applications, and
4. as public input to the CA Coastal Commission on Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

For years Carlsbad Citizens have told the City that Ponto Park is the far better solution to the documented Park and Open Space mistakes at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad. Ponto Park will save tax-payers tens of millions of dollars and provide a true and better Park. The attached data files should be thoroughly presented, reviewed, and publicly discussed by the CTGMC, Carlsbad City Council and Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission. Wasting tax-payer funds is not in the best interest of Carlsbad or the State of Californian.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2022 11:01 AM
To: 'City Clerk'; committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Confirmation public input forwarded as addressed - Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - Parks & Unconstrained-Useable Open Space facilities
Importance: High

Dear Michele & City Clerk:

I could not see/find that this email and 4 of 5 attachments were ever sent to the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions. I looked through both the Aug 25th and Sep 22nd Additional Meeting materials Staff sent to the CTGMC and could not find the email & 4 of 5 attachments. Maybe staff failed to forward them to as addressed.

Critical in these 4 files are the "2021-Oct Updated Coastal Recreation data file" & "2022 Sea Level Rise & planned loss of Open Space at Ponto" that provide critical data for the Sept 22nd 2022 meeting of the CTGMC.

Can I receive confirmation the May 30, 2022 email below & it's 4 of 5 attachments were forwarded as addressed, and when and how so I can reference that transmittal?

Thank you,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 1:47 PM
To: 'Michele Hardy'
Subject: FW: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - Parks & Unconstrained-Useable Open Space facilities

Michele:

Thanks for letting me know that the 'Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - NRPA & TPL data comparing Carlsbad Parks performance' emails were sent to the CTGMC.

I did not hear from you if these emails below and attachments were sent to the CTGMC? Can you please confirm?

Thanks,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 1:09 PM
To: 'committee@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Michele Hardy'
Cc: 'City Clerk'; 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: FW: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - Parks & Unconstrained-Useable Open Space facilities

Dear CTGMC & Michele:

We are resending this to received confirmation that the CTGMC has received the below email and attached data files for your Parks, and Open Space discussion.
Thank you and Aloha Aina,

Lance Schulte
P4P

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, May 30, 2022 1:21 PM
To: 'Eric.lardy@carlsbadca.gov'; council@carlsbadca.gov; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); Don Neu (Dneu@ci.carlsbad.ca.us)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: Public input to Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee & CCC - Parks & Unconstrained-Useable Open Space facilities

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad Council and Parks and Planning Commissions, & CA Coastal Commission:

The Committee is tasked with recommending to the Council proposed changes to City Park and City Unconstrained/Useable Open Space Standards within the Growth Management Program Update.

Because Carlsbad is quickly running out of vacant land, the Committee's recommendations are critical for very obvious reasons. The Committee will be recommending (for all future generations) the final methods to supply Citizen desired Parks and Unconstrained/Useable Open Space. It is important the Committee wisely represent the interests of those future generations. The Park and Open Space supply solutions for future generations will amend Carlsbad's updated 2015 General Plan and the "as of 2013" Local Coastal Program.

Since 2017 many People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have overwhelmingly expressed their need and desire for:

1. Fairness, and a true adequately sized and dimensioned Ponto Park to address City Park Master Plan documented "lack of Park Service and Park Inequity" in this area, and
2. Correcting the City's documented 30-acre shortfall in required Unconstrained and Useable Open Space in the Ponto area, and
3. Correcting the City's planned loss of 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space at Ponto (the State Campground and Beach) first documented in 2017 and thus not a part of the City's General Plan & Growth Management Program.

Since 2017, over 5,000 Carlsbad Citizen and visitor petitions have been sent to the City & Coastal Commission expressing the desire and need of both Citizens and visitors to have these Parks and Open Space issues addressed. The Council has been narrowing deferring addressing these issues and noted waiting for the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee to consider both the data and Citizen and visitor desires.

Attached are 5 data files sent to the City by Carlsbad People for Ponto. The data files were sent as comments to the City's proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) Amendment that seeks to change Carlsbad's 2013 LCP with the outdated 2015 General Plan, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan Update process, and the Growth Management Program that your Committee will be making recommendations to change. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens conducted over 50 official Carlsbad Public Records Requests to compile this data. We provide these data files in preparation of your June 23rd meeting.

1. Coastal Recreation and comparative Park data: Summary data on supply/demand/distribution-fairness of City Parks in Carlsbad, unflattering comparative data on how much parkland and where Carlsbad provides Parks

relative to Encinitas and Oceanside and national averages, documents Carlsbad's Park Master Plan mapping Park distribution unfairness at Ponto, and documenting that many Carlsbad's Park acres are Unusable for people because they are constrained habitat land protected from human use/intrusion.

2. Sea Level Rise & Carlsbad planned loss of Open Space at Ponto: A) Summary data on how sea level rise (SLR) will remove Open Space at Ponto. B) City GIS maps/data that shows 30-acres of required Unconstrained/Useable Open Space was not provided at Ponto (Zone 9) by using false exemptions while similar and adjacent Local Facility Management Zones (19 & 22) provided their required Unconstrained/Useable Open Space. C) City maps and data tables documenting the both loss of Open Space at Ponto from SLR and the missing Growth Management Open Space at Ponto.
3. Updated 2022-June Comparative Cost-Benefits of PCH Modification and Ponto Park: A) Summary City data comparing the Citizen and tax-payer Cost-Benefit of Park and Useable Open Space alternatives at Ponto. The data file initially compared cost-benefits of the 11-acre Ponto Planning Area F and pre-2022 City Cost data. However in May 2022 the City updated its PCH Relocation costs, and a willing seller of 14.3 acres of adjacent land (Ponto Planning Area G, H, and I; aka Kam Sang) was listed for sale. B) The Kam Sang list price of \$2.7 million per acre or a bit more than the \$2.4 to \$1.4 million per acre price of recent Ponto land sales noted in the file but are close. C) The City's updated PCH Relocation Costs are similar. The Cost-Benefit Comparison still shows purchasing Ponto Park land is still a better value for Carlsbad Citizens, and saves tax-payers money. The Comparison references a City map and data showing sea level rise impact areas, and the City's PCH Relocation environmental and design constraints.
4. Citizens' City Budget Ponto Park need-requests: A) Summary data and verbatim documentation of Carlsbad Citizens requests to budget to address the need for Ponto Park, and Open Space issues at Ponto. B) The volume of Citizen input on Ponto Park and Open Space, and the actual verbatim Carlsbad Citizen comments should be considered. C) In addition since 2017 when Carlsbad Citizen first became aware of several Ponto Planning Mistakes by the City:
 - a. false Growth Management Unconstrained/Useable Open Space 'Standard exemption' at Ponto
 - b. failure in the 2010 Ponto Vision Plan that is the basis for the 2015 General Plan Update, and the failure of the 2015 General Plan Update to follow the 1996 Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy for Planning Area F that required the City to consider and document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land use prior to proposing a change in the Non-residential Reserve land use policy. Failing to fully disclose the Coastal Commission's rejection of the Ponto Vision Plan in 2010 because of these reasons, and not disclosing 2016, 2017 and 2022 directions to the City..
 - c. SW Quadrant Park deficits going back to 2012
 - d. Not considering 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Report that shows the loss of 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space land uses at Ponto.
 - e. As a corollary example, the City has additional history in collaborating with developers to skirt standards and allow development without developers providing their required public facilities - the Rosalena HOA Trail segment of the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff-top trail at Ponto is a classic example. This example resulted in delaying construction of the public trail by over 35-years and ended up costing about 75 Carlsbad homeowners over \$1 million in additional costs. It almost resulted in no trail being built and City and/or developer pocketing money meant to pay for the trail. This scenario could happen a far larger scale and cost if Ponto developers are not required to provide the missing 30acres of required Useable Open Space at Ponto

Carlsbad People for Ponto Citizens have asked the City to provide the Citizen input since 2017 for all things Ponto related. Reviewing the public record of 5,000+ citizen communications since 2017 reveals only maybe a dozen (mostly developer paid or supported) are not in support of Ponto Park. Your fellow Carlsbad Citizens ask the Growth Management Committee to read their input and to consider future generations.

Thank you for serving on the Growth Management Committee. You each have a large and vital task, as your recommendations will be the beginnings of what (due to Carlsbad running out of vacant land) will be the 'final glide path' that forever defines Carlsbad's Quality of Life. After your recommendations, there will only be added population

demands on the public facilities. As more infill development is added and there may be no vacant land to provide needed supplies of facilities like Parks and Unconstrained/Useable Open Space.

I speak from having already professionally followed the path you are on. After working on Carlsbad's Growth Management Program in the mid-1980s I addressed this same issues for the then new City of Dana Point that (in 1989) was at a similar stage of 'near buildout as Carlsbad is now.

Based on my professional experience I implore you seriously and fully consider that data and desires your fellow Carlsbad People for Ponto Citizens have provided you and the City. Based on where Carlsbad is we, and you, will only get this one chance to get it right.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
35-year Carlsbad resident
former Carlsbad Growth Management and Dana Point city planner

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

2022-June General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, PCH Modification, and 14.3 acre Ponto Park to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto/WestBL/South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2

Key points regarding tax-payer Cost/Benefit comparison:

City Park Fairness: Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad has ZERO Parks and ZERO Park acres v. 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37 acres in North Carlsbad. South Carlsbad is home to 62% of Carlsbad citizens and the City major visitor industries, and they have no Coastal Park. North Carlsbad is home to 38% of Carlsbad citizens have the entire City's Coastal Parks. The City also falsely allowed Ponto Developers to NOT provide the required 15% unconstrained Growth Management Open Space required by other adjacent developers in Carlsbad. Consequently Ponto is already developed at a density 35% higher than the rest of City.

What is missing from South PCH: The only missing components of a Carlsbad Livable (Complete) Street are adequate Coastal sidewalks/pedestrian paths. Better safer protected bike paths for the volume of bike traffic on a higher-speed roadway are highly desired. Both these missing features can be cost-efficiently provided in the existing PCH configuration. The City had over 35-years to provide the missing sidewalks on PCH and should have added sidewalks years ago.

Generalized Costs: Costs initially came from publicly stated costs by Mayor Hall in a 2019 at Meet the Mayor Realtor luncheon at Hilton Garden Inn, the City's 2001 PCH Feasibility Analysis for PCH Relocation, the earlier \$13 million per mile cost for the simpler .85 mile City CIP #6054 PCH Modification Project at Terramar, general City cost data from official public records requests, and vacant Ponto land costs of \$1.4 to \$2.4 million per acre from recent recorded land sales at Ponto.

In May, 2022 the City released an updated cost increase for the .85 mile Terramar PCH Modification of \$22.4 million per mile; and an updated cost of between \$85 - \$60 million for the 2.3 mile South PCH Relocation Proposal that comes to \$40 to 26.1 million per mile. Kam Sang listed their 14.3 acre vacant site at Ponto for sale for \$2.7 million per acre in May. The Kam Sang list price is a bit higher than recent Ponto land costs, but the Kam Sang site is of significantly higher quality being adjacent to Batiquitos Lagoon, and with 270 degree lagoon and ocean views.

Generalized Benefits: The number of acres and the quality and usability of each of those acres, and the number of new added beach parking for each of the known Option's define each Option's benefits. There may be other unknown Options that have different benefits. The City's 2001 PCH Relocation Feasibility Analysis's highest Park and Open Space Option (2001 ERA Financial Analysis "Alternative 1-parks and open space scheme") only made possible a 4-acre Active Park north of Palomar Airport Road in North Carlsbad. The City's 2013 PCH Relocation Concept design eliminated that 4-acre Active Park and only showed a few small open space areas with picnic tables. Any PCH Modification benefits are limited by existing PCH constraints. See attached Part 2: City PCH map with numbered notes on various existing environmental and land use constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Modification Design.

PCH Modification limitations: Most critically PCH Modification does NOT add any new City land. Rearranging existing PCH land may add some usability beyond the usability of existing parkway areas along PCH. However significant land in PCH right-of-way is already constrained by habitat, slopes, and water quality detention basins. Past City Studies in 2001 and 2013 showed relatively modest changes in useable acreage from major PCH Modifications. Forever removing 2-travel lanes (over 50% of PCH capacity due to removing passing ability) will

create Terramar like traffic congestion, but could repurpose that City pavement for open space. Any net usable land in the PCH median will be relatively narrow and may be modest once all constraints are accounted for. PCH Modification should be accurately compared with the existing usable and open space parkway areas in the existing PCH configuration and Ponto Park situation. See attached Part 2: City PCH map with numbered notes on various existing land use constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Modification Design.

Four (4) Comparative tax-payer Cost/Benefits:

1. Completing PCH & adding missing sidewalk/path and additional public parking and bike safety:

4 vehicle lanes and 2 bike lanes 177 parking spaces currently exist along South Carlsbad Blvd

The only missing component of "Complete/Livable Street" is a pedestrian sidewalk/path on about 70% of PCH

Total Cost to provide missing sidewalks per City data = \$3-5 million (based on path width)

Costs for desirable safety upgrade to existing bike lanes are not known

Cost to add more Beach parking on City owned abandoned PCH North and South of Poinsettia ranges from:

- 273 additional spaces = \$ 0.76 million
- 546 additional spaces = \$ 1.1 million
- Plus an estimated \$1.5 million for 2 signalized intersection upgrades for full 4-way access
- Cost per parking space is estimated at \$19,275 to \$13,899 per additional parking space

Total cost: \$ 3.8 to 6.1 million to provide missing sidewalk/path and add more parking + unknown amount for any desired upgrades to existing bike lanes

2. '2013 2.3 mile PCH Modification Proposal' [AECOM 11/26/2013 Alternative Development Meeting]

Total Cost is \$75 million per Mayor Matt Hall, but updated by City to \$85-60 Million or \$40-26.1 million per mile.

The costs appear consistent with 20-years of cost inflation of the basic (unmitigated environmental and traffic)

2001 costs of \$26.5 to 37.3 million (in 2001 dollars) identified by the City's 2001 Feasibility Analysis by ERA. The City's 2001 ERA Analysis indicated fully mitigated costs will be higher.

Total \$85 to 60 million PCH Modification cost comes to:

\$ 21 to 6 million per acre to reuse existing City land into narrow open space areas (from portions of city roadway)

\$872,093 per additional parking space

- 86 additional parking spaces created = 263 replacement spaces - 177 existing spaces removed
- Includes multi-use pathway (sidewalk) within primarily native/natural landscaping.
- Possible 50% reduction in vehicle lanes (from 4 to 2 lanes) with corresponding traffic congestion like at Terramar. Not clear if Citizens and tax-payers will approve spending \$85 - 60 million to double traffic congestion.
- Includes about 4 - 10 acres for possible narrow passive Park area identified in City's 2001 PCH Modification Feasibility Analysis by ERA. However City's 2013 PCH Modification (AECOM) plans look like smaller acreage is provided.
- Does not purchase any new City land (only reconfigures existing City land) so requires Carlsbad Citizens to vote to expend funds per Proposition H, and as noted in the City's 2001 Feasibility Analysis likely will not qualify for regional, State or Federal tax-payer funding.
- 2013 PCH Modification proposal could not/did not consider and map City's 2017 sea level rise data to show what areas would be lost due to sea level rise and account for any added cost and issues.

3. 14.3 acre Ponto Coastal Park

Total Cost: \$52.3 million that includes \$38 million (full list price) to purchase 14.3 acres plus \$1 million per acre to landscape/irrigate like the recent development cost for Buena Vista Reservoir Park (aka Poinsettia 61). \$ 3.7 million per acre is the cost for buying 14.3 acres of New City land and developing a true City Park.

Ponto Park purchase:

- **is \$3.7 million per New Added Park Acre v. \$21 to \$6 million per acre to NOT buy new land but simply repurposed existing City land in PCH,**
- **Saves tax-payers \$17.3 million to \$2.3 million per acre,**
- **Saves tax-payers \$32.7 to \$7.7 million, and**
- **Provides up to 278% to 43% more Parkland than the 2.3 mile 'PCH Modification option'**
- Includes adding 14.3-acres of new and viable parkland similar to (but twice as large) as Carlsbad's Holiday Park. Site includes habitat and habitat connection to Batiquitos Lagoon, and lagoon and ocean view trails that connect to the ocean and eventually east along Batiquitos Lagoon to El Camino Real.
- Since an Open Space land purchase per Proposition C acquisition voters exempted such purchases from Proposition H. NCA already recommended vacant Ponto land be considered for City purchase as Open Space per the City's obligations under a lawsuit settlement.
- Ponto Park's cost savings over '2.3 mile PCH Modification' = \$32.7 to 7.7 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks cost savings over 'PCH Modification' = \$28.7 to 2.7 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks + 273 additional parking spaces cost savings over "PCH Modification" = \$28 to 2 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks + 546 additional parking spaces cost savings over "PCH Modification" = \$27.6 to 1.6 million

4. Combining both #1-PCH Completion and #3-Ponto Park:

Combining #1 and #3 creates at cost effective and more beneficial Coastal Park-Coastal Parking-Completes Streets solution. This solution actually adds 14.3-acres of New City land for a needed Park, provides for a Complete PCH without increasing traffic congestion, does not forever congest PCH travel if future PCH traffic increases, adds comparatively more beach parking, and preserves PCH land and provides the City with Coastal land use and sea level rise planning flexibility to address future needs by not forever committing the City's PCH land to a Final solution. See map on page 4 showing land use synergy of combining #1 and #3. **\$27.6 to 1.6 million in tax-payer cost savings are estimated from combining #1 & #3 compared to the estimated \$85 - 60 million PCH Modification of 2.3 miles. Combining #1 and #3 provides all the PCH Modification features, added beach parking benefits, and Adds 14.3 acres of New City land for parks, provides the City 100% of the flexibility it will need to address sea level rise, and do so for a reduced cost to tax-payers.** Page 5 shows the synergistic beach parking and Ponto Park relationship. The new 14.3 acre Kam Sang Ponto Park site is just south of the 11-acre Planning Area F site and between Avenida Encinas and Batiquitos Lagoon.

- a. Ponto Park's location allows it to use the 337-610 parking spaces created by #1 above (177 existing + 273 to 546 new parking spaces). The 337-610 parking spaces will allow Ponto Park to effectively host Carlsbad's special community events.
- b. Acquiring Ponto Park's 14.3-acres provides both the City and State of CA with important future land use options to address the Sea Level Rise and Coastal Erosion (SLR) planned by the City. These options are created by leaving the exiting South Carlsbad Blvd right-of-way substantially the same (except for adding needed sidewalks and using the existing Old paved roadway for parking) thus allowing future upland relocation of the Campground. If \$85 to \$60 million is spent on #2 the

likelihood this very expensive City expenditure would never be abandoned by the City to allow relocation of the Campground.

- c. Carlsbad' 2017 Sea Level Rise study shows SLR will eliminate ½ of the State Campground – a high-priority Coastal land use under the CA Coastal Act. The CA Coastal Act calls for “upland” relocation of high-priority Coastal land uses due to SLR impacts. Ponto Park could also provide for “upland” relocation of the State Campground.

Part 2 of this Comparative analysis is a separate 2-page map and data file. This Part 2 file consists of the City's PCH map of a reduced one lane in each direction (greater than 50% roadway capacity reduction) PCH configuration that maximizes potential 'excess right-of-way'. That map has numbered notes to marking locations of PCH environmental and design constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Relocation design, maps the City's 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Areas, and for reference outlines the easterly 6.5 acre portion of the 11-acre Planning Area F site for acreage comparison purposes.



Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on Oct 12th 2021:

On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:

- For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
- For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
- For Policy 6-10 concerns providing Low Cost Visitor Accommodations. Public Parks are the lowest cost (free) Visitor accommodating land use there is.

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City's past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: "Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980's. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad's 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- "POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.
- POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
- POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations"

The public record request is to see documents of:

- City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on January 2021:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 5-30 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| <u>Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage</u> | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland |

Anticipated Future Park development projects

| <u>Park - quadrant</u> | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- 112.8 acres of Existing & Future unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 37,600 Carlsbad citizens without useable parkland per City minimum standard.
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed below. They are:**
 - 4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,
 - 6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and
 - 2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant

Shortfall (excess) in
Current Quadrant
Park standard by

| | population | | Future Park | | existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants |
|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | acres | need | acres | % | |
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the demand for that Park.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning; is highly detrimental to the City, City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and City Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

2. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

3. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
- Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

4. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 "... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ... "; 2). This data be used in the City's analysis and the public's review and discussion about the City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Land Use Plan. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount "maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone" and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to "assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast". Most of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

5. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City's proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

6. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is an obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.


How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail




Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



7. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:

- Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - Source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

8. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can


only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

9. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.


10. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.

- Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
- Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
- Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
- Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the

Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



11. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that

15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

12. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:

- Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
- In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
- In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.

- Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
- In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
- In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without First disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
- In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to either:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of "Non-Residential Reserve" until such time as the City's past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park") to provide both "High-Priority" coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

13. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words "shall") these "low

priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City “may” or ‘may not’ choose (per the proposed “may” LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City’s (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy ‘shell game’. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two “may” criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only “low-priority” residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by “shall” policy) winners, and “high-priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal ‘long-shot’ (“may” policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the

documented “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently

dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

14. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

15. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is

illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

Submitted: May 28, 2020

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and Coastal Commission:

The City Budget should address both short-term Covid-19 impacts, and near/longer-term investments needed for Economic Recovery and Revitalization.

The quality of our Carlsbad coastline, Coastal Parks and open spaces are continually rated by Carlsbad citizens and businesses as the critical foundation of our quality of life, economic strength, and tourism industry. Ponto Coastal Park is a critically needed investment, and the last opportunity for the City to make an investment for Carlsbad's long-term sustainability. South Carlsbad Citizens, visitors, and the Visitor Industry have no Southern Coastal Park. Ponto is the only place to provide that needed investment for residents and visitors, and advance Economic Recovery and Revitalization of South Carlsbad's significant Visitor Industry. Coastal Recreation is the major attraction for visitors.

With these understandings we submit the following testimony and data from the City's FY 2019-20 Budget Public Input Report that highlights the documented significant number of citizens asking for a Ponto Coastal Park. We also note concerns about the Report's dilution of specific citizen input provided at both the March 4, 2019 and 2020 Citizen Workshops.

Citizen input on the need for a Ponto Coastal Park was the most numerous specific place need/desire citizens mentioned in the City's:

- Budget Public Input process,
- Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment process, and
- Parks Master Plan Update process.

The Budget Public Input process documented 85 specific, verbatim citizen comments on Ponto area park needs and over 90% of citizen requests that Council budget to address this need. These 85 Verbatim Citizen comments (listed at the end of this testimony and data) specifically address how they would like their (Park) tax dollars budgeted. Additionally, 2,500 similar public input email/petitions were submitted as public comments on Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment and Park Master Plan Update processes spoke to the need for a Ponto Coastal Park.

As you know, the 11-acre Ponto Planning Area F site is for sale. This site is similar in size/shape as Holiday Park, providing a Coastal site for similar multipurpose community functions.

Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (and thus General Plan and Zoning Code) requires the City to first consider and document the need for a "Public Park" before any land use can be planned for the Planning Area F site.

The City's Park Master Plan already documents the need for a Ponto "Public Park", showing the area as "unserved" by City Parks and an area of Park "inequity" correlating well with Citizen input.

The City also received offers of potential donations, or cost-saving collaborations from Carlsbad Citizens and non-profits to advance the much needed Ponto Coastal Park. The City disappointingly has not replied to these special opportunities.

Therefore, it is requested the City budget for a Ponto Coastal Park and contact the Planning Area F landowner regarding site purchase.

Consistent with Budget Public Input Report page 3 it is requested that this this testimony and data be provided to the Planning and Parks Commissions; and Coastal Commission as public input on the City Staff's proposed 1) City Budget, 2) Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, and 3) Parks Master Plan Update.

Thank you.
People for Ponto

The following data is from the Carlsbad FY 2019-20 Budget Public Input Report:
<https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=38546>

In reading the data different text treatment is used to differentiate between actual page number and text in the Report, Important Report text, and public comments and analysis of Report text. Following is a legend to those text treatments:

- (p.X) is the Report page number where the information is found, and normal text is the actual Report text.
- Text in **Bold Face** is particularly important Report text.
- **Arrow bullets and Text in Bold Italic Text** are analysis and comments on the Report's information.

Introduction (p. 3):

- **Members of the public have a right to be involved in decisions affecting their lives.**
- **It is the city's responsibility to seek out and facilitate the involvement of those interested in or affected by a decision. The city errs on the side of reaching out to people who might not be interested, rather than potentially missing people who are.**
- **City staff provide balanced and factual information to the public and do not engage in advocacy.**
- **Public dialogue strives for a focus on values over interests and positions.**
- **Public involvement planning is coordinated across all city departments to ensure consistency and avoid process fatigue.**

On (p. 5) specific Verbatim Public Input was generalized by City Staff as follows:

Main Themes: The following themes were a high priority overall:

- **Neighborhood quality of life**
- **Access to nature, trails and open space**
- Environmental sustainability
- Traffic and mobility

Most Important Services: City services in the following areas were identified as the most important:

- **Neighborhood quality of life**
- **Parks and recreation**
- Law enforcement
- Fire and paramedic service

- Environmental sustainability

Specific Areas for Budget Enhancement: When asked which services they would like to see enhanced in next year's budget, the top five responses were:

- **Neighborhood quality of life**
- **Parks and recreation**
- **Environmental sustainability**
- **Mobility/transportation**
- Arts and culture

- *The lack of a Coastal Park at Ponto impacts all South Carlsbad neighborhoods' quality of life. Carlsbad's Park Master Plan documents that Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad are "not served" by parks and Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is an area of park "inequity"*
- *The City and CA Coastal Commission are required to consider and document the need for a "Public Park" before any planning to allow any land use on Ponto Planning Area F. For over 10-years the City failed to disclose and follow this requirement – making multiple "Ponto planning mistakes". The City will now have to correct its multiple "Ponto planning mistakes" as part of the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment*
- *The lack of a Park at Ponto also impacts both Environmental Sustainability and Mobility/Transportation:*
 - *Prevents parks within walking distance, forces driving (and the need for more parking in our Park) to access parks.*
 - *Forces South Carlsbad Neighborhoods to drive long distances to North Carlsbad and/or Encinitas to access a Coastal Park*
 - *Congests North Carlsbad and/or Encinitas Coastal Parks with South Carlsbad Coastal Park demands*
 - *Congests North Carlsbad and/or Encinitas roadways and parking facilities with South Carlsbad Coastal Park demands.*
 - *Importantly, it would forever negatively impact the economic sustainability of Carlsbad's Visitor industry. There are thousands of inland South Carlsbad resort/hotel rooms that have no access to a Coastal Park. This will ultimately undermine the attractiveness and competitiveness of South Carlsbad's Visitor industry and the tax revenue the City receives from that industry.*

Word Maps (pp 6-8)

Staff provided 3 'word maps' saying the show the words mentioned at the March 4th 2020 workshop attend by 38 citizens.

- *There is citizen concern about the accuracy of these word maps and what is conveyed on pages 6-8 of the Report.*
- *Several of those 38 citizens, provided specific written (individual index cards) and verbal (round table flip chart notes) Pubic Input several stating the need for a "Ponto Coastal Park", another mentioned a "liner Park", and several mentioned the "Senior Center", all these written/verbal comments were not accurately documented or reported on pages 6-8. It appears the City Staff interrupted and translated/transformed the actual citizen comments (as documented in the index cards and flip chart notes) when creating the word maps. There is a concern that specific citizen input provided at the actual workshop was not accurately*

- Poinsettia Park: 2 times, this is 2% as much as Ponto area
- Veterans Park: 2 times, this is 2% as much as Ponto area
- Rancho Carrillo: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area
- Hub Park: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area
- Crossings Golf Course: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area
- Robertson Ranch: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area
- Palomar Airport: 1 time, this is 1% as much as Ponto area

➤ ***As the Budget Public Input Report suggests, reading of each of the Verbatim Comments of actual public input should be done. The place names area specific list above does not include broad places such as “beaches” the names of specific roads, and other names that appeared vague. It is clear in reading through and counting the place name references that the Ponto area expressed as Ponto, Zone 9 (i.e. Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9), and the coastal park references to Southwest Carlsbad and South Carlsbad was by far the greatest area of public input. This makes perfect sense in that for half of the City Ponto is the last significant vacant Coastal land available to address two of Carlsbad Citizens’ most important budget concerns ‘Neighborhood quality of life’ and ‘Parks and recreation’ that relate to core community values around Carlsbad’s “Beach”, “small beach town character”, and “valued open space”.***

Following is the listing of the Verbatim Public Input (Appendix A in Public Input Report, pp 24-91) that specifically referenced Ponto or a clear reference to Ponto such as Zone 9 or Coastal Park needs in Southwest Carlsbad. There are many more comments such as “The purchase of remaining open space for preservation of the last remaining coastal areas.” that logically and clearly refers to the Ponto situation. However these many additional comments were excluded from the list below since they did not specifically mention Ponto, Zone 9, or SW Carlsbad place names.

Of the 85 citizen comments below specifically referencing Ponto, 77 or 90.6% were asking the City to budget for a Ponto Coastal Park. Only 8, or 9.4% of those citizen comments were not asking for a Ponto Coastal Park. We are not sure if the 8 commenters knew about the City’s now acknowledged “Ponto planning mistakes” dating back over the past 10-years, as the City only first briefly acknowledged this recently on 1/28/20. We have found once citizens are truly aware of the facts and prior “Ponto planning mistakes” there is almost uniform desire for a Ponto Coastal Park. There is citizen concern that these “Ponto planning mistakes” are not being fully, openly and accurately being disclosed to Citizens during the various Public Input processes, thus tainting those Public Input processes.

Verbatim Ponto City Budget Public Input from pages 24-91 of FY 2019-20 Budget Public Input Report:

1. My biggest disappointment is the lack of park facilities in my section of the city, near South Ponto Beach. Lots of open land but no park within at least 2 miles. This should be a city priority
2. It used to be the beach but now Ponto & South Carlsbad are more like rocky shores. I’d like to see the rocks cleared up and more sand added to these beaches
3. COMMENT TRAFFIC IS BEING SPAMMED HERE TO PUSH THIS PONTO PARK PLOY (PPP) Develop Ponto and have the hotel maintain our beach! It’s all rocks currently!
4. Ponto Beach. We do NOT need a commercial development or hotel there. That needs to be a park and/or open space for future generations.

5. Ponto beach.
6. Don't ruin South Ponto Beach with condos and/or hotel, need to restore the sand on the beach.
7. Like most residents and visitors I treasure the beach. I feel the highest priority should be open space and parks that serve the beach region. Particularly important is the open space still available in the Ponto region. There is ample space here for an extraordinary area of open space and even a park. There is not one of either of these in the southwest quadrant near the beach. Children cannot walk safely to a park from that area. Open space and a park in the Ponto area would serve all residents, visitors, and the business community.
8. Beaches, parks, safe neighborhoods, OPEN SPACE! Need Beach parks like Del Mar Powerhouse/Sea Grove Park & Encinitas Community Park. Ponto Beach needs some attention.
9. I love the beach and the parks and fields and open space and hiking trails in Carlsbad. I wish we had more!! We have had 3 kids in sports in Carlsbad. Currently, field/park space is very limited and often over committed. Currently, there aren't enough fields to meet the need of the community. Adding more parks and fields would create a better community in the following ways.... The sports played on these fields help keep our kids fit and healthy; It keeps kids busy and out of trouble; It fosters friendships and community; it teaches team work and fosters dedication and teaches a willingness to help others succeed; it brings in community \$\$ from other teams who come to play on Carlsbad fields; It's a wonderful way to showcase our city to others who will want to return thus helping grow tourism. Additional Parks would offer the same benefits. We do not need more high density building. And, Please do NOT ruin Ponto with more building!!!!!!
10. We love the beach and the small-town feel Carlsbad has. We love the scattered open spaces and trails. Carlsbad is a great place to live and spend time outdoors, like the Ponto area. Let's keep it that way by not developing every last square foot into a condo complex, hotel or shopping mall, if that's what you want please move to Oceanside.
11. Let us protect the valuable open space that is left and not develop every square inch. Especially at the beach, let us save the land across the coast highway from Ponto Beach and make a beautiful park, not more condos and hotels. Carlsbad is in great financial shape and does not need to go after every development and tax dollar it can get. Some things are more important, like quality of life, than a fat wallet. I know that this will fall upon deaf ears amongst the two older members of the City Council, but maybe some rearranging of priorities is in order.
12. Would love to see the last areas of open land to stay that way. I have lived here for 25 years and have seen a tremendous amount of development eating away at the open beauty of the area. We have enough shopping centers and homes. Please leave the area at Ponto open and do not approve the Ponto development.
13. Keep Ponto Beach development free!
14. Preserving Open Space and Building Ponto Park in the South West Quadrant!
15. I second Tisha Klingensmith's comment and all the others regarding Ponto Beach development.
16. Preserving open space and maintaining high quality Parks and Rec with park location emphasis on geographical location. It's time to build a park in the SW quadrant near the beach for locals and visitors alike. Veterans Park is not a solution for each quadrant's deficiency, particularly in the south.
17. We need more parks, especially in southwest Carlsbad!
18. I agree, we need more parks and open space. I live in Zone 9 and don't have a park anywhere within walking distance.
19. We need to continue to preserve open space and NOT develop Ponto into an awful condo complex. We would love a park!

20. We need a park in the Ponto area and not a development. It is the last open space next to the beach left
21. I agree with the need to preserve open space throughout Carlsbad and NOT develop Ponto into awful condo complex.
22. We need to preserve our open space --it's what keeps the city feeling like a small town. We need more parks -esp one at Ponto in the SW quad!
23. Preserve the open space and build a park in SW quadrant at Ponto. We do not need or want any more huge developments, especially right by the beach in one of the last remaining open spaces. Once it's built, you can't un-build it. Build Ponto Park in SW quadrant. Do the right thing. Especially for our children and grandchildren. They won't thank us for building outrageously tall high density condos, hotels and unnecessary shops right by our gorgeous beaches. The only people this benefits are some wealthy developers, not the people of Carlsbad. Think long term, not short term. We have a beautiful city and community-preserve it now or it's gone forever!
24. We really need a park in the southwest quad by the beach. This could be an amazing asset (on SO many levels) for the community and visitors alike. The revenue stream would return the city investment in spades!
25. Parks. Needed in Ponto area our children in this area don't have a close park. And the house lots in our area are small.
26. I agree that we should be very mindful that the citizens of Carlsbad voted out the retail space plan at the power plant site a few years ago. The new Ponto project should not replace that. Citizens should be part of the decision to build out that area
27. We need to preserve our open space and we need a park at Ponto!
28. We need a park in the Southwest quadrant of our community. Safety in the community is what we like best in this area
29. Carlsbad's small town feel, friendly atmosphere and location has made it our ideal place to live for the past 20 years, We live across from South Ponto Beach and DESPERATELY need a park for our area residents. It would be sad to see the area overbuilt with high density projects and not retain some of the open space at this southern entrance to our "Village by the Sea". PLEASE help preserve some of its appeal before it is too late.
30. I love the quaintness of the Village, the open land areas, trails, small businesses and the arts. A huge NO to PONTO. Please stop the excessive building and development of the open areas of our beautiful and unique city. We have lived here for over 30 years and are sad to see so much over development. Keep our special village a village, and please don't turn it into another ordinary city.
31. Favorite is small town feel and the beach --the beach provides us with all the open space we need. The city has enough open space with all the lagoons, etc. --we don't need any more parks --especially at PONTO --I am thrilled to see and drive by every day the new resort at La Costa which is in Encinitas and that is what we need here at the South end of Carlsbad --more residential --NO more open space
32. What I love about Carlsbad is that it has a small village feel but it also has the beach and some restaurants and then little town. I really would like more to walk to around the Ponto area. Specifically I think it should be more of a beat centered area with places to grab ice cream or grab some food or a coffee and walk to the beach.
33. I love that our village that is not a strip of 101. The quaint cottages helped Carlsbad have a downtown feel. It has several streets with unique interest. I love the Trees on Grand! The landscape of the trees setting the height of the town. Unfortunately the taller buildings are killing that. Vertical dwellings are taking over.. think of the reason you travel to Europe. It's not

for Developers Generica. We also want the NRG power plant space into a Park... and... I would LOVE for the city to finish the rail trail to Ponto. Imagine taking a trail to Ponto? It would be a dream!

34. Our San Pacifico Community and the surrounding neighborhoods need a local park. So far Carlsbad has no real performing arts venue of any size to meet the needs of a city of more than 100,000. This should be a serious consideration when the new civic center is being designed.
35. We need more coastal parks and open space. Especially in zone 9
36. protect more open space, including Ponto
37. We need Veterans Park completed and Ponto park developed. Everyone in Carlsbad is engaged and we have been talking about the park deficits for a while now. Veterans park is over-due!!!
38. Our libraries are the best in the region! But I have to put them 4th to our Neighborhood quality of life, which is being impacted by huge developments destroying our property values, our piece of mind and privacy. We do need to insure that our environment is cared for, since all of these housing projects are going in. I do love our parks but we need to insure that the SW quadrant has their share of parks (think-Ponto).
39. Zone 9 (in southwest Carlsbad) does not have a park within walking distance! I hope the City can remedy this.
40. Ponto needs a park not a hotel or more condos. Please stop building on every last piece of land
41. See previous comment concerning the lack of a local, beach oriented park in the South Ponto area. Ditto a performing arts venue.
42. PLS get the Ponto Proyect development going....., that area of Carlsbad needs it asap
43. I support Ponto Development. PLs get it going...
44. Ponto has 2 miles of unobstructed beach access and a lagoon that already act as a "park within walking distance". The Ponto project was approved long ago and is part of the citizen approved master plan. Please get it done.
45. Strengthen and protect the financial stability of the City. Businesses pay a significant amount of taxes, property, sales and income and those employed spend and live here. Encourage affordable housing opportunities for everyone, think outside the box and find some unique solutions. Complete build out in areas available, Ponto Beach is a great opportunity and the project is well thought out, get it built. And please don't become a 'Nanny City' and waste time to pass frivolous laws restricting straws, plastic bags, soda consumption, etc.
46. Development of open space and parking space in the Ponto region
47. Specifically, I want the city to remedy the lack of equal access to parks and trails evident in the southwest quadrant of the city. I support a park project at Ponto: in the long run, the south coastal gateway to Carlsbad needs a welcoming park with beach access and supporting facilities. Though less extensive than Village beach areas, good design would merge a Ponto park with access to beach and access to the 'memorial area on the bluff at city border with the ecology of the Batiquitos Lagoon adjacent to make a marvelous creek to beach environment accessible for all and ever.
48. There are two miles of unobstructed beach plus the lagoon within "walking distance" of the neighborhoods near Ponto. The project was approved long ago and is part of the Master Plan approved by the citizens of Carlsbad. Zoning changes and project vote downs are often just another way to steal private property.
49. Local park deficits continue to be a problem. Let's please support Ponto Park development. We as a city are losing an unobstructed landmark in our community. Please share some of that with local residents. And, did I mention parking??
50. The extreme southwestern (Ponto) area of Carlsbad does not have a park within walking distance -this is my top priority to fix.

51. We have wonderful neighborhood parks, but not in Ponto and it's on the beach; Veteran's Park is more of a hiker/nature lover's place to enjoy nature.
52. We need a park at Ponto - to serve not only residents, but visitors and tourists.
53. A park is much needed in SW Quadrant of the city
54. Ponto Park. So much has been done for businesses, tourism, etc. This is the last bit of Carlsbad coast line left. And the residents could use more park space in the south part of the City. I don't want to see this area developed. Carlsbad has become overdeveloped.
55. I want to see a park for the Ponto road area. I feel that that area should not be used for condo - residential development. It is so important to showcase that wonderful piece of property, which is so rare to find all up the coast of Calif. and would be a welcomed park for all as you drive north into Carlsbad. ALSO I am very concerned that the Palomar Airport and the larger airplanes the new plan will bring and ask that the city stay involved to support our concerns, thank you for help I appreciate all off the councils work.
56. Ponto area open space and park development
57. Take control of our coastline, bring fire rings to Ponto beach, every family should have the experience of gathering around a roaring fire on evening.
58. Cancel the Ponto development tragedy. Build a free park and keep the free beach parking there.
59. Buy the land for open space on Ponto Drive and build a park in Zone 9 that has no park even though developers paid into the park fees for 20 + years.
60. support Ponto development
61. Now that we have removed the jetty and allowed Warm Waters to wash away, and now we are planning to build on Ponto, where will locals access the beach? If 50% of responders stated the beach is the best part of Carlsbad living, why are continually squandering this gift? I know the council would live to sell Agua Hedionda to a developer too. When will there be decisions made to maintain our quality of life? Furthermore, I selected transportation because my commute time has DOUBLED in the past 5 years. The 55mph speed limit on El Camino is a joke. It takes me 2 light cycles just to cross each intersection now due to this unmitigated growth with no regard for how people will get around. I'm continually dismayed by this city.
62. Preserve the open space at Ponto. Keep traffic under control.
63. Preserve open space in zone 9
64. Money for persevering open space in zone 9 and building parks in the SW quadrant!
65. More parks and open space in Southwest Carlsbad!
66. Why another proposed hotel at Ponto? There are an abundance of hotels & stores already available ---even more than necessary. Preserving nature & some green space is more important than more concrete & businesses with "lease available" signs everywhere!
67. Prop to aid Ponto to keep it natural, as park area & natural habitat.
68. Put budget money towards Parks and Recreation, specifically Preserving Open Space in Zone 9 and Building #PontoPark in the SW Quadrant (p 84)
69. Please put budget money towards Parks and Recreation, specifically Preserving Open Space in Zone 9 and Building #PontoPark in the SW Quadrant (p 85)
70. need a park in the southwest Carlsbad post development
71. Parks in southwest Carlsbad!
72. Zone 9's lack of park and open space is sad. The SW quadrant needs more places to take kids to play, seniors to walk and get outside, and for the community to gather. A park at Ponto would be an ideal place for that and would make for a beautiful and welcoming entry into Carlsbad for locals and tourists.
73. We need a park site near Ponto Beach on the property now slated for a 5 star hotel which has not been built despite attempts by several developers over the last ten plus years.

74. Please spend more on Parks and Recreation. We need to Preserve Open Space in Zone 9 and Build Ponto Park in the SW Quadrant. We do not need more homes congesting the already packed Coast Hwy. Adding sand to Ponto Beach would be nice too -too rocky!
75. I'm asking the City to put budget money towards Parks and Recreation, specifically Preserving Open Space in Zone 9 and Building #PontoPark in the SW Quadrant -this will enhance the quality of life in Carlsbad, contribute to the highest and best use, meet the requirement to have a park in this area, and make the area so desirable that it will allow raising of local tax rates (I don't believe I'm saying this). Best Regards, David Johnson
76. Put some park and playgrounds in SW Carlsbad. There are none near Ponto, yet there are open spaces, near Avenida Encinas and 101. Nothing to walk to. Thank you
77. We could really use a park in southwest Carlsbad especially the San Pacifico area. Thank you
78. Work toward filling the deficit in parks and open space in the Southwest part of Carlsbad, especially Ponto.
79. Would truly love the Ponto Beach Park! As a resident of South Carlsbad we need this!!!
80. There are no Parks in South Carlsbad. We are neglected here yet I pay very high taxes.
81. Build a Park at Ponto! Keep the open space!
82. I would like to see the city buy the Ponto property and develop it into a park.
83. Build a park at ponto
84. Appropriate development of open space and park space in the Ponto region. We are currently at huge deficit of both of these in the Ponto region
85. We are very quickly running out of open space. This is probably one of the most beautiful areas in the country, we need to preserve that beauty and maintain some open space. The open land near South Ponto beach must be preserved. There are no parks in the area, developing that area would not only add to the pollution but it would sacrifice one of the most beautiful parts of Carlsbad. Towns and Cities across the country are prioritizing open space that is so important, it is time we did that in Carlsbad. We need open space near Ponto Beach.

A few of the many Citizens asking the City Council to budget for a much needed Ponto Coastal Park






City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input 2 of 2

The City's map below is marked with the following numbered list of Area Constraints and Issues. The Constraints are from the City's 2013 PCH Modification designs, the City's older 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Study, and on-site observations. The Constraints will limit any fundamental change to the existing PCH landscape. For instance existing slope and habitat area will remain or have to be relocated which will limit the use of any excess land area from PCH Modification. These Constraints will then reduce from 62 acres the actual number of unconstrained and acres that are actually useable and can be used for different uses than currently exist.

1. Loss of the last section of Old "Historic 101" design, ambiance, and openness. Will it be replaced with typical urban arterial design?
2. Freshwater habitat
3. Sewer pumping facility
4. City's 2013 PCH plan for RESTORED RIPARIAN HABITAT
5. Sea Level Rise 2 meter Impact Area
6. City's 2013 PCH plan for BIO SWALE AND RESTORED RIPARIAN HABITAT
7. Existing beach parking to be retained
8. Least Tern habitat
9. Major storm water detention basin
10. Water
11. Slopes will likely need retaining walls to move road inland closer to proposed Kam Sang Resort
12. Endangered Species Habitat
13. City's 2013 PCH plan for COASTAL SAGE SCRUB RESTORATION
14. City's 2013 PCH plan for NATIVE GRASSLAND RESTORATION
15. City's 2013 PCH plan for BIO SWALE AND RESTORED RIPARIAN HABITAT
16. Eliminating access road for homes/businesses south of Cape Rey Resort. Who pays to replace?
17. Removes Cape Rey Resort developer required GMP Open Space for this LFMP. This GMP Open Space will have to be replaced. Who Pays?
18. City's 2013 PCH plan for L.I.D. BASIN / BIO SWALE
19. City left several acres vacant for 20+ years. This area can cost-effectively provide 200-500 more parking spaces w/o any PCH relocation.
20. Unusual jog in roadway. Is this viable?
21. City's 2013 PCH plan for RESTORED NATIVE LANDSCAPE
22. Habitat & need to provide major storm water quality detention basin before discharging urban and creek runoff into ocean.
23. Slopes will likely need retaining walls to move road inland closer to mobile home community.
24. Steep unusable slopes needed for Palomar Airport Road overpass over railroad corridor.

For a Cost/Benefit reference point, the City's PCH Modification at Terramar (CIP project #6054 from Cannon to Manzano) that is less constrained and simpler than South Carlsbad is projected to cost around \$13 million per mile. Vacant primarily unconstrained land sale costs at Ponto are documented at around \$1.4 to \$2.4 million per acre. Honest Cost/Benefit of these two options should be a public tax-payer discussion.



Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment: Right-of-Way and Available Land Analysis*

- Proposed ROW (Approximately 43 acres)
- Area Available for Other Uses (Approximately 62 acres)



July 13, 2021

Item #14

Page 47 of 53

* Analysis is based on aerial imagery. Right-of-way boundaries and acreages are approximate and intended for planning level analysis only.

* For comparative visual reference the * area is the 6.5 acre eastern portion of Planning Area F.

Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad's DLCP-LUPA's projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto

Introduction:

Carlsbad first documented Sea Level Rise (SLR) and associated increases in coastal erosion in a December 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment (2017 SLR Assessment). Prior planning activities (2010 Ponto Vision Plan – rejected by CA Coastal Commission, and 2015 General Plan Update) did not consider SLR and how SLR would impact Coastal Open Space Land Use & CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto. The 2017 SLR Assessment shows Open Space land and Open Space Land Uses are almost exclusively impacted by SLR at Ponto & South Coastal Carlsbad. The 2017 SLF Assessment also shows significant LOSS of Open Space land acreage and Land Uses. Most all impacted Open Space Land Uses are CA Coastal Act "High-Priority Coastal Land Uses" – Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations. Existing Ponto Open Space Land Uses are already very congested (non-existent/narrow beach) and have very high, almost exclusionary, occupancy rates (Campground) due to existing population/visitor demands. Future population/visitor increases will make this demand situation worst. The significant permanent LOSS of existing Coastal Open Space land and Coastal Open Space Land Use (and land) due to SLR reduces existing supply and compounds Open Space congestion elsewhere. Prior Ponto planning did not consider, nor plan, for significant SLR and current/future "High-Priority" Coastal Open Space Land Use demands.


Open Space and City Park demand at Ponto:

Open Space at Ponto is primarily 'Constrained' as defined by the City's Growth Management Program (GMP), and cannot be counted in meeting the City's minimal 15% 'Unconstrained' GMP Open Space Standard. Per the GMP Open Space Standard, the developers of Ponto should have provided in their developments at least 30-acres of additional 'Unconstrained' GMP Open Space at Ponto. City GIS mapping data confirm 30-acres of GMP Standard Open Space is missing at Ponto (Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9).

The City of Carlsbad GIS Map on page 2 shows locations of Open Spaces at Ponto. This map and its corresponding tax parcel-based data file document Ponto's non-compliance with the GMP Open Space Standard. A summary of that City GIS data file is also on page 2. The City said Ponto's non-compliance with the GMP Open Space Standard was 'justified' by the City 'exempting' compliance with the Standard. The City 'justified' this 'exemption' for reasons that do not appear correct based on the City's GIS map and data on page 2, and by a review of 1986 aerial photography that shows most of Ponto as vacant land. The City in the Citywide Facilities Improvement Plan (CFIP) said 1) Ponto was already developed in 1986, or 2) Ponto in 1986 already provided 15% of the 'Unconstrained' land as GMP Standard Open Space. Both these 'justifications' for Ponto 'exemption' in the CFIP were not correct. The legality of the City 'exempting' Ponto developers from the GMP Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation.

The City proposes to continue to exempt future Ponto developers from providing the missing 30-acres of minimally required GMP Open Space, even though a change in Ponto Planning Area F land use from the current 'Non-Residential Reserve' Land Use requires comprehensive Amendment of the Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9 to account for a land use change. City exemption is subject of litigation.

Ponto (west of I-5 and South of Poinsettia Lane) currently has 1,025 homes that per Carlsbad's minimal Park Standard demand an 8-acre City Park. There is no City Park at Ponto. Coastal Southwest Carlsbad has an over 6.5 acre Park deficit that is being met 6-miles away in NW Carlsbad. Ponto is in the middle of 6-miles of Coastline without a City Coastal Park west of the rail corridor.



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara had the same lagoon waters.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were never required to comply with the 15% Standard Open Space is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the 15% Growth Management Standard Open Space at Ponto

472 Acres
(197 Acres)
 275 Acres
X 15%
 41 Acres
(11 Acres)
30 Acres

Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 Constrained land excluded from GMP Open Space
 Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required
 GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data
Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

Sea Level Rise impacts on Open Space and Open Space Land Use Planning at Ponto:

The City's 2015 General Plan Update did not factor in the impacts of Sea Level Rise (SLR) on Ponto's Open Space land. In December 2017 the City conducted the first Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=33958>. The 2017 SLR Assessment is an initial baseline analysis, but it shows significant SLR impacts on Ponto Open Space. More follow-up analysis is being conducted to incorporate newer knowledge on SLR projections and coastal land erosion accelerated by SLR. Follow-up analysis may likely show SLR impacts occurring sooner and more extreme.

Troublingly the 2017 SLR Assessment shows SLR actually significantly reducing or eliminating Open Space land at Ponto. SLR is projected to only impact and eliminate Open Space lands and Open Space Land Use at Ponto. The loss of Ponto Open Space land and Land Use being at the State Campground, Beaches, and Batiquitos Lagoon shoreline. The losses of these Open Space lands and land uses would progress over time, and be a permanent loss. The 2017 SLR Assessment provides two time frames near-term 2050 that match with the Carlsbad General Plan, and the longer-term 'the next General Plan Update' time frame of 2100. One can think of these timeframes as the lifetimes of our children and their children (2050), and the lifetimes of our Grandchildren and their children (2100). SLR impact on Coastal Land Use and Coastal Land Use planning is a perpetual (permanent) impact that carries over from one Local Coastal Program (LCP) and City General Plan (GP) to the next Updated LCP and GP.

Following (within quotation marks) are excerpts from Carlsbad's 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment:

[Italicized text within brackets] is added data based on review of aerial photo maps in the Assessment.

"Planning Zone 3 consists of the Southern Shoreline Planning Area and the Batiquitos Lagoon. Assets within this zone are vulnerable to inundation, coastal flooding and bluff erosion in both planning horizons (2050 and 2100). A summary of the vulnerability assessment rating is provided in Table 5. A discussion of the vulnerability and risk assessment is also provided for each asset category.

5.3.1. Beaches

Approximately 14 acres of beach area is projected to be impacted by inundation/erosion in 2050. ... Beaches in this planning area are backed by unarmored coastal bluffs. Sand derived from the natural erosion of the bluff as sea levels rise may be adequate to sustain beach widths, thus, beaches in this reach were assumed to have a moderate adaptive capacity. The overall vulnerability rating for beaches is moderate for 2050.

Vulnerability is rated moderate for the 2100 horizon due to the significant amount of erosion expected as the beaches are squeezed between rising sea levels and bluffs. Assuming the bluffs are unarmored in the future, sand derived from bluff erosion may sustain some level of beaches in this planning area. A complete loss of beaches poses a high risk to the city as the natural barrier from storm waves is lost as well as a reduction in beach access, recreation and the economic benefits the beaches provide.

5.3.3. State Parks

A majority of the South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds (separated into four parcels) were determined to be exposed to bluff erosion by the 2050 sea level rise scenario (moderate exposure). This resource is considered to have a high sensitivity since bluff erosion could significantly impair usage of the facilities. Though economic impacts to the physical structures within South Carlsbad State Beach would be relatively low, the loss of this park would be significant

since adequate space for the park to move inland is not available (low adaptive capacity). State parks was assigned a high vulnerability in the 2050 planning horizon. State park facilities are recognized as important assets to the city in terms of economic and recreation value as well as providing low-cost visitor serving amenities. This vulnerability poses a high risk to coastal access, recreation, and tourism opportunities in this planning area.

In 2100, bluff erosion of South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds become more severe and the South Ponto State Beach day-use area becomes exposed to coastal flooding during extreme events. The sensitivity of the South Ponto day-use area is low because impacts to usage will be temporary and no major damage to facilities would be anticipated. Vulnerability and risk to State Parks remains high by 2100 due to the impacts to South Carlsbad State Beach in combination with flooding impacts to South Ponto.

Table 5: Planning Zone 3 Vulnerability Assessment Summary [condensed & notated]:

| <u>Asset Category</u> | <u>Horizon [time]</u> | <u>Hazard Type</u> | <u>Impacted Assets</u> | <u>Vulnerability Rating</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Beaches | 2050 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 14 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 54 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| Public Access | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 6 access points 4,791 feet of trails | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 10 access points 14,049 feet of trails | Moderate |
| State Parks <i>[Campground - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations]</i> | 2050 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [<18 Acres] | High |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [>18 Acres] <i>[loss of over 50% of the campground & its Low-cost Visitor Accommodations, See Figure 5.]</i> | High |
| Transportation (Road, Bike, Pedestrian) | 2050 | Bluff Erosion | 1,383 linear feet | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 11,280 linear feet | High |
| Environmentally Sensitive Lands | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 572 acres | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 606 acres | High |




Figure 7: Southern Shoreline Planning Area – Year 2050






Figure 5: CoSMoS Bluff Erosion Projections by 2100
(CoSMoS-COAST 2015)

[Figure 5 show the loss of over 50% of the campground and campground sites with a minimal .2 meter Sea Level Rise (SLR), and potentially the entire campground (due to loss of access road) in 2 meter SLF.]”

Directions to analyze and correct current and future LOSS of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto

On July 3, 2017 the CA Coastal Commission provided direction to Carlsbad stating:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto ... area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad. ... this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”

Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests (PRR 2017-260, et. al.) confirmed Carlsbad’s Existing LCP and its Ponto specific existing LUP polices and Zoning regulations were never followed in the City’s prior Ponto planning activities (i.e. 2010 Ponto Vision Plan & 2015 General Plan Update). The projected SLR loss of recreation (beach) and low-cost visitor accommodations (campground) at Ponto should factor in this Existing LCP required analysis, and a LCP-LUP for Ponto and Ponto Planning Area F.

In a February 11, 2020 City Council Staff Report City Staff stated:

“On March 14, 2017, the City Council approved the General Plan Lawsuit Settlement Agreement (Agreement) between City of Carlsbad and North County Advocates (NCA). Section 4.3.15 of the Agreement requires the city to continue to consider and evaluate properties for potential acquisition of open space and use good faith efforts to acquire those properties.”

In 2020 NCA recommended the City acquire Ponto Planning Area F as Open Space. The status of City processing that recommendation is unclear. However the Lawsuit Settlement Agreement and NCA's recommendation to the City should also be considered in the required Existing LCP analysis.

Summary:

Tragically Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) is actually planning to both SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE Coastal Open Space acreage, and to eliminate 'High-Priority Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto due to SLR.

The Existing LCP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F to analyze the deficit of Coastal Open Space Land Use should factor in the currently planned LOSS of both Coastal Open Space acreage and Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto due to SLR. As a long-range Coastal Land Use Plan this required LCP analysis needs to also consider the concurrent future increases in both population and visitor demand for those LOST Coastal Open Space acres and Coastal Open Space Land Uses.

It is very troubling that demand for these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses is increasing at the same time the current (near/at capacity) supply of these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses is significantly decreasing due to SLR. Instead of planning for long-term sustainability of these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses for future generations there appears to be a plan to use SLR and inappropriate (lower-priority residential) Coastal Land Use planning to forever remove those CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses from Ponto. CA Coastal Act Policies to address these issues should be thoroughly considered.

2021-2 proposed Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) will likely result in City and CA Coastal Commission making updates to the 2015 General Plan, based on the existing Ponto Planning Area F LCP – LUP Policy requirements, Ponto Open Space issues, high-priority Coastal Land Use needs, and SLR issues not addressed in the 2015 General Plan.

Subject: Public input for Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - do the right and smart thing for our future

Attachments: Carlsbad is below National Average & worst of 24 SoCal Coastal cities in providing Parks in a 10-minute walk to residents.pdf; TPL Support for Ponto Park - 2022-3-11.pdf; CTGMC key issues and suggestions -2022-12-6.pdf; History of Open Space at Ponto - 2022-1-26.pdf; Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA planned loss of OS at Ponto - 2022.pdf; 2022 General Comparative cost-benefits of Completing PCH-PCH Modification-Ponto Park - Part 1 of 2 (2).pdf; Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2021-Oct Updated Public Comments - Coastal Recreation.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2023 8:20 AM

To: Growth Management Committee <Committee@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Sean Adams' <adams.sean.a@gmail.com>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Boyle, Carrie@Coastal <carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; Ross, Toni@Coastal <Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc: info@peopleforponto.com

Subject: Public input for Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - do the right and smart thing for our future

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Parks and Planning Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's February 2023 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, and Carlsbad's Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 planning and development applications, and
4. as public input to the CA Coastal Commission on Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

In looking over the CTGMC's proposed report and recommendations, it appears the attached data and issues from over 5,000+ emails and extensive numbers of Carlsbad Citizens verbal comments provided city staff and the CTGMC have not been addressed.

Failure of the city staff and city to address these issues and providing a much needed and TRUE and significant Ponto Park (the last vacant land and opportunity to provide a true and meaningful Coastal Park) will undermine the Coastal Recreation needs (and future economic and social sustainability) of Carlsbad and future CA residents and visitors. Ponto has the last remaining vacant and unplanned Coastal land for a 6-mile length of coast that is without Coastal Park. Buying Ponto Park is the far better and magnitude CHEAPER means to provide a significant Coastal Park for this 6-mile length of Coast (and ALL South Carlsbad) that is without a Coastal Park.

The CTGMC needs to responsibly address the data and issues thousands of Carlsbad and North County Citizens and visitors have sent you. CTGMC and staff failure to address these issues will forever negativity impact forever our quality of life and eliminate the last viable, least constrained, and tax-payer effective option (Buying Ponto Park) for or future.

The CTGMC and city staff Own your decisions. Go down in history as being wise, true and doing the right thing for the future. Don't fail to address the FACTS and do nothing but kick-the-can-down-the road. We are running out of road and going over the cliff; as Seal Level Rise erodes our Coastal Recreation lands and our last vacant inland areas are vanishing. Your time is now or never to do the right (and most tax-payer efficient) think – buy Ponto Park!

Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2023 3:53 PM

To: 'committee@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; 'Homer, Sean@Parks'; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; 'Carrie Boyle'; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal'; 'melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com'

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: Public input for Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - Carlsbad below national average and lowest So CA Coastal city in providing Parks within 10-minute walk

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Parks and Planning Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's February 2023 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, and Carlsbad's Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 planning and development applications, and
4. as public input to the CA Coastal Commission on Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

For years Carlsbad Citizens have told the City that there is a need for a Park at Ponto:

- to provide for documented Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) land use at Ponto,
- to correct for the conversion of a 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use to Residential use and the elimination of planned Coastal Open Space at Ponto,
- to correct the Carlsbad's Park Master Plan documented lack of Park Service at Ponto,
- to provide South Carlsbad (62% of Carlsbad's total population and the City's major Coastal visitor and transit occupancy tax generator) with their ONLY Coastal Park west of I-5. The City unfairly, and contrary to CA Coastal Act Policy disproportionately provides 10 parks totaling 37 acres west of I-5 in Coastal North Carlsbad for 38% of the population but 0 (zero) Coastal Parks and 0 (zero) Coastal park acres west of I-5 in Coastal South Carlsbad for 62% of the population,
- to provide for an existing 6.5 acre local Neighborhood (i.e. Special use area) Park need at Ponto, and
- to provide a City Park within a 10-minute walk for Ponto residents.

Failure to correct this documented City Park unfairness is very damaging to the citizens, City finances, South Carlsbad's and California's visitor industry. The Coastal Recreation data file sent to you earlier documents some of the key facts.

However, we conducted some additional Trust for Public Land 10-minute walk data collection that the City Council, CTGMC, Parks and Planning Commissions and CA Coastal Commission need to also consider. That data is below and in the attached file, and again with last year's Trust for Public Land Ponto Park support letter (again attached) that reflects on Carlsbad poor performance relative to the 24 So Cal Coastal Cities (165 miles of coastline) from Malibu to the Mexican border in providing Parks within a 10-minute walk. The data and links to the data source is:

Carlsbad is 10% below the national average for cities & the worst of 24 Coastal So California cities - 165 miles of coastline - in providing Parks within a 10-minute walk to residents

The Trust for Public Land documents a city's 10-minute walk to Park at <https://www.tpl.org/parkserve>
The Average USA City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 55% of residents [10% above Carlsbad].
Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to **49.9% of residents [10% below National Average]**.
New York City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 99% of residents.

The Trust of Public Land submitted a letter to the City of Carlsbad, CA Coastal Commission, and CA State Park supporting Ponto Park

Carlsbad is the worst of 24 Southern CA Coastal cities (from Malibu south to Imperial Beach along 165 miles of coastline) in providing Parks within 10-minute walk to residents:

1. Palos Verdes Estates provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
2. El Segundo provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
3. Hermosa Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
4. Redondo Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 98% of residents
5. Manhattan Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 95% of residents
6. Del Mar provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 93% of residents
7. Dana Point provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 89% of residents
8. Huntington Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 85% of residents
9. Long Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 84% of residents
10. Laguna Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
11. Santa Monica provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
12. San Diego provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 81% of residents
13. Coronado provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
14. Newport Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
15. Imperial Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 74% of residents
16. Encinitas provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 68% of residents
17. Los Angeles provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
18. Solana Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
19. Oceanside provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 58% of residents
20. Seal Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 57% of residents
21. Malibu provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 53% of residents
22. San Clemente provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 52% of residents
23. Rancho Palos Verdes provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 50% of residents
24. **Carlsbad** provides Parks within 10-minute walk to **49.9% of residents.**

Carlsbad is the lowest & most unfair to citizens of the 24 Southern California Coastal cities along 165 miles of coast from Malibu to Imperial Beach.

Source of data: Trust for Public land parkscores

Trust for Public Land's 10-minute walk to Park Maps/data:

Carlsbad = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0611194#reportTop>

Encinitas = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0622678>

Irvine = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0636770>

Please, Please, please, consider and discuss this data, and

1. Create a 10-minute walk to City Park Standard in the
 - a. Parks Master Plan,
 - b. Growth Management Plan Update, and

c. Local Coastal Program Update.

2. Create a Park Policy that requires developers to dedicate Park Land (not pay Park-in-lieu-fees) in areas that do not have a minimum of 3 acres of City Park for each in 1,000 population within a 10-minute walk of the developer's proposed development (see attached CTGMC Key Issues & Suggestions file for details and Open Space suggestions)
3. Fix Coastal South Carlsbad's documented City Park inequity/unfairness with a significant and real Pronto Park
4. Save tax-payers tens of millions in dollars by cost effectively purchasing vacant land at Pronto for a Park, v. trying to maybe make a few bits of narrow PCH roadway median as a pseudo-park

- Do you want Carlsbad to be the worst city in Coastal Southern California in providing accessible Parks within a 10-minute walk to residents?
- Do you want Carlsbad to fail to upgrade its park standards while other cities updated their park Standards and make their cities more desirable?
- Do you want to undermine the quality of life for Carlsbad citizens and their children by not providing a park within a 10-minute walk to their home?
- Do you want to force Carlsbad families to have to drive to park?
- Do you want to slowly undermine a key visitor serving industry in South Carlsbad by not providing a significant and true and meaningful Coastal Park in South Carlsbad?
- Do you want tax-payers to pay tens of millions more to try to maybe try to make a few narrow portions of PCH median useable to people?

Please take responsibility and full ownership of your decisions on these important issues and questions. The individual decisions you make will likely be the last ones made. Once vacant land like at Pronto is developed it will be forever lost to address the critical, well documented Park and Coastal Park needs at Pronto as overwhelmingly communicated by Carlsbad Citizens and visitor businesses, and other citizens.

Please be wise and think about the future your decisions will bring.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

PS: The initial version of the "CTGMC key issues and Suggestions 2022-12-6" file (attached) sent to you 8/8/22. The attached updated file should replace that older file as there is new data on significant tax-payer cost savings from Pronto Park relative to PCH Relocation, and updated examples of how Coastal Open Space can be cost-effectively persevered and increased. Both Coastal Parks and Open Space are important Carlsbad and State of CA issues.

- Parks: Updated data shows that a 11.1 acre Pronto Park would now cost less \$20 million to buy and build. This is less than a City Pool Renovation. Carlsbad's Old City Council planned to spend \$65 to \$80 million in Carlsbad tax-payer dollars to address the Citywide need for a significant Coastal Park in South Carlsbad with a 2.3 mile PCH Relocation. The City identified in 2001 other pay-payer funds were highly unlikely. \$65 to \$80 million would only 'free-up' 15.8 acres of narrow PCH Median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 & #5"). As People for Pronto Citizens have been saying for years that Pronto Park is the better Park solution to the documented Coastal South Carlsbad Park needs – a citywide need. The CTGMC should include that citywide Park need and the logical, better and tax-payer responsible Pronto Park solution to that citywide Park need in your CTGMC recommendations to City Council.
- Open Space: Updated data shows how documented GM Open Space shortfalls can be properly and responsibly address in a collaborative citizen-based "Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan" approached. Also the need to maintain the 15% GM (Useable) Open Space Standard will be critical in the future

to maintain Open Space and prevent future conversion of Open Space to residential land use as part of Housing Plan updates.

For the CTGMC; Parks and Open Space are the 2 most critical/special of 6 Key Growth Management Program Update Issues and Suggestions the CTGMC should take to properly address these 6 key Growth Management Issues.

- Please read the Updated data and Suggestions.
- Please responsibly address the Growth Management issues of a citywide Park need for Coastal South Carlsbad as listed in the attached Suggestions. Include a South Carlsbad Coastal Park in your recommendations to the City Council. Acknowledge Ponto Park as the best and most tax-payer efficient solution to address that documented citywide park need.
- Please in your recommendations to City Council retain and enforce the Open Space Standard, and fix past errors made in falsely exempting certain developers in certain areas in the City from complying with the Growth Management Open Space Standard that other developers in other areas are required to provide.

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Happy holidays and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

2022 General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, PCH Modification, and Ponto Park to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto/West BL/South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2

Key base facts regarding tax-payer Cost/Benefit comparison:

City Coastal Park Fairness: Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad has ZERO Parks and ZERO Park acres v. 10 Coastal Parks in North Carlsbad. 62% of Carlsbad citizens and major visitor industries live in South Carlsbad with no Coastal Park. 38% of Carlsbad citizens have the entire City's Coastal Parks. The City also falsely allowed Ponto Developers to NOT PROVIDE the required 15% unconstrained Open Space required by other developers in Carlsbad. Consequently Ponto is already developed at a density 35% higher than the rest of City.

What is missing from South PCH: The only missing components of a Carlsbad Livable (Complete) Street are adequate Coastal sidewalks/pedestrian paths. Better safer protected bike paths for the volume of bike traffic on a higher-speed roadway are highly desired. Both these missing features can be (and should have already long ago been) provided in the existing PCH configuration.

Generalized Costs: Costs come from publicly stated costs by Mayor Hall in a 2019 at Meet the Mayor Realtor luncheon at Hilton Garden Inn, City PCH Modification Cost Studies for South PCH, \$13 million per mile cost for the simpler City CIP #6054 PCH Modification Project at Terramar, general City cost data from official public records requests, and vacant Ponto land costs of \$1.4 to \$2.4 million per acre from recent recorded land sales at Ponto.

Generalized Benefits: The number of acres and the quality and usability of each of those acres, and the number of new added beach parking for each of the known Option's define each Option's benefits. There may be other unknown Options that have different benefits. The City's 2001 PCH Modification Studies' highest Park and Open Space Option (2001 ERA Financial Analysis "Alternative 1-parks and open space scheme") only made possible a 4-acre Active Park north of Palomar Airport Road in North Carlsbad. The City's 2013 PCH Concept design eliminated that 4-acre Active Park and only showed a few small open space areas with picnic tables. Any PCH Modification Benefits are limited by existing PCH constraints. See attached Part 2: City PCH map with numbered notes on various existing land use constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Modification Design.

PCH Modification: PCH Modification does not add any new City land. Rearranging PCH land may add some usability beyond the usability of existing parkway areas along PCH. However significant land in PCH right-of-way is already constrained by habitat, slopes, and water quality detention basins. Past City Studies in 2001 and 2013 showed relatively modest changes in useable acreage from major PCH Modifications. Forever removing 2-travel lanes (over 50% of PCH capacity due to removing passing ability) will create Terramar traffic congestion, but could repurpose that City pavement for open space. Any net usable amount of open space land will however be relatively narrow and may be modest once all constraints are accounted for. PCH Modification should be accurately compared with the existing usable and open space parkway areas in the existing PCH configuration and Ponto Park situation. See attached Part 2: City PCH map with numbered notes on various existing land use constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Modification Design.

Comparative tax-payer Cost/Benefits:

1. Completing PCH & adding missing sidewalk/path and additional public parking and bike safety:

177 existing parking spaces along South Carlsbad Blvd

Existing 4 vehicle lanes and 2 bike lanes

The only missing component of “Complete/Livable Street” is a pedestrian sidewalk/path

Total Cost to provide missing sidewalks per City data = \$3-5 million (based on path width)

Costs for desirable safety upgrade to existing bike lanes are not known

Cost to add more Beach parking in abandoned PCH North and South of Poinsettia ranges from:

- 273 additional spaces = \$ 0.76 million
- 546 additional spaces = \$ 1.1 million
- Plus an estimated \$1.5 million for 2 signalized intersection upgrades for full 4-way access
- Cost per parking space is estimated at \$19,275 to \$13,899 per additional parking space

Total cost: \$ 3.8 to 6.1 million to provide missing sidewalk/path and add more parking + unknown amount for any desired upgrades to existing bike lanes

2. ‘2013 PCH Modification Proposal’ [AECOM 11/26/2013 Alternative Development Meeting]

Total Cost is \$75 million per Mayor Matt Hall. PCH Modification would be most the expensive City project so far. \$75 million current cost appears consistent with 20-years of cost inflation of the basic (unmitigated environmental and traffic) 2001 costs of \$26.5 to 37.3 million (in 2001dollars) identified by the City. The City’s 2001 Study indicated fully mitigated costs will be higher.

Total \$75 million PCH Modification cost comes to:

\$ 18.7 to 7.5 million per acre for narrow open space areas (from portions of city roadway)

\$872,093 per additional parking space

- 86 additional parking spaces created = 263 replacement spaces - 177 existing spaces removed
- Includes multi-use pathway (sidewalk) within primarily native/natural landscaping.
- Possible 50% reduction in vehicle lanes (from 4 to 2 lanes) with corresponding traffic congestion like at Terramar. Not clear if Citizens will approve spending \$75 million to double traffic congestion.
- Includes about 4 - 10 acres for possible narrow passive Park area identified in City’s 2001 PCH Modification Studies. However City’s 2013 PCH Modification (AECOM) plans look like smaller acreage is provided.
- Does not purchase any new land (only reconfigures existing City land) so requires Carlsbad Citizens to vote to expend funds per Proposition H.
- 2013 PCH Modification proposal did not consider and map City’s 2017 sea level rise data to show what areas would be lost due to sea level rise and account for any added cost and issues.

3. Ponto Coastal Park

Total Cost: \$20 – 22 million to purchase and build 11-acres as Mayor Matt Hall has publicly stated

\$ 2 to 1.8 million per acre (per Mayor) for new and fully useable City Park area

175% to 10% more total park land than ‘PCH Modification options’

- Includes adding 11-acres of new and viable parkland similar in shape (but larger in size) than Carlsbad’s Holiday Park. Site includes both habitat and E-W and N-S connections.

- Since an Open Space land purchase per Proposition C acquisition voters exempted such purchases from Proposition H. NCA recommend the site be considered for purchase as Open Space per the City's obligations under a lawsuit settlement.
- Ponto Park's cost savings over 'PCH Modification' = \$55 to 53 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks cost savings over 'PCH Modification' = \$51 to 47 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks + 273 additional parking spaces cost savings over "PCH Modification" = \$50.4 to 46.1 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks + 546 additional parking spaces cost savings over "PCH Modification" = \$50.1 to 45.8 million

4. Combining both #1-PCH Completion and #3-Ponto Park:

Combining #1 and #3 creates at cost effective and more beneficial Coastal Park-Coastal Parking-Completes Streets solution. This solution actually adds 11-acres of new City land for a needed Park, provides for a Complete PCH without increasing traffic congestion, does not forever congest PCH travel if future PCH traffic increases, adds comparatively more beach parking, and provides the City with Coastal land use and sea level rise planning flexibility to address future needs by not forever committing the City's PCH land to a Final solution. See map on page 4 showing land use synergy of combining #1 and #3.

\$50.4 to 45.8 million in tax-payer cost savings are estimated from combining #1 & #3 compared to the estimated \$75 million PCH Modification concept. Combining #1 and #3 provide all the features provided by more Benefits for a reduced

- a. Ponto Park's location allows it to use the 337-610 parking spaces created by #1 above (177 existing + 273 to 546 new parking spaces). The 337-610 parking spaces will allow Ponto Park to effectively host Carlsbad's special community events.
- b. Acquiring Ponto Park's 11-acres provides both the City and State of CA with important future land use options to address the Sea Level Rise and Coastal Erosion (SLR) planned by the City. These options are created by leaving the exiting South Carlsbad Blvd right-of-way substantially the same (except for adding needed sidewalks and using the existing Old paved roadway for parking) thus allowing future upland relocation of the Campground. If \$75,000,000 is spent on #2 the likelihood this very expensive City expenditure would never be abandoned by the City to allow relocation of the Campground.
- c. Carlsbad' 2017 Sea Level Rise study shows SLR will eliminate ½ of the State Campground – a high-priority Coastal land use under the CA Coastal Act. The CA Coastal Act calls for "upland" relocation of high-priority Coastal land uses due to SLR impacts. Ponto Park could also provide for "upland" relocation of the State Campground.

Part 2 of this Comparative analysis is a separate 2-page data file. This Part 2 file consists of the City's PCH map with numbered notes to documented City data on PCH design constraints, mapping the City's 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Areas, and outlining the easterly 6.5 acre portion of the 11-acre Planning Area F site that could be Ponto Park for acreage comparison purposes.



Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on Oct 12th 2021:

On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:

- For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
- For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
- For Policy 6-10 concerns providing Low Cost Visitor Accommodations. Public Parks are the lowest cost (free) Visitor accommodating land use there is.

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City's past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: "Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980's. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad's 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- "POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must, therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.
- POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING: Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
- POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES: Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations"

The public record request is to see documents of:

- City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

Updated Pubic Comments on Coastal Recreation submitted on January 2021:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 5-30 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |

City Park Standard data

| | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|----------------------------------------|
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |
| Park Standard % | 100% | 167% | 167% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
| Developed City Park | 2.47 | 3.65 | 5.5 | acres / 1,000 population |
| Developed Park | 100% | 148% | 223% | % is relative to Carlsbad |

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| <u>Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage</u> | <u>total park acres</u> | <u>Unusable park acres</u> | <u>% of park unusable</u> | <u>reason unusable</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland |

Anticipated Future Park development projects

Park - quadrant

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% **112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks**

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied the minimum amount of Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**
- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable 'park' / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad's current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed in the table below. They are:**
 - **4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,**
 - **6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and**
 - **2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant**

Shortfall (excess) in
Current Quadrant
Min. Park standard by
population Future Park

| | <u>acres</u> | <u>need</u> | <u>acres</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants</u> |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deficit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the Park demand.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning. Park Inequity is highly detrimental to the City, and City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

2. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

3. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
- Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

4. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 “... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ...”; 2). This data be used in the City’s analysis and the public’s review and discussion about the City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan. The City’s proposed Draft ‘Buildout’ Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount “maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone” and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to “assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”. Most of Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

5. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City’s proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

6. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is an obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail




Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



7. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:

- Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - Source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

8. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can


only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

9. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.


10. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.

- Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
- Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
- Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
- Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the

Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



11. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that

15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

12. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:

- Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
- In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
- In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.

- Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
- In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
- In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without First disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
- In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to either:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of "Non-Residential Reserve" until such time as the City's past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park") to provide both "High-Priority" coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

13. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words "shall") these "low

priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City “may” or ‘may not’ choose (per the proposed “may” LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City’s (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy ‘shell game’. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two “may” criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only “low-priority” residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by “shall” policy) winners, and “high-priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal ‘long-shot’ (“may” policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the

documented “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently

dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

14. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

15. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is

illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

Carlsbad is 10% below the national average for cities & the worst of 24 Coastal So California cities - 165 miles of coastline - in providing Parks within a 10-minute walk to residents

The Trust for Public Land documents a city's 10-minute walk to Park at <https://www.tpl.org/parkserve>
The Average USA City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 55% of residents [10% above Carlsbad].
Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 49.9% of residents [10% below National Average].
New York City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 99% of residents.

The Trust of Public Land submitted a letter to the City of Carlsbad, CA Coastal Commission, and CA State Park supporting Ponto Park

Carlsbad is the worst of 24 Southern CA Coastal cities (from Malibu south to Imperial Beach along 165 miles of coastline) in providing Parks within 10-minute walk to residents:

1. Palos Verdes Estates provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
2. El Segundo provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
3. Hermosa Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
4. Redondo Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 98% of residents
5. Manhattan Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 95% of residents
6. Del Mar provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 93% of residents
7. Dana Point provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 89% of residents
8. Huntington Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 85% of residents
9. Long Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 84% of residents
10. Laguna Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
11. Santa Monica provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
12. San Diego provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 81% of residents
13. Coronado provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
14. Newport Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
15. Imperial Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 74% of residents
16. Encinitas provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 68% of residents
17. Los Angeles provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
18. Solana Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
19. Oceanside provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 58% of residents
20. Seal Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 57% of residents
21. Malibu provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 53% of residents
22. San Clemente provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 52% of residents
23. Rancho Palos Verdes provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 50% of residents
24. **Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 49.9% of residents.**

Carlsbad is the lowest & most unfair to citizens of the 24 Southern California Coastal cities along 165 miles of coast from Malibu to Imperial Beach.

Source of data: Trust for Public land parkscores

Trust for Pulic Land's 10-minute walk to Park Maps/data:

Carlsbad = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0611194#reportTop>

Encinitas = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0622678>

Irvine = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0636770>

Following are 6 key major Growth Management Standards issues of citywide relevance that the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee (CTGMC) needs to act on, and citizen “Suggestions to CTGMC” on how to honestly and responsibly act on these 6 key issues in the CTGMC’s recommendations to the New City Council. This Update includes new information (pp 5-6) on the improved affordability of Ponto Park, and on how GM Open Space shortfall can be repaired. We hope the CTGMC will act honestly to make recommendations that truly and responsibly address known documented shortfalls in both Parks and GM Open Space. Responsible recommendations by the CTGMC can provide a sustainable Quality of Life to future Carlsbad generations and visitors. Only you own your recommendations.

1. The State of CA is forcing Carlsbad and all cities/counties in CA to provide for unlimited or Infinite Population and Visitor growth. So there will be an Infinite population & visitor demands for Parks, Open Space, water, and demands on our roads/transportation systems, and other Growth Management (GM) Quality of Life facilities. These infinite increases in population and visitor demand will come from high density development that requires more public Parks and Open Space to balance the high-densities. **Carlsbad’s new GM Standards will have to provide for a system of Infinite proportional increases in the supply of Parklands, Open Spaces, water, transportation facility capacity, etc. or our Quality of Life will diminish.**
 - a. Suggestions to CTGMC:
 - i. Completely restructure the General Plan, Local Coastal Program and GM Program to clearly recognize these facts and State requirements to proportionately provide public facilities to maintain/improve Carlsbad GM Quality of Life Standards for this Infinite growth of Population and Visitor demands.
 - ii. **Being a Coastal city Carlsbad has an added responsibility to proportionately maintain/improve providing High-Priority Coastal land uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations) needed at a regional and statewide level to address visitor needs for Coastal Recreation, access, and affordable accommodations.** Carlsbad needs to work with the State of CA Coastal Commission to completely restructure Carlsbad’s Coastal Land Use Plan to addresses the State’s requirement to provide an Infinite amount high-priority Coastal land uses for those Infinite Population and Visitor demands.
 - iii. **Trying to ignore these Infinite demands for Carlsbad’s Quality of Life facilities – like Parks and Open Spaces is a path to disaster and the ultimate degradation of Carlsbad’s Quality of Life.**
2. **Carlsbad has a huge Jobs v. Housing supply imbalance – far too many jobs around the airport for our amount of housing. This creates negative and costly land use and transportation planning distortions that radiate from the Airport Central Jobs through Carlsbad in all directions.** CA Housing law penalizes unbalanced cities like Carlsbad by requiring more housing in Carlsbad to bring jobs/housing ratio into balance. Carlsbad can correct this imbalance by 1 of 2 ways: 1) greatly increase housing supply (and thus increase the need and City expense for more GM Quality of Life facilities), or 2) more logically and cost effectively greatly decrease the amount of Jobs land use, so Carlsbad’s housing supply is in balance with jobs. These jobs will move to surrounding Cities that have more housing than jobs. **Rebalancing by reducing jobs land use creates added benefits for Carlsbad and our region by reducing Carlsbad’s peak-hour job commute traffic volumes and**

vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and by reducing the costs Carlsbad (and other cities and the region) have to pay to accommodate inter-city commute traffic. If Carlsbad reduces jobs land use will also reduce the amount of housing the State of California and SANDAG requires Carlsbad provide in its Housing Element thus reducing forcing incompatible high-density development into established neighborhoods and pressure to convert useable GM Open Space lands to housing land use.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Carlsbad can logically and cost effectively balance Jobs/housing supply by updating Growth Management Policy to reduce jobs to be in balance with housing by changing some of Carlsbad's General Plan land use around the airport into several high-density residential mixed-use Villages.** The City has started some of this, but can expand this effort but has not planned creating mixed-use village environments. These high-density villages will reduce jobs and provide both high-quality and high-density (affordable) housing within walking/biking distance to the major job center and new neighborhood commercial and Park uses in the Villages.
- ii. Prioritize transportation investments in safe bike paths, walking paths between Carlsbad's Central Jobs Core around the airport and Carlsbad's housing, particularly strongly connecting these new high-density mixed-use villages with the Central Jobs Core.
- iii. Update General Plan land use and housing policy to reduce concentrations of higher-density housing except around the airport jobs core.
- iv. Recognize the central Airport jobs core is 'Carlsbad's New Urban Downtown and "Transect Plan" accordingly toward lower densities on the City periphery.

3. Although some very critical areas (such as the Coastal lands at Ponto) are still vacant and can be wisely used for critical GM Quality of Life needs, much of Carlsbad is largely developed.

Redevelopment of developed land will require creating increased supplies of Parkland, Open Spaces, transportation capacity, and other Quality of Life facilities.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Completely rethink all City planning on existing vacant lands to assure that remaining vacant land is planned and being used wisely and fairly distributed to address critical Quality of Life needs in those areas, and not squandered on redundant land use.** The location of vacant land to address critical Park & Open Space needs should be preserved with land use planning.
- ii. Work with the State and CA Coastal Commission to preserve our Finite vacant Coastal lands for High-Priority Coastal Land Uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations and services) for the Infinite population and visitor demands both internal and external to Carlsbad that are/will be placed on them.
- iii. Fully and at the very beginning of any Carlsbad General Plan, Local Coastal Program and Growth Management Program actions going forward fully disclose, map and require consideration of the impact of future sea level rise and coastal erosion on Coastal land acres and land uses. Carlsbad has lost and will accelerate losing acres of Coastal land and High-priority Coastal Land Uses. Carlsbad must know, see, and discuss these losses BEFORE making any land use decisions in Carlsbad's Coastal Zone and any vacant Coastal Land.

4. **Carlsbad General Plan & Growth Management Plan do not provide a fair distribution of adequately sized City Parks for all Carlsbad families.** Veterans Park is a classic example. What will

be the City's largest park is only about 1-mile away from three other major City Parks (Zone 5, and the future Robinson Ranch and Hub Parks). This is a poor and unfair distribution and a misallocation City Park land resources. Saying Veterans Park is 'the park to serve SW, SE, and NE Carlsbad families' (the overwhelming major/majority funders of veterans Park) when those families are upwards of 6-miles away on major commercial arterials that kids can't logically/safely use is false and unfair. Most all the funding (developer fees) to build Veterans Park come from the SW, SE and NW Carlsbad but those areas are denied the Park the paid for. Veterans Park is inaccessible by almost all its intended users except by driving their cars and then storing their cars in parking lots on Parkland thus making less park land available for actual park use – this makes little common sense and is a great waste of tax-payer funds. This is dysfunctional along with being very unfair to families in SW, SE and NE Quadrats that are denied park acres near their homes which they funded. **Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps 'Park Service' areas of existing known Park Inequity or Unfairness (dysfunction), to show where new City Park investments should be made (See City map image with notes below).**

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

The Trust for Public Land provides a Park-Score to compare both a City's amount of park acres and the 'fairness' of access (within a 10-minute walk) to parks. **Carlsbad is below national averages in both park acres and fair access to parks. Carlsbad is also well below what our adjacent Coastal cities of Encinitas and Oceanside provide. Carlsbad only requires 3 acres of Park land per 1,000 population, while Encinitas and Oceans require 5 acres - 67% more than Carlsbad – of parkland. Also, Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be within a 10-minute walk to their citizens and families. Carlsbad has no such requirement.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

Carlsbad should change its General Plan, Parks and Growth Management Standards and CMC 20.44 to:

- i. **Be Above Average Nationally in both providing park acreage and in locating adequate park acreage to be within a 10-minute walk to all neighborhoods.**
 - ii. **Raise its minimum park acreage standard to 5 acres per 1,000 population, versus the current low 3 acres per 1,000. Carlsbad should be at least as good as Encinitas and Oceanside in requiring 5 acres, not 40% below what our adjacent Cities require/provide.**
 - iii. **Raise its park location standard to require an adequately sized park be provided to serve the neighborhood population within a 10-minute walk for all neighborhoods.**
 - iv. **Prioritize City Policy and Park Budgets and investments to achieve park fairness in 'Park Unserved areas' identified by Carlsbad's Park Master Plan.**
 - v. **Per Carlsbad's Municipal Code Chapter 20.44- DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES to require developers in 'Park Unserved areas' and in areas that do not have an adequately sized (5 acres per 1,000 population) park within a 10-minute walk to provide their developments required Park land acre dedication in actual Park land within a 10-minute walk to their development.**
 - vi. **Update the City's Park-in-lieu fee to assure the fee is adequate to actually buy the amount of park land a developer is to provide within a 10-minute walk of their development. The City's current 'Park-in-lieu-fee' is far too low and inadequate to actually buy land in area surrounding the proposed development.**
 - vii. **Only allow developers to pay a Park-in-lieu-fee where there is an adequately sized park (provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk of their development, and growth management planned future development in that area will not require more park land to provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk.**
 - viii. Consider updating Park policy to provide more multi-use flexibility in park land acres and development on Parks. Many Carlsbad Park acres are developed/dedicated to a single-purpose use, and unavailable for other park uses.
 - ix. Consider eliminating car parking lots from land that can be counted as parkland; or by significantly limiting park land used for parking to around 5%.
 - x. **Eliminate the counting of 'GM Constrained and Unusable land' and Protected Endangered Species Habitat land as Park land. GM Constrained/Unusable lands are undevelopable. Protected Habitat lands are by definition not useable for development by people. Habitat is dedicated for plants and animals. Parks are open spaces dedicated intended for people. Parkland calculations should exclude Unusable lands and Protected Habitat lands and only count 100% people Useable land as Park land. Where Park land abuts Habitat land a sufficient buffer space shall be provided to prevent people mixing with animals (ex. Rattlesnakes, etc.) and animals from people (habitat disturbance or destruction). This buffer area should not be counted as Park or Habitat acres, but as natural/developed buffer open space acres, and can be counted as part of the City's 15% Growth Management 'Aesthetic open Space'.**
5. Carlsbad's Coast is the most, if not the most, important feature of Carlsbad; and is consistently identified by citizens and businesses and our Community Vision. **Carlsbad's Coastal Parks (west of the I-5 corridor) are grossly unfairly distributed. Carlsbad's Coastal Parks do not fairly match the**

locational needs of the population. North Carlsbad that is 38% of Carlsbad's population and has 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37+ acres in size. South Carlsbad that is 62% of Carlsbad's population has 0 [ZERO] Coastal Parks totaling 0 [ZERO] acres. Again, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps this citywide unfairness (dots show park locations and circles show the area served by each park) and says that the City should look at buying and building New Parks in these areas that are unserved by City Parks (are not covered by a circle). The GM Update should correct this citywide unfair distribution of City Parks by making plans for new Park purchases to create City Parks in these unserved areas of Park Inequity.

To address citywide Coastal Park unfairness the current City Council wants to spend \$60-85 million in Carlsbad tax-payer funds to Relocate 2.3 miles of constrained Pacific Coast Highway median to try to make some of the narrow PCH median 'useable' by people. 2001 and 2013 City PCH Relocation studies identified only a small amount of 'people-useable acres' would be created next to PCH. The \$60-85 million tax-payer cost (\$26-37 million per mile) does NOT add one single square foot of new City land, it only inefficiently rearranges a small amount PCH median. The City can most tax-payer cost effectively provide needed sidewalks and bike improvements along the outside edges of PCH without PCH Relocation. The City's 2001 PCH Relocation Financial Study and 2013 PCH Relocation Design both indicated minimal useable land could be achieved by Relocation, and that the very high tax-payer cost to do so would be very difficult to fund. The City has known for well over 20-years that PCH Relocation is a high-cost and a poor solution to address the Citywide Coastal Park unfairness in South Carlsbad.

However, a **better and far less costly solution to correct Citywide Coastal Park unfairness and provide a much needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park is to simply buy currently vacant land that is for sale.** The City did this (although the City actually bought existing homes) when it expanded Pine Park. **Carlsbad tax-payers have used the City's own data to compare the tax-payer Cost/Benefits of simply purchasing vacant land v. trying to rearrange existing City owned land at PCH. Simply buying vacant land saves tax-payers saves tax-payers over \$32.7 to \$7.7 million.** Please read the following data files:

- 2022-June General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, 2.3 miles of PCH Modification (Island Way to La Costa Ave.), and 14.3 acre Ponto Park (Kam Sang) to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto in South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2.
- City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input: Part 2 of 2
- The most recent (9/19/22) land sale of 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F was less than \$8 million (less than \$706,000 per acre).
- **Buying and developing this 11.1 acre Ponto Park would cost less than \$20 million assuming a 10% profit to the new land-owner, and \$1 million per acre park construction cost like our newest Buena Vista Reservoir Park.** The cost to help correct a Citywide Coastal Park unfairness by simply buying & building a much needed **11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park would cost tax-payers less than the recently approved Measure J City Monroe Street Pool Renovation.** Investing less than \$20 million (\$1.8 million per acre) to buy and build an 11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park is a great tax-payer value v. \$65-80 million in tax-payer funds to rearrange 15.8 acres of narrow strips of constrained PCH median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 &5") for some minimal people use at a tax-payer cost of \$4-5 million per acre. **The overall and per acre costs of buying/building Ponto Park are over 2 to 3 times better value for tax-payers than PCH Relocation/rearrangement.**

- The City Council could/can buy land for Open Space (Parks are the most useable of the City's 4 Open Space categories) under voter approved Prop C Open Space land acquisition authority. **The City has been advised to buy Ponto Park under Prop C per the City's settlement of a Growth Management law suit.**

The Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is clearly a citywide issue. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad as it is unfair to the vast majority of Carlsbad citizens and their families as 62% of Carlsbad is in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is unfair to our major Visitor serving industries (and tax generators) in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad are clearly inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act, Carlsbad's Community Vision, and common sense. The Coastal South Carlsbad Park Inequity is also unfair to North Carlsbad because South Carlsbad's Coastal Park demand is being forced into Coastal North Carlsbad and congesting those parks, and adding to Coastal North Carlsbad traffic and parking impacts. It also increases greenhouse gases and VMT as it forces longer vehicle trips.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F has a specific Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy that says The City of Carlsbad must for the Ponto Area LCP 'Consider and Document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and or Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations west of the railroad tracks (at Ponto) prior to any Land Use change. **The discussion of Parks by the CTGMC is such a situation that requires the CTGMC to consider this adopted LCP Land Use Policies. Official public records requests have shown the City never followed this LCP Land Use Policy Requirement during the 2005 Ponto Vision Plan and 2015 General Plan Update, and in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission rejected the Ponto Vision Plan and told the City in 2017 that that land uses at Ponto could change based on the need for Coastal Recreation and/or Low Cost Visitor Accommodations.** The Mello II LCP that covers most of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone also has Land Use Policy 6.2 for the City to consider a major park in the Batiquitos (Ponto/South Carlsbad) area. The City has only implemented 1/6 to 1/3 of this policy. **The CTGMC should fully evaluate the citywide/South Carlsbad and local Ponto need for Coastal Parks as required by the City's adopted LCPs and CA Coastal Act.**
- ii. Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan Update and Growth Management Plan (GMP) did not, and was not updated to, consider the 2017 Sea Level Rise (SLR) Impact report showing the loss/impact on 32+ acres of Carlsbad's Coastal Land Use acreage in South Carlsbad – primarily Open Space Land Use (beach and Campground). **Both the General Plan (and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan) and GMP should be updated to account for the loss and replacement of these 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Use due to SLR.** The updates and the CTGMC should use the newest CA Coastal Commission SLR Guidelines/science, not the old guidelines used in 2017. Carlsbad's LCP and CA Coastal Act Land Use Polies call for 'upland relocation' to replace the SLR loss of high-priority Coastal Land Uses.
- iii. **The availability over the past several years of the last two sufficiently sized vacant lands suitable for a Ponto/South Carlsbad Coastal Park is a citywide issue. If these last two vacant lands are lost to development forever future generations will have lost the last opportunity for the needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park.** The 5/3/22 Citizen requests for the City to jointly study acquisition of one or both these last vacant lands for a needed (and only possible) true and meaningful Coastal Park for

South Carlsbad should be recommended by the CTGMC. **The CTGMC should recommend Carlsbad’s GMP be updated to incorporate Parkland acquisition of these last opportunities to provide the needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad.**

6. Carlsbad Growth Management Open Space Standard is that 15% of all the Useable (unconstrained and fully buildable) areas is to be preserved as Useable Open Space, and that all the 25 Local Facility Management Plans (LFMP) show how that 15% is provided. The City says:

OPEN SPACE


A. Performance Standard

Fifteen percent of the total land area in the Local Facility Management Zone (LFMZ) exclusive of environmentally constrained non-developable land must be set aside for permanent open space and must be available concurrent with development.

Yet the City has mapped and documented that this 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard was not complied with. The City also acknowledges that without changes to current City planning the 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard will never be complied with. The City acknowledges that only 13% has/will under current plans ever be provided. This missing 2% equals 501 acers of lost GM Open Space the GMP promised citizens. **Carlsbad law the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90, and section ‘21.90.130 Implementation of facilities and improvements requirements’; provide guidance on how non-compliance with a Performance Standards is to be handled.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. Retain the GM Open Space Standard of 15% of all unconstrained and developable land is maintained as Open Space. If the City removes the Open Space Standard, it will allow and encourage land use changes to remove GM Open Space and replace with development.
- ii. **The CTGMC should make a recommendation that an inventory of all 25 LFMP Zones be conducted and an inventory of each LFMP Zones provision of at least 15% Useable Open Space shall be compiled. No LFMP Zone shall be allowed to be “exempt” from this inventory.** The City’s computerized GIS mapping system makes it easy and clear as shown in the following City GIS map for LFMP Zone 9 (aka Ponto).



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara includes the same lagoon.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were not required to comply with the 15% Useable Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the Growth Management Standard of 15% Useable Open Space at Ponto

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from Growth Management (GMP) Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data |

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

- iii. In instances like LFMP Zone 9 (above image) that clearly did not provide at least 15% Useable Open Space and/or were falsely “exempted” the CTGMC should recommend that a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** shall be developed that explores the GM Open Space use/reuse of City land, land use planning requirements, and/or possible acquisitions of remaining vacant land acres to make up for any shortfall in meeting the 15% Useable Open Space in that a Zone. An example of this in LFMP Zone 9 is that the City’s regional Rail Trail will convert 2-lanes of almost all of Avenida Encinas to wider buffered bike lanes and an adequate portion of the converted 2 vehicle lanes can be landscaped (v. just painting strips as a buffer) to provide a safer/better bike lane buffer within a GM compliant Open Space. 2 vehicle lanes in Windrose Circle could also be similarly landscaped and converted to GM complaint Open Space. This is just one example of a cost-effective means to add GM Open Space that developers were falsely allowed to remove.
- iv. A **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** should involve a Citizens Advisory Committee composed of citizens within the impacted Zone and appointed by the Council Members representing the Zone, and a representative of each vacant land owner over of over 1-acre in size.
- v. Consistent with the Growth Management Ordinance land use changes and development applications within a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** Zone shall be deferred until the applications can considered with (or after adoption of) a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan**.

History of the false exemption of the Growth Management Open Space Standard provided Ponto developers in Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9 (LFMP-9):

The history of how required Growth Management Open Space (i.e. unconstrained/developable land) that should have been dedicated Open Space was, and is now being proposed to be, inappropriately converted to Residential land use by a Perpetuating a False Exemption of the Open Space Standard provided Ponto Developers. This False Exemption needs correction and restitution. Ponto's False Exemption of the Open Space Standard and the 'amendment shell-game' GM Open Space history is a critical warning sign to the **Carlsbad Tomorrow** Growth Management Committee, Planning Commission and City Council. Ponto is a critical warning that a strong, accountable and accurate Open Space Standard needs to be established for **Carlsbad Tomorrow**, AND a Growth Management Open Space restitution plan needs to be established and funded that corrects the False Exemption for Ponto Developers. If Ponto Developers were required like other similar developers at the time (Aviara and Poinsettia Shores, "urbanizing La Costa Zones 11 & 12, etc.) to provide the required Growth Management Open Space some of the critical Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues and extensive Carlsbad Citizen needs/demands/desires at Ponto could likely have already been addressed.

How citizens found out about the False Exemption provided Ponto Developers:

In 2017 for the 1st time the city provided the GIS maps/data base accounting of Open Space in the City. The City did this a part of settlement to a North County Advocates citizens' lawsuit. The City Open Space maps/data base allowed Carlsbad Citizens for the 1st time the ability to see and confirm what Open Space was produced by Growth Management (GM). The City's Open Space map/data based for Ponto (LFMP-9) documented that about 30-acres of GM Open Space was missing (see; Carlsbad Official Public Records Request - PRR 2017-164). As required by GM, and as Staff has said, to count as GM Open Space it must be dedicated and 'unconstrained/developable land' to meet the GM Open Space Standard. Being able to see for the 1st time the missing GM Open Space was one of the key awakenings that started People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens. Below is the City's Open Space Map for LFMP-9, with notes. We have the City's parcel-based Open Space data base that confirms all the numerical data in the notes.



**City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9)
Open Space:**

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara had the same lagoon waters.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were never required to comply with the 15% Standard Open Space is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map


City GIS map data summary of the 15% Growth Management Standard Open Space at Ponto


| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from GMP Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data |
| | 73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |

So were did the missing GM Open Space go?

In early 1985 prior to the Ponto's developer (SAMMIS) annexing Ponto into the City of Carlsbad, San Diego County's LAFCO (local agency formation commission) General Planned and pre-zoned, Ponto's Batiqitos Lagoon waters and the lagoon bluff slopes as Open Space. This Open Space was "Constrained Open Space" – State jurisdictional waters, and steep slopes with Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) habitat. These already pre-zoned constrained/non-developable Open Spaces were accounted for as part of the City's 25% pre-Growth Management Plan Open Space, and per Growth Management can't be counted in meeting the 15% Growth Management Open Space Standard. The pre-zoned Open Space is shown in the City's Open Space map and properly marked as "Preservation of Natural Resources" Open Space land. This already pre-zoned Constrained (non-developable, aka 'Preservation of Natural Resources') Open Space land at Ponto was documented in the proposed SAMMIS Batiqitos Lagoon Educational Park (BLEP) Master Plan MP-175 as Areas N, O, and P in the Land Use Summary below.

On Oct, 1 1985 Carlsbad approved SAMIS's Master Plan and EIR to develop Ponto. SAMIS's BLEP Master Plan MP-175. Following are BLEP MP-175's General Plan & Land Use Summary maps:





**CONCEPTUAL LAND USE PLAN
BATIQUITOS LAGOON EDUCATIONAL PARK**
SAMMIS PROPERTIES

The BLEP MP-175 did include a variety of GM compliant Open Space.

- 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use that was playfields and Coastal Recreation site for MP-175 and South Carlsbad. This is a Critical GM Open Space that was never dedicated.
- A minimum 30' wide landscaped Open Space on both sides of Windrose Circle that circled the Area P. Windrose Circle was bordered on each side by 30' of landscaped Open Space.
- Additional minimum 30' wide landscaped setbacks between buildings in Area A
- 2.8 acres of private recreation open space for the maximum amount of residential units
- 45' to 50' landscaped setbacks from the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff edge (this was later developed with Residential land use in some areas of Ponto).
- 75' landscaped separation between Areas C and D
- 70' landscaped separation between Areas D and E
- 25' landscaped setback along Avenida Encinas for Area E
- 30' to 80' landscape setback between Lakeshore Gardens and Area F
- 25' landscaped setback along Avenida Encinas for Area F
- 50' landscaped setback between Areas F and I
- 75' landscaped separation between Areas G and H
- 50' to 80' landscape setback for Area I between Lakeshore Gardens and between Area F

So, prior to Ponto being annexed into the City of Carlsbad in the mid-1980's and prior to Growth Management the Batiquitos Lagoon and lagoons bluff slopes (constrained and unusable due to habitat and slope constraints) were already pre-zoned Open Space and General Planned as Constrained Habitat Open Space. This constrained Open Space did not and cannot meet the 15% GM Open Space Standard.

In 1986 Citizens voted for the City's version of Growth Management that included a New Standard for Useable Open Space. The new standard was that 15% of all unconstrained useable/developable land within a Local Facility Management Zone was to be dedicated as Open Space. Once the vote was in the City adopted the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 of Carlsbad's Municipal Code (City Council Ordinance No. 9791. (Ord. 9829 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9808 § 1, 1986)).

In adopting the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90.010 the Council Clearly stated:

(b) The city council of the city has determined **despite previous city council actions**, including but not limited to, amendments to the land use, housing, and parks and recreation elements of the general plan, amendments to city council Policy No. 17, adoption of traffic impact fees, and modification of park dedication and improvement requirements, that the demand for facilities and improvements has outpaced the supply resulting in shortages in public facilities and improvements, including, but not limited to, streets, **parks, open space**, schools, libraries, drainage facilities and general governmental facilities. **The city council has further determined that these shortages are detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Carlsbad.**

(c) This chapter is adopted to ensure the implementation of the policies stated in subsection (a), to eliminate the shortages identified in subsection (b), **to ensure that no development occurs without providing for adequate facilities and improvements, ..."**

The Citizens and Council recognized that prior City plans were not adequate to address the current (and future) needs for facilities. Upon adoption of the New Growth Management Standards certain facilities were already below-Standard simply based on the existing development and population. Growth Management required additional facilities simply to bring the then current development/population up to the New Minimum Standards. I am personally familiar with 3 GM Standards in LFMP-6 (old La Costa) that I worked on – Library, Fire, and Park where already below-Standard i.e. existing development/population in Old La Costa required more facilities to meet the new Growth Management Standards. We worked to provide these new facilities for the existing development/population (i.e. fix the Standard deficits) and then to also plan even more additional facilities at a ratio that met the New Standards for the additional future development in Old La Costa. I can provide you some interesting stories on that.

I also recall working on the surrounding La Costa LRMP Zones 11 & 12 that Like Ponto/FMP-9 were considered "Cat II: Urbanizing" yet Unlike Ponto/LFMP-9 LFMP Zone 11 & 12 were not falsely exempted

for the GMP Open Space Standard and had to provide the GM Open Space Standard of 15% of the unconstrained/developable lands as dedicated Useable Open Space.

The Citizens vote on Proposition E and the subsequent Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 are the rules on which the Growth Management Plans (both Citywide and 25 Local Facility Plans) are required to follow.

To create the Citywide and the Local plans (Zones 1-6) for the largely developed areas the City needed to temporarily pause development activity to allow time for city staff to Draft the Growth Management Plan (my work as a city planner at the time was re-directed to draft growth management plans). So the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90.030, established a Temporary Development Moratorium to pause development processing activity while the Growth Management Plan was being Drafted. Following is that language of 21.90.030. Notes are shown as italicized text within *[example]*:

“21.90.030 General prohibition—Exceptions.

(a) Unless exempted by the provisions of this chapter, **no application for any building permit or development permit shall be accepted, processed or approved until a city-wide facilities and improvements plan has been adopted and a local facilities management plan for the applicable local facilities management zone has been submitted and approved according to this chapter.** *[Clearly indicates the exemptions in 21.90.030 are only from the temporary development moratorium created by 21.90.]*

(b) No zone change, general plan amendment, master plan amendment or specific plan amendment which would increase the residential density or development intensity established by the general plan in effect on the effective date of this chapter shall be approved unless an amendment to the citywide facilities management plan and the applicable local facilities management plan has first been approved. *[FYI, this provision of 21.90.030 has direct implications with respect of currently City/developer proposed General Plan/Zoning code/Local Coastal Program Amendments now being pursued by the City at Ponto Planning Area F and Ponto Site 18. The City did not and has not yet amended the CFMP and LFMP-9 to increase the City/developer proposed residential density or development intensity at Ponto]*

(c) The classes of projects or permits listed in this subsection shall be exempt from the provisions of subsection (a). Development permits and building permits for these projects shall be subject to any fees established pursuant to the city-wide facilities and improvement plan and any applicable local facilities management plan. *[Then lists various exemptions from the temporary development processing/building permit moratorium in 21.90. The BLEP MP's exemption from the temporary moratorium is (g)]*

(g) The city council may authorize the processing of and decision making on building permits and development permits for a project with a master plan approved before July 20, 1986, subject to the following restrictions *[this only applies to the “approved before July 20, 1986” BLEP MP, and NOT to any subsequent Master Plan Amendment]:*

- (1) The city council finds that the **facilities and improvements required by the master plan are sufficient to meet the needs created by the project and that the master plan developer has agreed to install those facilities and improvements to the satisfaction of the city council.** *[The Ponto developer needed to provide the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use and install the GM compliant Open Space required in the 1986 MP175 but did not]*
- (2) The master plan developer shall agree in writing that all facilities and improvement requirements, including, but not limited to, the payment of fees established by the city-wide facilities and management plan and the applicable local facilities management plan shall be applicable to development within the master plan area and that the master plan developer shall comply with those plans. *[this required the LFMP-9/BLEP MP to have 1) already been fully developed or 2) have already have dedicated 15% of the LFMP-9 as Growth Management compliant Open Space (i.e. Unconstrained and developable) to qualify for the Open Space exemption later falsely noted in the city-wide facilities and management plan. As clearly documented the BLEP MP did not meet the requirements to qualify for Open Space Standard Exemption in the city-wide facilities and management plan. The section also requires “all facilities” (including Open Space) requirements in the Citywide Growth Management Standard to apply to BLEP MP, not provide a means for a false exemption of the Open Space Standard]*
- (3) The master plan establishes an educational park and **all uses within the park comprise an integral part of the educational facility.** *[“all uses” including the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use and all the other GM compliant Open Spaces are an integral part. However the 12.8 acre open space land use was never built and the BLEP MP GM compliant Open Space never dedicated.]*
- (4) **Building permits for the one hundred twenty-nine [129] unit residential portion of Phase I of the project may be approved provided the applicant has provided written evidence that an educational entity will occupy Phase I of the project** which the city council finds is satisfactory and consistent with the goals and intent of the approved master plan. *[Clearly indicates the 21.90.030 exemption is only for building permits for Phase I of the BLEP MP. Of the 129 units only the 75 unit Rosalena development applied for and received building permits under this exemption. There are some very interesting issues related to this Rosalena Phase I development relative to GM complaint Open Space along the bluff edge that can be expanded on later if the CTGMC has questions.]*
- (5) Prior to the approval of the final map for Phase I the master plan developer shall have agreed to participate in the restoration of a significant lagoon and wetland resource area and made any dedications of property necessary to accomplish the restoration. *[Again clearly notes the exemption only allows a final map for Phase I to be processed. The “lagoon and wetland resource area” are part of the same constrained/undevelopable lands already pre-zoned prior to the BLEP MP being incorporated into the City of Carlsbad]*

The Aviara Master Plan (directly adjacent and east of Ponto) and was also being developed at the same time as Ponto/BLEP MP. 21.90.030 also provided the Aviara Master Plan a similar exemption (h) and similar lagoon related quid-pro-quo for that exemption. But Aviara did not receive a GM Open Space Standard Exemption. :

“(iv) Prior to any processing on the [Aviara] master plan the applicant shall grant an easement over the property necessary for the lagoon restoration and the right-of-way necessary for the widening of La Costa Avenue and its intersection with El Camino Real. (Ord. NS-63 § 1, 1989; Ord. 9837 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9808 § 1, 1986)”

Some City staff have incorrectly stated to the City Council that they believe 21.90.030 exempts Ponto/LFMP-9 from the Growth Management Ordinance/Program or Growth Management Open Space Standard. RESOLUTION NO. 8666- A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CARLSBAD, CALIFORNIA APPROVING TWO AGREEMENTS FOR BATIQUITOS LAGOON EDUCATIONAL PARK also shows the 21.90.030 exemption was only for development permits during the temporary building moratorium.

In 1986 the City falsely exempted in the Citywide Facilities Plan all Ponto developers from providing 15% of their useable/developable land as GM required Open Space. The City’s documented/adopted rationale in the Citywide Plan was that Ponto/LFMP-9 was 1) in 1986 already developed, or 2) in 1986 the developer had already met the GM Open Space Standard by having already dedicated 15% of the useable land as Open Space. Both situations were/are false. Any air photo map or even the 1986 LFMP-9 clearly states Ponto was NOT developed in 1986, as only the Lakeshore Gardens existed and the Ralphs Center was just starting construction. Also the City’s GIS Open Space mapping (see above) shows that SAMMIS the Ponto developer (BLEP Master Plan MP-175) in 1986 had Not dedicated as Open Space 15% of the useable land as Growth Management compliant Open Space as shown/described in the BLEP MP (i.e. the 12.8 Acre Recreation Commercial site and all the landscaped open space setbacks required in the BLEP MP-175. If that 15% was dedicated in 1986 it would show-up on the City’s inventory of Dedicated Open Space now. So how did this occur?

How Ponto’s planned GM Open Space was eliminated and replaced with Residential land use:

In late 1980’s SAMMIS the BLEP MP-175 developer started building the 75-home Rosalena Development as the first part of Phase I of the BLEP MP. The City (based on my recollection was very desirous to develop the BLEP MP) and required special time limits on the BLEP MP to actually advance building the ‘Educational Park’ with all the “initiated” land uses (including GM compliant Open Space) within a certain period of time. SAMMIS was having financial issues and difficulty delivering the BLEP MP land uses. Amendments (A, B, and C) to BLEP MP reflected on these difficulties:

- MP 175(A) to allow minor accessory structures within the rear yards of all Phase I single family lots located in Planning Area “C”. *[This is the Rosalena development that was part of Phase I for BLEP MP. This amendment has implications on the landscaped Open Space setback along the Batiquitos Lagoon bluff top, and the required Coastal access trail required by the Coastal*

Development Permit for Rosalena. This is an interesting history that can be explained later if the CTGMC would like.]

- MP 175(B) to realign Carlsbad Blvd., between North Batiquitos Lagoon and west of I-5 to accommodate the Sammis Development was WITHDRAWN January 12, 1990, and
- MP 175(C) a request for 5-year extension of time for Master Plan approval related to educational uses on this project was Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 2841, April 19, 1989 and approved City Council Ordinance No. NS-83, September 5, 1990.

SAMMIS went bankrupt around 1990 and Kaiza Development purchased the BLEP MP. Kaiza completed the Rosalena development started by SAMMIS. Kaiza then sought to completely change the planned land uses on all the remaining unconstrained/developable land in the BLEP MP.

General Plan and Master Plan Amendments eliminated/reduced BLEP's Growth Management compliant Open Space and replace with Residential uses in the "amended" Poinsettia Shores Master Plan:


When Kaiza acquired the BLEP MP-175 and its vacant land only the State Campground, Lakeshore Gardens, Ralphs Center, and now Rosalena were approved/existing developments at Ponto. Kaiza proposed a Master Plan Amendment to delete the BLEP MP-175 and all its developable land uses, except for the only portion of Phase I developed – the 75 unit Rosalena subdivision. The pre-BLEP MP pre-zoned (and General Planned) constrained/undevelopable Lagoon waters and lagoon bluff Open Spaces and the CA Coastal Act (LCP) required bluff top setbacks were the only Open Spaces retained in Kaiza's proposed General Plan land use and Master Plan Amendments.

Most all of the BLEP MP-175 (and Ponto/LFMP-9) land area was still undeveloped at the time Kaiza proposed changing all the General Plan land uses at Ponto and eliminating the usable Open Space in BLEP MP.

Kaiza's General Plan land use and Master Plan 'Amendments' made radical land use changes that converted some critical Useable GM Open Space to residential land use and also reduced some GM Open Space provided in BLEP MP. Following is Kaiza's Amended General Plan land use map and bullet summary of the major Open Space changes without getting into a very detailed forensic analysis:

- Eliminated the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use.
- Eliminated the minimum 30' wide landscaped Open Space on both sides of Windrose Circle for the large unbuilt portions of Windrose Circle
- Reduced by 10' the landscaped Open Space on the smaller built portion of Windrose Circle
- Eliminated on 40.3 acres the additional minimum 30' wide landscaped setbacks between buildings
- Reduced BLEP's 2.8 acres of private recreation open space to 2.3 acres
- Except for the Rosalena (BLEP Area C) and (PSMP Area J), maintained the 45' to 50' landscaped setbacks from the Batiquitos Lagoon Bluff edge
- Eliminated the 75' landscaped separation between BLEP MP Areas C and D

- Eliminated the 70' landscaped separation between BLEP MP Areas D and E
- Maintained the 25' landscaped setback along Avenida Encinas. [However new Master Plan Amendments MP-175L propose reducing the setback to 10' on the undeveloped frontage of Avenida between PCH and the railroad tracks]
- Placed a road in most of the 80' landscape setback between Lakeshore Gardens
- Eliminated the 50' landscaped setback between BLEP MP Areas F and I
- Eliminated the 75' landscaped separation between BLEP MP Areas G and H
- Added a 20' wide by 1,000' long landscaped strip for an HOA trail



Kaiza's Master Plan Amendment MP 175 (D) eliminated the 12.8 acre Open Space land use (with an associated General Plan Amendment to add more residential land use) and reduced the other useable Open Spaces required in the BLEP MP. When the 1994 Kaiza MP 175 (D) General Plan Amendments were proposed, it seemed they voided the '1986 GM Open Space exemption' that was clearly specific only to the 1986 BLEP MP land uses and regulation. Although this was a false exemption, the exemption only applied to the complete/integrated land use and open space provided in the 1986 BLEP MP. The 1986 exemption specific to BLEP MP could not apply to a different and later 1994 General Plan land use plan that eliminated the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial (Open Space) site to add residential land use

and that also reduced the GM compliant Open Space provided in the 1986 BLEP MP. 21.90.030(b) notes that:

“(b) No zone change, general plan amendment, master plan amendment or specific plan amendment which would increase the residential density or development intensity established by the general plan in effect on the effective date of this chapter shall be approved unless an amendment to the citywide facilities management plan and the applicable local facilities management plan has first been approved.”

The 1994 Kaiza General Plan land use and Master Plan (MP 175(D)) Amendments removed 12.8 acres of Recreation Commercial (GM compliant Open Space) to add residential land use. This violated 21.90.030(b) by doing so without a first providing a Citywide Facilities Plan Amendment that analyzed the actual amount of GM compliant Open Space being proposed in the 1994 Kaiza MP 175(D) relative to the 1986 BLEP MP on which the 1986 GM Open Space exemption for LFMP-9 was based. MP 175(D) is noted in the MP as follows:

- “MP 175 (D) Kaiza Poinsettia Master Plan To **replace educational uses with residential land uses** And rename to Poinsettia Shores Master Plan (was) Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 3552, November 3, 1993, Approved City Council Ordinance No. NS-266, January 18, 1994.”

Kaiza’s MP 175(D) inaccurately and bizarrely claimed BLEP MP’s prior false exemption from the GM Open Space Standard as the justification that Kaiza’s new 1994 Open Space land use changes that seem to reduce the amount of GM complaint Open Space in the 1986 BLEP MP are also exempt from the GM Open Space Standard. **Kaiza’s MP 175(D) claims the pre-Growth Management and pre-BLEP MP Constrained/Undevelopable lagoon waters and bluff habitat that per the 15% Growth Management Open Space Standard CAN NOT be counted as meeting the 15% GM Open Space Standard can be magically counted as meeting the 15% GM Open Space Standard. The GM Open Space Standard specifically states that only Unconstrained/Developable lands CAN BE counted as meeting the GM Open Space Standard.** The stated principles of Growth Management, the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90 and the Growth Management Open Space Standard DO NOT allow a developer or the City to count already documented Constrained and unbuildable habitat (and water) as Unconstrained and developable land. You can’t just turn ‘an apple into a banana by saying it’, or turn ‘Constrained/Undevelopable land into Unconstrained/Developable land by just saying it.

Compliance with the law in this Open Space issue is a part of a current lawsuit by North County Advocates a group of Citizens watchdogs. The City has unsuccessfully tried to diminish this lawsuit. A judge/jury will determine the outcome.

Additional MP 175 Amendments have been proposed by and approved to further modify land use and regulatory limitations at Ponto. These include:

- MP 175(E) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, Redefinition of minor amendment to provide a flexible regulatory procedure to encourage creative and imaginative planning of coordinated communities, WITHDRAWN November 1, 1994

- MP 175(F) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan minor amendment to actualize off-site option for provision of 90 affordable housing dwelling units, Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 3774, April 19, 1995
- MP 175(G) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan minor amendment to adopt Coastal Commission Suggested modifications, Approved Planning Commission Resolution No. 3922, June 5, 1996 Approved City Council July 16, 1996, NS-367
- MP 175(H) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan - major amendment FOR HOTEL AND TIMESHARE USES, WITHDRAWN January 16, 2003
- MP 175(I) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – Rosalena Trail Amendment, WITHDRAWN January 8, 2002
- MP 175(J) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – major amendment for Carlsbad Coast Residential project to allow RM land use on Poinsettia Shores, WITHDRAWN January 8, 2002
- MP 175 (K) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – Ponto Area Specific Plan Mixed use consisting of residential, commercial and retail uses, WITHDRAWN August 19, 2004
- MP 175(L) Poinsettia Shores Master Plan – Major amendment for commercial and residential development on Planning Area F, Still being proposed by developers and being processed by the City.

The false exemption for the BLEP MP based LFMP-9 should never have occurred. However, completely eliminating BLEP MP’s OpenSpace land use (12.8 acre Recreation Commercial) and reducing BLEP MP’s required Open Space while at the same time claiming the false BLEP MP Open Space Exemption is a violation of common sense, 21.90, and the very founding principles Growth Management.

The CA Coastal Commission in MP 175 (G) in part recognized the elimination of the 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use and maybe some of the Open Space land use changes and added the following land use regulations for 11.1 acre Planning Area F in the Carlsbad’s Local Coastal Program LCP). The LCP as per State Law and referenced in Carlsbad’s General Plan is the controlling land use regulation over the General Plan, Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and in the Coastal Zone:

“PLANNING AREA F: Planning Area F is located at the far northwest corner of the Master Plan area west of the AT&SF Railway right-of-way. This Planning Area has a gross area of 11 acres and a net developable area of 10.7 acres. Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an “unplanned” area, for which land uses will be determined at a later date when more specific planning is carried out for areas west of the railroad right-of-way. A future Major Master Plan Amendment will be required prior to further development approvals for Planning Area F, and shall include an LCP Amendment with associated environmental review, if determined necessary.

The intent of the NRR designation is not to limit the range of potential future uses entirely to nonresidential, however, since the City's current general plan does not contain an “unplanned” designation, NRR was determined to be appropriate at this time. In the future, if the Local Coastal Program Amendment has not been processed, and the City develops an “unplanned”

General Plan designation, then this site would likely be redesignated as “unplanned.” Future uses could include, but are not limited to: commercial, residential, office, and other uses, subject to future review and approval.

As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.”

In 2010 the CA Coastal Commission in 2010 rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan on which MP 175(K) was based. MP 175(K) was withdrawn.

On July 3, 2017 the CA Coastal Commission provided direction to the City of Carlsbad regarding MP 175(G), Carlsbad’s 2015 General Plan Update, Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment Land Use Plan (LUP) . CA Coastal Commission wrote to the City the following. Notes on the context of communication are in bracketed italics *[example]*:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto ... area. For example, **Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad. ...** this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. *[the discussion of the need for the City to conduct a citywide analysis of the location and amount of these uses in the Coastal Zone to assure the City General Plan within the Coastal Zone is providing the adequate amounts and locations of these land uses to fulfill the long-term population/visitor needs for these uses according to the CA Coastal Act]* **If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”**

In 2017 the City conducted the first Sea Level Rise (SLR) Vulnerability Assessment <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=33958> . That first initial analysis, shows significant SLR impacts that will reduce existing Ponto Open Space - the State beach and Campground and along the Batiquitos Lagoon. The City identified SLR impacts on Ponto Open Space are summarized in the next section of this history.

In 2023 the CA Coastal Commission will consider the data and public input and decide the appropriate land use for 11.1 acre Planning Area F based the CA Coastal Act and Coastal Act land use policies.

You can determine the Open Space and Park Quality of Life Standards that will be applied to this and other future land uses.

[City assessment of Sea Level Rise impacts on reducing Ponto Open Space](#)

The City's 2017 SLR assessment shows SLR will significantly reduce or eliminate only existing Open Space land at Ponto. The City's assessment quantifies the sporadic/episodic loss of Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad Open Space land and land uses being at the State Campground, Beaches, and Batiquitos Lagoon shoreline – about 32 acres by the year 2100, this would be an average loss of 17,000 square feet of Open Space per year. Following (within quotation marks) is a description, quantification and images of the City's projected loss of Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad Open Space land and land use due to SLR. *[Italicized text within brackets]* is added data based on review of aerial photo maps in the Assessment.

“Planning Zone 3 consists of the Southern Shoreline Planning Area and the Batiquitos Lagoon. Assets within this zone are vulnerable to inundation, coastal flooding and bluff erosion in both planning horizons (2050 and 2100). A summary of the vulnerability assessment rating is provided in Table 5. A discussion of the vulnerability and risk assessment is also provided for each asset category.

5.3.1. Beaches

Approximately 14 acres of beach area is projected to be impacted by inundation/erosion in 2050. ... Beaches in this planning area are backed by unarmored coastal bluffs. Sand derived from the natural erosion of the bluff as sea levels rise may be adequate to sustain beach widths, thus, beaches in this reach were assumed to have a moderate adaptive capacity. The overall vulnerability rating for beaches is moderate for 2050.

Vulnerability is rated moderate for the 2100 horizon due to the significant amount of erosion expected as the beaches are squeezed between rising sea levels and bluffs. Assuming the bluffs are unarmored in the future, sand derived from bluff erosion may sustain some level of beaches in this planning area. A complete loss of beaches poses a high risk to the city as the natural barrier from storm waves is lost as well as a reduction in beach access, recreation and the economic benefits the beaches provide.

5.3.3. State Parks

A majority of the South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds (separated into four parcels) were determined to be exposed to bluff erosion by the 2050 sea level rise scenario (moderate exposure). This resource is considered to have a high sensitivity since bluff erosion could significantly impair usage of the facilities. Though economic impacts to the physical structures within South Carlsbad State Beach would be relatively low, the loss of this park would be significant since adequate space for the park to move inland is not available (low adaptive capacity). State parks was assigned a high vulnerability in the 2050 planning horizon. State park facilities are recognized as important assets to the city in terms of economic and recreation value as well as providing low-cost visitor serving amenities. This vulnerability poses a high risk to coastal access, recreation, and tourism opportunities in this planning area.

In 2100, bluff erosion of South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds become more severe and the South Ponto State Beach day-use area becomes exposed to coastal flooding during extreme events. The sensitivity of the South Ponto day-use area is low because impacts to usage will be temporary and no major damage to facilities would be anticipated. Vulnerability and risk to State

Parks remains high by 2100 due to the impacts to South Carlsbad State Beach in combination with flooding impacts to South Ponto.

Table 5: Planning Zone 3 Vulnerability Assessment Summary [condensed & notated]:

| Asset | Horizon | | | Vulnerability |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <u>Category</u> | <u>[time]</u> | <u>Hazard Type</u> | <u>Impacted Assets</u> | <u>Rating</u> |
| Beaches | 2050 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 14 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 54 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| Public Access | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 6 access points 4,791 feet of trails | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 10 access points 14,049 feet of trails | Moderate |
| State Parks | 2050 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [<18 Acres] | High |
| [Campground - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations] | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [>18 Acres] <i>[loss of over 50% of the campground & its Low-cost Visitor Accommodations,</i> | High |
| <i>See Figure 5.]</i> | | | | |
| Transportation (Road, Bike, Pedestrian) | 2050 | Bluff Erosion | 1,383 linear feet | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 11,280 linear feet | High |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------|----------------------|-----------|----------|
| Environmentally Sensitive Lands | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 572 acres | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 606 acres | High |




Figure 7: Southern Shoreline Planning Area – Year 2050





Figure 5: CoSMoS Bluff Erosion Projections by 2100
(CoSMoS-COAST 2015)

[Figure 5 show the loss of over 50% of the campground and campground sites with a minimal .2 meter Sea Level Rise (SLR), and potentially the entire campground (due to loss of access road) in 2 meter SLF.]”

This 2017 SLR data and quantified losses of Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad Open Space land and land uses was not considered in the City’s rejected (by CCC) Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan. The Ponto Vision Plan is the basis for the City’s 2015 General Plan Update that is now being proposed in the City’s Local Coastal Program Amendment now before the CA Coastal Commission.

Summary:

LFPM-9 was clearly not developed in 1986, and did not then or now dedicate 15% of the unconstrained/developable land as Open Space as required by the Growth Management Open Space Standard. These two reasons for the City to “exempt” LFMP-9 from Open Space Standard were/are False. Saying Constrained/undevelopable land can be counted as Unconstrained/developable land is also false and clearly not allowed according to the Growth Management Ordinance, Standards, principles, and common-sense honesty to Carlsbad Citizens. LFMP-9, as the City’s own maps/data base show is clearly missing 30-acres of GM Open Space. In addition in 2017 we learned that Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad will lose about 32 acres of existing Open Space due to SLF.

Closing thoughts:

Growth Management is based on the type/amount/location of General Plan land use designations, the development potential of those land use designations in creating the demand for the type/amount/location of facilities, and supply of the type/amount/distribution of facilities – like Open Space and Parks. If the type/amount/location of supply of facilities does not meet the demand for those facilities then growth management fails and Quality of Life is reduced.

Quality of Life Standards are used to assure supply and demand for facilities is properly balanced with respect to type/amount/location.

Ponto is clearly unbalanced. The Ponto Census Tract is at a 40% higher population density than the rest of Carlsbad, yet is Ponto is NOT meeting the Open Space Standard and has NO Park (see City Open Space maps and Park Master Plan). Ponto and all South Carlsbad have higher population demand for Parks and Open Space facilities yet Ponto (that is the only place to provide Coastal Park and Open Space needs for South Carlsbad) has lower or none of those two most critical GM Facilities needed to balance and mitigate the 40% higher population density at Ponto and also the higher residential density in South Carlsbad.

Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad also have additional State and regional responsibilities to provide Coastal Recreation and Open Space for populations of people and visitors from outside of Ponto and Carlsbad.

This failure to honestly and adequately balance the type/amount/location higher population density by providing higher levels of Parks and Open Space in those areas will lead to a slow and but eventual reduction of the Quality of Life for those areas.

Common sense and the Carlsbad's Growth Management law say if you change the land use (like what was done and is still being proposed at Ponto) you change the type/amount/location of potential development and population and the Growth Management impacts. Land use changes require and honest/accurate/balanced update to Citywide and Local Growth Management Plans to accurately reflect those changes and provide an updated plan to provide facilities that meet the Standards for those land use changes. This is the fundamental heart of any Growth Management.

The Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and City Commissions and Council are all now facing the same issues and responsibility that we faced in the 1980's at the beginning of Growth Management. We established New Quality of Life Standards – for Open Space and Parks – that required New investments in Parks and Open Space by both the City and developers.


Open Space and Parks have always been identified as most critical for Carlsbad's quality of life. The Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, and City Commissions and Council, and Carlsbad Citizens are all at a critical crossroad.

- Do we, or don't we, enforce and set new standards that achieve the quality of life we desire?
- Do we or don't we, fix existing past errors and below desired standard situations?
- Do we or don't we, roll-up our sleeves a work together to a better Quality of Life?

As a long-time Carlsbad Citizen I am extremely disappointed by some who say we can't fulfill our Community Vision, we can't fix things, can't make things better, and can't add more Parks and Useable Open Space. This can't attitude is not out Community Vision. We can and we did before, and we can do it again and better.

Great cities for hundreds of years have Upgraded their Quality of Life Facility Standards, made and implemented/funded facilities to fix things up to those Standards. A City is just like a business or person - If you don't improve you decline. Examples of Upgrading and funding to New Parks and Open Space are many but include – Carlsbad's Buena Vista Reservoir Park, additions to Pine Park, Village H Park, and Aura Circle Open Space acquisition; and SDSU's major new Park at the redeveloped Qualcomm Stadium site.

Now like at the beginning of Carlsbad Growth Management the City can “despite previous city council actions” make improvements to its Growth Management and Quality of Life Standards to address past and future needs. Following illustrates existing R-23 (up to 23 dwellings per acre) development in Carlsbad – most of our future residential development will be required to be like this or more dense.



High-density housing can be great, but it requires MORE Parks and MORE useable Open Space within walking distance to balance the density and provide large places for families and kids to really play. In Carlsbad's high-density residential future with no backyards and stacked flat multi-family homes the need for both more Parks and Useable Open Space is much greater than in 1980's.

The time to fix the Parks and Useable Open Space problems at Ponto (LFMP-9) is now. Already Ponto is developed at a density that is 40% great than the rest of Carlsbad. New proposed and even higher-density developments (developer driven Amendments) propose to make Ponto even more dense, yet there are not Parks at Ponto and Ponto is missing 30-acres of Useable Open Space past developers should have provided.

A doable, time-tested, accountable, tax-payer saving, strongly citizen desired, accountable, and honest way to fix this was presented to you in 8/8/22 and 12/27/22 emails with attached "CTGMP Key Issues and Suggestions – 2022-12-6". Over 5,000 petitions expressing the need to fix the Park and Open Space problems at Ponto have been sent to the City and the City should have provided these to you in considering Park and Open Space issues.

Ponto Park and Open Space needs your help fixing NOW. If not Carlsbad Tomorrow will be less than it is today, and tragically will have failed our Community Vision.

Sea Level Rise and Carlsbad's DLCP-LUPA's projected/planned Loss of Open Space at Ponto

Introduction:

Carlsbad first documented Sea Level Rise (SLR) and associated increases in coastal erosion in a December 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment (2017 SLR Assessment). Prior planning activities (2010 Ponto Vision Plan – rejected by CA Coastal Commission, and 2015 General Plan Update) did not consider SLR and how SLR would impact Coastal Open Space Land Use & CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto. The 2017 SLR Assessment shows Open Space land and Open Space Land Uses are almost exclusively impacted by SLR at Ponto & South Coastal Carlsbad. The 2017 SLF Assessment also shows significant LOSS of Open Space land acreage and Land Uses. Most all impacted Open Space Land Uses are CA Coastal Act "High-Priority Coastal Land Uses" – Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations. Existing Ponto Open Space Land Uses are already very congested (non-existent/narrow beach) and have very high, almost exclusionary, occupancy rates (Campground) due to existing population/visitor demands. Future population/visitor increases will make this demand situation worst. The significant permanent LOSS of existing Coastal Open Space land and Coastal Open Space Land Use (and land) due to SLR reduces existing supply and compounds Open Space congestion elsewhere. Prior Ponto planning did not consider, nor plan, for significant SLR and current/future "High-Priority" Coastal Open Space Land Use demands.


Open Space and City Park demand at Ponto:

Open Space at Ponto is primarily 'Constrained' as defined by the City's Growth Management Program (GMP), and cannot be counted in meeting the City's minimal 15% 'Unconstrained' GMP Open Space Standard. Per the GMP Open Space Standard, the developers of Ponto should have provided in their developments at least 30-acres of additional 'Unconstrained' GMP Open Space at Ponto. City GIS mapping data confirm 30-acres of GMP Standard Open Space is missing at Ponto (Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9).

The City of Carlsbad GIS Map on page 2 shows locations of Open Spaces at Ponto. This map and its corresponding tax parcel-based data file document Ponto's non-compliance with the GMP Open Space Standard. A summary of that City GIS data file is also on page 2. The City said Ponto's non-compliance with the GMP Open Space Standard was 'justified' by the City 'exempting' compliance with the Standard. The City 'justified' this 'exemption' for reasons that do not appear correct based on the City's GIS map and data on page 2, and by a review of 1986 aerial photography that shows most of Ponto as vacant land. The City in the Citywide Facilities Improvement Plan (CFIP) said 1) Ponto was already developed in 1986, or 2) Ponto in 1986 already provided 15% of the 'Unconstrained' land as GMP Standard Open Space. Both these 'justifications' for Ponto 'exemption' in the CFIP were not correct. The legality of the City 'exempting' Ponto developers from the GMP Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation.

The City proposes to continue to exempt future Ponto developers from providing the missing 30-acres of minimally required GMP Open Space, even though a change in Ponto Planning Area F land use from the current 'Non-Residential Reserve' Land Use requires comprehensive Amendment of the Local Facilities Management Plan Zone 9 to account for a land use change. City exemption is subject of litigation.

Ponto (west of I-5 and South of Poinsettia Lane) currently has 1,025 homes that per Carlsbad's minimal Park Standard demand an 8-acre City Park. There is no City Park at Ponto. Coastal Southwest Carlsbad has an over 6.5 acre Park deficit that is being met 6-miles away in NW Carlsbad. Ponto is in the middle of 6-miles of Coastline without a City Coastal Park west of the rail corridor.



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara had the same lagoon waters.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were never required to comply with the 15% Standard Open Space is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the 15% Growth Management Standard Open Space at Ponto

472 Acres
(197 Acres)
 275 Acres
X 15%
 41 Acres
(11 Acres)
30 Acres

Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 Constrained land excluded from GMP Open Space
 Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement
 GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required
 GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data
Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

Sea Level Rise impacts on Open Space and Open Space Land Use Planning at Ponto:

The City's 2015 General Plan Update did not factor in the impacts of Sea Level Rise (SLR) on Ponto's Open Space land. In December 2017 the City conducted the first Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment <https://www.carlsbadca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=33958>. The 2017 SLR Assessment is an initial baseline analysis, but it shows significant SLR impacts on Ponto Open Space. More follow-up analysis is being conducted to incorporate newer knowledge on SLR projections and coastal land erosion accelerated by SLR. Follow-up analysis may likely show SLR impacts occurring sooner and more extreme.

Troublingly the 2017 SLR Assessment shows SLR actually significantly reducing or eliminating Open Space land at Ponto. SLR is projected to only impact and eliminate Open Space lands and Open Space Land Use at Ponto. The loss of Ponto Open Space land and Land Use being at the State Campground, Beaches, and Batiquitos Lagoon shoreline. The losses of these Open Space lands and land uses would progress over time, and be a permanent loss. The 2017 SLR Assessment provides two time frames near-term 2050 that match with the Carlsbad General Plan, and the longer-term 'the next General Plan Update' time frame of 2100. One can think of these timeframes as the lifetimes of our children and their children (2050), and the lifetimes of our Grandchildren and their children (2100). SLR impact on Coastal Land Use and Coastal Land Use planning is a perpetual (permanent) impact that carries over from one Local Coastal Program (LCP) and City General Plan (GP) to the next Updated LCP and GP.

Following (within quotation marks) are excerpts from Carlsbad's 2017 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment:

[Italicized text within brackets] is added data based on review of aerial photo maps in the Assessment.

"Planning Zone 3 consists of the Southern Shoreline Planning Area and the Batiquitos Lagoon. Assets within this zone are vulnerable to inundation, coastal flooding and bluff erosion in both planning horizons (2050 and 2100). A summary of the vulnerability assessment rating is provided in Table 5. A discussion of the vulnerability and risk assessment is also provided for each asset category.

5.3.1. Beaches

Approximately 14 acres of beach area is projected to be impacted by inundation/erosion in 2050. ... Beaches in this planning area are backed by unarmored coastal bluffs. Sand derived from the natural erosion of the bluff as sea levels rise may be adequate to sustain beach widths, thus, beaches in this reach were assumed to have a moderate adaptive capacity. The overall vulnerability rating for beaches is moderate for 2050.

Vulnerability is rated moderate for the 2100 horizon due to the significant amount of erosion expected as the beaches are squeezed between rising sea levels and bluffs. Assuming the bluffs are unarmored in the future, sand derived from bluff erosion may sustain some level of beaches in this planning area. A complete loss of beaches poses a high risk to the city as the natural barrier from storm waves is lost as well as a reduction in beach access, recreation and the economic benefits the beaches provide.

5.3.3. State Parks

A majority of the South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds (separated into four parcels) were determined to be exposed to bluff erosion by the 2050 sea level rise scenario (moderate exposure). This resource is considered to have a high sensitivity since bluff erosion could significantly impair usage of the facilities. Though economic impacts to the physical structures within South Carlsbad State Beach would be relatively low, the loss of this park would be significant

since adequate space for the park to move inland is not available (low adaptive capacity). State parks was assigned a high vulnerability in the 2050 planning horizon. State park facilities are recognized as important assets to the city in terms of economic and recreation value as well as providing low-cost visitor serving amenities. This vulnerability poses a high risk to coastal access, recreation, and tourism opportunities in this planning area.

In 2100, bluff erosion of South Carlsbad State Beach day-use facilities and campgrounds become more severe and the South Ponto State Beach day-use area becomes exposed to coastal flooding during extreme events. The sensitivity of the South Ponto day-use area is low because impacts to usage will be temporary and no major damage to facilities would be anticipated. Vulnerability and risk to State Parks remains high by 2100 due to the impacts to South Carlsbad State Beach in combination with flooding impacts to South Ponto.

Table 5: Planning Zone 3 Vulnerability Assessment Summary [condensed & notated]:

| <u>Asset Category</u> | <u>Horizon [time]</u> | <u>Hazard Type</u> | <u>Impacted Assets</u> | <u>Vulnerability Rating</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Beaches | 2050 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 14 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation/Erosion, Flooding | 54 acres (erosion) | Moderate |
| Public Access | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 6 access points 4,791 feet of trails | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 10 access points 14,049 feet of trails | Moderate |
| State Parks <i>[Campground - Low-cost Visitor Accommodations]</i> | 2050 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [<18 Acres] | High |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 4 parcels [>18 Acres] <i>[loss of over 50% of the campground & its Low-cost Visitor Accommodations, See Figure 5.]</i> | High |
| Transportation (Road, Bike, Pedestrian) | 2050 | Bluff Erosion | 1,383 linear feet | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Flooding, Bluff Erosion | 11,280 linear feet | High |
| Environmentally Sensitive Lands | 2050 | Inundation, Flooding | 572 acres | Moderate |
| | 2100 | Inundation, Flooding | 606 acres | High |




Figure 7: Southern Shoreline Planning Area – Year 2050






Figure 5: CoSMoS Bluff Erosion Projections by 2100
(CoSMoS-COAST 2015)

[Figure 5 show the loss of over 50% of the campground and campground sites with a minimal .2 meter Sea Level Rise (SLR), and potentially the entire campground (due to loss of access road) in 2 meter SLF.]”

Directions to analyze and correct current and future LOSS of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto

On July 3, 2017 the CA Coastal Commission provided direction to Carlsbad stating:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto ... area. For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad. ... this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”

Official Carlsbad Public Records Requests (PRR 2017-260, et. al.) confirmed Carlsbad’s Existing LCP and its Ponto specific existing LUP polices and Zoning regulations were never followed in the City’s prior Ponto planning activities (i.e. 2010 Ponto Vision Plan & 2015 General Plan Update). The projected SLR loss of recreation (beach) and low-cost visitor accommodations (campground) at Ponto should factor in this Existing LCP required analysis, and a LCP-LUP for Ponto and Ponto Planning Area F.

In a February 11, 2020 City Council Staff Report City Staff stated:

“On March 14, 2017, the City Council approved the General Plan Lawsuit Settlement Agreement (Agreement) between City of Carlsbad and North County Advocates (NCA). Section 4.3.15 of the Agreement requires the city to continue to consider and evaluate properties for potential acquisition of open space and use good faith efforts to acquire those properties.”

In 2020 NCA recommended the City acquire Ponto Planning Area F as Open Space. The status of City processing that recommendation is unclear. However the Lawsuit Settlement Agreement and NCA's recommendation to the City should also be considered in the required Existing LCP analysis.

Summary:

Tragically Carlsbad's Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) is actually planning to both SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE Coastal Open Space acreage, and to eliminate 'High-Priority Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto due to SLR.

The Existing LCP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F to analyze the deficit of Coastal Open Space Land Use should factor in the currently planned LOSS of both Coastal Open Space acreage and Coastal Open Space Land Uses at Ponto due to SLR. As a long-range Coastal Land Use Plan this required LCP analysis needs to also consider the concurrent future increases in both population and visitor demand for those LOST Coastal Open Space acres and Coastal Open Space Land Uses.

It is very troubling that demand for these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses is increasing at the same time the current (near/at capacity) supply of these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses is significantly decreasing due to SLR. Instead of planning for long-term sustainability of these CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses for future generations there appears to be a plan to use SLR and inappropriate (lower-priority residential) Coastal Land Use planning to forever remove those CA Coastal Act 'High-Priority' Coastal Open Space Land Uses from Ponto. CA Coastal Act Policies to address these issues should be thoroughly considered.

2021-2 proposed Draft Local Coastal Program – Land Use Plan Amendment (DLCP-LUPA) will likely result in City and CA Coastal Commission making updates to the 2015 General Plan, based on the existing Ponto Planning Area F LCP – LUP Policy requirements, Ponto Open Space issues, high-priority Coastal Land Use needs, and SLR issues not addressed in the 2015 General Plan.



March 11th, 2022

Carlsbad City Council
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Re: Support creation of Ponto Park – a needed park for South Carlsbad

Dear Mayor Hall,

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is strongly supporting the efforts of ‘People for Ponto’ and thousands of Carlsbad residents to build Ponto Park in the 11-acre coastal parcel known as ‘Planning Area F’ in South Carlsbad. For over 40-years TPL has been designing and building parks in California and although we have world-class parks and beaches, the fact remains 3.2 million Californians don’t have access to a park, and some of those Californians are residents of South Carlsbad. While the National Recreation and Park Association calls for 10-acres of park lands per 1000 residents as standard metric for healthy and vibrant cities, Carlsbad has a comparatively and relatively low park standard of only 3-acres/1,000 population and no requirement to provide accessible parks within walking distance.

And according to our own Trust for Public Land 2020-21 ‘City Parkscore’, Carlsbad is also below national averages both providing park land acreage and in providing residents a park within a 10-minute walk.

The City of Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan on pages 86-89 documents park service and park equity/inequity. Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan documents that Ponto area has no park and all of South Carlsbad (over 61% of the entire city population) has no Coastal Park while . Carlsbad provides 10 City Coastal Parks (totaling over 35-acres) in North Carlsbad, while South Carlsbad has no coastal parks to serve the 64,000 residents, many of which are children. Ponto Park at 11-acre Planning Area F is the last remaining reasonable bit of vacant and currently unplanned Coastal land to provide a Coastal Park for South Carlsbad. Ponto Park would also be in the middle of a 6-mile long section of North San Diego County coastline without Coastal Park, and would help address a regional need for a Coastal Park for these 6-miles of coastline.

The CA Coastal Act has numerous policies that support the creation of Ponto Park and Coastal Recreation land use. The City of Carlsbad’s history of following these CA Coastal Act polies now and over the past 40-years in its Local Coastal Program should be considered now in the City’s proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment. Over the past 40-years Carlsbad and California residents have forever

lost numerous opportunities to create vital Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation for our growing population.

In addition to the clear need for coastal parks in South Carlsbad, the citizens are overwhelmingly supporting the creation of Ponto Park in Planning area F. As you know during the past 2-years during the City Budget and Local Coastal Program Amendment processes, residents strongly demonstrated their desire that the City Council purchase and build Ponto Park. In 2019, 2020 and 2021 over 90% of citizen input expressed need was for Ponto Park, along with extensive verbal and written citizen testimony.

As COVID-19 vividly pointed out, parks are not an amenity, but a key component to human physical and mental health. Parks also provide environmental benefits and contribute to cleaner air and water, climate adaptation and social cohesion. TPL think you have a great opportunity to address equity and access to park space and improving the lives of thousands of Carlsbad residents and strongly urge you to support the building of Ponto Park for families and community.

Sincerely,

Rico Mastrodonato
Government Relations Director

Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 8:15 PM

To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>; Neelay Bhatt <neelay.bhatt@prosconsulting.com>

Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name George Mirth

E-mail gmith@gmail.com

Comments

Playing pickle ball on tennis court. As a both a tennis and pickle ball player , I would like to ask that Carlsbad tennis courts be open to either player. I have played at Kelly Park where tennis players have the gaul to protest players that choose to use pickle ball equipment on these courts open to the public. Now we see signs preventing pickle ball on these courts , obviously a result of tennis players protesting. Other cities (I moved into Carlsbad from the Bay Area) like Palo Alto seem to be responding to the increased demand and have granted access to both types of players to their public courts. I hope that Carlsbad can be progressive as well and take down these offensive signs and allow equal opportunity access to play any racket sport on these courts that my tax dollars support

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Subject: Public Input To Carlsbad Park Master Plan Update & LCPA - Critical data the Parks Commission & CCC should read-Consider
Attachments: image001.emz
Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, May 8, 2023 4:48 PM
To: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; CarlsbadLCPA@coastal.ca.gov
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: Public Input To Carlsbad Park Master Plan Update & LCPA - Critical data the Parks Commission & CCC should read-Consider
Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad Commission, City Council and **Park Commission**; and CA Coastal Commission:

The data input below is for Carlsbad Parks Master Plan Update and LCPA regarding local City Parks and Coastal Parks. This was emailed below last week, but not sure if the data was provided to the Carlsbad Park Commission and being considered by the Commission and Council in the aforementioned update and LCPA. So resending to make sure the data is delivered as addressed and considered.

Given the many People for Ponto Citizens that have provided data/desires regarding Ponto Park we would have assumed the City would have provided some advance notice to People for Ponto Citizens so they could again provide public input, v. learning after the fact a meeting was held of expressed concern by citizens. It appears no such advance notice was provided

In emails Kyle Lancaster confirmed that ALL the People for Ponto public input since 2017 would be provided to the Parks Commission during the Park Master Plan Update public input process. There is well over 5,500 data emails/petitions that have been sent since 2017, and P4P Carlsbad Citizens would like confirmation that that input is being provided to the Parks Commission and is being considered. Can documentation of that be provided?

The public input data below, and since 2017, is important.

Thank you.

Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, May 1, 2023 12:08 PM
To: 'Planning'; council@carlsbadca.gov; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov); 'SanDiegoCoast@coastal.ca.gov'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Smith, Darren@Parks'
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: 5/23/23 PC mtg Item #4 - Carlsbad & CA State laws on Park land dedication and fees - 5 acre per 1,000 population

Dear Carlsbad Planning Commission, City Council and **Park Commission**; and CA Coastal Commission and State Parks:

The Carlsbad Planning Commission (or City Council on appeal) should require Fenton the Ponto Developer of a portion of Ponto Site 18 to provide their required Parkland Dedication in actual Parkland at Ponto. Carlsbad staff should also be more honest and publicly communicate to Carlsbad Citizens the documented data enclosed in the email so Carlsbad Citizens are properly informed about Ponto Park issues and have a true and honest opportunity to provide input to the City and CA Coastal Commission.

As noted below I requested the email and data below be provided to you for the Ponto Site 18 related land use changes/development proposal that clearly documents the City's Parkland Dedication Ordinance (CMC 20.44) and standards that clearly states per 20.44.040 & 20.44.050 that it is the City's "decision making body" for the development proposal, i.e. Planning Commission or City Council, that decides if Park land is required or a commensurate Park in lieu fee will be required from the developer. Eric lardy has confirmed with me that the Planning Commission can legally ask for free City Parkland at Ponto to be provided by Fenton the Ponto developer per CMC 20.44 . However, it appears Eric has not provided that same information to the Planning Commission or Public.

As has been communicated to you and City the Planning Commission (as the "decision making body") should on May 3rd for Agenda Item #4 require developers at Ponto (Fenton) to provide their required by 20.44 Parkland dedication as an actual City dedication of land to the City for a Park as primarily intended by 20.44. This dedication of land will be free to the City and as noted in the financial calculations in the email below result in the City receiving over \$1 million more parkland value than a sub-standard in-lieu-fee. Requiring Fenton the Ponto developer to provide their require Parkland dedication in land as primarily intended by 20.44 and CA law is the smart, and right decision. Additional reasons the Planning Commission (or City Council on appeal) should require the Primary Land Dedication are:

1. Over 5,000 formally written petitions have been sent to the City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission asking that a much needed Public Park be provided at Ponto for both the 6.5 acre City Park needs of the Ponto residents and also for the Coastal Park needs for all of South Carlsbad that has no Coastal Park west of I-5 and Railroad corridor. There is also a regional need for a Coastal park at Ponto as Ponto is in the center of a 6-mile long section of coastline without any Coastal Park, and the Low-cost visitor Accommodation land use of the State Campground is planned to be further reduced or eliminated by Sea Level Rise and Coastal erosion and there is no plan and funding in place to address this loss.
2. Following is what Carlsbad Citizens told the City Council what they wanted the City to budget for and fund – Ponto Park. The Planning Commission getting free to the City Parkland at Ponto is the City's most cost effective way to provide a Ponto Park.



3. Fenton owns all the 17 acres of vacant land at Ponto from the Cape Rey Resort in the north to Avenida Encinas in the South and from Coast Highway (PCH/Carlsbad Blvd) in the west to the LOSSAN rail corridor in the east. They have the land at Ponto to provide their Parkland dedication as a dedication of land. In instances like this cities and the City typically require land. Only in instances of very small developments of less than 1-acre are 'in-lieu-fees' appropriate.
4. People for Ponto many times suggested/encouraged Fenton to buy the 11.1 acre adjacent Ponto Planning Area F land so Fenton and Carlsbad Citizens could work together to provide a 6.5+ acre Ponto Park (Ponto Planning Area F) via a land-swap with the City's Surplus Lands (Crossing Lot #5 and/or Farmers Site) like what was done for Buena Vista Reservoir Park/Poinsettia 61. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens want to work with Ponto property owners and the City Council to effect a fair and rational solution to the well documented need for a significant Ponto Park. The City staff report fails to disclose and discuss these multiple communications between People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens and Fenton that can create a win-win-win-win solution to the Park needs at Ponto. The Planning Commission can advance that solution by requiring Fenton provide their Parkland Dedication requirement as actual Parkland at Ponto..
5. The Fenton development is adding City Park demand AT PONTO from their proposed high-occupancy units at Ponto. The Parkland supply should be located at the Source of this Parkland demand, consistent with good planning and park principles.
6. Carlsbad's Park Master Plan on pages 86-88 maps and documents the need for a City Park in the Ponto location. See the City's map of park service (and unserved) areas:

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



7. The City and Carlsbad Taxpayers lose over \$1million in Parkland value if the Planning Commission fails to require Fenton provide their required CMC 20.44 Parkland Dedication as actual land dedicated at Ponto. Planning Commission failure to legally capture this lost value will push the cost of this lost value onto current/future Carlsbad tax-payers to make up for lost land value. See the legal and financial CMC 20.44 analysis in the 1/24/23 email below.
8. City has indicated it will Cost Carlsbad tax-payers at least \$65-80 million for a 3-mile PCH Relocation from Island Way to La Costa Avenue that per the City's 2001 PCH Relocation Analysis will only MAYBE make available about 16-acres of Carlsbad Blvd (aka Coast Highway/PCH) "surplus land" in this area for uses that maybe different than what they are used for now which is mostly constrained protected habitat. The City's 2001 Land Use and Financial Feasibility Studies of PCH Relocation has already 1) documented these 16 acres of "surplus land" which is mostly very narrow and highly constrained, 2) itemized only about 4 acres of reasonable Park land in North of Palomar Airport Road that maybe created from PCH Relocation, and 3) clearly documented that outside funding for PCH Relocation is very unlikely so most or the entire \$65-80 million cost for these 16 acres will be paid for by Carlsbad tax-payers. Carlsbad's 2001 PCH Relocation Financial study concluded the only viable way to pay for PCH Relocation was to sell most all the "documented and numbered Surplus Land" for commercial uses. So per the City's 2001 financial report PCH Relocation is not an Open Space or Park project but a land development project. Per Proposition H Carlsbad tax-payers will have to vote if they want the City to send \$65-80 million for maybe allowing some of 16 acres of Surplus land available for other uses, or \$4 to \$5 million per "surplus acre". Recent polling by the City shows that Carlsbad Citizens are not wanting PCH Relocation and voting for PCH Relocation is high unlikely. Verbatim Summary information from the City's 2001 PCH Relocation Studies by URS and ERA include:
 - a. The 2001 URS Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study documented the amount of potential "Surplus land" created by PCH Relocation as noted below. Only "Surplus Areas 4, 5 and 6A" which total 16.5 acres are in South Carlsbad (South of Palomar Airport Road) and need PCH Relocation to be accessible. Surplus Area 6A is east of PCH and can be used now without any PCH Relocation. The City has been misrepresenting how much "surplus land" is created by PCH Relocation. A lot of PCH land is does not need Relocation to be used for needed sidewalks and enhancing current bike lanes. The City incorrectly communicates that 60 acres of City land can be used due to PCH Relocation, which is not correct per the City's own 2001 URS Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study.

4.1 LAND USE ANALYSIS

Figure 4-1A shows the General Plan Land Use Designations, and Figure 4-1B shows the Zoning Designations. Most of the project area is residential, open space/unplanned, and industrial. The parcels being considered for this project are all currently designated as open space.

4.1.1 Surplus Lands

A City-provided GIS parcel map was used in conjunction with a City-generated map showing land ownership in the project area to calculate the acres of land remaining after Carlsbad Boulevard is realigned (Figure 1-3). Additionally, the amount of land owned by the State in the area north of Palomar Airport Road and south of Manzano Drive was calculated. The acres of land available following realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard are shown in Table 4.1-1. The amount of City-owned land available for other uses following realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard is approximately 41 acres. The amount of land owned by the State in the area north of Palomar Airport Road and south of Manzano Drive is approximately 15 acres.

**Table 4.1-1
LAND OWNERSHIP AND AMOUNT OF LAND AVAILABLE
CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT**

| Landowner | Acreage |
|---------------------|---------|
| City of Carlsbad | 41 |
| State of California | 15 |

The surplus useable land that will result from realigning Carlsbad Boulevard has been grouped into a total of seven surplus land areas, described in Table 4.1-2 below and illustrated in Figures 1-3 through 1-10.

**Table 4.1-2
SURPLUS LAND AREA DESCRIPTIONS
CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT**

| Surplus Land Area Number | Surplus Land Area Name | Acreage | Owner |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Manzano Parcel | 20.8 | State: approximately 14 acres City: approximately 6 acres |
| 2 | Palomar Point | 5.1 | State: approximately 0.5 acre City: approximately 4.5 acres |
| 3 | North Ponto Beach | 10.1 | City |
| 4 | State Beach and Campground | 13.7 | City |
| 5 | Boca Beach | 2.3 | City |
| 6A | Seapointe Parcel | 0.5 | City |
| 6B | PA "F" Frontage | 2.0 | City |

- b. The 2001 ERA Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study used the URS data to fiscally analyze alternative scenarios for realigning Carlsbad Boulevard away from the coast bluff edge and, in the process, creating opportunities for commercial, recreation, and open space uses. One of the study's objectives is to explore ways to generate revenue from useable public land created, including potential land sale or lease opportunities, and using this revenue to help offset the cost of realigning the road.
- c. The scenario that provided the most "Park and Open Space" is Alternative 1. The PCH Relocation "Surplus Areas" that are in South Carlsbad are #4, 5 and 6A or 6B as documented below. Table 1 below documents how many Gross Acres of "Surplus land Area" PCH Relocation provides. The report notes that there are many Constraints on these "Surplus Areas" and the acres listed below may not be achievable or may cost much more to be made/mitigated to be used as noted.

Table 1: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 1 - Parks and Open Space

| Units | Surplus Area: | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------|------|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B |
| Acres | 20.8 | 5.1 | 10.1 | 13.7 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Developable Commercial | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | - | - | - | 2.0 | - | - | - |
| Public parking | 1.0 | 0.6 | - | 1.5 | 0.9 | - | 0.6 |
| Community facility | 0.8 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| Active parks | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open space | 15.0 | 4.4 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial-Restaurants | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Time Share | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | 45 | - | - | - |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | 50 | - | - | - |
| Common facilities | | - | - | 3,000 | - | - | - |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spaces | 140 | 50 | - | 200 | 135 | 90 |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | 2,500 | - | - | 3,000 | - | - |
| Restrooms | Number | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | 15.0 | 4.4 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 |

Source: URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd; and Economics Research Associates

d.

Table 5: PRELIMINARY REVENUE/COST COMPARISON (Year 2001 Dollars)

| | Alternatives | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Revenues From Commercial Land Sales | \$ 1,131,000 | \$ 9,219,000 | \$ 28,155,000 | \$ 19,465,000 |
| Capitalized Value of Fiscal Revenues to City & RDA | \$ 217,000 | \$ 10,849,000 | \$ 24,743,000 | \$ 16,429,000 |
| Total Potential Revenues | \$ 1,348,000 | \$ 20,068,000 | \$ 52,898,000 | \$ 35,894,000 |
| Less: Road Construction Costs | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 |
| Net Revenues <Deficit> After Road Construction Costs | \$ (17,452,000) | \$ 1,268,000 | \$ 34,098,000 | \$ 17,094,000 |
| Less: Public Parking, Parks, Open Space, and Facilities | \$ 8,999,580 | \$ 12,062,589 | \$ 8,496,734 | \$ 9,358,925 |
| Net Revenues <Deficit> After Public Costs | \$ (26,451,580) | \$ (10,794,589) | \$ 25,601,266 | \$ 7,735,075 |

Source: Economics Research Associates; URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd

e.

Qualifications: While it appears that alternatives 3 and 4 generate enough revenue to cover development costs, the findings at this preliminary planning stage of analysis are qualified, as follows: •

The cost estimates are based on gross cost factors and need to be refined as project design becomes more specific. • The cost estimates do not include any extraordinary off-site costs, such as for environmental or traffic mitigation. • Some of the parcels identified for potential development, particularly those west of the alignment, may be vulnerable to long term erosion problems; therefore, their stability needs to be verified. • Most of the value is generated on Surplus Area 1 [aka the Manzano Drive Site that is north of Palomar Airport Road], which is owned by the State of California. The City or Redevelopment Agency would not realize the value of Surplus Area 1 unless the State trades the parcel to the City or Agency for other considerations. Therefore, the City or Agency may not be able to apply proceeds from the value of Surplus Area 1 to road realignment and public facility costs.

- f. [other tax-payer funding] CONCLUSION: Both the SANDAG representative and the CalTrans Local Assistance Program representative noted that most road or highway realignments are done to facilitate development. Policymakers are aware of this and generally design funding programs in a way that encourages the private sector to pay for as much of the project costs as possible. Programs are also designed to encourage municipalities to utilize funds from their share of the gas tax, TransNet, and even the General Fund and Community Development Block Grants before turning to State and Federal funds. Finally, due to the limited funds available, all funding sources give priority to projects of a regional significance over those of local importance.

Since PCH Relocation is not needed to add any new roadway (or bike lane or sidewalk) capacity to PCH, and in fact will DECREASE vehicle roadway capacity if PCH is converted from 4 to 2 lanes, additional roadway funding to Relocate PCH is unlikely. The cost of PCH Relocation will therefore likely fall predominately on Carlsbad tax-payers. The tax-payer value of PCH Relocation has always been questionable at best. That is the reason it has not been built over the past 40-years and even now the City's General Plan DOES NOT COMMIT to providing PCH Relocation only that it "may" or 'may not' ever happen. A People for Ponto Citizen prepared using City cost data A Cost-Benefit Analysis comparing PCH Relocation with simply providing the missing sidewalks on PCH and buying Vacant Ponto land for a Ponto Park. That Cost-Benefit Analysis showed that Buying Ponto Park would save Carlsbad's and other tax-payers tens of millions of tax-dollars and while also providing more and better Park and beach parking facilities and benefits. These 2001 Study and People for Ponto's Cost-Benefits facts need to be publicly disclosed to and considered by the Planning Commission.

9. As noted in 20.44 there is nothing in Carlsbad's Growth Management Program that supersedes or prevents the Planning Commission (or City Council on appeal) from requiring the Parkland dedication as land. A Carlsbad City Ordinance and City discretion on how to augment /address City Park needs supersedes a LFMP plan. The City has clearly demonstrated this fact in its most recent Park - Buena Vista Reservoir Park (aka Poinsettia 61) in NW Carlsbad; and in its suggestion that PCH Relocation is the Park solution. All the City's Growth Management documents (both Citywide and LFMP Zone 1) DID NOT include require, include or even mention Buena Vista Reservoir Park. Nor do they mention PCH Relocation. The City used its authority to provide Buena Vista Reservoir Park independently and outside of any Growth Management plan . The City did not Violate its Growth Management Plan by creating Buena Vista Reservoir Park, and the Planning Commission and City are legally allowed to create a City Park at Ponto and are legally allowed to require the Ponto developer provide their Parkland dedication requirement as actual Parkland at Ponto.
10. The City is in the process of updating its Growth Management Program. The need for Ponto Park was the most Citizen requested item submitted to the City's Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee with well over 100 emails and many speakers over many meetings. The Growth Management Update Committee was prevented from making Ponto need and Ponto specific recommendations to the City Council, but the **has recommended**
11. The City is the worst Coastal City for 165 miles of coastline from the City of Malibu to the City of Imperial Beach in providing Parkland access to its citizens. Requiring Fenton the Ponto developer to provide their Required Parkland as land at Ponto will be a small but very important step in the right direction to start digging Carlsbad out of being dead last in providing park access. The Trust for Public Land has mapped and documented this fact. The Trust for Public Land has also sent a letter to the City and City Council highlighting the need for a City Park at Ponto. The Planning Commission should have been provided a copy of the Trust for Public Land's letter. Following is the Trust for Public Land data showing that Carlsbad is the worst City in providing Park access to its citizens. Ponto is one of worst areas in Carlsbad for City Park access per the City's Park Master Plan. The

Planning Commission getting .7 acres of free City Parkland at Ponto as Fenton is required to provide by CMC 20.44 will help Carlsbad move from being the worst City in Coastal So. California in providing Park access for its citizens.

The Trust for Public Land documents a city's 10-minute walk to Park at <https://www.tpl.org/parkserve>
The Average USA City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 55% of residents [10% above Carlsbad].
Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 49.9% of residents [10% below National Average].
New York City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 99% of residents.

The Trust of Public Land submitted a letter to the City of Carlsbad, CA Coastal Commission, and CA State Park supporting Ponto Park

Carlsbad is the worst of 24 Southern CA Coastal cities (from Malibu south to Imperial Beach along 165 miles of coastline) in providing Parks within 10-minute walk to residents:

1. Palos Verdes Estates provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
2. El Segundo provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
3. Hermosa Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
4. Redondo Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 98% of residents
5. Manhattan Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 95% of residents
6. Del Mar provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 93% of residents
7. Dana Point provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 89% of residents
8. Huntington Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 85% of residents
9. Long Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 84% of residents
10. Laguna Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
11. Santa Monica provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
12. San Diego provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 81% of residents
13. Coronado provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
14. Newport Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
15. Imperial Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 74% of residents
16. Encinitas provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 68% of residents
17. Los Angeles provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
18. Solana Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
19. Oceanside provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 58% of residents
20. Seal Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 57% of residents
21. Malibu provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 53% of residents
22. San Clemente provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 52% of residents
23. Rancho Palos Verdes provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 50% of residents
24. **Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 49.9% of residents.**

Carlsbad is the lowest & most unfair to citizens of the 24 Southern California Coastal cities along 165 miles of coast from Malibu to Imperial Beach.

Source of data: Trust for Public land parkscores

Trust for Public Land's 10-minute walk to Park Maps/data:

Carlsbad = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0611194#reportTop>

Encinitas = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0622678>

Irvine = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0636770>

Planning and Park Commissions, City Council and CA Coastal Commission, please require Fenton provide their City Parkland dedication requirement as actual Parkland at Ponto as legally allowed by CMC 20.44. It is the right, it is legal thing to do. Please also ready the Data in the 1/24/23 email below that you should have been provided earlier.

Lance Schulte

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 2:22 PM

To: 'committee@carlsbadca.gov'; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; 'Homer, Sean@Parks'; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; 'Carrie Boyle'; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; 'Ross, Toni@Coastal'; 'melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com'

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: 1-26-23 CTGMC mtg - CA State law on Park land dedication and fees - 5 acre per 1,000 population

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's 1/26/22 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 land use changes, and Local Coastal Program Amendments, and
4. as public input to the CCC on Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program, and
5. as public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

At the 1-11-22 CTGMC meeting comments are what is the State Park Land Dedication Standard. This Standard (the Qumby Act) defines under that Ca Subdivision code how much land a city in the State of CA can require or developers to provide a city for park land. I recall the It was apparently incorrectly mentioned as 3 acres of Park land per 1,000 population was the State Standard, where as it is up to 5 acres per 1,000 population. Following is a link to the CA Qumby Act and the citation that 5 acres per 1,000 population can be required of new development.

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/taftca/latest/taft_ca/0-0-0-12312

“10-11-6: LAND DEDICATION AND FEE DETERMINATIONS: (C) The amount of land to be dedicated shall be based on the number of units in the subdivision multiplied by the number of persons per dwelling (as determined pursuant to subsection (B) of this section) **multiplied by five (5) acres per one thousand (1,000) city inhabitants (section 66477 of the subdivision map act)**”

I hope this data clears up confusion on how many acres of Park land Carlsbad can require of new development. It seems prudent to require developers provide the maximum amount of Park land per State law and not less, and most particularly in areas of Carlsbad that have no accessible Park within a 10-minute walk.

Thank you, and with Aloha Aina for Carlsbad,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 1:39 PM

To: committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov)

Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'

Subject: 1-26-23 CTGMC mtg - public input on Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance and City losses

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Housing and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Please again consider this email and attachment on 1/26/23.

This may clear up some what appeared to be a miscommunication by staff on 1/11/23 that appeared to say that the developer can decide how to comply with the Park Dedication Ordinance (Dedicate land or pay an in-lieu-of-dedication fee). This is not correct. Per 21.44 a develop may propose, but it is the City that decides how and where the Park land required is to be provided. Per 21.44.040 & 21.44.050 of the City's Park Dedication Ordinance Clearly states it is the City “decision making body” for the development proposal, i.e. Planning Commission or City Council, that decides is Park land is required or a commensurate Park in lieu fee will be required from the developer. In almost all instances Park land in the area (aka 10-minutewalk) of the development is better as that is where the development's Park land demand is created and where additional Park land supply should be created.

I hope this email and data helps the CTGMC in address the critical Park Land needs in various areas of Carlsbad, and this Ponto Site 18 example provides actual data using a currently proposed project in an area Carlsbad's Park Master Plan (current but soon to be changed) indicates is 'unserved by parks' and should be an area where new parks should be provided.

Please note in this Ponto Site 18 example there IS vacant land (about 1 acre) left-over after the development that the developer could dedicate to the City for the developer's Park Land dedication requirement. The CTGMC would be thoughtful to include in your Standard recommendations to include strong policy requirements to get Park land v. fees in areas needing Parks.

Thank you,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2022 11:39 AM
To: committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; 'council@carlsbadca.gov'; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle (carrie.boyle@coastal.ca.gov); 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal (Toni.Ross@coastal.ca.gov)
Cc: 'info@peopleforponto.com'
Subject: public input on Carlsbad Parkland Dedication Ordinance and City losses

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks, Housing and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

Please consider this data file and public input email/attachment in the CTGMC, Housing Element and Parks Master Plan Updates, Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, and the Ponto Site 18 proposed land use changes and development application.

'Example of Carlsbad's Park-in-lieu Fee failing to actually provide the required Parkland or improvements

The example is for Ponto Site 18 one of the City's proposed General Plan & Local Coastal Program land use changes to provide RHNA required housing sites for the years 2021-2029. Ponto Site 18 is the Ponto Storage site and surrounding lots. Ponto Site 18's map and City description is provided on pages 4-5 below.

The example shows Carlsbad loses significant amounts of money, and more critically loses precious and irreplaceable Parkland that developers are required to provide for free. These City losses are absorbed by current and future Carlsbad tax-payers. For the relatively small 5 acre and 86 dwelling unit Ponto Site 18 proposal the loss to Carlsbad is \$ 1.084 million in lost parkland value. Below is the spreadsheet calculation of that loss.

Beyond showing a typical over \$ 1 million loss per 86 dwellings, there is added concern for the CTGMC in that this example is a proposed Carlsbad General Plan & Local Coastal Program Land Use Change to try to accommodate the years 2021-2029 the RHNA requirement to add/increase Residential use. Every 8 years we are/will be changing our General Plan land use to add more high-density housing and increasing City Park demand particularly for areas developed more densely.

If these higher-density projects do not dedicate actual City Park within walking distance not only is Carlsbad loosing over \$1 million per 86 dwellings, we are losing free and easy opportunities to get City Parkland dedicated for free per CMC 20.44, and will slowly be degrading our Quality of Life in these areas and also Citywide.

Calculation of Ponto Site 18 Parkland dedication requirement and City losses from the Park-in-lieu Fee:

| Ponto Site 18 - Fenton proposed development's Park land dedication requirement | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | https://library.qcode.us/lib/carlsbad_ca/pub/municipal_code/item/title_20-chapter_20_44 |
| US Census data | https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/carlsbadcitycalifornia/POP060210#POP060210 |
| Carlsbad Park Dedication Requirement is 3 acres of land per 1,000 population of the proposed development. Population of proposed development is based on population per household based on latest US Census data 2020 US Census data is 2.64 people per household | |
| FYI, Carlsbad 3 acres /1,000 is comparatively very low both locally and nationally. And there is no 'walkably requirement'. 5 acres /1,000 population is what Encinitas and Oceanside require along with a 10-minute walk location requirement. | |
| Fenton owns almost 6 acres of land in Site 18, 4.64 acres of which they want to develop now, and the other 1+ acre part they want to develop later. on the 4.64 acre site change VC-Visitor Commercial/R-15 (15 dwellings per acre) General Plan land use and Zoning to 100% residential and develop at 19.125 dwellings per acre on 4.64 acres. | |
| On the 1+ acre site, instead of providing their required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between PCH & Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. | |
| Instead of providing the required Park land dedication, Fenton is proposing to develop the remaining 1 acre area (between Pecha and Ponto Drive) as General Commercial. | |
| Site 18 (Fenton) development proposal for the 4.64 acre portion is development of 86 household units (over 19 dwelling units per acre in higher occupancy units than typical) consisting of: | |
| 8 | 2-bedroom homes = 9% of total units proposed |
| 40 | 3-bedroom homes = 47% of total units proposed |
| 38 | 4-bedroom homes = 44% of total units proposed |
| 86 | 100% |
| Fenton is proposing 91% of the project with 3 or 4 bedrooms so the project will have higher occupancy, and likely more children, per housing unit than the Citywide average of 2.64 people per housing unit | |
| Fenton Park land dedication requirement per CMC 20.44 | |
| calculation | 86 DU of Fenton proposed development |
| X | 2.64 average population per DU per 2020 US Census |
| = | 227 estimated population of Fenton project |
| / | 1,000 population that needs 3 acres of Park land per CMC 20.44 |
| = | 0.22704 percentage of 3 acres of Park land required for 227 people |
| X | 3 acres of Park land required per 1,000 people |
| = | 0.68112 acres of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| X | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| = | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| | 1 acre of Fenton's unused vacant 'Ice plant lots' between PCH & Ponto Drive that can provide Fenton's Park land requirement |
| \$ | 398,696 per City Master Fee Schedule. Consistent with what Fenton said was would be the 'Park-in-lieu Fee for their 86 DU project |
| \$ | 50 Estimated SF cost Fenton paid for Ponto Site 18 or S 2.18 million per acre |
| \$ | 1,483,479 cost of 29,670 SF of Ponto Site 18 land to satisfy Fenton's Park land requirement |
| for the Ponto Site 18 5-acre 86 dwelling unit land use change and development proposal: | |
| \$ | (1,064,783) Dollars the City is losing in Park land value and not receiving in its Park-In-lieu Fee, so this is a gift to the developer |
| | -73% % of lost Park land value City is losing and not receiving in its PIL Fee, so this is a City gift to the developer |
| \$ | 1,000,000 per acre cost to develop a Park like Buena Vista Reservoir Park |
| | 43,560 square feet per acre |
| \$ | 22.96 Cost per sq. ft. |
| | 29,670 square feet of Park land required for Fenton's proposed 86 DU project based on Citywide average population per DU |
| \$ | 681,120 Cost to develop Fenton's 29,670 sq. ft. of Park Land Dedication as a Park |
| \$ | (282,424) Dollars City loses from Park-In-lieu Fees not even being adequate to cover Actual Minimal Park Development Costs |

Following this calculation:

- on page 3-4 are the relevant excerpts of Carlsbad's Dedication of Land for Recreational Purposes Ordinance 20.44, and
- on page 5-6 is the City's map and description of the proposed Ponto Site 18 land use change

20.44 Dedication of Land for Recreational Facilities

20.44.010 Purpose.

This chapter is enacted pursuant to the authority granted by Section 66477 of the Government Code of the State of California. The park and recreational facilities for which dedication of land and/or payment of a fee is required by this chapter are in accordance with the recreational element of the general plan of the City of Carlsbad. (Ord. 9614 § 1, 1982; Ord. 9190 § 2)

20.44.040 Standards and formula for dedication of land.

If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that a park or recreational facility is to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents of the subdivision, the subdivider shall, at the time of the filing of the final or parcel map, dedicate land for such facility pursuant to the following standards and formula:

The formula for determining acreage to be dedicated shall be as follows:

Average no. of persons per dwelling unit (based on most recent federal census)

x

3 park acres per 1,000 population

x

Total number of dwelling units

The total number of dwelling units shall be the number permitted by the city on the property in the subdivision at the time the final map or parcel map is filed for approval, less any existing residential units in single-family detached or duplex dwellings. The park land dedication requirement will be reviewed annually effective July 1, and adjusted as necessary by resolution of the city council to reflect the latest federal census data. (Ord. CS-192 § 49, 2012; Ord. CS-162 § 1, 2011; Ord. NS-757 § 1, 2005; Ord. NS-588 § 1, 2001; Ord. 9831 § 1, 1987; Ord. 9770 § 1, 1985; Ord. 9724 § 1, 1984; Ord. 9644 § 1, 1982; Ord.

20.44.050 Standards for fees in lieu of land dedication.

A. If the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map determines that there is no park or recreational facility to be located in whole or in part within the proposed subdivision, the subdivider shall, in lieu of dedicating land, pay a fee equal to the value of the land prescribed for dedication in Section 20.44.040 and in an amount determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 20.44.080.

B. If the proposed subdivision contains 50 parcels or less, only the payment of fees shall be required except that when a condominium project, stock cooperative, or community apartment project exceeds 50 dwelling units, dedication of land may be required notwithstanding that the number of parcels may be less than 50.

20.44.060 Determination of land or fee.

A. Whether the decision-making authority for the tentative map or tentative parcel map requires land dedication or elects to accept payment of a fee in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, shall be determined by the decision-making authority at the time of approval of the tentative map or tentative parcel map. In making that determination, the decision-making authority shall consider the following:

- 1 Park and recreation element of the general plan;
- 2 Topography, geology, access and location of land in the subdivision available for dedication;
- 3 Size and shape of the subdivision and land available for dedication;
- 4 The feasibility of dedication;
- 5 Availability of previously acquired park property.

B. The determination of the city council as to whether land shall be dedicated, or whether a

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is a group of eight vacant and underutilized properties in the Ponto area, located south of the Cape Rey Carlsbad Beach hotel and east of Carlsbad Boulevard. The site is bisected by Ponto Drive. North of Ponto Drive are three underutilized parcels containing a mini storage, miscellaneous buildings and other storage uses on nearly five acres. To the south, across Ponto Drive, is a cluster of five small vacant properties total just over an acre.

Site topography is generally flat. Some of the parcels may be constrained due to environmentally sensitive habitat. One parcel is alongside the railroad corridor. All the parcels are located outside the McClellan-Palomar Airport flight path.

The site does not include a vacant 11-acre parcel along either side of Ponto Drive and fronting Avenida Encinas. The parcel is commonly referred to as "Planning Area F."

SITE FEATURES

- Vacant/underutilized
- Utilities accessible
- In the Coastal Zone
- Site constraints

SITE OPPORTUNITY

The site consists of a mix of residential and non-residential land use designations. Two of the eight parcels have a split land use designation of VC (Visitor Commercial) and R-15 (11.5 to 15 dwelling units per acre, or du/ac). The one parcel alongside the railroad corridor is designated R-15. The R-15 designation often applies to small lot single family or detached or attached condominium development. The cluster of five vacant parcels south of Ponto Drive is designated GC (General Commercial). General Commercial permits a broad range of commercial uses. It also permits properties to be developed in a mixed-use format, with limited residential above first floor commercial.

Staff has received a letter from one property owner expressing support for higher density.

Except for the VC-designated portion of the two parcels, which is not anticipated to change, the redesignation of all parcels to R-23 is contemplated. R-23 is a residential designation the state identifies as suitable for moderate income households. The R-23 designation would permit a density range of 19 to 23 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). This density is typical of two- and three-story apartment and condominium developments.

To change any designation, amendments to the General Plan, Local Coastal Program, zoning, Poinsettia Shores Master Plan, and the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan would be required. These amendments would require City Council and California Coastal Commission approval.



Upper area proposed for land use change & higher density

Part of Lower area can (should) be dedicated to provided needed parkland

POTENTIAL HOUSING SITES

Site Number: 18 – North Ponto Parcels



| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Parcels Numbers | 216-010-01, 216-010-02, 216-010-03, 216-010-04, 216-010-05, 214-160-25, 214-160-28, 214-171-11 | GMP Quadrant | Southwest |
| Ownership | Private (separate ownership) | Parcel Size | Approximately 6 acres (all parcels) |
| Current General Plan Designations | R-15 (Residential 8-15 du/ac), VC (Visitor Commercial)/R-15, GC (General Commercial) | Proposed General Plan Designation | R-23 (Residential, 19 to 23 du/ac)* <i>*The VC designation, which applies to two properties, is not anticipated to change and would remain in the same location.</i> |
| Current Residential Opportunity | Approximately 44 units (based on the existing R-15 designation and limited residential permitted on GC-designated properties) | Proposed Residential Opportunity | Approximately 90 units (at 19 du/ac)* <i>*No yield is determined from portions of property designated VC.</i> |
| Income category of units (based on minimum density) | Moderate | | |

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Sincerely and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Honorable Mayor Keith Blackburn, City Council Members, Melanie Burkholder, Priya Bhat-Patel, and Teresa Acosta.

Over the past several years the sport of pickleball has become the fastest growing sport in America. As the result, the need for additional outdoor Pickleball facilities has grown at an exponential rate. One factor contributing to the sustained growth of pickleball is that it is played by men, women and children of all age groups. Also, it is inexpensive to purchase Pickleball equipment and the game is much easier and less physically demanding than the sport of tennis.

Unfortunately, throughout these "past several years," the City of Carlsbad has built only six (6) dedicated outdoor Pickleball courts. During this time, many Carlsbad Pickleball players have attended City Planning and Council meetings urging decision makers to increase the availability of outdoor dedicated Pickleball courts. It has been brought to your attention that the use of our parks "court sports" assets is heavily skewed toward the game of tennis yet nothing has been done to remedy this situation.

Members of the Pickleball community understand the Growth Management Process and the time required to ensure the availability of outstanding facilities like our Poinsettia Community Park. They also see extremely long waits to play their game while tennis courts sit empty. In the case of Poinsettia, 50 feet away. From the standpoint of space efficiency, the area required for one tennis court, where up to four Tennis players can play, can contain four Pickleball courts that can accommodate up to sixteen players.

By this petition, Carlsbad Pickleball players are requesting that you promptly address and take steps to increase the availability outdoor courts for the game of Pickleball in Carlsbad.

Carlsbad Pickleball Support Group

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT. IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Amber Kaufman | Amber Kaufman |
| 2. Margie Dawson | Margie Dawson |
| 3. Karen Fischer | Karen Fischer |
| 4. Dianne Shapp | Dianne Shapp |
| 5. Lisa Temple | Lisa Temple |
| 6. Kim Piker | Kim Piker |
| 7. Theresa Reilly | Theresa Reilly |
| 8. Kay Krist | Kay Krist |
| 9. Kathleen Delany | Kathleen Delany |
| 10. John Farlan | John Farlan |
| 11. Will Farlan | Will Farlan |

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name


















Sign Your Name

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Casper Bergman | Thomas McConkey |
| 2. Thomas McConkey | Thomas McConkey |
| 3. Dani Kennedy | Dani Kennedy |
| 4. Irene Abrahamian | Irene Abrahamian |
| 5. Christina Patterson | Christina Patterson |
| 6. Katherine Chapin | Katherine Chapin |
| 7. Rina Rochow | Rina Rochow |
| 8. Delisa Debes | Delisa Debes |
| 9. Terri Acker | Terri Acker |
| 10. Karen Stock | Karen Stock |
| 11. SHERI CLARKE | Sheri Clarke |
| 12. STACY Kreysa | Stacy Kreysa |
| 13. JANE HARA | Jane Hara |
| 14. James Cunningham | James Cunningham |
| 15. Carol Smith | Carol Smith |
| 16. Jimmy Medina | Jimmy Medina |
| 17. ELIOT RACHMAN | Eliot Rachman |
| 18. Derek Abdala | Derek Abdala |
| 19. Bob Gronenberg | Bob Gronenberg |
| 20. Elizabeth Gronenberg | Elizabeth Gronenberg |
| 21. TERRI ACKER | Terri Acker |
| 22. David Faves | David Faves |
| 23. Todd Smith | Todd Smith |
| 24. Bob Frazier | Bob Frazier |
| 25. ZEV RUBINSTEIN | Zev Rubinstein |

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

1. Kow Henry 
2. Katherine Aymilia 
3. George Ayntua 
4. Diana Rempfer 
5. Arthur Rempfer 
6. Sharon Lephann 
7. Bill Korkowicz 
8. Lucy Globerson 
9. Bill Meadows 
10. Camilla Fallis 
11. Dan Beat 
12. Keri James 
13. Denise Trerdoch 
14. JERRI-Ann JACOBS 
15. Dai Logan 
16. JEANETTE BURN 
17. JOE GARDELLA 
18. Quinton Kaufman 
19. William Kaufman 
20. Michael Anger 
21. NEIL BRUNGER 
22. Cindy Salazar 
23. Dob Fischvogt 
24. SCOTT GUERRERO 
25. MARK VEAS 

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

1. STEVEN WIRTH
2. Ken Wartman
3. Susan Childs
4. M. Azul Mejia
5. JIM WEINBERG
6. Susan Urquidi
7. TODD RANDOLPH
8. MIRE ROTO
9. Claire Cavanaugh
10. DAN BERSE
11. LISA ANGELO
12. Shawn Neely-Wirth
13. Michele Marzullo
14. DAVID CASSAW
15. Brianna Stevens
16. Anna Schiff
17. Debbie Schiff
18. Jennifer Wingo
19. Kody Yun
20. Andrew Park
21. Vince Petrucci
22. CINDY STECKA
23. Victoria Bradford
24. MARIO COVIC
25. Kaelyn Paparisto

[Handwritten signatures in black ink corresponding to the printed names on the left. Some signatures are crossed out with red lines.]

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

1. Eric Forsythe
2. Lisa Hardy
3. Colleen Haggis
4. Ann Koell
5. Maria Mejia-O'Neill
6. LuAnn Gordon
7. Jennifer Adler
8. Catherine MacArthur
9. Paloma Jackson
10. Laura Quiroz
11. Debra
12. Sunny Conci
13. Andrea Chinn-Parillo
14. Kathy Streckenbach
15. Patrick Strickon
16. Jerry Norman
17. Thomas D Hanami
18. Scott A. Roods
19. SEAN MCHUGH
20. FRED LAW
21. Alan Antexeni
22. Michael Galvin
23. Megan Tsang
24. Laura Montenegro
- 25.

[Handwritten signatures corresponding to the printed names above]

Honorable Mayor Keith Blackburn, City Council Members, Melanie Burkholder, Priya Bhat-Patel, and Teresa Acosta.

Over the past several years the sport of pickleball has become the fastest growing sport in America. As the result, the need for additional outdoor Pickleball facilities has grown at an exponential rate. One factor contributing to the sustained growth of pickleball is that it is played by men, women and children of all age groups. Also, it is inexpensive to purchase Pickleball equipment and the game is much easier and less physically demanding than the sport of tennis.

Unfortunately, throughout these "past several years," the City of Carlsbad has built only six (6) dedicated outdoor Pickleball courts. During this time, many Carlsbad Pickleball players have attended City Planning and Council meetings urging decision makers to increase the availability of outdoor dedicated Pickleball courts. It has been brought to your attention that the use of our parks "court sports" assets is heavily skewed toward the game of tennis yet nothing has been done to remedy this situation.

Members of the Pickleball community understand the Growth Management Process and the time required to ensure the availability of outstanding facilities like our Poinsettia Community Park. They also see extremely long waits to play their game while tennis courts sit empty. In the case of Poinsettia, 50 feet away. From the standpoint of space efficiency, the area required for one tennis court, where up to four Tennis players can play, can contain four Pickleball courts that can accommodate up to sixteen players.

By this petition, Carlsbad Pickleball players are requesting that you promptly address and take steps to increase the availability outdoor courts for the game of Pickleball in Carlsbad.

Carlsbad Pickleball Support Group

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT. IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name








Sign Your Name

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Bruce Schmuckle | Bruce Schmuckle |
| 2. Joe Srimano | Joe Srimano |
| 3. GLENN ROSUCK | Glenn Rosuck |
| 4. DAVE KEMP | Dave Kemp |
| 5. HELEN REBERTS | Helen Roberts |
| 6. Don Storlie | Don Storlie |
| 7. Becky Palsmoier | Becky Palsmoier |
| 8. Terry PARSONS | Terry Parsons |
| 9. Richard Stolens | Richard Stolens |
| 10. Nan Gelardo | Nan Gelardo |
| 11. Devin Owens | Devin Owens |

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name














Sign Your Name

1. Dana Ebbets-Reed 
2. Kelly Bruen 
3. JEFFREY BRUCK 
4. Debra Douglass 
5. Cheryl Zenimura 
6. PAUL Thannifoni 
7. Jim Jones 
8. Melissa Manbum 
9. MIRKO Manbum 
10. Scott Kappel 
11. John Sweet 
12. Niel Otinera 
13. Joe Zomara 
14. JEFF PAINTER 
15. ROBERT Steinberg 
16. Choir Reed 
17. Wendy Reed 
18. Diane Cohen 
19. Mike Bolanos 
20. CARL HONCKEN 
21. Kris Graft 
22. Sam McElly 
23. Shannon Fark 
24. DAN BERGUS 
25. GEORGE Von Fow 

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Tony Knuth |  |
| 2. Michael Calvin |  |
| 3. Andrew Reinhold |  |
| 4. T.J. Donnelly |  |
| 5. Niels Teruoort |  |
| 6. Robert A Adler |  |
| 7. Lionel J Martoccia III |  |
| 8. Chad. Abington |  |
| 9. Nick Ellis |  |
| 10. LAUREN VALENTINO |  |
| 11. MIGUEL E CARRION |  |
| 12. Michael Scodellaro |  |
| 13. Kelia Scodellaro |  |
| 14. Beatriz Carlas |  |
| 15. Ian Stewart |  |
| 16. Jim Hagan |  |
| 17. Darren Wassell |  |
| 18. Julie Wassell |  |
| 19. Wyatt Saxten |  |
| 20. Grant Chelf |  |
| 21. Gary Leeper |  |
| 22. Tyler Miller |  |
| 23. Gregory Benedikt |  |
| 24. Elliott Sherman |  |
| 25. Kalina Shatto |  |








PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. | Kevin Tracy | Kevin Tracy |
| 2. | Don Gausi | Don Gausi |
| 3. | Roxanne Rusing | Roxanne Rusing |
| 4. | KOTT SHELSTROM | KOTT SHELSTROM |
| 5. | Ric CAZALE'S | Ric CAZALE'S |
| 6. | Brighte | Brighte |
| 7. | Alex Gallegos | Alex Gallegos |
| 8. | Shelly Ibr | Shelly Ibr |
| 9. | Cristina Leiva | Cristina Leiva |
| 10. | Michael Surkin | M: Surkin |
| 11. | Amanda Manfredi | Amanda Manfredi |
| 12. | KARIN SAKUL | Karin Sakul |
| 13. | JOE STOTT | Joe Stott |
| 14. | Linda WOLF | Linda Wolf |
| 15. | Robin Dunbar | Robin Dunbar |
| 16. | SACHIN CHAWLA | Sachin Chawla |
| 17. | SACHA SIMOES | Sacha Simoes |
| 18. | MILE CRUZ | Mile Cruz |
| 19. | Ryan Coleman | Ryan Coleman |
| 20. | RyNE CHALOUX | RyNE CHALOUX |
| 21. | Tristan Ramachandran | Tristan Ramachandran |
| 22. | Adam Delgado | Adam Delgado |
| 23. | Ken Giannotti | Ken Giannotti |
| 24. | Brian Cote | Brian Cote |
| 25. | Benjamin Fischer | Ben Fischer |

















PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.


| <u>Print Your Name</u> | <u>Sign Your Name</u> |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Noah Kesslin |  |
| 2. Larry Kesslin |  |
| 3. Hise Kesslin |  |
| 4. Keller Fitzpatrick |  |
| 5. Wesley Heim |  MORE! |
| 6. Drew Schaller |  |
| 7. Shane Rusing |  |
| 8. Enzo Fernandez |  |
| 9. Stem Burmick |  |
| 10. Juliet Slawson | Juliet Flouger |
| 11. Michelle Reed | Michelle Reed |
| 12. Andy Osborne |  |
| 13. Chris Rube | CHRIS RUBE |
| 14. Zack Kato |  |
| 15. Toni Green |  |
| 16. Deborah Fiddes |  |
| 17. JEFF KIMURA |  |
| 18. DIANE KIMURA |  |
| 19. MALU MACIAS | Alfred Macias |
| 20. Jeremiah Yassa |  |
| 21. Megan Willcox Morales |  |
| 22. KELLY KIMURA | Kelly Kimura |
| 23. BRIAN GRAB | Brian Grab |
| 24. Jenn Smith |  |
| 25. AARON BENEDET | |

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. STAN SATTY |  |
| 2. Donna Ellenburg |  |
| 3. DAVE JAMES |  |
| 4. JEFF S. MOODY |  |
| 5. Carol Burton |  |
| 6. NOEL TIMM |  |
| 7. John Cameron |  |
| 8. Britt McNeen |  |
| 9. Holly Rait |  |
| 10. Anatole Rait |  |
| 11. Anna Seaton |  |
| 12. QUENTIN HARTMAN |  |
| 13. Stephen Pession |  |
| 14. Stephen Juarez |  |
| 15. Miguel Juarez |  |
| 16. Tyler Trizila |  |
| 17. Jennifer Baer |  |
| 18. APRIL ARCAKIS |  |
| 19. Scott Manfield |  |
| 20. DOUG GORE |  |
| 21. BRUCE GREEN |  |
| 22. Mausj Chalam |  |
| 23. Avery Schmidt |  |
| 24. WSA FORTMAN |  |
| 25. DAVE KLARICH |  |



PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name














Sign Your Name

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | ANH PLATT | Anh Platt |
| 2. | John Platt | John Platt |
| 3. | GEORGE FELTON | George Felton |
| 4. | Dana Beal | Dana Beal |
| 5. | DAVID RAYM | David Raym |
| 6. | TONI MCKEE | Toni McKee |
| 7. | Jan Marker | Jan Marker |
| 8. | Lew Wellens | Lew Wellens |
| 9. | Brett Lewis | Brett Lewis |
| 10. | Eric Schiefe | Eric Schiefe |
| 11. | Kathy Hofmann | Kathy Hofmann |
| 12. | Tracie Modarse | Tracie Modarse |
| 13. | Cochran Sexton | Cochran Sexton |
| 14. | IRA TWEED | Ira Tweed |
| 15. | Jordan Sdra | Jordan Sdra |
| 16. | RICHARD DEANE | Richard Deane |
| 17. | Kenneth Alexander | Kenneth Alexander |
| 18. | Cassandra Boyer | Cassandra Boyer |
| 19. | KORBY SMITH | Korby Smith |
| 20. | PAUL SPENCEN | Paul Spencen |
| 21. | AI MACIAS | Alfred Macias |
| 22. | Hoke Macias | Hoke Macias |
| 23. | Kyle Webb | Kyle Webb |
| 24. | KATHUN CHIRDS | Kathun Chirds |
| 25. | John Moss | John Moss |

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Robert Martin |  |
| 2. | KARL BORDINE |  |
| 3. | Rick Schuck |  |
| 4. | Cassy Hill |  |
| 5. | John Sanchez |  |
| 6. | Drew Sutter |  |
| 7. | Michael Borrelli | Michael Borrelli |
| 8. | ANTHONY DASPIT |  |
| 9. | Joel Ruckert |  |
| 10. | Colleen Holt | Colleen M Holt |
| 11. | Jennifer Gilbert |  |
| 12. | Greg Meowan |  |
| 13. | MERRICK PATRICARDI |  |
| 14. | Justin Cole |  |
| 15. | Gina Bowen |  |
| 16. | TYLER DAIN 'PRO' | Tyler Dain |
| 17. | ROGER HOLT |  |
| 18. | Sten Gilbert | Sten Gilbert |
| 19. | Tony Ly |  |
| 20. | Robert Bern |  |
| 21. | Tom Hirschberger | Tom Hirschberger |
| 22. | Christin Strode | Christin Strode |
| 23. | Ray Latouio |  |
| 24. | Steven A. Pierce |  |
| 25. | Denise Nard. | Denise Nard |

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT. IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

1. Mike Anello
2. David Vandertie
3. Citrus SANDRICK
4. Don Lang
5. Lee Amerbach
6. Steve Knapall
7. William Cox
8. DEENA DELANEY
9. Ty Butt
10. Carolyn Lang
11. MARIA Garcia
12. Chris Frowse
13. JAMES MATARESE
14. RICHARD ROESTAD
15. Tyson Robinson
16. Chris Young
17. JOHN H. WALSH
18. Jack Hayes
19. ROB SLOAN
20. ALEX ADAMS
21. Joel Kudren
22. Chris Wells
23. Stephanie Conway
24. Mike Conway
25. Paul Jones

1. Michael Anello
2. Mandarita
3. [Signature]
4. [Signature]
5. [Signature]
6. [Signature]
7. [Signature]
8. [Signature]
9. [Signature]
10. [Signature]
11. [Signature]
12. [Signature]
13. [Signature]
14. [Signature]
15. [Signature]
16. [Signature]
17. [Signature]
18. [Signature]
19. [Signature]
20. [Signature]
21. [Signature]
22. [Signature]
23. [Signature]
24. [Signature]
25. [Signature]

Honorable Mayor Keith Blackburn, City Council Members, Melanie Burkholder, Priya Bhat-Patel, and Teresa Acosta.

Over the past several years the sport of pickleball has become the fastest growing sport in America. As the result, the need for additional outdoor Pickleball facilities has grown at an exponential rate. One factor contributing to the sustained growth of pickleball is that it is played by men, women and children of all age groups. Also, it is inexpensive to purchase Pickleball equipment and the game is much easier and less physically demanding than the sport of tennis.

Unfortunately, throughout these "past several years," the City of Carlsbad has built only six (6) dedicated outdoor Pickleball courts. During this time, many Carlsbad Pickleball players have attended City Planning and Council meetings urging decision makers to increase the availability of outdoor dedicated Pickleball courts. It has been brought to your attention that the use of our parks "court sports" assets is heavily skewed toward the game of tennis yet nothing has been done to remedy this situation.

Members of the Pickleball community understand the Growth Management Process and the time required to ensure the availability of outstanding facilities like our Poinsettia Community Park. They also see extremely long waits to play their game while tennis courts sit empty. In the case of Poinsettia, 50 feet away. From the standpoint of space efficiency, the area required for one tennis court, where up to four Tennis players can play, can contain four Pickleball courts that can accommodate up to sixteen players.

By this petition, Carlsbad Pickleball players are requesting that you promptly address and take steps to increase the availability outdoor courts for the game of Pickleball in Carlsbad.

Carlsbad Pickleball Support Group

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT. IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

1. RICK LEBEAU

RFB

1/22/23

2. DIANE STRUTNER

grain strutner

3. Gabriel Bensen

GB

4. Yelena Pavlova

Yelena

5. David Felzer

DF

6. Shannon Wilson

Shannon Wilson

7. BING TONG

Bing Tong

8. Lyone Rine

L. Rine

9. Chris Chatfield

Chris Chatfield

10. DAVID LARGENT

David Largent

11. Marlene Hudge

Marlene Hudge 1/22/23

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name











Sign Your Name

1. Zachary Weaver
2. Ronalds Tombling
3. Kyle Reese
4. Suzanne Krivulshayka
5. Andy Weaver
6. Anna Anhalt
7. KARITA PATEL
8. Paige Lavery
9. Zach Parker
10. Robert Brandt
11. Kevin Moody
12. Valery Naskrent
13. Macy Vedder
14. Crystal Duncan
15. Tamara Urie
16. Renata Jure
17. Rajesh Talwar
18. Kathleen McGill
19. Jason Thornborough
20. Chris Pittard
21. Jimmy McJura
22. Henry Elser
23. Ryan Pierson
24. Wendy Sakunde
25. [Signature]

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name








Sign Your Name

1. Debra Trauxler 
2. Axel Martinel 
3. Jim Nelson 
4. Matt Brunsman 
5. Xing Lan 
6. Marco Bernal 
7. Joe Barcia 
8. LETICIA GARCIA 
9. Seth Maloz 
10. John Mery 
11. RYAN JAGG 
12. Will Rahn 
13. Gabe Warden 
14. Timothy Kuska 
15. KAREN HU 
16. Paul Manger 
17. BRIAN HERSHMAN 
18. ROB KEBBEKUS 
19. Brandon Cristoffel 
20. Ramesh Vinjam 
21. Shaun Wirschen 
22. John Hostetler 
23. Doug Miller 
24. Max Pann 
25. 

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

















Sign Your Name

1. Diana Paxton 
2. Robert Paxton 
3. Kleese Schreiv 
4. Gary Schneiv 
5. Emma Schneiv 
6. Jaemm Yi 
7. Zara Blackstone 
8. halina Kagan 
9. Dary Peterson 
10. Kathy Winfield 
11. Stephen Parks 
12. Kobi R Yeh 
13. BARBARA White 
14. JOHN MARTIN 
15. Ryan Miller 
16. JACK England 
17. Ellen Ashton 
18. Tracy Norton 
19. Mandy Kohan 
20. Adir Saati 
21. WALLACE Soofa 
22. Vita Tameilai 
23. Fakaosi Pifeleti 
24. Arlene Kaleopa 
25. Avi Shamm

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

1. Isha Sharma 
2. Matt Goldberg 
3. Anna Goldberg 
4. Kevin Ozaki 
5. Sam Bell 
6. Shannon Davis 
7. SHANE FREDERICK 
8. Chaco Clotfelter 
9. Mark Nicholas 
10. Will Schaefer 
11. ELIZABETH BERTIN 
12. Mark Edly 
13. Robin Ellingson 
14. Margarett Peew 
15. Rebecca Yee 
16. Tom Eynick 
17. David Quan 
18. Billy Barnett 
19. Maki Okada 
20. Michael Kake 
21. Marlene Kote 
22. Dan Traxler 
23. Cam Clendenin 
24. MARIA MORICZ 
25. JAY JOHNSON 

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

1. Andrew Conito
2. EDMOND ZARDE
3. Nicole Manuquid
4. David Naskrant
5. Robyn Ozaki
6. Jeanelle Bausback
7. David Geler
8. Cathy Dittrich
9. Fran Terfiletti
10. Brad McMurray
11. Susan Salluce
12. John Salluce
13. David Baum
14. Bea Severson
15. Tom Hallan
16. Steven Deszler
17. Greg Hester
18. Bill Gage
19. Crista Fontaine
20. Steve Bettely
21. BILLY BEATRICE
22. NASHAW FETTY
23. Matt Shipley
24. Will Vertun
25. DAKOTA RUBY

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| 1. Kim Jones | Kim Jones |
| 2. Malwina Sitarz | Malwina Sitarz |
| 3. Adriana Kuenzi | Adriana Kuenzi |
| 4. Laura Montenegro | Laura Montenegro |
| 5. Dagan Stagg | Dagan Stagg |
| 6. Ruby Callahan | Ruby Callahan |
| 7. Jae H. GI | Jae H. GI |
| 8. Alex Frascchetti | Alex Frascchetti |
| 9. Kenny Murphy | Kenny Murphy |
| 10. Julie McMill | Julie McMill |
| 11. Catalina Kuenzi | Catalina Kuenzi |
| 12. Charles Rollins | Charles Rollins |
| 13. Taryn Nair | Taryn Nair |
| 14. Dina Carroll | Dina Carroll |
| 15. John Carroll | John Carroll |
| 16. Don Wagner | Don Wagner |
| 17. Meghan White | Meghan White |
| 18. Ray Heinonen | Ray Heinonen |
| 19. Jo Lynn | Jo Lynn |
| 20. GARY FORTMAN | GARY FORTMAN |
| 21. LEVIN HALEM | LEVIN HALEM |
| 22. SUSAN SHAW | SUSAN SHAW |
| 23. Shane Ross | Shane Ross |
| 24. Liz Boass | Liz Boass |
| 25. Susan Oja | Susan Oja |

Honorable Mayor Keith Blackburn, City Council Members, Melanie Burkholder, Priya Bhat-Patel, and Teresa Acosta.

Over the past several years the sport of pickleball has become the fastest growing sport in America. As the result, the need for additional outdoor Pickleball facilities has grown at an exponential rate. One factor contributing to the sustained growth of pickleball is that it is played by men, women and children of all age groups. Also, it is inexpensive to purchase Pickleball equipment and the game is much easier and less physically demanding than the sport of tennis.

Unfortunately, throughout these "past several years," the City of Carlsbad has built only six (6) dedicated outdoor Pickleball courts. During this time, many Carlsbad Pickleball players have attended City Planning and Council meetings urging decision makers to increase the availability of outdoor dedicated Pickleball courts. It has been brought to your attention that the use of our parks "court sports" assets is heavily skewed toward the game of tennis yet nothing has been done to remedy this situation.

Members of the Pickleball community understand the Growth Management Process and the time required to ensure the availability of outstanding facilities like our Poinsettia Community Park. They also see extremely long waits to play their game while tennis courts sit empty. In the case of Poinsettia, 50 feet away. From the standpoint of space efficiency, the area required for one tennis court, where up to four Tennis players can play, can contain four Pickleball courts that can accommodate up to sixteen players.

By this petition, Carlsbad Pickleball players are requesting that you promptly address and take steps to increase the availability outdoor courts for the game of Pickleball in Carlsbad.

Carlsbad Pickleball Support Group

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT. IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name






- | | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| 1. Paula Moody | Paula Moody |
| 2. Jennifer Granich | Jennifer Granich |
| 3. Tim Granich | Tim Granich |
| 4. Jassal Strahn | J. Strahn |
| 5. Greg Hoffman | Greg Hoffman |
| 6. Bita Hoffman | Bita Hoffman |
| 7. Cooper Hoffman | Cooper Hoffman |
| 8. Katelyn Godwin | Katelyn Godwin |
| 9. Jessica Glavin | J. Glavin |
| 10. Trevor Glavin | Trevor Glavin |
| 11. Wendy Yen | Wendy Yen |

T

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name
















Sign Your Name

1. Greg Lowe 
2. Karen Lowe 
3. Carol Olsen 
4. Dennis Olsen 
5. Brad Hunter 
6. Sammie Murphy 
7. Brian McGuffay 
8. Holly Gilliland 
9. Lisa Kennedy 
10. SEAN ~~AWAY~~ MIVENCH 
11. Sam McVeigh 
12. RICH FITZGERALD 
13. Ben Wu 
14. Ryan Gutsch 
15. Gianluca Pesaresi 
16. Laurie Greenfield 
17. Ray Bledsoe 
18. Pat Pittsby 
19. PETE SNOFFER 
20. Chase Lucas 
21. Maddox Ponstord 
22. Billy Bergin 
23. Marco 
MARCO PESARES!
24. Judy Bosler 
25. Charlene Hu 
Heber T 

PLEASE SIGN THIS PETITION IF YOU SUPPORT THIS EFFORT, IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO SEE HOW MANY PEOPLE WANT PICKLEBALL TO CONTINUE TO FLOURISH IN THE CITY OF CARLSBAD.

Print Your Name

Sign Your Name

1. Milly Haynes 
2. Jen Seelye 
3. Lorraine Torino 
4. Mark Rhein 
5. Katy Meyers 
6. Robert DeGazio 
7. Stuart Asakawa 
8. Tyler Mallari 
9. May Trish 
10. Kristen Goy 
11. BRENT GOY 
12. Hollie Prussack 
13. Karen Coco 
14. Andy Warren 
15. CYNIS ASSI 
16. Isabella Wear 
17. Alex Wolfe 
18. Michael Wolfe 
19. Skylin Gallegos 
20. Ardash Nartzman 
21. STEPHANIE CHAMM 
22. Cole Wolfson 
23. DON FALKNER 
24. DAVID HUANG 
25. Yanmin Sun 

Kirk Conkle

Rod Seery
MARK SPENCER

Ali Sparkman

Cara Emenhiser

John O'Neil

Jared Emenhiser

Let well

~~Let well~~

~~Cara~~ Emenhiser

Cara M. Emenhiser

~~John~~

~~Jared~~

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-mobility Commissions and CA Coastal Commission on City Budget -DLCPA-PMU processes - So Carlsbad Blvd. Realignment
Attachments: Carlsbad Budget-Draft LCP Amendment-Parks Master Plan - Public Comments - So Carlsbad Blvd Realignment.pdf; Carlsbad_Bldv_Realingment-1 .pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 10:29 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Scott Chadwick <scott.chadwick@carlsbadca.gov>; Gary Barberio <Gary.Barberio@carlsbadca.gov>; Don Neu <Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov>; Jennifer Jesser <Jennifer.Jesser@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Nathan Schmidt <Nathan.Schmidt@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Erin Prahler' <Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Cort Hitchens' <cort.hitchens@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Gabriel Buhr' <gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov>; 'Fred Sandquist' <sandquist2@earthlink.net>; 'Laura Walsh' <lauraw@surfridersd.org>; 'People for Ponto' <info@peopleforponto.com>; Lisa Urbach <lisa.urbach@parks.ca.gov>

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad City Council-Planning-Parks-mobility Commissions and CA Coastal Commission on City Budget -DLCPA-PMU processes - So Carlsbad Blvd. Realignment

Dear Carlsbad City Council, and Planning, Parks and Traffic & Mobility Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission:

People for Ponto submits this email, and the two (2) attachments as public comments on the City Budget, Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, Parks Master Plan Update, and Livable Streets improvement processes. We request this email and attachment be provided to the Carlsbad City Council, and Planning, Parks and Mobility Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission as public input on the City Staff proposed 1) Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment, 2) Parks Master Plan Update, and 3) Mobility improvement processes. Thank you.

Email confirmation of receipt and delivery of this email/attachment is requested. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lance Schulte
People for Ponto

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Carlsbad proposed Draft Budget, Local Coastal Program Amendment, & Parks Master Plan Update – Public Comments

City Budget, Draft LCP Amendment and Parks Master Plan Update issues – South Carlsbad Boulevard (PCH) Realignment land use policy/mapping clarity, and environmental and budget feasibility:

Please see and include the attached City of Carlsbad’s CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT STUDY PHASE II: PRELIMINARY FINANCIAL ANALYSIS dated October 4, 2001 in this public comment. The realignment study evaluated the City selling and/or leasing portions of the exiting South Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way for Commercial land use. This is concerning on serval levels.

This public comment requests that in the Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment (DLCPA) and Parks Master Plan Update processes:

1. Provide clear public disclosure and discussion as to if the City’s:
 - a. proposed DLCPA Land Use policies [Pages/Figures: p. 1-5 Figure 1-1, p. 2-11 Figure 2-1, pp. 2-19 & 20 Figure 2-2b & 2-2c; and Pages/Policies: p. 2-22, Ponto/Southern Waterfront, p. 2-23 Draft Policy LCP-2-P.5, p. 2-24 Draft Policy LCP-2-P.7, p. 2-26 Draft Policy LCP-2-P.19]; or
 - b. existing General Plan Land Use Element [Pages: p. 2-35, p. 2-38, pp. 2-47-48; and Policies: 2-G.20, 2-P.51, 2-P.52, 2-P.53, 2-P.55, and 2-P.90] General Plan policies)

provide in any way the opportunity to convert South Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way into Commercial Land Use as part of realignment. Realignment was portrayed to Citizens as an elaborate way to provide a much needed pedestrian sidewalk/pathway, or Promenade along South Carlsbad Boulevard, not a ‘pathway to change open landscaped right-of-way land to Commercial uses’.

- Are the DLCPA Realignment Land Use policy and/or mapping allowing Commercial use on City designated right-of-way land like proposed in Carlsbad’s 2001 Realignment Study?
 - Does the City’s General Plan polices allow, support or imply Commercial use in any Realignment right-of-way land?
2. To even start having that important public disclosure and discussion, citizens must have both clear DLCPA Land Use Policies and Land Use Maps that show exactly “what and where” the City’s potential proposed Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment “is, and what and where it is not”.
 - The DLCPA Land Use Policies are vague and DLCPA Land Use Maps do not show any Land Use (Open Space or Commercial) associated with the Realignment. This vagueness is counter to the some very specific land uses and areas itemized in the City’s 2001 Study – why?

It is requested that both the DLCPA Land Use Policies and Maps be amended to be consistent and clear as to “what” and “where” the Realignment is and what proposed DLCPA policies apply to those areas, and what Land Uses are being proposed to be assigned to those areas in the Land Use Plan(s).

3. As part of this clear disclosure by the City and public discussion, it also seems logical to roughly update the 20-year old ‘preliminary study’ of realignment costs to have a general understanding if South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment is even environmentally/fiscally viable. Current costs could exceed \$75 million. Carlsbad Citizens and taxpayers need to know if the ‘Realignment Promenade/Linear Park’ is a viable project the City will be implementing and when. Or is the ‘Realignment Promenade/Linear Park’ more a ‘Trojan horse’ – outside an apparently attractive celebration, while truthfully hidden inside is disappointment resulting in ruin. The City’s 20-year old 2001 Realignment Study seems to point to this concern/possibility.
4. The DLCPA should add a clear and accountable Public Coastal Access, Livable Streets and Connectivity Policy (Section 4.8, at p. 4-41) that requires the City to fully fund and construct as soon as possible a sidewalk/pedestrian path/‘Promenade’ along South Carlsbad Boulevard to “Complete” and make “Livable” this street. The missing safe pedestrian Coastal Access along South Carlsbad Boulevard represents over ½ of Carlsbad’s coastline. The City’s CIP #60311 Budget already has \$3.2 million, which based on City costs for sidewalk construction, is sufficient to complete most of this needed sidewalk/pedestrian path/‘Promenade’. The sidewalk/pedestrian path/‘Promenade’ can be quickly, simply and cost effectively accomplished with an existing budget for that purpose, and within the existing right-of-way configuration. The few short sections along bridges can be cost effectively addressed with vehicle/bike lane restriping and maybe a ‘jersey barrier’ similar to what was done at Agua Hedionda. Again, the missing sidewalk/pedestrian path/‘Promenade’ can be substantially completed using existing budgeted CIP funds for that purpose. Special design and landscape qualities could be budgeted and incorporated to enhance to a ‘Promenade’ level, or be similar to North Carlsbad Boulevard’s ‘Promenade’ design. A community-based design process could define consensus on that.

As supporting data that should be factored in the above 4 requests, the Mayor stated in 2020 that the South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment would presently cost about \$75 million. This figure appears it maybe a rational estimate, but should be verified. Would South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment be the most expensive City project ever? The \$75 million Realignment cost is \$5 million more than the City’s Golf Course land acquisition and construction costs. The City Golf Course is 402.8 acres, and is understood to be the most expensive to acquire/build municipal golf course in the USA, and most expensive to-date Carlsbad City project.

Sadly in comparison, South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment does Not acquire or add any new land. Realignment simply realigns up to 54.5 acres of existing City owned landscaped right-of-way, to then repurpose only 4 - 10.8 acres for possible Park use under the 4 Land Use Alternatives as documented in the City’s 2001 Realignment Study. The \$75 million Realignment cost would thus cost \$7 - 19 million to simply repurpose each acre of existing City right-of-way land for Park use. This cost per acre appears

fiscally imprudent given much better alternatives. In comparison the Mayor stated the alternative 11 acre Ponto Coastal Park that is required to be studied under Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program would only cost \$20-22 million. The \$20-22 million figure also appears a rational estimate given vacant land costs in the area is roughly \$1.5 – 2 million per acre. So it is actually 7 to 9.5 times more cost effective to simply purchase vacant land that actually adds New land and is also required to be studied/considered for Park use. Again, the Relocation proposal's \$7 – 19 million cost per acre is NOT to buy any new land, but simply rearrange existing land the City already owns and is already landscaped and open as part of the roadway median. It seems logical to fully and publicly vet the proposed South Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Land Use Policies/Map/Costs. The Realignment concept seems fiscally imprudent and a significant squandering of taxpayer resources.

These public comments are not against a much needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad as there is none and this is vitally needed to provide a Coastal Park for ½ of Carlsbad's citizens and for the thousands of Visitors staying at the thousands of South Carlsbad Resort and hotel rooms. As the Mayor stated this is the most cost effective solution providing MORE NEW parkland at a fraction of the cost of the Realignment. Over 2,500 emails from citizens and visitors have asked the City Council to provide this much needed Ponto Coastal Park.

These public comments are also not against a much needed sidewalk/pedestrian pathway (including a wider than normal pathway) to provide safe (Complete-Livable Streets) pedestrian Coastal Access along South CARLSBAD Boulevard - in fact just the opposite. The public comment #4 specifically asks for a clear, accountable, funded DLCPA Policy that achieves rapid implementation of a sidewalk/pedestrian path/Promenade within the existing South Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way configuration. This requested LCP Policy would address the critically needed Coastal Access, public safety, and mobility needs along South Carlsbad Boulevard, that has been delayed way too long. Citizens and visitors should not have to wait over 20-years for this much needed Coastal Access and public safety facility for over ½ of Carlsbad's coastline.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lance Schulte

Attachment: City of Carlsbad's CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT STUDY PHASE II: PRELIMINARY FINANCIAL ANALYSIS, dated October 4, 2001

Carlsbad Golf Course information: <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/politics/sdut-city-to-pay-off-golf-course-bond-debt-2016jul07-story.html>

ERA

Economics Research Associates

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD
REALIGNMENT STUDY
PHASE II: PRELIMINARY
FINANCIAL ANALYSIS**

Submitted to:
The City of Carlsbad

Prepared by:
Economics Research Associates
URS Corporation
Wallace, Roberts & Todd

October 4, 2001
ERA Project No. 14158

964 5th Avenue Suite 214
San Diego, CA 92101 ERA is affiliated with Drivers Jonas
619.544.1402 FAX 619.544.1404 www.erasf.com/erasf
Los Angeles San Francisco San Diego
Chicago Dallas Washington DC London



Economics Research Associates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. | Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. | Development Scenarios..... | 2 |
| III. | Land and Fiscal Value Estimates | 7 |
| IV. | Other Potential Sources for Funding Realignment Costs..... | 11 |
| | Appendix..... | 15 |



Economics Research Associates

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Table 1: Development Program Scenarios – Alternative 1..... | 3 |
| Table 2: Development Program Scenarios – Alternative 2..... | 4 |
| Table 3: Development Program Scenarios – Alternative 3..... | 5 |
| Table 4: Development Program Scenarios – Alternative 4..... | 6 |
| Table 5: Preliminary Revenue/Cost Comparison | 8 |

GENERAL LIMITING CONDITIONS

Every reasonable effort has been made to ensure that the data contained in this study reflect the most accurate and timely information possible, and they are believed to be reliable. This study is based on estimates, assumptions and other information reviewed and evaluated by Economics Research Associates from its consultations with the client and the client's representatives and within its general knowledge of the industry. No responsibility is assumed for inaccuracies in reporting by the client, the client's agent and representatives or any other data source used in preparing or presenting this study.

This report is based on information that was current as of *October 2001* or as noted in the report, and Economics Research Associates has not undertaken any update of its research effort since such date.

No warranty or representation is made by Economics Research Associates that any of the projected values or results contained in this study will actually be achieved.

Possession of this study does not carry with it the right of publication thereof or to use the name of "Economics Research Associates" in any manner without first obtaining the prior written consent of Economics Research Associates. No abstracting, excerpting or summarization of this study may be made without first obtaining the prior written consent of Economics Research Associates. This report is not to be used in conjunction with any public or private offering of securities or other similar purpose where it may be relied upon to any degree by any person other than the client without first obtaining the prior written consent of Economics Research Associates. This study may not be used for purposes other than that for which it is prepared or for which prior written consent has first been obtained from Economics Research Associates.

This study is qualified in its entirety by, and should be considered in light of, these limitations, conditions and considerations.

I. INTRODUCTION

The *Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study* is an analysis of alternative scenarios for realigning Carlsbad Boulevard away from the coast bluff edge and, in the process, creating opportunities for commercial, recreation, and open space uses. One of the study's objectives is to explore ways to generate revenue from useable public land created, including potential land sale or lease opportunities, and using this revenue to help offset the cost of realigning the road.

This Phase II report is a preliminary evaluation of each scenario's financial implications. The Phase I report, presented in April 1999, evaluated the market context in which development may take place. Some of the key rent and market assumptions presented in this report are based on the 1999 research, adjusted for inflation. A market analysis update has not taken place since 1999. The values presented here are preliminary estimates for planning purposes only, and should not be interpreted as valuations or appraisals since they are based on conceptual development programs, gross preliminary development cost factors, and two-year old market research. Valuations or appraisals will require greater due diligence regarding current market conditions, more specific development and site planning programs, and more detailed cost estimates.

II. DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS

URS Corporation and the City of Carlsbad have identified four alternative land use scenarios for a realigned Carlsbad Boulevard. The proposed realignment creates 4-6 new surplus land areas resulting 5-7 potential parcels (see the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study – Phase I and Phase II for more details regarding these alignments and surplus land areas). The consultant team prepared hypothetical development programs for each alternative. These hypothetical development programs are not recommendations; rather, they were devised to test the potential financial impact of the following alternative approaches towards reuse of the surplus land that is created with the road realignment. They were also designed to serve as a starting point for discussion of preferred uses and to allow the decision-makers to select and combine the elements from each alternative that they find most desirable. Finally, these scenarios serve as starting points for discussions with State Parks, which is critical for the pivotal Manzano parcel.

- Alternative 1 tests the financial impacts of a parks and open space scheme. It assumes that no major commercial development occurs and that the surplus parcels are used for parking, community facilities, parks, open space, and camping (concessionaire), as shown in Table 1.
- Alternative 2 tests the financial impacts of a predominately parks and open space scheme, with limited commercial development. It assumes that a time-share and executive meeting hotel is built on a small portion of Surplus Area 1, and that the rest of Surplus Area 1 and all of the other parcels are used for parking, community facilities, parks, or open space, as shown in Table 2.
- Alternative 3, as shown in Table 3, tests the financial impacts of a significant commercial development scheme. It assumes significant commercial development on almost half of Surplus Areas 1 (specialty retail, restaurants, and office) and 3 (hotel), and all of Surplus Areas 2 (time-share), 6A (time-share), and 6B (office), as shown in Table 3. More than half of Surplus Area 1 is used as park space and more than half of Surplus Area 3 remains open space. Parcels 4 and 5 provide parking and open space.
- Alternative 4 tests the financial impacts of a significant commercial development scheme for a majority of Surplus Area 1 (specialty retail, restaurants, time-share, and executive meeting hotel), with a neighborhood park on the remaining portion of Surplus Area 1, as shown in Table 4. Parcels 2, 3, and 6A remain open space, and 4, 5, and 6B contain public parking and open space.

Table 1: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 1 - Parks and Open Space

| | Units | Surplus Area: | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------|-----|------|-------|-----|-----|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B |
| Acreage | | 20.8 | 5.1 | 10.1 | 13.7 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Developable Commercial | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | - | - | - | 2.8 | - | - | - |
| Public parking | | 1.0 | 0.6 | - | 1.5 | 0.9 | - | 0.6 |
| Community facility | | 0.8 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| Active parks | | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open space | | 15.0 | 4.4 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial-Restaurants | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Time Share | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | - | 45 | - | - | - |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | - | 50 | - | - | - |
| Common facilities | | - | - | - | 3,000 | - | - | - |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spaces | 140 | 50 | - | 200 | 135 | - | 90 |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | 2,500 | - | - | 3,000 | - | - | - |
| Restrooms | Number | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | 15.0 | 4.4 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 |

Source: URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd; and Economics Research Associates

Table 2: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 2

| | Units | Surplus Area; | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------|-----|------|------|--------|-----|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B |
| Acreage | | 20.8 | 5.1 | 10.1 | 13.7 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Developable Commercial | | 5.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public parking | | - | 2.6 | 6.9 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.6 |
| Community facility | | - | - | - | 0.1 | 0.4 | - | - |
| Active parks | | - | 1.6 | 1.6 | - | 0.5 | - | 1.4 |
| Open space | | 15.8 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 10.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | - |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial-Restaurants | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Time Share | Rooms | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Common facilities | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spaces | - | 150 | 870 | 520 | 176 | 10 | 90 |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | - | - | - | - | 19,600 | - | - |
| Restrooms | Number | - | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | - | 1.6 | 1.6 | - | 0.5 | - | 1.4 |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | 15.8 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 10.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | - |

Source: URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd; and Economics Research Associates

Table 3: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 3

| | Units | Surplus Area: | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------|-----|------|---|---|-----|--------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B |
| Acreage* | | 20.8 | 5.1 | 10.1 | - | - | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Developable Commercial | | 10.0 | 5.1 | 4.3 | - | - | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Campground | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public parking | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Community facility | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Active parks | | 10.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open space | | - | - | 5.8 | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | 40,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial-Restaurants | s.f. | 40,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office | s.f. | 80,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 15,000 |
| Time Share | Rooms | - | 150 | - | - | - | 30 | - |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | 300 | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Common facilities | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spaces | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Restrooms | Number | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | 10.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | - | - | 5.8 | - | - | - | - |

*Acreages may not equal total due to rounding

Source: URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd; and Economics Research Associates

Table 4: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 4

| Units | Surplus Area: | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------|---|---|---|----|----|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B | |
| Acreage* | 20.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Developable Commercial | 15.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Campground | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Public parking | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Community facility | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Active parks | 5.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Open space | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | 45,000 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Commercial-Restaurants | s.f. | 45,000 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Office | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Time Share | Rooms | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Campground | | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Common facilities | | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spaces | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Restrooms | Number | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | 5.8 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | - | - | - | - | - | - | |

*Acreages may not equal total due to rounding

Source: URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd; and Economics Research Associates

III. LAND AND FISCAL VALUE ESTIMATES

ERA estimated the approximate residual land value and the capitalized value of the estimated fiscal revenue associated with each of the alternative alignments and development scenarios. The estimates are very preliminary since they are based on hypothetical development programs without architectural designs, rent assumptions based on 1999 research (updated to 2001 values), preliminary site capacity and site planning analysis, and gross development cost estimates for buildings and site development. The detailed analyses for each alternative are presented in Appendix A. These estimates, which are not appraisals, will need to be revised as development programs become more specific, and they do not form the basis for a financial offering, bond, or prospectus without additional planning, engineering, cost estimating, and due diligence.

The residual land value estimates translate into the potential revenue generated from commercial land sales, or the capitalized values of leases, of surplus land areas created by the road realignment. These estimates are preliminary approximations of what a developer might be willing to pay for the land in order to obtain a reasonable rate of return on total capital (debt and equity capital). In order to be conservative, no real appreciation was assumed; in other words, rents only rise with inflation. Some developers may speculate that rents will rise faster than inflation, which would result in higher values than estimated in this report. The fiscal revenue translates into the capitalized value of the potential fiscal resources to the City and Redevelopment Agency that could help finance some of the Carlsbad Boulevard realignment costs.

The total revenue from commercial land sales (or leases) and the capitalized value of fiscal revenue was compared to URS Corporation's preliminary estimate of road realignment costs (\$18.8 million), and Wallace, Roberts, and Todd's preliminary estimates of possible public parking, parks, open space, and community facility costs (\$8.5-12.1 million). While road realignment costs are required to produce the surplus parcels, costs to develop the open space are flexible. The estimates provided assume maximum improvements to the open space.

As shown in Table 5, Alternative 1, the least commercial scenario, generates very limited revenue, only \$1.1 million in commercial land value, and over \$0.2 million in the capitalized value of fiscal revenue, for a total of almost \$1.3 million. Other sources would have to fund over \$17.5 million in road construction costs, and \$9.0 million in public facility, parks, and open space costs, or the amount of improvements would have to be reduced.

Table 5: PRELIMINARY REVENUE/COST COMPARISON (Year 2001 Dollars)

| | Alternatives | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Revenues From Commercial Land Sales | \$ 1,131,000 | \$ 9,219,000 | \$ 28,155,000 | \$ 19,465,000 |
| Capitalized Value of Fiscal Revenues to City & RDA | \$ 217,000 | \$ 10,849,000 | \$ 24,743,000 | \$ 16,429,000 |
| Total Potential Revenues | \$ 1,348,000 | \$ 20,068,000 | \$ 52,898,000 | \$ 35,894,000 |
| Less: Road Construction Costs | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 |
| Net Revenues <Deficit> After Road Construction Costs | \$ (17,452,000) | \$ 1,268,000 | \$ 34,098,000 | \$ 17,094,000 |
| Less: Public Parking, Parks, Open Space, and Facilities | \$ 8,999,580 | \$ 12,062,589 | \$ 8,496,734 | \$ 9,358,925 |
| Net Revenues <Deficit> After Public Costs | \$ (26,451,580) | \$ (10,794,589) | \$ 25,601,266 | \$ 7,735,075 |

Source: Economics Research Associates; URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd

Alternative 2 generates over \$9.2 million in commercial land value, and \$10.8 million in fiscal revenue, for a total of \$20.1 million. This amount is enough to cover the \$18.8 million in road realignment costs, but not enough to cover the estimated \$12.1 million in potential public facility, parks, and open space costs. Other sources would have to fund approximately \$10.8 million in public facility, parks, and open space costs, or the amount or type of improvements would have to be reduced.

Alternative 3, the most commercial scenario, generates an estimated \$28.2 million in revenues from commercial land value, and \$24.7 million in capitalized fiscal revenue, for a total of \$52.9 million. This amount is substantially more than enough to cover the \$18.8 million in road realignment costs, and \$8.5 million in public facility, parks, and open space costs.

Alternative 4 generates an estimated \$19.5 million in commercial land value, and \$16.4 million in capitalized fiscal revenue, for a total of \$35.9 million, which is more than enough to cover the \$18.8 million in road realignment costs, and \$9.4 million in public facility, parks, and open space costs.

QUALIFICATIONS

While it appears that alternatives 3 and 4 generate enough revenue to cover development costs, the findings at this preliminary planning stage of analysis are qualified, as follows:

- The cost estimates are based on gross cost factors and need to be refined as project design becomes more specific.
- The cost estimates do not include any extraordinary off-site costs, such as for environmental or traffic mitigation.
- Some of the parcels identified for potential development, particularly those west of the alignment, may be vulnerable to long term erosion problems; therefore, their stability needs to be verified.

- A significant share of value and fiscal revenue in scenarios 2, 3, and 4 is attributable to hotels, which in 1999 demonstrated only average performance, especially among moderately priced hotels. Also, a new hotel has been developed since 1999. While the parcels identified for potential hotel development are competitive because of the views they offer, hotel development and financing are relatively risky.
- WRT has determined that the hypothetical development programs can fit on the parcels, and URS Corporation has initially determined that the circulation system can accommodate the development. However, there could be difficult site planning issues with some of the parcels that would limit their development potential to less than what is assumed in this analysis.
- The development cost estimates for the commercial development scenarios, for the most part, do not assume structured parking. If structured parking is required, development costs could be greater which would diminish residual land values unless higher rents are achievable.
- Most of the value is generated on Surplus Area 1, which is owned by the State of California. The City or Redevelopment Agency would not realize the value of Surplus Area 1 unless the State trades the parcel to the City or Agency for other considerations. Therefore, the City or Agency may not be able to apply proceeds from the value of Surplus Area 1 to road realignment and public facility costs. Nevertheless, under Alternative 3, the capitalized value of the fiscal revenue alone might be sufficient to cover road construction costs and a portion of public facility costs. The capitalized value of fiscal revenue under Alternative 4 comes close to covering road construction costs, but is not sufficient to cover other public facility costs.
- Competitive market conditions could change which would affect the market potential of the development programs assumed in the scenarios analyzed in this report. The estimated values are based on the hypothetical development programs for each parcel. If development programs change, the values will change.

IV. OTHER POTENTIAL SOURCES FOR FUNDING REALIGNMENT COSTS

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and State of California Transportation Department (CalTrans) are the traditional sources of funds for capital improvements to highways. For example, the Federal government offers approximately 70 different transportation-funding programs. The majority of these funds are made available for disbursement to regional entities such as SANDAG, while a small portion is made available directly to municipalities.

FUNDS AVAILABLE DIRECTLY TO MUNICIPALITIES

The CalTrans Local Assistance Program (LAP) is responsible for helping municipalities located in CalTrans District 11 identify which Federal and State funding programs for which they are eligible and guiding them through the application process. Each program is specifically tailored for a given need, and has very strict eligibility requirements. One such specialized program funds "Intelligent Transportation Systems". Funds are available to projects that integrate new technology (computer-related) with the road/highway project to improve traffic flow. Because this program is new, eligibility requirements are not yet well defined.

There is no program specifically for road or highway realignment. Moreover, it is estimated that for every 10 applicants to each of the programs above, only the most urgent project is funded, leaving 90 percent of the applications unsuccessful. Given the level of competition for funds, if the City of Carlsbad finds that portions of the road may fall into one or more of the eligible categories, the application should present as compelling a case as possible. In any case, once a specific construction plan has been determined, a representative from the City of Carlsbad should meet with a representative from the Local Assistance Program to discuss the program in detail and determine whether or not portions of the project are eligible for Federal or State aid.

Finally, another option is direct funding from special state legislative action.

REGIONAL FUNDS

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) administers the apportionment of funds from the larger, more general State and Federal transportation funding programs. The most likely source of funding for a project such as the realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard is the Regional Arterial Projects section of the Surface Transportation Projects.

For a project to receive an apportionment from SANDAG, it must be included in the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP). The City of Carlsbad is an active participant on the CTEC committee, the body that periodically updates the RTIP. However, it is important to note that the current RTIP (2000-2004) provides only \$153 million towards projects estimated to cost nearly \$392 million. Also, the current RTIP specifically states that "local governments will obtain private developer financing for those on- and off-site roadway and transit improvement necessary to accommodate the increased travel generated by private development."

The major source of Federal transportation funds administered by SANDAG is the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). In addition to highway and surface road construction and improvements, TEA-21 is a source of funds for driver safety initiatives, transit programs, rail projects, and transportation research. TEA-21 was established in 1998 and funded through 2003, thus funding levels beyond that time are unknown. The Surface Transportation Program (STP) is the section of TEA-21 relevant to the realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard. One STP program, Transportation Enhancement Activities Program, funds highway enhancement activities over and above mitigation, standard landscaping and other permit requirements for a normal transportation project. Project eligibility categories under the Transportation Enhancement Program which may be applicable to the realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard are: 1) Scenic or historic highway programs; 2) Landscaping and other scenic beautification; 3) Environmental mitigation to address water pollution due to highway runoff.

Currently, all TEA-21 funds, including STP, have been assigned to projects (detailed in SANDAG's 2000 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan); however, SANDAG continues to pursue additional discretionary funding available through TEA-21 on an annual basis.

In 1987, San Diego voters passed Proposition A, which authorized a one-half percent sales tax increase dedicated for transportation improvements. The first \$1 million in annual TransNet revenue is set aside for bicycle-related projects and the remainder is divided equally between highway, public transit and local street and road projects. Highway projects are approved for funding by SANDAG, CalTrans, the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board, and the North San Diego County Transit Development Board. Local street and road projects are approved for funding by the city councils of the 18 cities and the County Board of Supervisors. The Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project is a potential candidate project. TransNet funds have been programmed through 2004, and the measure will expire in 2008.

LOCAL SOURCES

Local sources include developer financed road improvements, transportation impact fees, tax increment financing in redevelopment project areas, infrastructure financing districts, assessment districts, Community Facilities Districts, General Obligation Bonds, and the General Fund.

To the extent that the realignment also increases road capacity that is required to mitigate the impacts of new development, developer financed road improvements or impact fees may apply. If the road realignment simply moves the road without enhancing capacity for future local developments, however, the nexus may not be strong enough for developer funding or impact fees to apply. Alternatively, the City may negotiate voluntary contributions to road realignment costs through development agreements on larger land development projects in the vicinity of Carlsbad Boulevard that require City discretionary approval.

Since the proposed Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project is within a newly adopted redevelopment project area, the City's Redevelopment Agency may use tax increment to finance some of the realignment costs. Tax increment financing does not result in higher tax rates; rather, the incremental gain in property tax revenues is directed toward certain improvements within a redevelopment project area. To the extent that the realignment creates parcels that are commercially developed, the realignment project will be directly responsible for the tax increment generated by those commercial developments. Because tax increment will not be generated until the parcels are developed with commercial uses, there may be a cash flow financing issue to overcome to fund the realignment costs that will occur in advance of tax increment.

Another type of property tax increment financing is the Infrastructure Financing District (IFD). It also is based on the incremental gain in property taxes rather than an increase in tax rates. The City of Carlsbad was one of the first jurisdictions in California to form an IFD. Unlike tax increment in redevelopment project areas, an IFDs do not have to be located in redevelopment project areas and, therefore, do not have to address blight or meet the "predominately urbanized" test of redevelopment law. The public facility that is financed must serve the community at large. However, unlike a redevelopment project area that can be formed by Council action, an IFD must be approved by two-thirds of the voters if 12 or more registered voters reside in the district. Otherwise, two-thirds of the property owners within the district must vote to approve the district. The affected taxing agencies must also approve the district and tax increment sharing must be negotiated.

Properties that benefit from the realignment may be assessed for a portion of the cost through a benefit assessment district, such as the *Municipal Improvement Act of 1913*. The assessments may be pledged to support debt service on bonds, issued under the *Improvement Bond Act of 1915*. The formation process must establish the scope of improvements, identify the benefiting parcels, and determine an equitable allocation of costs. Property owners vote for or against formation of an assessment district at a public hearing. Some of the benefiting properties that are owned by the State may not be assessed.

A Community Facilities District, commonly known as a Mello-Roos district, is a special tax that can be based on a formula that has a less strict benefit allocation. However, a Community Facilities District requires two-thirds voter approval of voters residing within the district. If there are fewer than twelve registered voters in the district, the qualified electors are defined as owners of land within the district, with each owner allowed one vote per acre.

General Obligation Bonds, backed by the full faith and credit of the City, are the most secure and lowest cost form of debt financing. However, it would require two-thirds voter approval among Carlsbad's electorate, which may be difficult for the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project unless it is perceived as a project that has citywide benefits.

Finally, the General Fund may be used to fund a portion of road improvements through the Capital Improvement Plan, either as direct allocations, or as annual lease payments on Certificates of Participation. Fiscal revenue from development on surplus parcels could help augment the General Fund, especially if a hotel or specialty retail is developed, to enable the City to use General Fund monies for some of the road realignment and other public facility costs.

CONCLUSION

Both the SANDAG representative and the CalTrans Local Assistance Program representative noted that most road or highway realignments are done to facilitate development. Policymakers are aware of this and generally design funding programs in a way that encourages the private sector to pay for as much of the project costs as possible. Programs are also designed to encourage municipalities to utilize funds from their share of the gas tax, TransNet, and even the General Fund and Community Development Block Grants before turning to State and Federal funds. Finally, due to the limited funds available, all funding sources give priority to projects of a regional significance over those of local importance.

APPENDIX**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1.A.1 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 1, Land Use Scenario A; Proforma Cash Flow – Preliminary Residual Land Value

Table 1.A.2 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 1, Land Use Scenario A; Fiscal Revenues

Table 1.A.3, 4, 5 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 1, Parcel 4, Land Use Scenario A; RV Operating Statement

Table 2.A.1 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 2, Land Use Scenario A; Proforma Cash Flow – Preliminary Residual Land Value

Table 2.A.2 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Fiscal Revenues

Table 2.A.3, 4, 5 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

Table 2.A.6 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Time Share

Table 3.A.1 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Land Use Scenario A; Proforma Cash Flow – Preliminary Residual Land Value

Table 3.A.2 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Land Use Scenario A; Fiscal Revenues

Table 3.A.3, 4 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Retail/Commercial Operating Statement

Table 3.A.5, 6 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Office Operating Statement

Table 3.A.7 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 2, Land Use Scenario A; Time Share

Table 3.A.8, 9, 10 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 3, Land Use Scenario A; Full Service Hotel



Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.11 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 6A, Land Use Scenario A; Time Share

Table 3.A.12, 13 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 6B, Land Use Scenario A; Office Operating Statement

Table 4.A.1 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 3, Parcel 6B, Land Use Scenario A; Proforma Cash Flow – Preliminary Residual Land Value

Table 4.A.2 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Fiscal Revenues

Table 4.A.3, 4, 5 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

Table 4.A.6, 7 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Retail/Commercial Operating Statement

Table 4.A.8 Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment – Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A; Time Share

Table 1.A.1

02-Oct-01

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Land Use Scenario A
PROFORMA CASH FLOW - PRELIMINARY RESIDUAL LAND VALUE
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| | Yr. 2001 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | Value | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS**Net Sources of Funds By Land Use**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| RV - Concessionaire | - | (0.79) | (0.82) | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 5.40 |
| Sub-total | \$ - | \$ (0.79) | \$ (0.82) | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 5.40 |
| Net Cash Flow After Developer Costs | \$ - | \$ (0.8) | \$ (0.8) | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.4 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 0.5 | \$ 5.4 |

Net Present Value After Developer Costs

| | | |
|---------------------|-------|----------------------------------|
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$1.20 million, Yr. 2003 dollars |
|---------------------|-------|----------------------------------|

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 1.A.2
CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Land Use Scenario A
FISCAL REVENUES

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| PROPERTY TAXES | | <i>Expressed In Millions of US Dollars</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Uses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RV | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| City's Share | 4.75% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| RDA's Non-housing Share | 60.00% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 |
| TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES | | <i>Expressed In Millions of US Dollars</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Service Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Transient Occupancy Tax @ | 10.00% of Room Revenue | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Gross Fiscal Operating Income From TOT & TI | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 |
| SALES TAX REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage & 50% of Other Hotel Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| TOTAL FISCAL REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total Fiscal Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL REVENUE | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 |
| Reversion @ | 7% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.47 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.50 |
| NET CASH FLOW | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.50 |
| Net Present Value @ 10% | | \$0.23 million Yr. 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 1.A.3

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Parcel 4, Land Use Scenario A
RV Concessionaire Operating Statement

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Number of RV Spaces | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | |
| Total Potential Number of nights | | - | - | - | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 55.0% | 60.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | |
| Avg. Daily RV Rate /1 | \$ 40 | 42 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 49 | 51 | 52 | 54 | 55 | 57 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 64 | |
| Number of Primitive Spaces | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | |
| Total Potential Number of nights | | - | - | - | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | 18,250 | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | 55.0% | |
| Avg. Daily RV Rate /1 | \$ 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Space Rental Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.83 | \$ 0.86 | \$ 0.88 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 0.93 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 0.99 | \$ 1.02 | \$ 1.05 | \$ 1.08 | |
| As % of Room Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage | 20% | - | - | - | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | |
| Other Revenues | 30% | - | - | - | 0.20 | 0.23 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.33 | |
| Subtotal (Non-Room Revenues) | 50% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 0.54 | |
| Gross Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.02 | \$ 1.14 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 1.28 | \$ 1.32 | \$ 1.36 | \$ 1.40 | \$ 1.44 | \$ 1.49 | \$ 1.53 | \$ 1.58 | \$ 1.63 | |
| Departmental Costs & Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | As % of Departmental Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spaces | 25% | - | - | - | 0.17 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Food & Beverage | 75% | - | - | - | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.16 | |
| Other Departments | 50% | - | - | - | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.16 | |
| Total Departmental Expenses (% of Gross Revenues) | 37% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 0.55 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.60 | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | 63% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.79 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.84 | \$ 0.86 | \$ 0.89 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 0.94 | \$ 0.97 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.03 | |

Notes:

/1 Rate, after discounts, per occupied room.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table I.A.4

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Parcel 4, Land Use Scenario A
RV Operating Statement**

| | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | - | - | - | - | - | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.91 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.03 | |
| Undistributed Operating Expenses | As % of Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 5.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 |
| Management Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Sales & Marketing | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| Energy Costs | 6.0% | - | - | - | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 |
| Repairs & Maintenance | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.07 |
| Total | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.27 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 |
| Gross Operating Profit | 41.3% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 0.55 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.67 |
| Fixed Expenses & Capital Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes (based on 1% of prior year capitalized value) | formula | - | - | - | - | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| Incentive Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Insurance | 1.0% | - | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Capital Reserve | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Total | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.12 |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | - | - | - | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 0.55 |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table I.A.5

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 1, Parcel 4, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)
RV Operating Statement**

| | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | - | - | - | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 0.55 |
| Reversion @ 11.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.00 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.15 |
| Net Sales Proceeds | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.85 |
| Total Sources of Funds | - | - | - | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.50 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.53 | \$ 5.40 |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Number of Spaces | 95 | 48 | 48 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Development Costs - Annual % | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Development Costs per space /1 | \$ 15,263 | 0.79 | 0.82 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Development Costs | \$ - | \$ 0.79 | \$ 0.82 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - | (0.79) | (0.82) | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 5.40 |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | - | (0.79) | (1.61) | (1.24) | (0.86) | (0.44) | (0.01) | 0.44 | 0.90 | 1.37 | 1.85 | 2.36 | 2.87 | 3.41 | 8.80 |
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$1.20 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 New development costs include direct costs, off-site & on-site costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

/2 Included in development cost per space

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.1

02-Oct-01

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Land Use Scenario A
PROFORMA CASH FLOW - PRELIMINARY RESIDUAL LAND VALUE
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| | Yr. 2001 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | Value | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS**Net Sources of Funds By Land Use**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Executive Mtg. Hotel Net Cash Flow | - | (11.06) | (11.40) | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.11 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.41 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 41.24 |
| Time Share | - | - | (11.54) | 9.24 | (2.72) | 9.81 | 10.10 | 10.40 | 1.07 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-total | \$ - | \$ (11.06) | \$ (22.93) | \$ 12.06 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 12.74 | \$ 13.12 | \$ 13.52 | \$ 4.28 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.41 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 41.24 |

Net Cash Flow After Developer Costs

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| \$ - | \$ (11.1) | \$ (22.9) | \$ 12.1 | \$ 0.1 | \$ 12.7 | \$ 13.1 | \$ 13.5 | \$ 4.3 | \$ 3.3 | \$ 3.4 | \$ 3.5 | \$ 3.6 | \$ 3.7 | \$ 41.2 |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|

Net Present Value After Developer Costs

| | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$9.78 million US dollars |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.2

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
FISCAL REVENUES**

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| PROPERTY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Uses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Executive Mtg. Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.34 |
| Time Share | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.67 | \$ 0.68 |
| Total Property Tax Increment | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 0.93 | \$ 0.95 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 0.98 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.02 |
| City's Share | 4.75% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.05 |
| RDA's Non-housing Share | 60.00% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.54 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.57 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.61 |
| TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Executive Mtg. Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.57 | \$ 6.18 | \$ 6.36 | \$ 6.55 | \$ 6.75 | \$ 6.95 | \$ 7.16 | \$ 7.38 | \$ 7.60 | \$ 7.83 | \$ 8.06 | \$ 8.30 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax @ | 10.00% of Room Revenue | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.83 |
| Gross Fiscal Operating Income From TOT & TI | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 1.06 | \$ 1.17 | \$ 1.28 | \$ 1.32 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.38 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.49 |
| SALES TAX REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage & 50% of Other Hotel Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| Total Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| TOTAL FISCAL REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.66 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.83 |
| Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| Total Fiscal Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.10 | \$ 1.20 | \$ 1.31 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.39 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.50 | \$ 1.54 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL OPERATING INCOME | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.10 | \$ 1.20 | \$ 1.31 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.39 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.50 | \$ 1.54 |
| Reversion @ | 7% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 23.64 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.10 | \$ 1.20 | \$ 1.31 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.39 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.50 | \$ 25.18 |
| NET CASH FLOW | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.10 | \$ 1.20 | \$ 1.31 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.39 | \$ 1.42 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.50 | \$ 25.18 |
| Net Present Value @ | 10% | \$11.51 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.3

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hotel - Exec. Conf. Ctr. Number of Rooms | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| Total Potential Number of Room nights | | - | - | - | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 65.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% |
| Avg. Daily Rm. Rate Hotel 2 /1 | \$ 135 | 143 | 148 | 152 | 157 | 161 | 166 | 171 | 176 | 181 | 187 | 192 | 198 | 204 | 210 | 217 |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | |
| Room Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.57 | \$ 6.18 | \$ 6.36 | \$ 6.55 | \$ 6.75 | \$ 6.95 | \$ 7.16 | \$ 7.38 | \$ 7.60 | \$ 7.83 | \$ 8.06 | \$ 8.30 |
| As % of Room Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage | 45% | - | - | - | 2.51 | 2.78 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.04 | 3.13 | 3.22 | 3.32 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 |
| Other Revenues | 15% | - | - | - | 0.84 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.07 | 1.11 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.25 |
| Subtotal (Non-Room Revenues) | 60% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.34 | \$ 3.71 | \$ 3.82 | \$ 3.93 | \$ 4.05 | \$ 4.17 | \$ 4.30 | \$ 4.43 | \$ 4.56 | \$ 4.70 | \$ 4.84 | \$ 4.98 |
| Gross Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8.91 | \$ 9.88 | \$ 10.18 | \$ 10.49 | \$ 10.80 | \$ 11.13 | \$ 11.46 | \$ 11.80 | \$ 12.16 | \$ 12.52 | \$ 12.90 | \$ 13.28 |
| Departmental Costs & Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | As % of Departmental Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rooms | 25% | - | - | - | 1.39 | 1.54 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.79 | 1.84 | 1.90 | 1.96 | 2.02 | 2.08 |
| Food & Beverage | 75% | - | - | - | 1.88 | 2.09 | 2.15 | 2.21 | 2.28 | 2.35 | 2.42 | 2.49 | 2.56 | 2.64 | 2.72 | 2.80 |
| Other Departments | 50% | - | - | - | 0.42 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.62 |
| Total Departmental Expenses (% of Gross Revenues) | 41% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.69 | \$ 4.09 | \$ 4.22 | \$ 4.34 | \$ 4.47 | \$ 4.61 | \$ 4.74 | \$ 4.89 | \$ 5.03 | \$ 5.18 | \$ 5.34 | \$ 5.50 |
| Gross Operating Revenues | 59% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.22 | \$ 5.79 | \$ 5.97 | \$ 6.14 | \$ 6.33 | \$ 6.52 | \$ 6.71 | \$ 6.92 | \$ 7.12 | \$ 7.34 | \$ 7.56 | \$ 7.78 |

Notes:

/1 Rate, after discounts, per occupied room.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.4

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| | <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | | - | - | - | - | - | 5.97 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.71 | 6.92 | 7.12 | 7.34 | 7.56 | 7.78 | |
| Undistributed Operating Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 5.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.54 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.57 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | |
| Management Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Sales & Marketing | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.56 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.66 | |
| Energy Costs | 6.0% | - | - | - | 0.53 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.65 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.73 | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.80 | |
| Repairs & Maintenance | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.36 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | |
| Total | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.17 | \$ 2.24 | \$ 2.31 | \$ 2.38 | \$ 2.45 | \$ 2.52 | \$ 2.60 | \$ 2.67 | \$ 2.75 | \$ 2.84 | \$ 2.92 | |
| Gross Operating Profit | 36.6% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.26 | \$ 3.62 | \$ 3.73 | \$ 3.84 | \$ 3.95 | \$ 4.07 | \$ 4.19 | \$ 4.32 | \$ 4.45 | \$ 4.58 | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 | |
| Fixed Expenses & Capital Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes | formula | - | - | - | - | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.34 | 0.34 | |
| Incentive Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Insurance | 1.0% | - | - | - | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | |
| Capital Reserve | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Total | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.45 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.82 | \$ 0.84 | \$ 0.86 | \$ 0.88 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 0.93 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 0.98 | \$ 1.01 | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.11 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.41 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 3.85 | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.5

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)**
Hotel Operating Statement

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Sources of Funds | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | \$ 3.11 | \$ 3.21 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.41 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 3.85 |
| Reversion @ 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 38.54 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.16 |
| Net Sales Proceeds | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 37.38 |
| Total Sources of Funds | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | \$ 3.11 | \$ 3.21 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.41 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 41.24 |
| Development Costs | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | 75 | 75 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Development Costs - Annual % | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Development Costs per room - Hotel /1 | \$ 135,000 | 11.06 | 11.40 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Development Costs | \$ - | \$ 11.06 | \$ 11.40 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | - | (11.06) | (11.40) | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.11 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.41 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 41.24 |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | - | (11.06) | (22.46) | (19.64) | (16.80) | (13.87) | (10.85) | (7.74) | (4.53) | (1.22) | 2.19 | 5.71 | 9.34 | 13.07 | 54.31 |
| Net Present Value @ 14.0% | \$1.02 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 New development costs include direct costs, off-site & on-site costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

/2 Included in development cost per room

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 2.A.6

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 2, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A

Time Share

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Time Share (Number of Rooms) | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Available | | - | - | - | 2,550 | 2,550 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Sold Per Year | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Cumulative Intervals Sold | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 2,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | 5,100 | |
| Interval Sales Price | \$ 18,500 | \$ 19,627 | \$ 20,215 | \$ 20,822 | \$ 21,447 | \$ 22,090 | \$ 22,753 | \$ 23,435 | \$ 24,138 | \$ 24,862 | \$ 25,608 | \$ 26,377 | \$ 27,168 | \$ 27,983 | \$ 28,822 | \$ 29,687 | |
| Sales Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Annual Sales Volume | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 22.75 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 2.49 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Sales Volume | - | - | - | 21.45 | 43.54 | 66.29 | 89.72 | 113.86 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | 116.35 | |
| Cost of Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Per Room | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product Cost (excluding land cost) /1 | \$ 205,000 | - | - | 11.54 | - | 12.24 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Gross Profit Before Land Costs | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (11.54) | \$ 21.45 | \$ 9.85 | \$ 22.75 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 2.49 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Profit Before Land Costs | - | - | (11.54) | 9.91 | 19.76 | 42.51 | 65.95 | 90.09 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | 92.57 | |
| Costs & Expenses/2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Annual Gross Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commissions | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 | \$ 5.01 | \$ 5.16 | \$ 5.31 | \$ 0.55 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Marketing | 22.0% | - | - | - | 4.72 | 4.86 | 5.01 | 5.16 | 5.31 | 0.55 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Sales Overhead | 5.0% | - | - | - | 1.07 | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 0.12 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Administration | 7.0% | - | - | - | 1.50 | 1.55 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 0.17 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Acct./Legal/Counseling | 0.5% | - | - | - | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Depreciation | 0.3% | - | - | - | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Other | 0.1% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Total Cost & Expenses (% of Annual Gross Sales) | 56.9% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 12.20 | \$ 12.57 | \$ 12.95 | \$ 13.33 | \$ 13.73 | \$ 1.41 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (11.54) | \$ 9.24 | \$ (2.72) | \$ 9.81 | \$ 10.10 | \$ 10.40 | \$ 1.07 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (11.54) | \$ (2.29) | \$ (5.01) | \$ 4.80 | \$ 14.90 | \$ 25.30 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 26.37 | |
| Net Present Value @ | 15.0% | \$8.09 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 Development costs include allocated share of onsite/offsite costs.

/2 Selling and marketing expenses only. Operating expenses are covered 100% by annual fees.

Source: RCI Consulting, Inc.; and Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.1

02-Oct-01

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Land Use Scenario A
PROFORMA CASH FLOW - PRELIMINARY RESIDUAL LAND VALUE
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| | Yr. 2001 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | Value | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS**Net Sources of Funds By Land Use**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Commercial Retail Cash Flow | - | (2.95) | (3.04) | 1.74 | 2.13 | 2.20 | 2.26 | 2.33 | 2.40 | 2.47 | 2.55 | 2.62 | 2.70 | 2.78 | 30.38 |
| Office 1 | - | - | (9.90) | 1.59 | 1.84 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 2.13 | 2.19 | 2.25 | 2.32 | 2.39 | 2.46 | 2.54 | 27.97 |
| Time Share | - | - | (17.30) | 9.24 | 9.52 | (9.10) | 10.10 | 10.40 | 10.72 | 11.04 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Full Service Hotel | - | (20.49) | (21.10) | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.72 | 6.93 | 7.15 | 7.37 | 81.27 |
| Time Share 6A | - | - | (6.92) | 6.93 | 7.43 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office 6B | - | - | (1.71) | 0.30 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 5.24 |
| Sub-total | \$ - | \$ (23.44) | \$ (59.99) | \$ 25.36 | \$ 26.89 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 20.77 | \$ 21.39 | \$ 22.04 | \$ 22.71 | \$ 12.03 | \$ 12.40 | \$ 12.77 | \$ 13.16 | \$ 144.86 |

Net Cash Flow After Developer Costs

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| \$ - | \$ (23.4) | \$ (60.0) | \$ 25.4 | \$ 26.9 | \$ 1.2 | \$ 20.8 | \$ 21.4 | \$ 22.0 | \$ 22.7 | \$ 12.0 | \$ 12.4 | \$ 12.8 | \$ 13.2 | \$ 144.9 |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|

Net Present Value After Developer Costs

| | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$29.87 million 2003 dollars |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|

Table 3.A.2

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Land Use Scenario A

FISCAL REVENUES

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| PROPERTY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Uses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.20 | \$ 0.21 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.24 | \$ 0.24 | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.25 |
| Office 1 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.18 | \$ 0.19 | \$ 0.20 | \$ 0.20 | \$ 0.21 | \$ 0.21 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.23 |
| Time Share 2 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.73 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.89 | \$ 0.91 | \$ 0.92 | \$ 0.94 |
| Full-Service Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.55 | \$ 0.57 | \$ 0.58 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 |
| Time Share 6A | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 |
| Office 6B | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| Total Property Tax Increment | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.17 | \$ 1.32 | \$ 1.46 | \$ 1.60 | \$ 1.76 | \$ 1.92 | \$ 2.08 | \$ 2.12 | \$ 2.17 | \$ 2.21 | \$ 2.25 |
| City's Share | 4.75% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 |
| RDA's Non-housing Share | 60.00% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.79 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 1.05 | \$ 1.15 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 1.27 | \$ 1.30 | \$ 1.33 | \$ 1.35 |
| TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Service Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 10.31 | \$ 11.44 | \$ 11.78 | \$ 12.14 | \$ 12.50 | \$ 12.88 | \$ 13.26 | \$ 13.66 | \$ 14.07 | \$ 14.49 | \$ 14.93 | \$ 15.38 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax @ | 10.00% of Room Revenue | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.03 | \$ 1.14 | \$ 1.18 | \$ 1.21 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 1.29 | \$ 1.33 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.41 | \$ 1.45 | \$ 1.49 | \$ 1.54 |
| Gross Fiscal Operating Income From TOT & TI | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.03 | \$ 1.90 | \$ 2.03 | \$ 2.16 | \$ 2.29 | \$ 2.42 | \$ 2.57 | \$ 2.71 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.85 | \$ 2.92 | \$ 3.00 |
| SALES TAX REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail Commercial | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 |
| Food & Beverage & 50% of Other Hotel Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 |
| Total Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 |
| TOTAL FISCAL REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.85 | \$ 0.94 | \$ 1.04 | \$ 1.14 | \$ 1.24 | \$ 1.35 | \$ 1.38 | \$ 1.40 | \$ 1.43 | \$ 1.46 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.03 | \$ 1.14 | \$ 1.18 | \$ 1.21 | \$ 1.25 | \$ 1.29 | \$ 1.33 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.41 | \$ 1.45 | \$ 1.49 | \$ 1.54 |
| Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 | \$ 0.49 |
| Total Fiscal Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.34 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.69 | \$ 2.83 | \$ 2.99 | \$ 3.15 | \$ 3.23 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.40 | \$ 3.49 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL REVENUE | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.34 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.69 | \$ 2.83 | \$ 2.99 | \$ 3.15 | \$ 3.23 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.40 | \$ 3.49 |
| Reversion @ | 7% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 53.62 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.34 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.69 | \$ 2.83 | \$ 2.99 | \$ 3.15 | \$ 3.23 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.40 | \$ 57.11 |
| NET CASH FLOW | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.34 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.69 | \$ 2.83 | \$ 2.99 | \$ 3.15 | \$ 3.23 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.40 | \$ 57.11 |
| Net Present Value @ | | \$26.25 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.3

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A

Retail/Commercial: Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Rental Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Cumulative Gross Leasable Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | 40,000 | - | - | - | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | |
| Restaurants | 40,000 | - | - | - | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | |
| Total | 80,000 | - | - | - | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | |
| Occupancy Rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | |
| Restaurants | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | |
| Average NNN Base Rent Per s.f. Per Yr/1 | US\$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | \$ | 20.00 | 21.22 | 21.85 | 22.51 | 23.19 | 23.88 | 24.60 | 25.34 | 26.10 | 26.88 | 27.68 | 28.52 | 29.37 | 30.25 | 31.16 | 32.09 |
| Restaurants | \$ | 30.00 | 31.83 | 32.78 | 33.77 | 34.78 | 35.82 | 36.90 | 38.00 | 39.14 | 40.32 | 41.53 | 42.77 | 44.06 | 45.38 | 46.74 | 48.14 |
| Average Gross Sales Per Square Foot Per Year | US\$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | \$ | 250.00 | 265 | 273 | 281 | 290 | 299 | 307 | 317 | 326 | 336 | 346 | 356 | 367 | 378 | 389 | 401 |
| Restaurants | \$ | 375.00 | 398 | 410 | 422 | 435 | 448 | 461 | 475 | 489 | 504 | 519 | 535 | 551 | 567 | 584 | 602 |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Rent Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.85 | \$ 2.27 | \$ 2.34 | \$ 2.41 | \$ 2.48 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.63 | \$ 2.71 | \$ 2.79 | \$ 2.87 | \$ 2.96 | \$ 3.05 | |
| Gross Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.85 | \$ 2.27 | \$ 2.34 | \$ 2.41 | \$ 2.48 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.63 | \$ 2.71 | \$ 2.79 | \$ 2.87 | \$ 2.96 | \$ 3.05 | |
| Operating Expenses | % of Rev. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 4.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.09 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.12 | |
| Sales & Marketing | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | |
| Total | 6.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.17 | \$ 0.17 | \$ 0.18 | \$ 0.18 | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.74 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.33 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.87 | |

Notes:

/1 Triple-net rent where tenant pays for pro-rata share of common area charges, insurance, property taxes, and utilities in addition to base rent. No rent for tenant improvements; tenants pay for improvements.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.4

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Retail/Commercial: Operating Statement

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.74 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.33 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.87 |
| Reversion @ 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$28.66 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ 4.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ 1.15 |
| Net Sale Proceeds | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$27.51 |
| Total Sources of Funds | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.74 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.33 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$30.38 |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gross Leasable Area (s.f.) | 80,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Inflation Assumptions | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Commercial Retail | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Restaurants | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| New Development Costs/2 | \$ - | \$ 2.95 | \$ 3.04 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Total Development Costs | - | 2.95 | 3.04 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | - | (2.95) | (3.04) | 1.74 | 2.13 | 2.20 | 2.26 | 2.33 | 2.40 | 2.47 | 2.55 | 2.62 | 2.70 | 2.78 | 30.38 |
| CUMULATIVE CASH FLOW | - | (2.95) | (5.99) | (4.25) | (2.11) | 0.08 | 2.35 | 4.68 | 7.08 | 9.55 | 12.10 | 14.72 | 17.42 | 20.20 | 50.58 |

Residual Land Value = Net Present Value @ 14.0% \$8.28 million 2003 dollars

Notes:

/1 New development costs, include direct costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.5

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Office Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| | Yr. 2001 Value | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | | |
| Rental Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Office | New | 80,000 | - | - | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | | |
| Total GLA | | 80,000 | - | - | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 90% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | | |
| Occupied Space | | | - | - | 64,000 | 72,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | | |
| Average NNN Rent Per s.f. Per Year | \$ | 22.80 | \$ 24.19 | \$ 24.91 | \$ 25.66 | \$ 26.43 | \$ 27.22 | \$ 28.04 | \$ 28.88 | \$ 29.75 | \$ 30.64 | \$ 31.56 | \$ 32.51 | \$ 33.48 | \$ 34.49 | \$ 35.52 | \$ 36.59 | |
| | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Gross Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.69 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.33 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | | |
| Operating Expenses | % of Rev. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.11 | | |
| Sales & Marketing | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | | |
| Total | 6.0% | \$ - | - | - | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.14 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.17 | | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.84 | \$ 2.00 | \$ 2.06 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.19 | \$ 2.25 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.39 | \$ 2.46 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.61 | | |

Notes:

/1 Triple-net rent where tenant pays for pro-rata share of common area charges, insurance, property taxes, and utilities in addition to base rent. No rent for tenant improvements; tenants pay for improvements.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.6

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)**

Office Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Sources of Funds | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.84 | \$ 2.00 | \$ 2.06 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.19 | \$ 2.25 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.39 | \$ 2.46 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 2.61 |
| Reversion @ | 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 26.14 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ | 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.78 |
| Net Sale Proceeds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 25.35 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.84 | \$ 2.00 | \$ 2.06 | \$ 2.13 | \$ 2.19 | \$ 2.25 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.39 | \$ 2.46 | \$ 2.54 | \$ 27.97 |
| Development Costs | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Gross Leasable Area | New | 80,000 | - | - | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 |
| Development Costs Annual % | New | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Development Costs | \$ 110.00 | per sf | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 9.90 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Total Development Costs | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 9.90 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | | - | - | (9.90) | 1.59 | 1.84 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 2.13 | 2.19 | 2.25 | 2.32 | 2.39 | 2.46 | 2.54 | 27.97 |
| CUMULATIVE CASH FLOW | | - | - | (9.90) | (8.31) | (6.47) | (4.47) | (2.41) | (0.28) | 1.91 | 4.16 | 6.49 | 8.88 | 11.34 | 13.88 | 41.85 |

Residual Land Value= Net Present Value @ 14.0% \$4.79 million 2003 dollars

Notes:

/1

New development include direct costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.7

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 2, Land Use Scenario A
Time Share

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Available | | - | - | - | 3,825 | 3,825 | 3,825 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Sold Per Year | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Cumulative Intervals Sold | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 2,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 6,000 | 7,000 | 650 | 650 | 650 | 650 | 650 | |
| Interval Sales Price | \$ 18,500 | \$ 19,627 | \$ 20,215 | \$ 20,822 | \$ 21,447 | \$ 22,090 | \$ 22,753 | \$ 23,435 | \$ 24,138 | \$ 24,862 | \$ 25,608 | \$ 26,377 | \$ 27,168 | \$ 27,983 | \$ 28,822 | \$ 29,687 | |
| Sales Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Annual Sales Volume | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 22.75 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 24.86 | \$ 25.61 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Sales Volume | - | - | - | 21.45 | 43.54 | 66.29 | 89.72 | 113.86 | 138.73 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | 164.33 | |
| Cost of Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Per Room | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product Cost (excluding land cost) /1 | \$ 205,000 | - | - | 17.30 | - | - | 18.91 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Gross Profit Before Land Costs | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 3.84 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 24.86 | \$ 25.61 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Profit Before Land Costs | - | - | (17.30) | 4.14 | 26.23 | 30.08 | 53.51 | 77.65 | 102.51 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | 128.12 | |
| Costs & Expenses/2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Annual Gross Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commissions | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 | \$ 5.01 | \$ 5.16 | \$ 5.31 | \$ 5.47 | \$ 5.63 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Marketing | 22.0% | - | - | - | 4.72 | 4.86 | 5.01 | 5.16 | 5.31 | 5.47 | 5.63 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Sales Overhead | 5.0% | - | - | - | 1.07 | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.24 | 1.28 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Administration | 7.0% | - | - | - | 1.50 | 1.55 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.79 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Aect./Legal/Consulting | 0.5% | - | - | - | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.13 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Depreciation | 0.3% | - | - | - | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Other | 0.1% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Total Cost & Expenses (% of Annual Gross Sales) | 56.9% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 12.20 | \$ 12.57 | \$ 12.95 | \$ 13.33 | \$ 13.73 | \$ 14.15 | \$ 14.57 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ 9.24 | \$ 9.52 | \$ (9.10) | \$ 10.10 | \$ 10.40 | \$ 10.72 | \$ 11.04 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ (8.06) | \$ 1.46 | \$ (7.64) | \$ 2.46 | \$ 12.86 | \$ 23.58 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 34.61 | |
| Net Present Value @ | 15.0% | \$7.68 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 Development costs include allocated share of onsite/offsite costs.

/2 Selling and marketing expenses only. Operating expenses are covered 100% by annual fees.

Source: RCI Consulting, Inc.; and Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.8

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 3, Land Use Scenario A
Full Service Hotel**

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| DPI: 1.5 (Hotel 2 - Exec. Conf. Ctr.) Number of Rooms | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | |
| Total Potential Number of Room nights | | - | - | - | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | 109,500 | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 65.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | |
| Avg. Daily Rm. Rate Hotel 2 /1 | \$ 125 | 133 | 137 | 141 | 145 | 149 | 154 | 158 | 163 | 168 | 173 | 178 | 184 | 189 | 195 | 201 | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Room Revenues | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 10.31 | \$ 11.44 | \$ 11.78 | \$ 12.14 | \$ 12.50 | \$ 12.88 | \$ 13.26 | \$ 13.66 | \$ 14.07 | \$ 14.49 | \$ 14.93 | \$ 15.38 | |
| | As % of Room Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage | 55% | - | - | - | 5.67 | 6.29 | 6.48 | 6.68 | 6.88 | 7.08 | 7.29 | 7.51 | 7.74 | 7.97 | 8.21 | 8.46 | |
| Other Revenues | 30% | - | - | - | 3.09 | 3.43 | 3.54 | 3.64 | 3.75 | 3.86 | 3.98 | 4.10 | 4.22 | 4.35 | 4.48 | 4.61 | |
| Subtotal (Non-Room Revenues) | 85% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8.77 | \$ 9.72 | \$ 10.02 | \$ 10.32 | \$ 10.63 | \$ 10.94 | \$ 11.27 | \$ 11.61 | \$ 11.96 | \$ 12.32 | \$ 12.69 | \$ 13.07 | |
| Gross Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 19.08 | \$ 21.16 | \$ 21.80 | \$ 22.45 | \$ 23.13 | \$ 23.82 | \$ 24.54 | \$ 25.27 | \$ 26.03 | \$ 26.81 | \$ 27.62 | \$ 28.44 | |
| Departmental Costs & Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | As % of Departmental Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rooms | 25% | - | - | - | 2.58 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.03 | 3.13 | 3.22 | 3.32 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.62 | 3.73 | 3.84 | |
| Food & Beverage | 75% | - | - | - | 4.25 | 4.72 | 4.86 | 5.01 | 5.16 | 5.31 | 5.47 | 5.63 | 5.80 | 5.98 | 6.16 | 6.34 | |
| Other Departments | 50% | - | - | - | 1.55 | 1.72 | 1.77 | 1.82 | 1.88 | 1.93 | 1.99 | 2.05 | 2.11 | 2.17 | 2.24 | 2.31 | |
| Total Departmental Expenses (% of Gross Revenues) | 44% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8.38 | \$ 9.30 | \$ 9.57 | \$ 9.86 | \$ 10.16 | \$ 10.46 | \$ 10.78 | \$ 11.10 | \$ 11.43 | \$ 11.78 | \$ 12.13 | \$ 12.49 | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | 56% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 10.70 | \$ 11.87 | \$ 12.23 | \$ 12.59 | \$ 12.97 | \$ 13.36 | \$ 13.76 | \$ 14.17 | \$ 14.60 | \$ 15.04 | \$ 15.49 | \$ 15.95 | |

Notes:

/1 Rate, after discounts, per occupied room.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.9

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 3, Land Use Scenario A
Full Service Hotel

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | - | - | - | - | - | 12.23 | 12.59 | 12.97 | 13.36 | 13.76 | 14.17 | 14.60 | 15.04 | 15.49 | 15.95 | |
| Undistributed Operating Expenses | As % of Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 5.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.95 | \$ 1.06 | \$ 1.09 | \$ 1.12 | \$ 1.16 | \$ 1.19 | \$ 1.23 | \$ 1.26 | \$ 1.30 | \$ 1.34 | \$ 1.38 | \$ 1.42 |
| Management Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 |
| Sales & Marketing | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.95 | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.12 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.26 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.42 |
| Energy Costs | 6.0% | - | - | - | 1.14 | 1.27 | 1.31 | 1.35 | 1.39 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.52 | 1.56 | 1.61 | 1.66 | 1.71 |
| Repairs & Maintenance | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.76 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.07 | 1.10 | 1.14 |
| Total | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.20 | \$ 4.66 | \$ 4.80 | \$ 4.94 | \$ 5.09 | \$ 5.24 | \$ 5.40 | \$ 5.56 | \$ 5.73 | \$ 5.90 | \$ 6.08 | \$ 6.26 |
| Gross Operating Profit | 34.1% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 6.50 | \$ 7.21 | \$ 7.43 | \$ 7.65 | \$ 7.88 | \$ 8.12 | \$ 8.36 | \$ 8.61 | \$ 8.87 | \$ 9.14 | \$ 9.41 | \$ 9.69 |
| Fixed Expenses & Capital Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes (based on 1% of prior year capitalized value) | formula | - | - | - | - | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.61 | 0.62 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 0.68 |
| Incentive Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 |
| Insurance | 1.0% | - | - | - | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Capital Reserve | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 |
| Total | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.95 | 1.61 | 1.66 | 1.70 | \$ 1.75 | \$ 1.79 | \$ 1.84 | \$ 1.89 | \$ 1.94 | \$ 1.99 | \$ 2.04 | \$ 2.10 |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | - | - | - | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.72 | 6.93 | 7.15 | 7.37 | 7.60 |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.10

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 3, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)**
Full Service Hotel

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--|
| Yr. 2001 Value | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | - | - | - | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | \$ 6.14 | \$ 6.33 | \$ 6.52 | \$ 6.72 | \$ 6.93 | \$ 7.15 | \$ 7.37 | \$ 7.60 | |
| Reversion @ | 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75.95 | |
| Less Cost of Sales @ | 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.28 | |
| Net Sales Proceeds | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 73.68 | |
| Total Sources of Funds | - | - | - | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | \$ 6.14 | \$ 6.33 | \$ 6.52 | \$ 6.72 | \$ 6.93 | \$ 7.15 | \$ 7.37 | \$ 81.27 | |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Number of Rooms | 300 | 150 | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Development Costs - Annual % | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| Development Costs per room - Hotel /1 | \$ 125,000 | 20.49 | 21.10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Total Development Costs | \$ - | \$ 20.49 | \$ 21.10 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | - | (20.49) | (21.10) | 5.55 | 5.60 | 5.77 | 5.95 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.72 | 6.93 | 7.15 | 7.37 | 81.27 | |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | - | (20.49) | (41.59) | (36.04) | (30.44) | (24.67) | (18.72) | (12.58) | (6.25) | 0.27 | 6.99 | 13.93 | 21.07 | 28.44 | 109.71 | |
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$3.94 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 New development costs include direct costs, off-site & on-site costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

/2 Included in development cost per room

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.11

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 6A, Land Use Scenario A
Time Share**

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 | |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Time Share Rooms | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Available | | - | - | - | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | |
| Total Number of Intervals Sold Per Year | | - | - | - | 750 | 780 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Cumulative Intervals Sold | | - | - | - | 750 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | 1,530 | |
| Interval Sales Price | \$ 18,500 | \$ 19,627 | \$20,215 | \$20,822 | \$21,447 | \$22,090 | \$22,753 | \$23,435 | \$24,138 | \$24,862 | \$25,608 | \$26,377 | \$27,168 | \$27,983 | \$28,822 | \$ 29,687 | |
| Sales Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Annual Sales Volume | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 16.08 | \$ 17.23 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Sales Volume | - | - | - | 16.08 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | 33.32 | |
| Cost of Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Per Room | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product Cost (excluding land cost) /1 | \$ 205,000 | - | - | 6.92 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Gross Profit Before Land Costs | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (6.92) | \$ 16.08 | \$ 17.23 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Profit Before Land Costs | - | - | (6.92) | 9.16 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | 26.39 | |
| Costs & Expenses/2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Annual Gross Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commissions | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.54 | \$ 3.79 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Marketing | 22.0% | - | - | - | 3.54 | 3.79 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Sales Overhead | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.80 | 0.86 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Administration | 7.0% | - | - | - | 1.13 | 1.21 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Acct./Legal/Counseling | 0.5% | - | - | - | 0.08 | 0.09 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Depreciation | 0.3% | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Other | 0.1% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Total Cost & Expenses (% of Annual Gross Sales) | 56.9% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 9.15 | \$ 9.80 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (6.92) | \$ 6.93 | \$ 7.43 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (6.92) | \$ 0.01 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | \$ 7.44 | |
| Net Present Value @ | 15.0% | \$3.10 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 Development costs include allocated share of onsite/offsite costs.

/2 Selling and marketing expenses only. Operating expenses are covered 100% by annual fees.

Source: RCI Consulting, Inc.; and Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.12

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 6B, Land Use Scenario A
Office Operating Statement

| Yr. 2001 Value | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | | | |
| | Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | | |
| | Rental Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| | Office | New | 15,000 | - | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | | |
| | Total GLA | | 15,000 | - | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | | |
| | Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | - | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | | |
| | Occupied Space | | - | - | - | 12,000 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | 14,250 | | |
| | Average NNN Rent per s.f., Per Year | \$ | 22.80 | \$ 24.19 | \$ 24.91 | \$ 25.66 | \$ 26.43 | \$ 27.22 | \$ 28.04 | \$ 28.88 | \$ 29.75 | \$ 30.64 | \$ 31.56 | \$ 32.51 | \$ 33.48 | \$ 34.49 | \$ 35.52 | \$ 36.59 | |
| | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| | Gross Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.52 | | |
| | Operating Expenses | % of Rev. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Administrative & General | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | | |
| | Sales & Marketing | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | | |
| | Total | 6.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.02 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | | |
| | NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.49 | | |

Notes:

/1 Triple-net rent where tenant pays for pro-rata share of common area charges, insurance, property taxes, and utilities in addition to base rent. No rent for tenant improvements; tenants pay for improvements.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 3.A.13

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 3, Parcel 6B, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)
Office Operating Statement

| Yr. 2001 Value | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| | Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Net Operating Income | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Reversion @ | 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4.90 | |
| | Less Cost of Sales @ | 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.15 | |
| | Net Sale Proceeds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.75 | |
| | Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 5.24 |
| | Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Inflation Assumptions | | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| | Gross Leasable Area | New | 15,000 | - | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| | Development Costs Annual % | New | - | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | New Development Costs | \$ 101.44 | per sf | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.71 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| | Total Development Costs | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.71 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| | NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | | - | - | (1.71) | 0.30 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 5.24 |
| | CUMULATIVE CASH FLOW | | - | - | (1.71) | (1.41) | (1.05) | (0.67) | (0.29) | 0.11 | 0.52 | 0.94 | 1.38 | 1.83 | 2.29 | 2.77 | 8.01 |
| | Residual Land Value= Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$1.01 | million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1

New development costs include direct costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.1

02-Oct-01

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
PROFORMA CASH FLOW - PRELIMINARY RESIDUAL LAND VALUE
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| | Yr. 2001 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | Value | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

Net Sources of Funds By Land Use

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|------------|------------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Executive Mtg. Hotel Net Cash Flow | - | (11.06) | (11.40) | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.12 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 41.27 |
| Commercial Retail Cash Flow | - | (3.32) | (3.42) | 1.96 | 2.40 | 2.47 | 2.55 | 2.62 | 2.70 | 2.78 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.04 | 3.13 | 34.18 |
| Time Share | - | - | (17.30) | 9.24 | 9.52 | (9.10) | 10.10 | 10.40 | 10.72 | 11.04 | 7.39 | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-total | \$ - | \$ (14.38) | \$ (32.12) | \$ 14.02 | \$ 14.76 | \$ (3.70) | \$ 15.67 | \$ 16.14 | \$ 16.63 | \$ 17.13 | \$ 13.67 | \$ 6.47 | \$ 6.67 | \$ 6.87 | \$ 75.45 |

Net Cash Flow After Developer Costs

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| \$ - | \$ (14.4) | \$ (32.1) | \$ 14.0 | \$ 14.8 | \$ (3.7) | \$ 15.7 | \$ 16.1 | \$ 16.6 | \$ 17.1 | \$ 13.7 | \$ 6.5 | \$ 6.7 | \$ 6.9 | \$ 75.5 |
|------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|

Net Present Value After Developer Costs

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Net Present Value @ | 14.0% | \$20.65 | million 2003 dollars |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------------|

Table 4.A.2

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
FISCAL REVENUES**

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| PROPERTY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Uses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Executive Mtg. Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.30 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.31 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 |
| Commercial Retail | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.23 | \$ 0.24 | \$ 0.24 | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.25 | \$ 0.26 | \$ 0.26 | \$ 0.27 | \$ 0.27 | \$ 0.28 | \$ 0.28 |
| Time Share | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.22 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.73 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.97 | \$ 0.99 | \$ 1.01 | \$ 1.03 |
| Total Property Tax Increment | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.15 | \$ 1.29 | \$ 1.45 | \$ 1.56 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.62 | \$ 1.66 |
| City's Share | 4.75% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.05 | \$ 0.06 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.07 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.08 |
| RDA's Non-housing Share | 60.00% of Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.44 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.60 | \$ 0.69 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.87 | \$ 0.94 | \$ 0.96 | \$ 0.97 | \$ 0.99 |
| TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAXES | | Expressed In Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Executive Mtg. Hotel | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.57 | \$ 6.18 | \$ 6.36 | \$ 6.55 | \$ 6.75 | \$ 6.95 | \$ 7.16 | \$ 7.38 | \$ 7.60 | \$ 7.83 | \$ 8.06 | \$ 8.30 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax @ | 10.00% of Room Revenue | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.83 |
| Gross Fiscal Operating Income From TOT & TI | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 1.02 | \$ 1.12 | \$ 1.22 | \$ 1.33 | \$ 1.44 | \$ 1.55 | \$ 1.67 | \$ 1.77 | \$ 1.81 | \$ 1.86 | \$ 1.90 |
| SALES TAX REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Retail Commercial | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.26 | \$ 0.32 | \$ 0.33 | \$ 0.34 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.39 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 |
| Food & Beverage & 50% of Other Hotel Revenues | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.03 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 | \$ 0.04 |
| Total Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 |
| TOTAL FISCAL REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.65 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.84 | \$ 0.94 | \$ 1.01 | \$ 1.03 | \$ 1.05 | \$ 1.07 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | \$ 0.68 | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.72 | \$ 0.74 | \$ 0.76 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.81 | \$ 0.83 |
| Sales Tax Revenue | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.29 | \$ 0.35 | \$ 0.36 | \$ 0.37 | \$ 0.38 | \$ 0.40 | \$ 0.41 | \$ 0.42 | \$ 0.43 | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.46 | \$ 0.47 |
| Total Fiscal Revenue Available for Fiscal Operating Costs | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.85 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.48 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.83 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.09 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.38 |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FISCAL OPERATING INCOME | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.85 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.48 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.83 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.09 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 2.38 |
| Reversion @ | 7% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 36.54 |
| Total Sources of Funds | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.85 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.48 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.83 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.09 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 38.92 |
| NET CASH FLOW | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.85 | \$ 1.37 | \$ 1.48 | \$ 1.59 | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.83 | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.09 | \$ 2.20 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.32 | \$ 38.92 |
| Net Present Value @ | 10% | \$17.43 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.3

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| | Yr. 2001 Value | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Hotel Rooms | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | |
| Total Potential Number of Room nights | | - | - | - | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | 54,750 | |
| Average Annual Occupancy Rate | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 65.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | |
| Avg. Daily Rm. Rate Hotel 2 /1 | \$ 135 | 143 | 148 | 152 | 157 | 161 | 166 | 171 | 176 | 181 | 187 | 192 | 198 | 204 | 210 | 217 | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Room Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.57 | \$ 6.18 | \$ 6.36 | \$ 6.55 | \$ 6.75 | \$ 6.95 | \$ 7.16 | \$ 7.38 | \$ 7.60 | \$ 7.83 | \$ 8.06 | \$ 8.30 | |
| As % of Room Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food & Beverage | 45% | - | - | - | 2.51 | 2.78 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.04 | 3.13 | 3.22 | 3.32 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | |
| Other Revenues | 15% | - | - | - | 0.84 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.07 | 1.11 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.25 | |
| Subtotal (Non-Room Revenues) | 60% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.34 | \$ 3.71 | \$ 3.82 | \$ 3.93 | \$ 4.05 | \$ 4.17 | \$ 4.30 | \$ 4.43 | \$ 4.56 | \$ 4.70 | \$ 4.84 | \$ 4.98 | |
| Gross Revenues | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8.91 | \$ 9.88 | \$ 10.18 | \$ 10.49 | \$ 10.80 | \$ 11.13 | \$ 11.46 | \$ 11.80 | \$ 12.16 | \$ 12.52 | \$ 12.90 | \$ 13.28 | |
| Departmental Costs & Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | As % of Departmental Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rooms | 25% | - | - | - | 1.39 | 1.54 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.79 | 1.84 | 1.90 | 1.96 | 2.02 | 2.08 | |
| Food & Beverage | 75% | - | - | - | 1.88 | 2.09 | 2.15 | 2.21 | 2.28 | 2.35 | 2.42 | 2.49 | 2.56 | 2.64 | 2.72 | 2.80 | |
| Other Departments | 50% | - | - | - | 0.42 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.62 | |
| Total Departmental Expenses (% of Gross Revenues) | 41% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.69 | \$ 4.09 | \$ 4.22 | \$ 4.34 | \$ 4.47 | \$ 4.61 | \$ 4.74 | \$ 4.89 | \$ 5.03 | \$ 5.18 | \$ 5.34 | \$ 5.50 | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | 59% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5.22 | \$ 5.79 | \$ 5.97 | \$ 6.14 | \$ 6.33 | \$ 6.52 | \$ 6.71 | \$ 6.92 | \$ 7.12 | \$ 7.34 | \$ 7.56 | \$ 7.78 | |

Notes:

/1 Rate, after discounts, per occupied room.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.4

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Executive Meeting Hotel Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| | <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Gross Operating Revenues | | - | - | - | - | - | 5.97 | 6.14 | 6.33 | 6.52 | 6.71 | 6.92 | 7.12 | 7.34 | 7.56 | 7.78 | |
| Undistributed Operating Expenses | | As % of Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 5.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.45 | \$ 0.49 | \$ 0.51 | \$ 0.52 | \$ 0.54 | \$ 0.56 | \$ 0.57 | \$ 0.59 | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.64 | \$ 0.66 | |
| Management Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Sales & Marketing | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.56 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.66 | |
| Energy Costs | 6.0% | - | - | - | 0.53 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.65 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.73 | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.80 | |
| Repairs & Maintenance | 4.0% | - | - | - | 0.36 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.53 | |
| Total | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.17 | \$ 2.24 | \$ 2.31 | \$ 2.38 | \$ 2.45 | \$ 2.52 | \$ 2.60 | \$ 2.67 | \$ 2.75 | \$ 2.84 | \$ 2.92 | |
| Gross Operating Profit | 36.6% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3.26 | \$ 3.62 | \$ 3.73 | \$ 3.84 | \$ 3.95 | \$ 4.07 | \$ 4.19 | \$ 4.32 | \$ 4.45 | \$ 4.58 | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 | |
| Fixed Expenses & Capital Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Property Taxes | formula | - | - | - | - | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.34 | |
| Incentive Fee | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Insurance | 1.0% | - | - | - | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | |
| Capital Reserve | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 | |
| Total | 5.0% | - | - | - | 0.45 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.81 | \$ 0.84 | \$ 0.86 | \$ 0.88 | \$ 0.90 | \$ 0.93 | \$ 0.95 | \$ 0.98 | \$ 1.00 | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.12 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 3.86 | |

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.5

**CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
(BEFORE TAXES & FINANCING)**

Hotel Operating Statement

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>Yr. 2001 Value</u> | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Year 4</u> | <u>Year 5</u> | <u>Year 6</u> | <u>Year 7</u> | <u>Year 8</u> | <u>Year 9</u> | <u>Year 10</u> | <u>Year 11</u> | <u>Year 12</u> | <u>Year 13</u> | <u>Year 14</u> | <u>Year 15</u> |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | \$ 3.12 | \$ 3.21 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.42 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 3.86 |
| Reversion @ 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 38.57 |
| Less Cost of Sales @ 3.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.16 |
| Net Sales Proceeds | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 37.42 |
| Total Sources of Funds | - | - | - | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | \$ 3.12 | \$ 3.21 | \$ 3.31 | \$ 3.42 | \$ 3.52 | \$ 3.63 | \$ 3.74 | \$ 41.27 |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Assumptions | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | 75 | 75 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Development Costs - Annual % | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Development Costs per room - Hotel /1 | \$ 135,000 | 11.06 | 11.40 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Development Costs | \$ - | \$ 11.06 | \$ 11.40 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | - | (11.06) | (11.40) | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.93 | 3.02 | 3.12 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.74 | 41.27 |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | - | (11.06) | (22.46) | (19.64) | (16.80) | (13.87) | (10.85) | (7.73) | (4.52) | (1.20) | 2.21 | 5.73 | 9.36 | 13.10 | 54.38 |
| Net Present Value @ 14.0% | \$1.04 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 New development costs include direct costs, off-site & on-site costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.6

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Retail/Commercial: Operating Statement

| | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 | |
| Rental Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | |
| Cumulative Gross Leasable Area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | 45,000 | - | - | - | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | |
| Restaurants | 45,000 | - | - | - | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | |
| Total | 90,000 | - | - | - | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | |
| Occupancy Rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | |
| Restaurants | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | |
| Average NNN Base Rent Per s.f. Per Yr/1 | US\$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | \$ | 20.00 | 21.22 | 21.85 | 22.51 | 23.19 | 23.88 | 24.60 | 25.34 | 26.10 | 26.88 | 27.68 | 28.52 | 29.37 | 30.25 | 31.16 | 32.09 |
| Restaurants | \$ | 30.00 | 31.83 | 32.78 | 33.77 | 34.78 | 35.82 | 36.90 | 38.00 | 39.14 | 40.32 | 41.53 | 42.77 | 44.06 | 45.38 | 46.74 | 48.14 |
| Average Gross Sales Per Square Foot Per Year | US\$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial Retail | \$ | 250.00 | 265 | 273 | 281 | 290 | 299 | 307 | 317 | 326 | 336 | 346 | 356 | 367 | 378 | 389 | 401 |
| Restaurants | \$ | 375.00 | 398 | 410 | 422 | 435 | 448 | 461 | 475 | 489 | 504 | 519 | 535 | 551 | 567 | 584 | 602 |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Operating Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Rent Revenue | \$ | - | - | - | 2.09 | 2.55 | 2.63 | 2.71 | 2.79 | 2.87 | 2.96 | 3.05 | 3.14 | 3.23 | 3.33 | 3.43 | |
| Gross Revenues | \$ | - | - | - | 2.09 | 2.55 | 2.63 | 2.71 | 2.79 | 2.87 | 2.96 | 3.05 | 3.14 | 3.23 | 3.33 | 3.43 | |
| Operating Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | % of Rev. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative & General | 4.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.08 | \$ 0.10 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.11 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.12 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.14 | |
| Sales & Marketing | 2.0% | - | - | - | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | |
| Total | 6.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 0.13 | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.16 | \$ 0.17 | \$ 0.17 | \$ 0.18 | \$ 0.18 | \$ 0.19 | \$ 0.19 | \$ 0.20 | \$ 0.21 | |
| NET OPERATING INCOME (ex. depr., interest & tax) | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.86 | \$ 2.95 | \$ 3.04 | \$ 3.13 | \$ 3.22 | |

Notes:

/1 Triple-net rent where tenant pays for pro-rata share of common area charges, insurance, property taxes, and utilities in addition to base rent. No rent for tenant improvements; tenants pay for improvements.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.7

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A
Retail/Commercial: Operating Statement

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Year 9 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 | Year 13 | Year 14 | Year 15 | |
| Sources of Funds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | |
| Net Operating Income | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.86 | \$ 2.95 | \$ 3.04 | \$ 3.13 | \$ 3.22 | |
| Reversion @ | 10.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$32.24 | |
| Less Cost of Sales @ | 4.0% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | \$ 1.29 | |
| Net Sale Proceeds | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$30.95 | |
| Total Sources of Funds | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1.96 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.47 | \$ 2.55 | \$ 2.62 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.78 | \$ 2.86 | \$ 2.95 | \$ 3.04 | \$ 3.13 | \$34.18 | |
| Development Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gross Leasable Area (s.f.) | 90,000 | - | 45,000 | 45,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Inflation Assumptions | | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Commercial Retail | | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Restaurants | | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| New Development Costs/2 | \$ 135.00 | \$ - | \$ 3.32 | \$ 3.42 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | |
| Total Development Costs | | - | 3.32 | 3.42 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| NET CASH FLOW (before financing & taxes) | | - | (3.32) | (3.42) | 1.96 | 2.40 | 2.47 | 2.55 | 2.62 | 2.70 | 2.78 | 2.86 | 2.95 | 3.04 | 3.13 | 3.18 |
| CUMULATIVE CASH FLOW | | - | (3.32) | (6.74) | (4.78) | (2.38) | 0.09 | 2.64 | 5.26 | 7.96 | 10.74 | 13.61 | 16.56 | 19.60 | 22.73 | 56.90 |

Residual Land Value = Net Present Value @ 14.0% \$9.32 million 2003 dollars

Notes:

/1 New development costs, include direct costs, indirect costs, and developer profit.

Source: Economics Research Associates

Table 4.A.8

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT - Alternative 4, Parcel 1, Land Use Scenario A

Time Share

| | Yr. 2001 Value | 2003 Year 1 | 2004 Year 2 | 2005 Year 3 | 2006 Year 4 | 2007 Year 5 | 2008 Year 6 | 2009 Year 7 | 2010 Year 8 | 2011 Year 9 | 2012 Year 10 | 2013 Year 11 | 2014 Year 12 | 2015 Year 13 | 2016 Year 14 | 2017 Year 15 |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflation Factor | 3% | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.30 | 1.34 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.51 | 1.56 | 1.60 |
| Real Escalation | 0% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Time Share (Number of Rooms) | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| Total Number of Intervals Available | | - | - | - | 3,825 | 3,825 | 3,825 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 |
| Total Number of Intervals Sold Per Year | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 650 | - | - | - | - |
| Cumulative Intervals Sold | | - | - | - | 1,000 | 2,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 6,000 | 7,000 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 | 7,650 |
| Interval Sales Price | \$ 18,500 | \$ 19,627 | \$ 20,215 | \$ 20,822 | \$ 21,447 | \$ 22,090 | \$ 22,753 | \$ 23,435 | \$ 24,138 | \$ 24,862 | \$ 25,608 | \$ 26,377 | \$ 27,168 | \$ 27,983 | \$ 28,822 | \$ 29,687 |
| Sales Revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | Expressed in Millions of US Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Annual Sales Volume | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 22.75 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 24.86 | \$ 25.61 | \$ 26.37 | \$ 27.14 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Cumulative Sales Volume | - | - | - | 21.45 | 43.54 | 66.29 | 89.72 | 113.86 | 138.73 | 164.33 | 181.48 | 181.48 | 181.48 | 181.48 | 181.48 | 181.48 |
| Cost of Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Per Room | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product Cost (excluding land cost) /1 | \$ 205,000 | - | - | 17.30 | - | - | 18.91 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gross Profit Before Land Costs | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ 21.45 | \$ 22.09 | \$ 3.84 | \$ 23.44 | \$ 24.14 | \$ 24.86 | \$ 25.61 | \$ 17.14 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Cumulative Profit Before Land Costs | - | - | (17.30) | 4.14 | 26.23 | 30.08 | 53.51 | 77.65 | 102.51 | 128.12 | 145.26 | 145.26 | 145.26 | 145.26 | 145.26 | 145.26 |
| Costs & Expenses/2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | As % of Annual Gross Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commissions | 22.0% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4.72 | \$ 4.86 | \$ 5.01 | \$ 5.16 | \$ 5.31 | \$ 5.47 | \$ 5.63 | \$ 3.77 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Marketing | 22.0% | - | - | - | 4.72 | 4.86 | 5.01 | 5.16 | 5.31 | 5.47 | 5.63 | 3.77 | - | - | - | - |
| Sales Overhead | 5.0% | - | - | - | 1.07 | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.24 | 1.28 | 0.86 | - | - | - | - |
| Administration | 7.0% | - | - | - | 1.50 | 1.55 | 1.59 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.79 | 1.20 | - | - | - | - |
| Acct./Legal/Consulting | 0.5% | - | - | - | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.09 | - | - | - | - |
| Depreciation | 0.3% | - | - | - | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - |
| Other | 0.1% | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | - | - | - | - |
| Total Cost & Expenses (% of Annual Gross Sales) | 56.9% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 12.20 | \$ 12.57 | \$ 12.95 | \$ 13.33 | \$ 13.73 | \$ 14.15 | \$ 14.57 | \$ 9.76 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Development Profit (Loss) | 43% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ 9.24 | \$ 9.52 | \$ (9.10) | \$ 10.10 | \$ 10.40 | \$ 10.72 | \$ 11.04 | \$ 7.39 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Cumulative Cash Flow | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (17.30) | \$ (8.06) | \$ 1.46 | \$ (7.64) | \$ 2.46 | \$ 12.86 | \$ 23.58 | \$ 34.61 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 | \$ 42.00 |
| Net Present Value @ | 15.0% | \$9.27 million 2003 dollars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

/1 Development costs include allocated share of onsite/offsite costs.

/2 Selling and marketing expenses only. Operating expenses are covered 100% by annual fees.

Source: RCI Consulting, Inc.; and Economics Research Associates

Subject: 2023-7-18 Council meeting agenda Item #9 Public Input data for Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, Park Master Plan Update, Growth Management Plan Update, and South Carlsbad Coastline Project.

Attachments: 2008_Carlsbad_Blvd_Realignment_Summary_Memo by Debbie Fountain.pdf; 2022 General Comparative cost-benefits of Completing PCH-PCH Modification-Ponto Park - Part 1 of 2 v1.pdf; City's PCH area map w numbered notes of Constraints - 2 of 2.pdf; Excerpt from 5-1-23 email to City and CCC on PCH Relocation cost-acres south of Island Way.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2023 5:18 PM

To: City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; CarlsbadLCPA@coastal.ca.gov

Cc: 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; Tom Frank <Tom.Frank@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>; 'People for Ponto' <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: 2023-7-18 Council meeting agenda Item #9 Public Input data for Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, Park Master Plan Update, Growth Management Plan Update, and South Carlsbad Coastline Project.

Dear City Council; CA Coastal Commission & State Parks; and Carlsbad Planning, Mobility/Traffic and Park Commissions:

Please receive and consider this public input email and attached '2008 internal City Staff memo, and 2-part Cost/Benefit/Constraints data regarding the Carlsbad's 40-year old PCH Median Relocation/Adjustment proposal, as Pubic Input data for 1) Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, 2) Park Master Plan Update, 3) Growth Management Plan Update, and 4) South Carlsbad Coastline Project.

The attached "2008 ." file is an internal City Memo to "Leadership Team" on the 40-year history of City plans/motivations for PCH Median Relocation that discusses several issues that the City has not publicly disclosed to Carlsbad Citizens nor posted on the City's South Carlsbad Coastline Project, thus preventing Citizens from being properly informed about the City's proposal that will require a Citizen vote to fund. Some of the key points from that internal City Memo include:

- The project was to be "dedicated to recreational purposes, including campsites"
- 7 parcels of land could be created.
- Most of the 7 parcels of land, and the most useable/viable land, is owned by the State of California
- Without a trade of City and State land the City "would not experience any significant revenue producing land that could help finance the alignment"
- 2001 City Financial Analysis concluded:
 - Project costs are high, and the acreage of the 7 Parcels is modest as noted in the Memo (documented in 2001 URS & ERA Studies)
 - Since project does not increase roadway capacity the project is NOT fundable by developers or traffic/road funds
 - City studied different land use plans on the 7 Parcels that were NOT "dedicated to recreational purposes, including campsites", and the "highest development value (was) attributed to ("risky") hotel development" of the Parcels
 - No project funding source was identified by the Financial Analysis
- City's Ponto Vision Plan
 - moved southbound lanes east

- used “narrow median” for parking, ‘liner park’, and possible campground addition
- concluded public funding is needed for a realignment of median
- The August 4, 2008 internal City Memo to “Leadership Team” includes “Table 6-2 Comparison of Carlsbad Boulevard Re-alignment Alternates” that documents comparative data on the 4 re-alignment alternatives in the Ponto Vision Plan area

The City’s 2001 URS and ERA PCH Relocation Studies of both the amount of land in the 7 Parcels that could be created from PCH Median Relocation/Modification and the City’s current cost estimates should be fully disclosed to Citizens. For the 3-mile segment from Island Way south to La Costa Avenue (aka State Campground), there is only about 16 acres in 3 of the 7 Parcels. The City’s current cost estimate for this 3-mile segment is \$65 to \$80 million or \$21.6 to \$26.6 million per mile, or \$4 to \$5 million per acre to access the City’s existing land in the PCH Median. Attached are summary portions of the City’s URS & ERA Relocation Studies that list the 7 Parcels and note key PCH Financing issues (this was emailed to the City and CA Coastal Commission and State Parks on Monday, May 1, 2023 12:08 PM).

The attached 2-part ‘Cost/Benefit/Constraints’ data uses City data to summarize and compare the City’s PCH Median Relocation/Modification project with other alternative Plans to achieve a much needed Ponto Coastal Park and the Projects stated purpose to be “dedicated to recreational purposes, including campsites”. For example a recent sale of 11.1 acres of vacant Ponto land sold for around \$720,000 per acre and another 15 acre vacant parcel at Ponto currently for sale for about \$2.5 million per acre. Both the vacant sites are far more cost effective for tax-payers than the \$4 to \$5 million per acre cost to make narrow (less useable/desirable) Parcels from the City’s already owned PCH Median.

The City Council and CA Coastal Commission should consider this Alternative and the comparative data as part of the City’s analysis and Public communication/discussion of 1) Carlsbad’s proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, 2) Park Master Plan Update, 3) Growth Management Plan Update, and 4) South Carlsbad Coastline Project.

Can Citizens please get a confirmation from the City and CCC that this data will be Publicly communicated/discussed and considered?

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT

History

- City and State began to explore a program to relocate the southbound lanes in early 1980s
- Potential realignment incorporated into South Carlsbad State Beach General Plan and adopted by State in 1982.
- Plan proposed additional property to the west be dedicated to recreational purposes, including campsites, parking, beach access, and state administration and maintenance facilities.
- A major feature of plan was a group campsite and hostel on Manzano property.
- Plan anticipated a "T" intersection with Carlsbad Blvd.

Studies Summary

- 1992 - report completed on Carlsbad Blvd and Palomar Airport Intersection
- Study concluded not cost effective to salvage the existing bridge; minimize the skew of intersection
- Conceptual eastern alignment for Carlsbad Blvd and studied from an environmental standpoint in 1998.
- 7 parcels of land adjacent to the existing So. Carlsbad State Beach campground and coastline created
- No significant environmental constraints.
- Additional evaluation needed on historical significance of bridges.
- Exterior noise levels might be exceeded at Solamar Mobile Home Park; mitigation possible
- Most of value in surplus land generated on the land owned by the State
- Unless there was a trade of lands, the City would not experience any significant revenue producing land that could be used to help finance the alignment.
- 2001 – Financial analysis completed for Carlsbad Blvd Realignment.
- Explore ways to generate revenue from useable public land created from project.
- Use revenue to offset costs of realignment
- Preliminary estimates were \$18.8 million to realign.
- Highest development value attributed to hotel development.
- May be difficult to have private development pay for road realignment if it does not create enhanced capacity for private development; no nexus
- City could negotiate contributions from private developers.
- No specific funding source for the realignment project; included in SCCRA as a result.
- SCCRA could bond or take a loan from the City to complete realignment project; repay through future tax increment generated by private development

Ponto Plan

- Southbound lanes to move east; public amenities such as parking, linear park included on surplus land
- Ponto Drive to the lagoon bridge; northbound lanes stay where they are
- Narrow median, remove cypress trees and create a standard intersection at Avenida Encinas.
- Surplus land could be used for expansion of campgrounds.
- Assumption that realignment project would need to be publicly financed to create the opportunities.

August 4, 2008

TO: LEADERSHIP TEAM

FROM: HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

INFORMATION ON CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT STUDY AND OTHER DISCUSSIONS AS RELATED TO PONTO BEACHFRONT VILLAGE VISION PLAN AND OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS

Per the request of the Leadership Team, this memorandum is provided to summarize the activity to date as related to studies of the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Project, project financing and any related planning documents, studies, etc.

Historical Background from State perspective

Based on research related to the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment, the City and State of California began to explore a program to relocate the southbound lanes of Carlsbad Boulevard (between Manzano Drive and San Marcos Creek to the east and adjacent to the northbound lanes) in the early 1980s. The potential realignment was incorporated into the South Carlsbad State Beach General Plan and adopted by the State in 1982.

The 1982 plan proposed that all additional property west of the realigned Carlsbad Boulevard be dedicated to various recreational purposes, including additional campsites, parking, beach access, and State administration and maintenance facilities. A major feature of this plan was a group campsite and hostel on property owned by the State between Manzano Drive and Palomar Airport Road. This plan anticipated that Palomar Airport Road would be realigned to a "T" intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. To date, limited progress has been made towards implementing this plan.

Studies of Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment by the City

The City commissioned a study of the reconfiguration of the Carlsbad Boulevard and Palomar Airport Road (PAR) Intersection in the early 1990s. A report was prepared by Boyle Engineering in 1992. Key issues evaluated in the study included the irregular angle created where PAR joins Carlsbad Boulevard, vertical alignments, and the feasibility of salvaging the existing railroad bridge west of Avenida Encinas. The study concluded that it was not cost effective to salvage the existing bridge and recommended an alternative that would minimize the skew of the intersection.

A conceptual eastern alignment for Carlsbad Boulevard was developed by staff and a study of the environmental constraints and opportunities created by the realignment was commissioned in 1998. The study was also to include 1) a technical evaluation of alternative land uses for the surplus land, with a number-one priority on open-space recreational opportunities; and, 2) potential for reveue-generating recreational/tourist-serving commercial land uses to fund the realignment. If realigned according to the staff conceptual plan, which includes the "T" intersection at Carlsbad Boulevard and PAR, seven (7) parcels of land adjacent to the existing South Carlsbad State Beach campground and the coastline would be created for public and/or private development.

Conclusions of this study included: 1) no significant environmental constraints; 2) two bridges located across Encinas Creek on the southbound lanes of Carlsbad Boulevard were built in 1928 and may be historically significant. Further evaluation was recommended; 3) City's exterior noise levels may be exceeded at the Solamar Mobile Home Park due to the expected increases in traffic. However, mitigation could easily be achieved; and, 4) most of the value in surplus land would be generated on the land owned by the State. Unless there was a trade of lands, the City would not experience any significant revenue producing land that could be used to help finance the realignment.

In 2001, a financial analysis was completed for the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project. An objective of this study was to explore ways to generate revenue from useable public land created from the realignment project, including potential land sale or lease opportunities, and using this revenue to help offset the cost of realigning the road. The preliminary estimates of the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project were \$18.8 million. The significant value for development purposes (to assist in paying for the improvements) was attributable to hotel development, but considered risky from a financing standpoint. A specific note in the financial analysis indicated that if the road realignment simply moves the road without enhancing capacity for future local developments, developer financed road improvements or impact fees may not apply due to the lack of a nexus. The report indicated that the City could negotiate contributions to the road alignment costs. Because there was not a specific funding source (including developer financing) identified for the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project and the realignment was deemed necessary to generate developable properties, the City formed a Redevelopment Area, known as the South Carlsbad Coastal Redevelopment Area in 2000. It was intended that the Redevelopment Agency would initially finance the realignment and that subsequent development would then reimburse the Agency and repay the debt. No action has been taken to date to proceed with the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project and create financing through the Redevelopment Agency. However, it is important to note that a portion of Carlsbad Boulevard was realigned with the Poinsettia Properties project. Apparently, this was a negotiated project with the developer. This created some surplus land (city-owned land) in front of, and immediately adjacent to, the State campground.

When work began on the Ponto Vision Plan, staff reviewed the initial studies completed on the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment. A consensus was reached at that time with Public Works that the specific alignment within the Ponto Vision Plan area could be further studied to determine the most appropriate alignment to benefit the City. The consultant for the Ponto Vision Plan was instructed to do so.

Ponto Vision Plan Studies

Preliminary land use strategies by RBF (consultant on the Ponto Vision Plan) indicated that the City would get the most public benefit from relocating the Carlsbad Boulevard southbound travel lanes eastward (which is consistent with the initial studies) and adjacent to the northbound lanes. No realignment was recommended for the northbound lanes. The staff team working on this project felt that it was important to include public parking and public space (linear park) in the excess right-of-way to be created by the realignment.

In 2007, 4 alternatives for the realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard were presented to the City Council and Housing and Redevelopment Commission for consideration and a selection of alignment choice. The Council selected the alignment which: moved the Southbound lanes to the east from Ponto Drive to the lagoon bridge (adjacent to the northbound lanes, which would not be realigned), narrowing the

median in middle, removing the Cypress Trees and creating a more standard intersection at Avenida Encinas. This would create additional land on the west side for more public parking and an expanded linear park. It could also be used for expansion of the State campground if a subsequent decision is approved to do so. At the time of this approval, no decision was made as to how the realignment project or the public improvements would be funded. If a nexus can be made or a deal negotiated with a private developer, these improvements could potentially be developer financed. It is more likely, however, that the realignment project and public improvements would need to be publicly financed with the potential to raise additional revenues through development to repay the financing debt.

South Carlsbad Coastal Redevelopment Area (SCCRA) Master Plan

When the SCCRA was adopted in 2000, the original intent was to subsequently prepare a Master Plan for the entire area that would address the Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment project (and make a final decision on the alignment) as well as develop a desired comprehensive land use strategy for the area, including both private and public development. The Master Plan was intended to provide better detail and a more comprehensive plan for future development. However, after adoption of the redevelopment plan, a subsequent decision was made to discontinue efforts for an area-wide Master Plan. The SCCRA was subsequently divided into three (3) planning areas for land use planning purposes (see attached map). Planning Area #3 (the Ponto Area) was identified as the first area for which to develop a land use strategy. This is because it was the only area at the time with interested developers and the greatest immediate demonstrated need for City/Agency guidance. The Ponto Vision Plan was completed and approved in November/December, 2007.

It was intended that Planning Area #1 (the power plant properties) would be the second area for which a land use strategy would be developed. However, this action was delayed in order to incorporate the area into the larger "Cannon Corridor land use strategy". This strategy was also subsequently abandoned and the focus was placed on the "Prop D" lands. The land use strategy for these open space areas did not incorporate the power plant properties or the 48 acres of visitor-serving commercial land east of I-5 (owned by SDGE). As a result, it may be necessary for the City and/or Redevelopment Agency to reconsider a land use strategy for these properties at a later date.

Planning Area #2 (Manzano Property to Ponto Drive) was considered the last area for which a land use strategy was needed due to the influence that the State of California had over much of the land and their public statements that they had no interest (at the time) in trading lands with the City or pursuing development on their properties. This plan was also put on hold due to the decline in tax increment revenues for the Redevelopment Agency as a result of reassessment of the power plant properties. There was concern that there would be no potential funding for the Carlsbad Realignment project and that bonds could not be issued to finance the project due to the uncertain tax increment revenues. A loan from the General Fund to the Redevelopment Agency was also viewed as financially infeasible due to concerns over future ability by the Agency to repay the debt. At this time, there are no land use planning strategies under development for Planning Areas #1 or #2.

Please contact me at X2935 if any additional information is required, or if there are any questions on the information provided above.

Debbie Fountain

**Table 6-2
Comparison of Carlsbad Boulevard Re-Alignment Alternatives**

| FACTOR | ALTERNATIVE 1 | ALTERNATIVE 2 | ALTERNATIVE 3 | ALTERNATIVE 4 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Additional Vacated Acreage Available for Other Uses | Creates 0.8 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, available for use as a public linear park. | Creates 2.0 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard north of Avenida Encinas and 1.8 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard south of Avenida Encinas, available for use as a public linear park or potential expanded use for the South Carlsbad State Beach Campground. | Creates 0.8 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, available to be used as a public linear park. Creates 1.2 acres on east side of Carlsbad Boulevard, north of Avenida Encinas and 2.2 acres on east side of Carlsbad Boulevard, south of Avenida Encinas, available for additional development or community amenities. | Creates 0.5 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, available for use as a public linear park. South of Beach Way: Creates 0.8 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, available for use as a public linear park. |
| Effect on Vegetative Communities | Approximately 3.0 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub to be affected in median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. Retains cypress trees in median south of Avenida Encinas. | Approximately 3.7 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub to be affected in median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. Potential disturbance to approximately 0.6 acres of Southern Coastal Salt Marsh in median immediately north of the Los Batiquitos Lagoon bridges. Removal of cypress trees in median south of Avenida Encinas. | Approximately 3.7 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub to be affected in median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. Potential disturbance to approximately 0.6 acres of Southern Coastal Salt Marsh in median immediately north of the Los Batiquitos Lagoon bridges. Removal of cypress trees in median south of Avenida Encinas. | Approximately 3.0 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub to be affected in median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. Retains cypress trees in median south of Avenida Encinas. |
| Parking | Provides 61 parking spaces (60 degree diagonal) and 48 parallel parking spaces. | Provides 61 parking spaces (60 degree diagonal) and 48 parallel parking spaces. | Provides 61 parking spaces (60 degree diagonal) and 48 parallel parking spaces. | Provides 61 parking spaces (60 degree diagonal) and 48 parallel parking spaces. |

| FACTOR | ALTERNATIVE 1 | ALTERNATIVE 2 | ALTERNATIVE 3 | ALTERNATIVE 4 |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Traffic Signal Operations | More complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas due to width of median (longer time to make turning movements) but similar to existing condition. | Less complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas, due to standardized intersection (i.e., no wide median). | Less complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas, due to standardized intersection (i.e., no wide median). | More complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas due to width of median (longer time to make turning movements) but similar to existing condition. |
| Vehicular Bridges | Retains existing northbound bridge; requires new southbound bridge to implement the grade-separated pedestrian underpass to the west. | Retains existing northbound bridge; requires new southbound bridge to accommodate lanes re-location and to implement the grade-separated pedestrian underpass to the west. | Requires two new bridges – one northbound and one southbound. | Retains existing northbound bridge; requires new southbound bridge to accommodate lanes re-location and to implement the grade-separated pedestrian underpass to the west. |

2022 General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, 2.3 mile PCH Modification, and Ponto Park to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto/West BL/South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2

Key base facts regarding tax-payer Cost/Benefit comparison:

City Coastal Park Fairness: Ponto/Coastal South Carlsbad has ZERO Parks and ZERO Park acres v. 10 Coastal Parks and 37 Park acres in North Carlsbad. 62% of Carlsbad citizens and major visitor industries live in South Carlsbad with no Coastal Park. 38% of Carlsbad citizens have the entire City's Coastal Parks. The City also falsely allowed Ponto Developers to NOT PROVIDE the required 15% unconstrained Open Space required by other developers in Carlsbad. Consequently Ponto is already developed at a density 35% higher than the rest of City. Higher density logically requires more parks and park acres.

What is missing from 2.3 mile South PCH: The only missing components of a Carlsbad Livable (Complete) Street are about 1.6 miles of adequate Coastal sidewalks. Better, safer protected bike paths for the volume of bike traffic on a higher-speed roadway are highly desired. Both these features can be (and should have already long ago been) provided in the existing PCH configuration.

Generalized Costs: Costs come from publicly stated costs by Mayor Hall in a 2019 at Meet the Mayor Realtor luncheon at Hilton Garden Inn, City PCH Modification Cost Studies for South PCH, \$13 million per mile cost for the simpler City CIP #6054 PCH Modification Project at Terramar, general City cost data from official public records requests, and vacant Ponto land costs of \$1.4 to \$2.4 million per acre from recent recorded land sales at Ponto.

Generalized Benefits: The number of acres and the quality and usability of each of those acres, and the number of new added beach parking for each of the known Option's define each Option's benefits. There may be other unknown Options that have different benefits. The City's 2001 PCH Modification Studies' highest Park and Open Space Option (2001 ERA Financial Analysis "Alternative 1-parks and open space scheme") only made possible a 4-acre Active Park north of Palomar Airport Road in North Carlsbad. The City's 2013 PCH Concept design eliminated that 4-acre Active Park and only showed a few small open space areas with picnic tables. Any PCH Modification Benefits are significantly limited by existing PCH constraints. See attached Part 2: City PCH map with numbered notes on various existing land use constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Modification Design.

PCH Modification: PCH Modification does not add any new City land. Rearranging PCH land may add some usability beyond the existing usability of parkway areas along PCH. However significant land in PCH right-of-way is already constrained by habitat, slopes, and water quality detention basins. Past City Studies in 2001 and 2013 showed relatively modest changes in useable acreage from major PCH Modifications. Forever removing 2-travel lanes (over 50% of PCH capacity due to removing passing ability) will create Terramar traffic congestion, but could repurpose some of that City pavement for open space. Any net usable amount of open space land will however be relatively narrow and may be modest once all constraints are accounted for. PCH Modification should be accurately compared with the existing usable and open space parkway areas in the existing PCH configuration and Ponto Park situation. See attached Part 2: City PCH map with numbered notes on various existing land use constraints from the City's 2013 PCH Modification Design.

Comparative tax-payer Cost/Benefits:

1. Completing 2.3 miles of PCH by adding missing sidewalk/path. Adding parking and bike safety:

Only about 1.6 miles of the 2.3 miles needs sidewalks

There are 177 existing parking spaces along South Carlsbad Blvd

Existing 4 vehicle lanes and 2 bike lanes

The only missing component of "Complete/Livable Street" is some pedestrian sidewalk/paths

Total Cost to provide missing sidewalks per City data = \$3-5 million (based on path width)

Costs for desirable safety upgrade to existing bike lanes are not known

Cost to add more beach parking in abandoned PCH North and South of Poinsettia ranges from:

- 273 additional spaces = \$ 0.76 million
- 546 additional spaces = \$ 1.1 million
- Plus an estimated \$1.5 million for 2 signalized intersection upgrades for full 4-way access
- Cost per parking space is estimated at \$19,275 to \$13,899 per additional parking space

Total cost: \$ 3.8 to 6.1 million to provide missing sidewalk/path and add more parking + unknown amount for any desired upgrades to existing bike lanes

2. '2013 PCH Modification Proposal' [AECOM 11/26/2013 Alternative Development Meeting]

Total Cost is \$75 million per Mayor Matt Hall. PCH Modification would be most the expensive City project so far. \$75 million current cost appears consistent with 20-years of cost inflation of the basic (unmitigated environmental and traffic) 2001 costs of \$26.5 to 37.3 million (in 2001dollars) identified by the City. The City's 2001 Study indicated fully mitigated costs will be higher.

Total \$75 million PCH Modification cost comes to:

\$ 18.7 to 7.5 million per acre for narrow open space areas (from portions of city roadway)

\$872,093 per additional parking space

- 86 additional parking spaces created = 263 replacement spaces - 177 existing spaces removed
- Includes multi-use pathway (sidewalk) within primarily native/natural landscaping.
- Possible 50% reduction in vehicle lanes (from 4 to 2 lanes) with corresponding traffic congestion like at Terramar. Not clear if Citizens will approve spending \$75 million to double traffic congestion.
- Includes about 4 - 10 acres for possible narrow passive Park area identified in City's 2001 PCH Modification Studies. However City's 2013 PCH Modification (AECOM) plans look like smaller acreage is provided.
- Does not purchase any new land (only reconfigures existing City land) so requires Carlsbad Citizens to vote to expend funds per Proposition H.
- 2013 PCH Modification proposal did not consider and map City's 2017 sea level rise data to show what areas would be lost due to sea level rise and account for any added cost and issues.

3. Ponto Coastal Park

Total Cost: \$20 – 22 million to purchase and build 11-acres as Mayor Matt Hall has publicly stated

\$ 2 to 1.8 million per acre (per Mayor) for new and fully useable City Park area

175% to 10% more total park land than 'PCH Modification options'

- Includes adding 11-acres of new and viable parkland similar in shape (but larger in size) than Carlsbad's Holiday Park. Site includes both habitat and E-W and N-S connections.

- Since an Open Space land purchase per Proposition C acquisition voters exempted such purchases from Proposition H. NCA recommend the site be considered for purchase as Open Space per the City's obligations under a lawsuit settlement.
- Ponto Park's cost savings over 'PCH Modification' = \$55 to 53 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks cost savings over 'PCH Modification' = \$51 to 47 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks + 273 additional parking spaces cost savings over "PCH Modification" = \$50.4 to 46.1 million
- Ponto Park's + adding missing sidewalks + 546 additional parking spaces cost savings over "PCH Modification" = \$50.1 to 45.8 million

4. Combining both #1-PCH Completion and #3-Ponto Park:

Combining #1 and #3 creates at cost effective and more beneficial Coastal Park-Coastal Parking-Completes Streets solution. This solution actually adds 11-acres of new City land for a needed Park, provides for a Complete PCH without increasing traffic congestion, does not forever congest PCH travel if future PCH traffic increases, adds comparatively more beach parking, and provides the City with Coastal land use and sea level rise planning flexibility to address future needs by not forever committing the City's PCH land to a Final solution. See map on page 4 showing land use synergy of combining #1 and #3.

\$50.4 to 45.8 million in tax-payer cost savings are estimated from combining #1 & #3 compared to the estimated \$75 million PCH Modification concept. Combining #1 and #3 provide all the features provided by more Benefits for a reduced

- a. Ponto Park's location allows it to use the 337-610 parking spaces created by #1 above (177 existing + 273 to 546 new parking spaces). The 337-610 parking spaces will allow Ponto Park to effectively host Carlsbad's special community events.
- b. Acquiring Ponto Park's 11-acres provides both the City and State of CA with important future land use options to address the Sea Level Rise and Coastal Erosion (SLR) planned by the City. These options are created by leaving the exiting South Carlsbad Blvd right-of-way substantially the same (except for adding needed sidewalks and using the existing Old paved roadway for parking) thus allowing future upland relocation of the Campground. If \$75,000,000 is spent on #2 the likelihood this very expensive City expenditure would never be abandoned by the City to allow relocation of the Campground.
- c. Carlsbad' 2017 Sea Level Rise study shows SLR will eliminate ½ of the State Campground – a high-priority Coastal land use under the CA Coastal Act. The CA Coastal Act calls for "upland" relocation of high-priority Coastal land uses due to SLR impacts. Ponto Park could also provide for "upland" relocation of the State Campground.

Part 2 of this Comparative analysis is a separate 2-page data file. This Part 2 file consists of the City's PCH map with numbered notes to documented City data on PCH design constraints, mapping the City's 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Areas, and outlining the easterly 6.5 acre portion of the 11-acre Planning Area F site that could be Ponto Park for acreage comparison purposes.




City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input 2 of 2

The City's map below is marked with the following numbered list of Area Constraints and Issues. The Constraints are from the City's 2013 PCH Modification designs, the City's older 2017 Sea Level Rise Impact Study, and on-site observations. The Constraints will limit any fundamental change to the existing PCH landscape. For instance existing slope and habitat area will remain or have to be relocated which will limit the use of any excess land area from PCH Modification. These Constraints will then reduce from 62 acres the actual number of unconstrained and acres that are actually useable and can be used for different uses than currently exist.

1. Loss of the last section of Old "Historic 101" design, ambiance, and openness. Will it be replaced with typical urban arterial design?
2. Freshwater habitat
3. Sewer pumping facility
4. City's 2013 PCH plan for RESTORED RIPARIAN HABITAT
5. Sea Level Rise 2 meter Impact Area
6. City's 2013 PCH plan for BIO SWALE AND RESTORED RIPARIAN HABITAT
7. Existing beach parking to be retained
8. Least Tern habitat
9. Major storm water detention basin
10. Water
11. Slopes will likely need retaining walls to move road inland closer to proposed Kam Sang Resort
12. Endangered Species Habitat
13. City's 2013 PCH plan for COASTAL SAGE SCRUB RESTORATION
14. City's 2013 PCH plan for NATIVE GRASSLAND RESTORATION
15. City's 2013 PCH plan for BIO SWALE AND RESTORED RIPARIAN HABITAT
16. Eliminating access road for homes/businesses south of Cape Rey Resort. Who pays to replace?
17. Removes Cape Rey Resort developer required GMP Open Space for this LFMP. This GMP Open Space will have to be replaced. Who Pays?
18. City's 2013 PCH plan for L.I.D. BASIN / BIO SWALE
19. City left several acres vacant for 20+ years. This area can cost-effectively provide 200-500 more parking spaces w/o any PCH relocation.
20. Unusual jog in roadway. Is this viable?
21. City's 2013 PCH plan for RESTORED NATIVE LANDSCAPE
22. Habitat & need to provide major storm water quality detention basin before discharging urban and creek runoff into ocean.
23. Slopes will likely need retaining walls to move road inland closer to mobile home community.
24. Steep unusable slopes needed for Palomar Airport Road overpass over railroad corridor.

For a Cost/Benefit reference point, the City's PCH Modification at Terramar (CIP project #6054 from Cannon to Manzano) that is less constrained and simpler than South Carlsbad is projected to cost around \$13 million per mile. Vacant primarily unconstrained land sale costs at Ponto are documented at around \$1.4 to \$2.4 million per acre. Honest Cost/Benefit of these two options should be a public tax-payer discussion.



Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment: Right-of-Way and Available Land Analysis*

- Proposed ROW (Approximately 43 acres)
- Area Available for Other Uses (Approximately 62 acres)



July 13, 2021

Item #14

Page 47 of 53

* Analysis is based on aerial imagery. Right-of-way boundaries and acreages are approximate and intended for planning level analysis only.

* For comparative visual reference the * area is the 6.5 acre eastern portion of Planning Area F.

Excerpt from Monday, May 1, 2023 12:08 PM email to City of Carlsbad, and CA Coastal Commission & State Parks regarding City of Carlsbad's proposed PCH Relocation Project

1. City has indicated it will Cost Carlsbad tax-payers at least \$65-80 million for a 3-mile PCH Relocation from Island Way to La Costa Avenue that per the City's 2001 PCH Relocation Analysis will only MAYBE make available about 16-acres of Carlsbad Blvd (aka Coast Highway/PCH) "surplus land" in this area for uses that maybe different than what they are used for now which is mostly constrained protected habitat. The City's 2001 Land Use and Financial Feasibility Studies of PCH Relocation has already 1) documented these 16 acres of "surplus land" which is mostly very narrow and highly constrained, 2) itemized only about 4 acres of reasonable Park land in North of Palomar Airport Road that maybe created from PCH Relocation, and 3) clearly documented that outside funding for PCH Relocation is very unlikely so most or the entire \$65-80 million cost for these 16 acres will be paid for by Carlsbad tax-payers. Carlsbad's 2001 PCH Relocation Financial study concluded the only viable way to pay for PCH Relocation was to sell most all the "documented and numbered Surplus Land" for commercial uses. So per the City's 2001 financial report PCH Relocation is not an Open Space or Park project but a land development project. Per Proposition H Carlsbad tax-payers will have to vote if they want the City to send \$65-80 million for maybe allowing some of 16 acres of Surplus land available for other uses, or \$4 to \$5 million per "surplus acre". Recent polling by the City shows that Carlsbad Citizens are not wanting PCH Relocation and voting for PCH Relocation is high unlikely. Verbatim Summary information from the City's 2001 PCH Relocation Studies by URS and ERA include:
 - a. The 2001 URS Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study documented the amount of potential "Surplus land" created by PCH Relocation as noted below. Only "Surplus Areas 4, 5 and 6A" which total 16.5 acres are in South Carlsbad (South of Palomar Airport Road) and need PCH Relocation to be accessible. Surplus Area 6A is east of PCH and can be used now without any PCH Relocation. The City has been misrepresenting how much "surplus land" is created by PCH Relocation. A lot of PCH land is does not need Relocation to be used for needed sidewalks and enhancing current bike lanes. The City incorrectly communicates that 60 acres of City land can be used due to PCH Relocation, which is not correct per the City's own 2001 URS Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study.

SECTION FOUR

Phase II Findings

4.1 LAND USE ANALYSIS

Figure 4-1A shows the General Plan Land Use Designations, and Figure 4-1B shows the Zoning Designations. Most of the project area is residential, open space/unplanned, and industrial. The parcels being considered for this project are all currently designated as open space.

4.1.1 Surplus Lands

A City-provided GIS parcel map was used in conjunction with a City-generated map showing land ownership in the project area to calculate the acres of land remaining after Carlsbad Boulevard is realigned (Figure 1-3). Additionally, the amount of land owned by the State in the area north of Palomar Airport Road and south of Manzano Drive was calculated. The acres of land available following realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard are shown in Table 4.1-1. The amount of City-owned land available for other uses following realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard is approximately 41 acres. The amount of land owned by the State in the area north of Palomar Airport Road and south of Manzano Drive is approximately 15 acres.

**Table 4.1-1
LAND OWNERSHIP AND AMOUNT OF LAND AVAILABLE
CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT**

| Landowner | Acreage |
|---------------------|---------|
| City of Carlsbad | 41 |
| State of California | 15 |

The surplus useable land that will result from realigning Carlsbad Boulevard has been grouped into a total of seven surplus land areas, described in Table 4.1-2 below and illustrated in Figures 1-3 through 1-10.

**Table 4.1-2
SURPLUS LAND AREA DESCRIPTIONS
CARLSBAD BOULEVARD REALIGNMENT**

| Surplus Land Area Number | Surplus Land Area Name | Acreage | Owner |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Manzano Parcel | 20.8 | State: approximately 14 acres City: approximately 6 acres |
| 2 | Palomar Point | 5.1 | State: approximately 0.5 acre City: approximately 4.5 acres |
| 3 | North Ponto Beach | 10.1 | City |
| 4 | State Beach and Campground | 13.7 | City |
| 5 | Boca Beach | 2.3 | City |
| 6A | Seapointe Parcel | 0.5 | City |
| 6B | PA "F" Frontage | 2.0 | City |

- b. The 2001 ERA Carlsbad Boulevard Realignment Study used the URS data to fiscally analyze alternative scenarios for realigning Carlsbad Boulevard away from the coast bluff edge and, in the process, creating opportunities for commercial, recreation, and open space uses. One of the study's objectives is to explore ways to generate revenue from useable public land created, including potential land sale or lease opportunities, and using this revenue to help offset the cost of realigning the road.
- c. The scenario that provided the most "Park and Open Space" is Alternative 1. The PCH Relocation "Surplus Areas" that are in South Carlsbad are #4, 5 and 6A or 6B as documented below. Table 1 below documents how many Gross Acres of "Surplus land Area" PCH Relocation provides. The report notes that there are many Constraints on these "Surplus Areas" and the acres listed below may not be achievable or may cost much more to be made/mitigated to be used as noted.

Table 1: DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SCENARIOS - Alternative 1 - Parks and Open Space

| Units | Surplus Area: | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------|------|-------|-----|-----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6A | 6B |
| Acres | 20.8 | 5.1 | 10.1 | 13.7 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Developable Commercial | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | - | - | - | 2.8 | - | - | - |
| Public parking | 1.0 | 0.0 | - | 1.5 | 0.9 | - | 0.6 |
| Community facility | 0.8 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| Active parks | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open space | 15.0 | 4.4 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 |
| Commercial Uses | | | | | | | |
| Commercial-Retail | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Commercial-Restaurant | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office | s.f. | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Time Share | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Full Service Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Executive Meeting Hotel | Rooms | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Campground | | | | | | | |
| Primitive sites | Sites | - | - | 45 | - | - | - |
| RV sites | Sites | - | - | 80 | - | - | - |
| Common facilities | | - | - | 3,000 | - | - | - |
| Public Parking | | | | | | | |
| Free | Spots | 140 | 80 | 200 | 135 | - | 40 |
| Community Facility | | | | | | | |
| Visitor Center | s.f. | 2,500 | - | 3,000 | - | - | - |
| Restrooms | Number | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Active Park Facilities | | | | | | | |
| Active Parks | acres | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Open Space Facilities | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | acres | 15.0 | 4.4 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 |

Source: URS, Wallace, Roberts & Todd, and Economic Research Associates

d.

Table 5: PRELIMINARY REVENUE/COST COMPARISON (Year 2001 Dollars)

| | Alternatives | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Revenues From Commercial Land Sales | \$ 1,131,000 | \$ 9,219,000 | \$ 28,155,000 | \$ 19,465,000 |
| Capitalized Value of Fiscal Revenues to City & RDA | \$ 217,000 | \$ 10,849,000 | \$ 24,743,000 | \$ 16,429,000 |
| Total Potential Revenues | \$ 1,348,000 | \$ 20,068,000 | \$ 52,898,000 | \$ 35,894,000 |
| Less: Road Construction Costs | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 | \$ 18,800,000 |
| Net Revenues <Deficit> After Road Construction Costs | \$ (17,452,000) | \$ 1,268,000 | \$ 34,098,000 | \$ 17,094,000 |
| Less: Public Parking, Parks, Open Space, and Facilities | \$ 8,999,580 | \$ 12,062,589 | \$ 8,496,734 | \$ 9,358,925 |
| Net Revenues <Deficit> After Public Costs | \$ (26,451,580) | \$ (10,794,589) | \$ 25,601,266 | \$ 7,735,075 |

Source: Economics Research Associates; URS; Wallace, Roberts & Todd

e.

Qualifications: While it appears that alternatives 3 and 4 generate enough revenue to cover development costs, the findings at this preliminary planning stage of analysis are qualified, as follows: • The cost estimates are based on gross cost factors and need to be refined as project design becomes more specific. • The cost estimates do not include any extraordinary off-site costs, such as for environmental or traffic mitigation. • Some of the parcels identified for potential development, particularly those west of the alignment, may be vulnerable to long term erosion problems; therefore, their stability needs to be verified. • Most of the value is generated on Surplus Area 1 [aka the Manzano Drive Site that is north of Palomar Airport Road], which is owned by the State of California. The City or Redevelopment Agency would not realize the value of Surplus Area 1 unless the State trades the parcel to the City or Agency for other considerations. Therefore, the City or Agency may not be able to apply proceeds from the value of Surplus Area 1 to road realignment and public facility costs.

f. [other tax-payer funding] CONCLUSION: Both the SANDAG representative and the CalTrans Local Assistance Program representative noted that most road or highway realignments are done to facilitate development. Policymakers are aware of this and generally design funding programs in a way that encourages the private sector to pay for as much of the project costs as possible. Programs are also designed to encourage municipalities to utilize funds from their share of the gas tax, TransNet, and even the General Fund and Community Development Block Grants before turning to State and Federal funds. Finally, due to the limited funds available, all funding sources give priority to projects of a regional significance over those of local importance.

Since PCH Relocation is not needed to add any new roadway (or bike lane or sidewalk) capacity to PCH, and in fact will DECREASE vehicle roadway capacity if PCH is converted from 4 to 2 lanes, additional roadway funding to Relocate PCH is unlikely. The cost of PCH Relocation will therefore likely fall predominately on Carlsbad tax-payers. The tax-payer value of PCH Relocation has always been questionable at best. That is the reason it has not been built over the past 40-years and even now the City's General Plan DOES NOT COMMIT to providing PCH Relocation only that it "may" or 'may not' ever

happen. A People for Ponto Citizen prepared using City cost data A Cost-Benefit Analysis comparing PCH Relocation with simply providing the missing sidewalks on PCH and buying Vacant Ponto land for a Ponto Park. That Cost-Benefit Analysis showed that Buying Ponto Park would save Carlsbad's and other tax-payers tens of millions of tax-dollars and while also providing more and better Park and beach parking facilities and benefits. These 2001 Study and People for Ponto's Cost-Benefits facts need to be publicly disclosed to and considered by the Planning Commission.

Subject: Public Input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendments and Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - TPL map showing how poorly Carlsbad provides Parks - do the right thing for our future

Attachments: 2023-7-18 TPL Carlsbad ParkServe data 2023-07-18_232304.pdf; TPL Support for Ponto Park - 2022-3-11.pdf; Carlsbad 2019 proposed Draft LCP Amendment - People for Ponto 2023-Jul Updated Public Comments - Coastal Recreation.pdf; CTGMC key issues and suggestions -2022-12-6.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, July 23, 2023 11:01 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; CarlsbadLCPA@coastal.ca.gov; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: 'People for Ponto' <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: Public Input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendments and Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - TPL map showing how poorly Carlsbad provides Parks - do the right thing for our future

Dear Carlsbad City Council, CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks, and Carlsbad Parks and Planning Commissions:

This is public input to the Carlsbad City Council and Parks and Planning Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission regarding Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, and Growth Management & Parks Master Plan Updates.

Carlsbad City staff is directed to provide the City Council with a staff customized 'park accessibility' data from City staff consultants. However most of this work has already been done, is for free, and well documented by the Trust for Public Lands "Park Serve" data base. The TPL's "Park Serve" data base is the only data base that allows an 'apples-to-apples comparison' with other cities. The TPL's 'apples-to-apples comparison' shows:

- Carlsbad is the worst city in the 29 cities from Santa Barbara south to the Mexican board - for over 250 miles of CA coastline and for the over 5 million CA State Citizens within those Coastal cities – in providing park access. Attached is Carlsbad's "Park Serve" map/data that:
 - 48% of Carlsbad residents live within a 10-minute walk of a park
 - Only 57,941 (48%) of Carlsbad's population of 119,744 are within 10-minute walk of a park a is Served by Parks
 - TPL's data base is overgenerous in its accounting the Total Number of Parks in Carlsbad as 46 'parks'. This includes
 - TPL's data base is overgenerous in its accounting the Total Park Acres as 3,364 'park acres'.
- Still with the overgenerous accounting of 46 Parks and 3,364 park acres for Carlsbad, Carlsbad is still the worst of the 29 CA Coastal Cities from Santa Barbara to the Mexico (over 250 miles of CA Coastline and for over 5 Million CA Citizens) in providing Park Access to citizens, families and children per the same TPL's 'apples-to-apples' comparison. as listed below:

The Trust of Public Land submitted the attached letter to the City of Carlsbad, CA Coastal Commission, and CA State Park supporting Ponto Park. The TPL's 'apples-to-apples' comparison of these 29 Cities from Best-to-Worst is as follows:

1. Palos Verdes Estates provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
2. El Segundo provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
3. Hermosa Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
4. Redondo Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 98% of residents

5. Manhattan Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 95% of residents
6. Del Mar provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 93% of residents
7. Dana Point provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 89% of residents
8. Carpinteria provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 87% of residents
9. Huntington Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 85% of residents
10. Long Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 84% of residents
11. Laguna Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
12. Santa Monica provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
13. Oxnard provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
14. San Diego provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 81% of residents
15. Santa Barbara provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 78% of residents
16. Coronado provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
17. Newport Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
18. Imperial Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 74% of residents
19. Port Hueneme provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 73% of residents
20. Ventura provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 69% of residents
21. Encinitas provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 68% of residents
22. Los Angeles provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
23. Solana Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
24. Oceanside provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 58% of residents
25. Seal Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 57% of residents
26. Malibu provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 53% of residents
27. San Clemente provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 52% of residents
28. Rancho Palos Verdes provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 50% of residents
29. **Carlsbad provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 48% of residents [Carlsbad is lowest & most unfair]**

The Council and staff should be embarrassed if this is Park Standard you are providing citizens.

The CA Coastal Commission and Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions should read the data in the attached "Coastal Recreation" data file that has been provided many times but never acknowledged or discussed by the City. The "Coastal Recreation" data file documents some of the past Mayor and Council's shortcomings in Parks and Coastal Land Use planning for Parks in South Carlsbad.

Carlsbad Citizens have provided the City Council multiple times Key Suggestions on how the new Mayor and new Council can honestly, responsibly and more cost effectively address the documented need for Ponto Park (and fix the FALSE 'Open Space Standard exemption' past Councils provided Ponto developers. Those Suggestions are summarized in the attached "CTGMC key issues and suggestions 2022-12-6" file. Sadly these Carlsbad Citizen Suggestions have been completely ignored and not publicly disclosed/discussed/considered by the City Council.

We again ask the new Mayor and new Council to read/disclose/publicly discuss the Public Input Citizens send you. Please don't ignore, hide, cover up and fail to discuss this Public Input.

We are sending you this public input because we sincerely/deeply care about Carlsbad and the future Park environment we will leave future generations of Carlsbad citizens, families, children and visitors.

Aloha Aina,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Friday, July 14, 2023 10:40 AM

To: 'clerk@carlsbadca.gov'; council@carlsbadca.gov; CarlsbadLCPA@coastal.ca.gov

Cc: 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks (Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov); 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; 'People for Ponto'; 'Eric Lardy'

Subject: 2023-7-18 Council agenda item #9 - Public input for Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - do the right and smart thing for our future

Dear Carlsbad City Council, CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks, and Carlsbad Parks and Planning Commissions:

We again send you data and request you read, publicly disclose/discuss/consider the extensive Carlsbad Citizen input and documented data, as has been asked of you by over 5,500 petitions and many verbal presentations.

- Your Staff Report did not clearly disclose to you and Carlsbad Citizens the extent of Public Input on the Growth Management Update. The Staff Report hides from your and Citizen review 1,248 pages and 21 MB of Citizen Public in a link at a bottom of a report and does not even not even attempt to summarized the magnitude and main points of Citizen Input on Growth Management. Those failings are a disservice to you and Carlsbad Citizens. The vast majority of Carlsbad Citizens wanted an honest addressing of needed Park Accessibility, removing false ‘exemptions’ to the Open Space Standard, and because these issues intersect in a critical location specifically provide a much needed (and better tax-payer solution) Ponto Park. This was the vast majority of Citizen input, but was/is being hidden and ‘swept under the rug’ in the report to you and Citizens. Over 400 formal written petitions were submitted to the Committee.
 - Do the Right Thing – require an honest and full public accounting of the Carlsbad Citizen Input on Growth Management and Council Please discuss and honestly consider and represent that Carlsbad Citizen input.
 - Do the Right Thing – read and publicly disclose/discuss and direct staff to work WITH (not against) Citizens on the practical and data based suggestions in the attached “CTGMC key issues and suggestions 2022-12-6” file.
- Carlsbad Citizens had to find out that Carlsbad is 5 more cities worst at providing Park access for its residents. Carlsbad is the worst city in the 29 cities from Santa Barbara south to the Mexican board - for over 250 miles of CA coastline – in providing park access. The Council and staff should be embarrassed if this is Park Standard you are providing citizens. See the attached “Coastal Recreation” data file for that and other data showing the past Council’s failure in Parks and Coastal Land use planning for Parks in South Carlsbad.
 - Do the Right Thing – plan and fund Park accessibility for all Carlsbad residents be best not the worst.
 - Do the Right Thing – plan/fund a well-documented and much needed Ponto Park that is adequate in size/share to be a Park. A ‘fancy sidewalk’ is not a Park.
 - Do the Right Thing – READ, publicly discuss, take ownership in your direction to City staff on the Updated Park and Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) data in the attached “2023 Jul - Coastal Recreation” file.
 - Do the Right Thing – READ, publicly discuss, take ownership the Park input from the nationally recognized Trust for Public Land in the attached “TPL Support for Ponto Park” file.
 - Do the Right Thing – fix the unfair distribution of City Parks and fix the clear need for a true Ponto Park as outlined in the attached “CTGMC key issues and suggestions 2022-12-6” file.
 - Do the Right Thing and work with Carlsbad People for Ponto Citizens. Carlsbad can be great if you let Carlsbad Citizens in and work for them. We have offered to help with dotation’s but have been turned away by the City.
- It is well documented in the attached “History of Open Space at Ponto” data file that past Council’s falsely “exempted” certain developers from providing the 15% Useable Growth Amendment Open Space required by the Open Space Standard. Ponto (LFMP Zone 9) developers were falsely ‘exempted’ as City data clearly shows Ponto was not developed in 1986 and did not in 1986 already dedicate 15% of the developable land as GM Open Space. In fact the City removed planned GM Open Space out of Ponto in 1996 land use changes that converted planned GM Open Space into Residential land use. The data in the “History of Open Space at Ponto” shows why Ponto, even with its currently 32 acres of vacant land – that last along Coastal South Carlsbad, is already developed at 40% higher residential density than the rest of the Carlsbad. Ponto has 40% more residential density, NO Park, and is missing due to past false ‘exemptions’ about 30 acres GM Open Space that Ponto

developers should have been required to provide. If this Council perpetuates a false 'exemption' that falsehood and lie to citizens will be your personal lie to both current and future Carlsbad families.

- Do the Right Thing – READ and publicly and honestly discuss the History of Growth Management Open Space at Ponto, and take ownership in your direction to City staff in the attached "History of Open Space at Ponto" file.
 - Do the Right Thing – and don't perpetuate a lie to Carlsbad Citizens about False Growth Management Open Space Exemptions. Be honest in your representation of current and future Citizens
 - Do the Right Thing – fix the False Open Space Exemptions as outlined in the attached "CTGMC key issues and suggestions 2022-12-6" file.
- Sadly Carlsbad found out in 2017 it will lose about 30 acres of Open Space (the State Campground and City's ONLY Low-cost Visitor Accommodations) in Coastal South Carlsbad due to sea level rise and increased Coastal/bluff erosion. Prior Council's never considered this loss of Open Space in the 2015 General Plan. Yet the City still asking the CA Coastal Commission to adopt the 2015 General Plan even though the Council now knows about how Carlsbad will lose 30 acres of Coastal Open Space in South Carlsbad. The attached "sea level rise & DLUP-LUPA planned loss of OS at Ponto" data file documents the Coastal Open Space loss the Past Council ignored. The current Council should account for and replace this loss of 30 acres of Coastal Open Space due to sea level rise in both the Growth Management plan and Local Coastal Program Updates.
 - Do the Right Thing – READ and publicly and honestly discuss Sea Level Rise/Coastal Erosion issues never considered in the Growth Management Plan Update, 2015 General Plan Update, and City proposed LCPA based on 2015 General Plan. The Sea Level Rise/Coastal Erosion issues are in the attached "Sea Level Rise & Carlsbad DLCP-LUPA planned loss of OS at Ponto" file.
 - Do the Right Thing – address this Coastal Open Space loss now with full public disclosure to Citizens, and directing accountable plans and funded actions in both the proposed Growth Management and Local Coastal Program updates.
 - Do the Right Thing – use the data/suggestions in the attached "CTGMC key issues and suggestions 2022-12-6" file to synergistically support addressing the loss of Coastal Open Space and critical Coastal Open Space Land Use in Coastal South Carlsbad.
- Sadly the current Council, and Carlsbad Citizens, were not provided all the over \$2 million in tax-payer paid Council studies and past Council's actions/inactions over 40-years on the proposed PCH Median Relocation Proposal. Most critically the current Council and Carlsbad Citizens have not been publicly presented the two 2001 Studies by URS & ERA that defined the number/amount of "Surplus Area" created by PCH Median Relocation and the "Financial Feasibility" of PCH Median Relocation. The current Council and Citizens are not being provided all the facts and data on the City's website. It is dishonest not to fully provide Citizens that data. Sadly the past Council's never considered other tax-payer saving solutions to address the well documented need for Ponto Park. Then, as now, there are more tax-payer efficient means to address the documented need for a Ponto Park and Complete PCH with needed sidewalks, bike lane improvements, and beach parking along PCH as documented in the attached "2 Part General Comparative Cost-Benefit & PCH Constraints Map" data files.
 - Do the right thing – direct staff to provide you and Carlsbad Citizens the 2001 Studies by URS and ERA, and the 2013 Study that shows likely environmental constraints in the PCH.
 - The current Council is now seeing PCH Relocation around Palomar Airport Road is already falling short and not able to 'create' the amount of "Surplus Area" from PCH Median Relocation as mapped out in the 2001 Studies; and the current Council is seeing costs are coming in at a far higher tax-payer cost.
 - Other better options to address Ponto Park needs are available and documented in the attached "2 Part General Comparative Cost-Benefit & PCH Constraints" data files.
 - Do the Right Thing – read, disclose and make publicly available to Carlsbad Citizens the two 2001 PCH Studies and the attached "2 Part Comparative Cost-Benefits & PCH Constraints" data files.
 - Carlsbad tax-payers will need to vote on PCH Median Relocation and both YOU and Citizens need to know the facts and fully consider the better options available to address the

documented need for a true Ponto Coastal Park and PCH (sidewalk, bikelane improvements, and beach parking).

If the current Council has a once in lifetime opportunity to correct past false exemptions and errors before it is too late. If the current Council fails to represent Carlsbad Citizens and perpetuates past falsehoods/errors/unfairness, they will become your personal falsehoods to the current Citizens you are supposed to represent and a false and failed legacy for future Carlsbad Citizens and their children. If the current Council fails to honestly represent and address Citizens' data/desires on Growth Management and Quality of Life issues you will ultimately lead the City down a path of lower quality of life (and reduced relative investment and value) as other cities provide more and better distributed Parks.

Failure to honestly provide a much needed and TRUE and significant Ponto Park (the last vacant land and opportunity to provide a true and meaningful Coastal Park) will push demand, increase VMT, traffic and parking congestion into North Carlsbad. Failure to provide a TRUE and significant Ponto Park will undermine the South Carlsbad's Coastal Recreation needs (and future economic and social sustainability) of all of current and future Carlsbad residents and visitors.

Ponto has the last remaining vacant and unplanned Coastal land for a 6-mile length of coast that is without Coastal Park. Buying Ponto Park is the far better and magnitude CHEAPER means for tax-payers to provide a significant Coastal Park for this 6-mile length of Coast (and ALL South Carlsbad) that is without a Coastal Park. The current Council should give Citizens the option to vote on the best and most cost effective solution for a much needed Ponto Park.

The current Council needs to responsibly address the data and issues thousands of Carlsbad Citizens have sent you. If the current Council fails to address these issues you will forever negatively impact forever our quality of life and eliminate the last viable, least constrained, and tax-payer effective option (Buying Ponto Park) for our future.

Each of the City Council members individually our your decision. Go down in history as being wise, true and doing the right thing for the future. Don't fail to disclose/address the FACTS. Your time is now. do the Right (and most tax-payer efficient) Thing – buy Ponto Park!

Lance Schulte

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



Project Areas


Carlsbad, CA - City Level Report

All statistical results are aggregated for the listed project areas and their service areas. Service areas are based on 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk times from project access points defined for each project area and based upon the walkable network.

| City Statistics | Current |
|--------------------|---------|
| City: Carlsbad, CA | |
| Park Acres | 3,364 |
| Total Population | 119,744 |
| Served Population | 57,941 |
| Percent Served | 48.4% |

Legend


- City Boundary
- Parks
- Service Areas
- Priority areas for new parks
 - Very high priority
 - High priority
 - Moderate priority






| Population | Within a 10-minute walk |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Total Population | 57,941 |

| Age | Within a 10-minute walk |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Children (less than age 20) | 13,069 |
| Adults (age 20 to age 64) | 34,460 |
| Seniors (age 65 and up) | 10,412 |




| Households by Income | Within a 10-minute walk |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Low income | 3,639 |
| Middle income | 5,454 |
| High income | 13,855 |

(Generated from urban area median income)



| Race/Ethnicity | Within a 10-minute walk |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| White* | 39,422 |
| Black* | 604 |
| Asian* | 4,221 |
| Native American* | 143 |
| Pacific Islander* | 114 |
| Other Race* | 342 |
| Two or More Races* | 3,618 |
| Hispanic | 9,478 |

* Excludes those that report Hispanic origin (which is captured separately from race by the U.S. Census)



Demographic information is derived from ESRI 2022 Demographic Forecast Block Groups data.

This report was created on July 18, 2023 using the ParkServe® interactive mapping site. It is for informational purposes only. The providers of this report disclaim any and all warranties, express or implied, including fitness for a particular purpose or merchantability, and make no representation that the report is complete, accurate, or error free. Use and reliance on this report is at the sole risk of the party using same.

On 7/14/23 the following data was sent to the City of Carlsbad & CA Coastal Commission. The City is the worse Coastal City for over 250 miles of coastline from the City of Santa Barbara to the Mexican border in providing Parkland access to its citizens. Requiring Fenton the Ponto developer to provide their Required Parkland as land at Ponto will be a small but very important step in the right direction to start digging Carlsbad out of being dead last in providing park access. In 2023 Carlsbad refused to even ask the Ponto developer to provide their required Parkland Dedication as actual ParkLand at Ponto. The Trust for Public Land has mapped and documented this fact. The Trust for Public Land has also sent a letter to the City and City Council highlighting the need for a City Park at Ponto. Following is the Trust for Public Land data showing that Carlsbad is the worst City in providing Park access to its citizens. Ponto is one of worst areas in Carlsbad for City Park access per the City's Park Master Plan. The Trust for Public Land documents a city's 10-minute walk to Park at <https://www.tpl.org/parkserve>. The Average USA City provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 55% of residents [10% above Carlsbad]. **Carlsbad** provides Parks within 10-minute walk to **49.9% of residents [10% below National Average]**.

Carlsbad is the worst of 29 Southern CA Coastal cities (from Santa Barbara south to the Mexican Border on over 250 miles of coastline) in providing Parks within 10-minute walk to residents:

1. Palos Verdes Estates provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
2. El Segundo provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
3. Hermosa Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 100% of residents
4. Redondo Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 98% of residents
5. Manhattan Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 95% of residents
6. Del Mar provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 93% of residents
7. Dana Point provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 89% of residents
8. Carpinteria provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 87% of residents
9. Huntington Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 85% of residents
10. Long Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 84% of residents
11. Laguna Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
12. Santa Monica provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
13. Oxnard provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 82% of residents
14. San Diego provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 81% of residents
15. Santa Barbara provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 78% of residents
16. Coronado provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
17. Newport Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 76% of residents
18. Imperial Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 74% of residents
19. Port Hueneme provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 73% of residents
20. Ventura provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 69% of residents
21. Encinitas provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 68% of residents
22. Los Angeles provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
23. Solana Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 63% of residents
24. Oceanside provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 58% of residents
25. Seal Beach provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 57% of residents
26. Malibu provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 53% of residents
27. San Clemente provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 52% of residents
28. Rancho Palos Verdes provides Parks within 10-minute walk to 50% of residents
29. **Carlsbad** provides Parks within 10-minute walk to **49.9% of residents [Carlsbad is lowest & most unfair]**

Carlsbad is the lowest & most unfair to citizens of the 29 Southern California Coastal cities along over 250 miles of CA Coastline from Santa Barbara to the Mexican border. The population in these 29 cities is in the millions, and Carlsbad is the worst in providing (and planning to provide) Park access. Additional facts in this document, further documents the situation, and need for Ponto Park.

Source of data: Trust for Public land parkscores

Trust for Public Land's 10-minute walk to Park Maps/data:

Carlsbad = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0611194#reportTop>

Encinitas = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0622678>

Irvine = <https://parkserve.tpl.org/mapping/index.html?CityID=0636770>

As fully documented in the "History of Open Space at Ponto" data file sent to both the City & CCC. The initial 1986 LCP for Ponto included a 12.8 acre Recreation Commercial land use (along with other additional Recreation and Open Space uses) that were never built. The 12.8 Recreation Commercial land use was eliminated by the City & CCC and converted to Residential land use in a 1994 LCP amendment with a land use regulation Policy placed on a 11.1 acre Planning Area F site to address the Coastal Recreation and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation needs for the State and LCP area. That existing Planning Area F LCP Policy a critical subject of the Carlsbad's proposed 2019 LCP Amendment

Updated Pubic Comments Coastal Recreation submitted on Oct 12th 2021:

On 10/8/21 the Carlsbad City Council and CA Coastal Commission were emailed data from an Official Carlsbad Public Records Request (# R002393-092121) on the City of Carlsbad's past compliance/noncompliance with the currently exiting Mello II LCP Land Use Policies # 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 Certified in the mid-1980s. The City's documents show:

- For Policy 6-2 the 200-300 acre Park called out in Policy 6-2 has been reduced to Veterans Park's 91.5 acres, of which only 54% or 49.5 acres is even useable as a Park. The City provided no documents on how a 200-300 acre park called for in Policy 6-4 is now only 49.5 useable acres.
- For Policy 6-4 there were no City documents were provided. There was no City Public discussion, consideration, or City compliance with Policy 6-4 since the mid-1980's.
- For Policy 6-10 concerns providing Low Cost Visitor Accommodations. Public Parks are the lowest cost (free) Visitor accommodating land use there is.

The 3 existing LCP Land Use Policies are important for Carlsbad, and California's, Coastal land use resources. There appears little to no discussion of the City's past apparent failure to implementation of these 3 LCP LUPs in the current City consideration of changes to the LCP.

Following is a copy of Public Records Request # R002393-092121: "Carlsbad's Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the Mello II Segment of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone has long established land use Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 that were adopted by Carlsbad and Certified by the CA Coastal Commission in the early/mid-1980's. Mello II LCP Policies 6-2, 6-4 & 6-10 are shown on page 86-87 of Carlsbad's 2016 compiled LCP and are:

- "POLICY 6-2 REGIONAL PARK: If the population of Carlsbad increases in accordance with SANDAG's projected Series V Population Forecasts, it is estimated that Carlsbad will need to develop a new regional park containing 200 to 300 acres in order to adequately serve the public. A location for a new regional park must,

therefore, be established. Consideration should be given to a facility within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, or adjacent lands. The Batiquitos Lagoon area should also be considered.

- **POLICY 6-4 NEED FOR ADDITIONAL OVERNIGHT CAMPING:** Additional overnight camping facilities, the main source of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities, are needed throughout the San Diego coastal region. Additional facilities of this kind should be provided in a regional park within the Carlsbad area. This can be accomplished in conjunction with an eventual Batiquitos Park, within the Aqua Hedionda Specific Plan Area, and/or along with the development of private recreational facilities.
- **POLICY 6-10 LOWER COST VISITOR-SERVING RECREATIONAL USES:** Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Encourage a range of affordability for overnight visitor accommodations. Evaluate the affordability of any new or redeveloped overnight visitor accommodations, including amenities that reduce the cost of stay. Mitigation may be applied to protect and encourage affordable overnight accommodations”

The public record request is to see documents of:

- City Staff reports, presentations and communications to the Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council regarding the City’s consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies; and
- Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commissions, and City Council minutes, resolutions and ordinances documenting City of Carlsbad consideration and implementation of these 3 specific (6-2, 6-4, and 6-10) Mello II LCP land use policies.”

Updated Pubic Comments on Coastal Recreation submitted on January 2021:

Over 11-months ago in a 1/29/20 1:56PM email People for Ponto Carlsbad citizens first provided the City of Carlsbad both data and comments on **14 critical Coastal Recreation issues (see pages 5-30 below)**. The data and the 14 critical issues do not seem to be receiving appropriate disclosure/presentation/discussion/consideration in the Dec 2, 2020 Staff Report to the Planning Commission. To assure the 26-pages of citizen data and requests in the 1/29/20 email was received by the Planning Commission the file was re-emailed on 12/22/20 12:24pm and specifically addressed to City Council, City Clerk, Planning Commission, Parks Commission, Housing Commission, HEAC, CA Coastal Commission, and CA HCD. As citizens we request each of these 14 data points (with supporting data) be honestly considered.

In reading the Dec 2 Staff Report citizens conducted additional analysis of City Park data. That research further reinforces and documents the 14 Critical Coastal Recreation issues and highlights the relatively poor amount of City Park and Coastal Recreation planned by Carlsbad’s Staff proposed Draft LCP-LUPA. We hope the City Council and City Commissions, and CA Coastal Commission & HCD will consider this additional analysis of City data and citizen input:

| <u>Coastal Zone data</u> | <u>Carlsbad</u> | <u>Oceanside</u> | <u>Encinitas</u> | <u>note or source</u> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Coastline miles | 6.4 | 3.9 | 6.0 | Carlsbad Draft LCPA 201, Google Maps |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 9,219 | 1,460 | 7,845 | & Oceanside & Encinitas LCPs |
| Coastal Zone Acres | 100% | 16% | 85% | % relative to Carlsbad |
| <u>City Park Standard data</u> | | | | |
| City Park Standard | 3 | 5 | 5 | required park acres / 1,000 population |

Park Standard % 100% 167% 167% % is relative to Carlsbad

- Oceanside & Encinitas 'require' and plan for 67% MORE Parkland than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad 'requires' and plans for ONLY 60% as much Parkland as Oceanside & Encinitas
- Carlsbad only requires developers provide 60% of the parkland (or in-lieu fees) as Oceanside & Encinitas require
- Encinitas has a 'Goal' to provide 15 acres of Park land per 1,000 population

Developed City Park 2.47 3.65 5.5 acres / 1,000 population

Developed Park 100% 148% 223% % is relative to Carlsbad

- Oceanside provides 48% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Encinitas provide 123% MORE developed park land than Carlsbad
- Carlsbad ONLY provides 68% and 45% as much Parks as Oceanside & Encinitas respectively

National Recreation & Park Asso. Metric: a typical City provides 1 park / 2,281 pop. & 9.9 Park acres / 1,000 population

- Carlsbad (3 acre) Park Standard is ONLY 30% of what a typical City provides nationally
- Carlsbad requires developers to provide, 70% LESS Park acres than typical City provides nationally

National Recreation & Park Asso., Trust for Public Land, et. al.: 10 minute (1/2 mile) Walk to a Park Planning Goal

- Both Oceanside and Encinitas plan parks to be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk to homes.
- Carlsbad DOES NOT plan Parks within walking distance to homes
- Carlsbad is NOT providing equitable and walking/biking access to Parks

Some Carlsbad Parks that are not fully useable as Parks:

| | total park acres | Unusable park acres | % of park unusable | reason unusable |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Existing Parks with Unusable Open Space acreage | | | | |
| Alga Norte - SE quadrant | 32.1 | 10.7 | 33% | 1/3 of park is a Parking lot not a park In many other Carlsbad Parks a significant percentage of those Parks are consumed by paved parking lots and unusable as a Park. |
| Hidden Hills - NE quadrant | 22.0 | 12.7 | 58% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| La Costa Canyon SE quadrant | 14.7 | 8.9 | 61% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Leo Carrillo - SE quadrant | 27.4 | 16.5 | 60% | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Poinsettia - SW quadrant | <u>41.2</u> | <u>11.1</u> | <u>27%</u> | city identified unusable habitat open space |
| Existing Park subtotal | 137.4 | 59.9 | 44% | 44% of these Parks are unusable as Parkland |

Anticipated Future Park

development projects

Park - quadrant

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Veterans - NW | 91.5 | 49.5 | 54% | estimated unusable habitat open space |
| Cannon Lake - NW | 6.8 | 3.4 | 50% | estimated unusable water open space |
| Zone 5 Park expansion - NW | 9.3 | 0 | 0 | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Robertson Ranch - NE | <u>11.2</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | appears 100% useable as a Park |
| Future park subtotal | 118.8 | 52.9 | 45% | 45% of Future Parks are unusable as Parks |

Unusable Open Space acres

in Existing & Future Parks 256.2 112.8 44% 112.8 acres or 44% is unusable as Parks

- 112.8 acres or 44% of the Existing & Future Parks are unusable Open Space and can't be used as Parkland
- **Based on City's minimum 3-acres/1,000 population Park Standard, 112.8 acres of Unusable Parkland means 37,600 Carlsbad Citizens (or 32.5% of Carlsbad's current population of 112,877) will be denied the minimum amount of Parkland that they can actually use as a Park.**

- **59.9 acres of Existing unusable ‘park’ / 3 acre park standard x 1,000 population = 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children are currently being denied useable park land. 19,967 is 17.7% of Carlsbad’s current population.**
- In addition to these 19,967 existing citizens and their children denied park land, the City needs to develop additional Park acreage in the NE, SW and SE quadrants to cover current shortfalls in meeting in the minimal 3 acre/1,000 population park standard for the current populations in the NE, SW and SE quadrants.
- **The current NE, SW and SE quadrants park acreage shortfalls are in addition to the 19,967 Carlsbad citizens and their children that do not have the minimum 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 population**
- **Current FY 2018-19 MINIMUM park acreage shortfalls are listed in the table below. They are:**
 - **4.3 acres for 1,433 people in NE quadrant,**
 - **6.8 acres for 2,266 people in SW quadrant, and**
 - **2.3 acres for 767 people in SE quadrant**

| | Shortfall (excess) in Current Quadrant <u>Min. Park standard by</u> | | <u>Future Park</u> | | <u>existing Park shortfalls are for NE, SW & SE quadrants</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <u>acres</u> | <u>population need</u> | <u>acres</u> | <u>%</u> | |
| NW quadrant | (-14.2) | (-4,733) | 107.6 | 91% | Current NW parks are 14.2 acres over min. standard & capacity for 4,733 more people at min. park standard. 91% of all Future City Parks are in NW quadrant |
| NE quadrant | 4.3 | 1,433 | 11.2 | 9% | Future Park will exceed minimum NE park standard |
| SW quadrant | 6.8 | 2,266 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 2,266 people in SW quad. Park deficit |
| SE quadrant | 2.3 | 767 | 0 | 0% | No min. parks for 767 SE quadrant Park deficit |

A Park Standard minimum is just a “Minimum”. City policy allows the City to buy/create parks above the City’s current 3 acre/1,000 pop. MINIMUM (and lowest) Park Standard of surrounding Coastal cities. Carlsbad already did this in the NW quadrant. It then added 3.1 more NW quadrant Park acres as part of the Poinsettia 61 Agreement. Poinsettia 61:

- converted 3.1 acres of NW City land planned/zoned for Residential use to Open Space Park land use/zoning,
- facilitated a developer building condos (increasing park demand) in the SW quadrant,
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay \$3 million to build the 3.1 acre NW quadrant park, and
- required the SW Quadrant developer pay to convert 3.1 acres of NW Quadrant & 5.7 acres of SW Quadrant City Park land to habitat that will be unusable as a City Park.

So Poinsettia 61 increased SW Quadrant development (that both increased SW Park Demand and expanded the current SW Quadrant Park deceit) while simultaneously using SW Quadrant development to pay for the conversion of 3.1 acres of residential land in the NW Quadrant to City Park (the NW Quadrant already has surplus park land per the City’s minimum standard).

People for Ponto strongly supports creating City Parks above the City’s current low 3-acre per 1,000 population minimum, as the City’s minimum standard is relatively low and substandard relative to other cities; many Carlsbad parks have significant acreage that is in fact ‘unusable’ as a park. Most importantly People for Ponto Citizens think it is very important to prioritize providing City Parks in areas of Park Inequity that are unserved by City Parks. However it seems very unfair to the SW Quadrant citizens to be so unserved and starved of the bare minimum of City Parks while at the same time funding City Parks in excess of City standard in other Quadrants.

The Poinsettia 61 illustrates a larger unfair (and dysfunctional) distribution of Quadrant based City Park demand and supply that is keenly evident in the demands/supply funding and location disparity of Veterans Park. Most all the

development impact and park demand that paid Veterans Park fees came from the SW, SE and NE Quadrants yet the Veterans Park (supply) is not in those SW, SE and NE Quadrants. This inequity is counter to the implicit City requirement that City Parks be provided within the Quadrant of their Park demand. It is logical and proper that City Parks be provided and equitably distributed to be close to the development and population that generated the Park demand.

The City Park inequity at Ponto and in other Coastal areas of the City is counter to several CA Coastal Act policies; counter to good city planning and good CA Coastal planning. Park Inequity is highly detrimental to the City, and City and CA citizens in the long-term; fails to properly distribute and match the location supply with the location of demand for Parks; and is counter to basic fundamental issues of fairness. Since 2017 People for Ponto has tried to get the City Council and Staff to address this inequity, specifically at Ponto, and to do so in a way that embraces a true and honest Citizen-based planning process.

Coastal Recreation:

2. Request that the City as part of its Draft LCP Public Review process broadly-publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCPA processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park: This disclosure is needed to correct about 20 years of City misrepresentation to the public on the since 1996 and currently Existing LCP requirements at Ponto, and the City's prior planning mistakes at Ponto. Citizens have been falsely told by the City that all the Coastal planning at Ponto was done already and that the City followed its Existing LCP regarding the need for a park at Ponto, and that this is already decided and could not be reversed. This misinformation has fundamentally stifled public review and public participation regarding the Coastal Zone. City failure to provide such a broad-public disclosure on the documented prior, and apparently current proposed, "planning mistakes" would appear to violate the principles of Ca Coastal Act Section 30006. A broad-public disclosure would for the first time allow citizens to be accurately informed on the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto so they can provide informed public review and comment regarding the need for a Coastal Park in in this last vacant 'unplanned' area. The requested broad-public disclosure by the City of the City past mistakes and the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto is consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) "Section 30006 Legislative findings and declarations; public participation - The Legislature further finds and declares that **the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning**, conservation and development; that achievement of **sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support**; and that the continuing planning and implementation of **programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation.**" The public cannot participate as outlined in CCA Section 30006 if past City 'mistakes' and misrepresentations on Coastal planning at Ponto go undisclosed to the public. If the public isn't fully informed about the 20-years of LCP planning mistakes at Ponto how could the public in the past (and now in the present) participate in the proposed LCP Amendment – **Public Participation as noted in Section 30006 above is the means to sound coastal conservation and development and is "... dependent upon public understanding ..."**. The City's past mistakes at Ponto need to be corrected by slightly different a Draft LCP Amendment process than currently outlined by the City; a new process is needed that clearly, opening and honestly informs and engages the public on the Existing LCP Ponto issues. The City's current Draft LCP Amendment process fails to follow CCA Section 30006 in that most all the citizens we encounter are as yet unaware of the City's Ponto mistakes and how they can participate in in the DLCPA process without that information. We see this daily in conversations we have with our fellow citizens. We even saw at the Oct 20, 2019 Carlsbad Planning Commission meeting that the Planning Commission was unaware of the planning mistakes at Ponto. How can a decision body of the City make a decision without knowing about these prior 'planning mistakes' facts that surround what they are being asked to decide on? Repeatedly since 2017 Carlsbad citizens and People for Ponto have asked the City to fully acknowledge the City's prior flawed planning at Ponto, and to correct that with ether maintaining the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use or restarting the Coastal Planning at Ponto with a true and accurately informed Community-based Coastal Planning process consistent with Section 30006.

We request the City during the DLCPA Public Review period broadly and publicly disclose to all Carlsbad Citizens the City's acknowledged prior LCP and other "planning efforts" public participation processing and planning "mistakes" regarding the requirement that the Ponto area be considered as a public park, and 1) provide a truly honest public participation process on that disclosure consistent with CCA Section 30006 as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process or 2) retain the Existing LCP Non-residential Reserve Land Use and require a comprehensive and honest community-based redo of Coastal Resource planning at Ponto.

3. City fully and publicly reply to and the City Council consider the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process: Lance Schulte on 1/23/20 received an email reply by the City to his follow-up email regarding the status of the 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests public comments and letters presented to the Planning Commission. This is appreciated, however it is request that the City fully publicly reply to the 11-20-19 citizen concerns/requests regarding the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and present the to the City Council 11/20/19 citizen concerns/requests so the City Council can consider them and provide any direction to City Staff. City Staff first presented a summary presentation of the proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Carlsbad Planning Commission on November 20, 2019, and indicated the public comment period would close on November in less than 2-weeks. Citizens and citizen groups provided public testimony to the Planning Commission, both verbally and in two written letters. The CCC was copied on those letters. The testimony and letters noted significant concerns about the City's proposed LCP Amendment process and made three requests:
- Disclose and provide a publically accessible 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan and Policies so everyone can see the proposed changes to the Existing LCP.
 - Provide true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern or objections. Citizen Workshops, when done right, are valuable means to openly educate, discuss and work to consensus options. These areas, including Ponto, were/are subject to multiple lawsuits, so true open and honest public workshops would provide an opportunity to openly and honestly discuss the issues and hopefully build public consensus/support for solutions. This approach seems consistent with CCA Section 30006, and common sense.
 - Extend the public comment period 6-months to allow Citizen Review of the Redline Version of the LCPA and allow time for Citizen Workshops.


The City did extend the Public Review period 2-months over the holidays to January 31, 2020. This is appreciated although many think this is inadequate given the significance of the Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, and lack of Redline Version to compare. The City and their consultants required several extra years beyond schedule prepare the proposed LCP Amendments. The extra years of City Staff work reflects on the volume of the over 500-pages in the documents and the time needed to understand the Existing LCP and then create an Amended LCP. Citizens need sufficient time, proper comparative tools (redline) and a process (workshops) to understand the proposed LCP Amendments that is reflective of extensive extra time needed by City Staff and consultants needed. Truncation of lay public review to a few months for an Amendment that took paid professionals many years to produce seems a more than a bit inappropriate. The City appears to be rejecting citizens' request to be provided a 'Redline Version' of the Existing 2016/Proposed LCP land use Plan. So public review comments will tainted or will miss many issues due having to manually cross-reference a 150-page Existing LCP LUP with a Proposed 350-page Proposed LCP LUP. There will be unknown and unconsidered changes in the Draft LCP Amendment that the public and city and CCC decision makers will not know about due to the lack of 'Redline Version'.

The City also appears to reject citizen requests for true Citizen Workshops on the major remaining vacant Coastal land that still have outstanding Citizen Concern – such as Ponto. Like Coastal Recreation issue #1 above the following citizen requests appear consistent with CA Coastal Act (CCA) Section 30006, and the City's rejection of that requests seem counter to the CA Coastal Act.

We again request of the City to provide: 1) a 'Redline Version' to the public and decision makers, along with sufficient time to review and comment on the 'Redline Version'; and 2) true Citizen Workshops for Ponto and the

other last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands in Carlsbad as part of the Draft LCP Amendment process, or as part of deferred LCP Amendment process for those areas.

4. Coastal Zoned land is precious: the very small amount of remaining vacant Coastal land should be reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses under the CA Coastal Act to provide for the growing and forever ‘Buildout’ needs of Carlsbad and CA Citizens, and our visitors.
 - Less than 1.8% (76 square miles) of San Diego County’s 4,207 square miles is in Coastal Zone. This small area needs to provide for all the forever Coastal needs of the County, State of CA, and Visitors. Upland Coastal Recreation (Coastal Park) land use is needed to provide land to migrate the projected/planned loss of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation land uses due to Sea Level Rise impacts. There is only 76 miles of total coastline in San Diego County; a significant amount is publicly inaccessible military/industrial land. So how the last few portions of Coastal Land within Carlsbad (which is about 8% of San Diego County’s Coastline) is planned for the forever needs for High-Coastal-Priority Recreation Land Use is critical for Carlsbad, San Diego, and California Statewide needs into the future.
 - Most all the developable Coastal land in Carlsbad is already developed with Low-Coastal-Priority residential uses. Only a very small percentage of Carlsbad’s developable Coastal land, maybe 1-2%, is still vacant. This last tiny portion of fragment of vacant developable Coastal Land should be documented in the Draft LCP and reserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Land uses – most critically Coastal Recreation – to address the growing Coastal Recreation needs from a growing population and visitors. These growing needs are all the more critical in that existing Coastal Recreation lands will be decreasing due to inundation and erosion due to DLCPA planned Sea Level Rise.
 - This image of the western half of San Diego County graphically shows (in the blue line) the very small Coastal Zone Area that needs to provide the Carlsbad’s and California’s Coastal Recreational needs for all San Diego County residents and Visitors:



We request that 1) the amount and location of remaining vacant Coastal land in Carlsbad be documented and mapped and be reserved for high-priority Coastal Land Uses consistent with CCA Goals in Section 30001.5 "... (c) ... **maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone** consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. (d) **Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.** ... "; 2). This data be used in the City's analysis and the public's review and discussion about the City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Land Use Plan. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Land Use Plan will forever lock in the amount "maximum public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone" and will be the final Coastal Land Use Plan that is supposed to "assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast". Most of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone is already developed or committed to low-priority land uses contrary to these CCA Goals, so how we finally and forever plan to use of the last small remaining vacant Coastal Land is very important.

5. The proposed Draft LCP Amendment in Chapter 3 makes unfounded statements regarding the proposed Amendment to the LCP Land Use Plan provision of "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation land use: On page 3-3, at the beginning of the Chapter 3 – Recreation and Visitor Serving Uses the City correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation uses, and cites multiple CCA Sections to that effect. The City's proposed Coastal Land Use Plan then states on page 3-5 that a high proportion of land in the City is dedicated open

space available for passive and active use, yet provides no justification or accurate metric to support this statement. This is a critical unsubstantiated and speculative statement that is not supported by any comparative data (justifying the “high proportion” statement). The City later in Chapter 3 compared the adjoining cities of Oceanside and Encinitas to try to show how the proposed Draft LCP LUP Amendment provides higher levels of Visitor Serving Accommodations. That ‘non-common denominator’ comparison was fundamentally flawed, as noted in a prior separate Draft LCPA public review comment from People for Ponto regarding another high-priority Coastal land use (visitor accommodations) planned for in Chapter 3, but at least it was an attempt to compare. However, for the Coastal Recreation portion of Chapter 3, the City does not even attempt to provide any comparative data to support (or justify) the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan and statements. The Coastal Recreation Chapter also fails to disclose Carlsbad’s adopted City Park Master Plan (Park Service Area and Equity map) data that shows a clear conflict between the CA Coastal Act Policy Sections noted at the beginning of Chapter 3 and Chapter 3’s proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan.

Comparative Coastal Recreation: Comparing the Land Use Plan and policies of Oceanside, Carlsbad and Encinitas, one finds Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreational Plan and Policies are not “high”, but very low compared with Oceanside and Encinitas. Carlsbad has a General Plan Park Standard of 3 acres of City Park per 1,000 Population. Oceanside has a 5 acres of City Park Standard per 1,000 population, and Encinitas has a 15 acres per 1,000 population standard, and an in-lieu park fee requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population. Carlsbad’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is in fact not ‘high’ but is in fact the lowest of the three cities, with Carlsbad providing only 40% of Oceanside’s park standard, and only 20% of Encinitas’s Park Standard. Citywide Carlsbad currently has 2.47 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, Oceanside currently has 3.6 acres of developed park per 1,000 population, and Encinitas currently has 5.5 acres of developed park per 1,000 population. Although this data is citywide, it shows Carlsbad’s current amount of developed parkland is less than 70% of what Oceanside currently provides, and less than 45% of what Encinitas currently provides. Carlsbad is not currently providing, nor proposing a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide, a ‘high’ proportion of Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to Oceanside and Encinitas.

On page 3-5 Carlsbad may be misrepresenting city open space that is needed and used for the preservation of federally endangered species habitats and lagoon water bodies. This open space Land cannot be Used for Coastal Recreation purposes; and in fact Land Use regulations prohibit public access and Recreational Use on these Lands and water bodies to protect those endangered land and water habitats. 78% of Carlsbad’s open space is “open space for the preservation of natural resources” and cannot be used for Coastal Parks and Recreational use. Although “open space for the preservation of natural resources” does provide scenic or visual amenity, and this amenity is addressed as a different coastal resource. Visual open space is not Coastal Recreation Land Use. It appears Carlsbad is proposing in the Draft LCP Amendment to continue to, providing a ‘low’ percentage of Coastal Park Land Use and Coastal Recreation Land Use compared to adjoining cities.

In addition to the comparatively low amount of Coastal Park land Carlsbad plans for, Carlsbad scores very poorly regarding the equitable and fair distribution and accessibility of Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation Land Uses. Both the City of Oceanside and Encinitas have very robust and detailed Park and Land Use plans to promote an equitable distribution of, and good non-vehicular accessibility, to their Coastal Parks. By comparison, Carlsbad’s park land use plan scores poorly, as exemplified in Ponto and South Carlsbad. Ponto’s existing population requires about 6.6 acres of City Parkland per Carlsbad’s low 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. Yet the nearest City Park is several miles away and takes over 50 minutes to walk along major arterial roadways and across Interstate 5 to access. As such this nearest park is not an accessible park for Ponto children, and thus Ponto children have to play in

however it more accurately illustrated in the following data/image from the adopted Carlsbad Park Master Plan's "Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)". The image below titled 'No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad' shows Carlsbad's adopted "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" from the City's Park Master Plan that says it maps "the population being served by that park type/facility." The added text to the image is data regarding park inequity and disparity in South Carlsbad. The image compiles Carlsbad's adopted Park "Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps)" for Community Parks and Special Use Area Parks that are the City's two park acreage types produced by the City's comparatively low standard of 3 acre of City Park per 1,000 population. The City's Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) shows areas and populations served by parks within the blue and red circles. City data clearly shows large areas of overlapping Park Service (areas/populations served by multiple parks) in North Carlsbad and also shows large areas in South Carlsbad with No Park Service (areas/populations unserved by any parks) and Park Inequity in South Carlsbad. It clearly shows the City's Documented Park Need and Park inequity at Ponto. The Existing LCP LUP for Ponto's Planning Area F in is required to "consider" and "document" the need for a "Public Park". The City's adopted Park Service Area Maps (Equity Maps) clearly shows the inequity of Coastal City Park between North and South Carlsbad, and the need for Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad – particularly at Ponto. The City's proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan instead proposes to lock-in documented City Public Coastal Park inequity and unserved Coastal Park demand at Ponto and South Carlsbad forever. It does so by proposing the last vacant undeveloped/unplanned Coastal land – Ponto Planning Area F - in the unserved Ponto and South Carlsbad coastline areas instead of being planned for much needed City Park and Coastal Recreation use be converted to even more low-priority residential and general commercial land uses. These 'low-priority' residential uses, by the way, further increase City Park and Coastal Recreation demand and inequity in Coastal South Carlsbad. This is wrong, and a proposed 'forever-buildout' wrong at the most basic and fundamental levels. The proposed Draft Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan by NOT providing documented needed City parks for vast areas of Coastal South Carlsbad is inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act policies and Existing LCP LUP requirements for Ponto Planning Area F; and also inconsistent with fair/equitable/commonsense land use and park planning principles, inconsistent with CA Coastal Commission social justice goals, inconsistent with social equity, inconsistent with VMT reduction requirements, and inconsistent with common fairness. A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan should be provided that provides for a socially equitable distribution of Coastal Park resources so as to would allow children, the elderly and those without cars to access Coastal Parks. The proposed Draft 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan forever locking in the unfair distribution of City Parks appears a violation of the not only CCA Sections 30213, 30222, 30223, and 30252(6) but also the fundamental values and principles of the CA Coastal Act. The Draft also appears a violation of Carlsbad's Community Vision.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



A different Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is required to provide a more equitable distribution of City Parks with non-vehicular accessibility. Such a different plan would advance State and City requirements to reduce vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and sea level rise impacts. Please note that the data for the above basic comparison comes from City of Carlsbad, Oceanside and Encinitas General Plan and Park Master Plan documents.

Data shows the proposed Coastal Recreation Plan conflicts with the CA Coastal Act policy Sections. As mentioned page 3-3 correctly states that the CA Coastal Act (CCA) places a high priority on maximizing Recreation Land Uses, and pages 3-5 list multiple CA Coastal Act (CCA) policy Sections that confirm this. However, given the significant statewide importance of Coastal Recreation Land Use, the City proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan does not appear to adequately address and implement these CCA Policies, and most noticeably in the Ponto area of South Carlsbad. Coastal Recreation is a significant Statewide High-Priority Land Use under the CCA. For a substantially developed non-coastal-industry city like Carlsbad Coastal Recreation is likely the biggest land use issue. This issue is even more elevated due to the fact that there are only a few small areas left of undeveloped Coastal land on which to provide Coastal Recreation, and Carlsbad is proposing a Coastal 'Buildout' Land Use Plan on those areas. The use of the last few remaining vacant portions of Coastal land for Coastal Recreation Land Use is the most important land use consideration in the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment as population and visitor growth will increase demands for Coastal Recreation. It is thus very surprising, and disturbing that the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan is so short, lacks any comparative and demand projection data, lacks any resource demand/distribution and social equity data, and lacks any rational and clear connection with CCA Policy and the proposed 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use plan. This is all the more troubling given that:

- The Ponto area represents the last significant vacant undeveloped/unplanned land near the coast in South Carlsbad that can provide a meaningful Coastal Park.
- The fact that the City's Existing LCP requires the city consider and document the need for a "i.e. Public Park" on Ponto's Planning Area F prior to the City proposing a change of Planning Area F's "Non-residential

Reserve” land use designation. The City has repeatedly failed to comply with this LCP LUP requirement, and worse has repeatedly failed to honestly inform citizens of this LCP LUP requirement at planning Area F before it granted any land use. The City, apparently implementing speculative developer wishes, has repeatedly proposed changing Planning Area F’s Coastal Land Use designation to “low-priority” residential and general commercial land uses without publically disclosing and following the Existing LCP LUP.

- The City’s currently developed parks in the southern portion of the City do not meet the city’s comparatively low public park standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 population. Since 2012 there has been City park acreage shortfall in both SW and SE Carlsbad.
- The Existing population of Ponto (west of I-5 and south of Poinsettia Lane) requires about 6.6 acres of Public Park based on the City’s comparatively low public park standard of 3 acres per 1,000 population. There is no Public Park in Ponto. Adding more population at Ponto will increase this current park demand/supply disparity.
- Carlsbad and other citizens have since 2017 expressed to the City the strong need for a Coastal Park at Ponto, and requested the City to provide a true citizen-based planning process to consider the Public Park need at Ponto. The Citizens’ requested process is fully in-line with CCA Goals, Public Participation Policy, Land Use Policies, and the Existing LCP Land Use Plan/requirements for Planning Area F and is the most appropriate means to consider and document the need for a Public Park at Ponto as required by the Existing LCP Land Use Plan.
- Planning Area F is for sale, and a non-profit citizens group has made an offer to purchase Planning Area F for a much needed Coastal Park for both Ponto and inland South Carlsbad residents and visitors. How should these facts be considered by the City and CCC?
- Carlsbad has no Coastal Parks west of I-5 and the railroad corridor for the entire southern half of Carlsbad’s 7-mile coastline.
- The southern half of Carlsbad’s coastline is 5.7% of the entire San Diego County coastline and represents a significant portion of regional coastline without a meaningful Coastal Park west of I-5 and the Railroad corridor.
- The City’s proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan provides No Documentation, No Rational, and No Supporting or Comparative Data to show the proposed Coastal Recreation Land Use Plan in fact complies with the CA Coastal Act.

6. There is no Coastal Recreation/Park west of interstate 5 for all South Carlsbad, or half of the entire City. This is an obviously unfair and inequitable distribution of Coastal Recreation/Park resources that should be corrected by changes to the Draft LCP Land Use Amendment: The following image (which was sent to the City and CCC on several prior communications) was first requested by former Carlsbad Councilman Michael Schumacher during a People for Ponto presentation/request at the Oct 23, 2018 City Council meeting. The data compiled in the image shows how the South Coastal Carlsbad (Ponto) is not served by a Park per the City’s adopted Parks Master Plan. The blue dots on the map are park locations and blue circle(s) show the City’s Park Master Plan adopted Park Service Areas and Park Equity. This data, from pages 87-88 of the City of Carlsbad Parks Master Plan, shows all City Parks (both Community Parks and Special Use Areas in Coastal Carlsbad (except Aviara Park east of Poinsettia Park and west of Alga Norte Park). The text on the left margin identifies the South Carlsbad Coastal Park (west of I-5) gap along with the number of South Carlsbad Citizens (over half the City’s population) without a Coastal Park. The left margin also identifies more local issues for the over 2,000 Ponto area adults and children. For Ponto residents the nearest Public Park and City proposed ‘solution’ to the South Carlsbad and Ponto Public Park deficit are miles away over high-speed/traffic roadways and thus somewhat hazardous to access and effectively unusable by children/the elderly or

those without cars. Having been a 20-year resident of Ponto I regularly see our children have to play in the street as there are no Public Park with large open fields to play at within a safe and under 1-hour walk away. Ponto citizens have submitted public comments regarding this condition and the lack of a Park at Ponto

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away




Ponto is at the center of regional 6-mile Coastal Park Gap. A Coastal Park in this instance being a Public Park with practical green play space and a reasonable connection with the Coast (i.e. located west of the regional rail and Interstate-5 corridors). The following image shows this larger regional Coastal Park Gap centered on the Ponto Area, and the nearest Coastal Parks – Cannon Park to the north, and Moonlight Park to the south.

Regionally this image shows Ponto is the last remaining significant vacant Coastal land that could accommodate a Coastal Park to serve the Coastal Park current needs of over existing 2,000 Ponto residents, 64,000 existing South Carlsbad residents, and a larger regional population. It is also the only area to serve the Coastal Park needs for the thousands of hotel rooms in Upland Visitor Accommodations in South Carlsbad.

How Ponto Serves Region

- Ponto is in the middle of the regional Coastal Park Gap
- A Ponto Coastal Park fills a critical 6 mile gap of coastline without a Coastal Park - 8.6% of SD County coastline
- A Ponto Coastal Park Serves over 26,000 homes & 64,000 citizens just in South Carlsbad without a Coastal Park
- Serves many more people outside Carlsbad




As People for Ponto first uncovered and then communicated in 2017 to the City and CCC; Carlsbad's Existing (since 1994) Local Coastal Program LUP currently states (on page 101) that Ponto's Planning Area F: carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Carlsbad's Existing Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan states: "Planning Area F carries a Non-Residential Reserve (NRR) General Plan designation. Planning Area F is an "unplanned" area ..." and requires that: "... **As part of any future planning effort, the City and Developer must consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e. public park) on the west side of the railroad.**" CA Coastal Commission actions, Carlsbad Public Records Requests 2017-260, 261, and 262, and 11/20/19 City Planner statements confirm the City never fully communicated to Carlsbad Citizens the existence of this LCP requirement nor did the City comply with the requirements. Of deep concern is that the City is now (as several times in the past) still not honestly disclosing to citizens and implementing this Existing LCP requirement as a true and authentic 'planning effort'. The lack of open public disclosure and apparent fear of true public workshops and Public Comment about the Existing Planning Area F LCP requirements are troubling. The point of a 'planning effort' is to openly and publically present data, publically discuss and explore possibilities/opportunities, and help build consensus on the best planning options. Citizens are concerned the city has already made up its mind and there is no real "planning effort" in the proposed Draft LCP Amendment process, just a brief Staff Report and at the end provide citizens 3-minutes to comment on the proposal. This is not the proper way to treat the last remaining significant vacant land in South Carlsbad that will forever determine the Coastal Recreation environment for generations of Carlsbad and California citizens and visitors to come.

The following data/images show how Ponto is in the center of the 6-mile (west of I-5 and Railroad corridor) regional Coastal Park gap. Ponto is the last remaining vacant and currently "unplanned" Coastal land that is available to address this regional Coastal Park Gap.

How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- **Relieves Coastal Park congestion** in North Carlsbad, Encinitas and Solana Beach
- Area currently needs Coastal Park as seen by:
 - Ponto Beach parking congestion
 - current trespass use of Planning Area F as a Park
- **6.6 acre portion of Planning Area F** addresses SW Quad City Park deficit



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- A Ponto Park helps address 2050 and beyond Regional Population and Visitor Growth demands for Coastal Parks
- A Ponto Park provides the lowest-cost coastal access and recreation opportunities for CA citizens and visitors



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Vital park and open space amenity for Visitor serving businesses and accommodations
- 6.6 acre unique City Coastal Park venue to stage special events: Runs, bike rides, triathlons, sports, coastal festivals, etc.



How Ponto Serves Region cont.

- Critical Park space for So. Carlsbad State Beach Campground
- Provides a big training and staging space for Junior lifeguards
- Dog walk trail




Ponto Coastal Park Concept

- A concept – but shows potential recreational opportunities
- Provides **vital parkland support for beach & open play fields**
- Concept plan a gift from San Pacifico Community Association



One possible Concept image of a potential Ponto Coastal Park at Planning Area F is illustrated below. The potential for a Ponto Coastal Park is real. The speculative land investment fund (Lone Star Fund #5 USA L.P. and Bermuda L.P.) that currently owns Planning Area F is selling the property, and is available for the City of Carlsbad to acquire to address the documented demand/need for a City Park and City Park inequity at Ponto and in Coastal South Carlsbad. A Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 is working to acquire donations to help purchase the site for a Park. These situations and opportunities should be publicly discussed as part of the City Staff's proposed Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment.



7. Projected increases in California, San Diego County and Carlsbad population and visitor growth increases the demand for High-Priority-Coastal Recreation land use:

- Increasing Citizen demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

San Diego County Citizen Population - Source: SANDAG Preliminary 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1980 | 1,861,846 |
| 1990 | 2,498,016 |
| 2000 | 2,813,833 |
| 2010 | 3,095,313 |
| 2020 | 3,535,000 = 46,500 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |
| 2030 | 3,870,000 |
| 2040 | 4,163,688 |
| 2050 | 4,384,867 = 57,700 Citizens per mile of San Diego County coastline |

2020 to 2050 = 24% increase in San Diego County population.

Citizen Population will continue beyond 2050. Carlsbad may plan for 'Buildout' in 2050, but what is San Diego County's 'Buildout'? There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for this growing population. If we do not increase our supply of Coastal Recreational Resources for these increased demands our Coastal Recreation Resources will become more overcrowded, deteriorated and ultimately diminish the Coastal Recreation quality of life for Citizens of Carlsbad and California. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5) and there is No Coastal Park in all of South Carlsbad to address the Coastal Recreation needs of the 64,000 South Carlsbad Citizens.

- Increasing Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational land needs to be addressed with increased Coastal Recreation land:

Yearly Visitors to San Diego County – source: *San Diego Tourism Authority; San Diego Travel Forecast, Dec, 2017*

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016 | 34,900,000 |
| 2017 | 34,900,000 |
| 2018 | 35,300,000 |
| 2019 | 35,900,000 |
| 2020 | 36,500,000 = average 100,000 visitors per day, or 2.83% of County’s Population per day, or 1,316 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2020 |
| 2021 | 37,100,000 |
| 2022 | 37,700,000 |

This is growth at about a 1.6% per year increase in visitors. Projecting this Visitor growth rate from 2020 to 2050 results in a 61% or 22,265,000 increase in Visitors in 2050 to:

| | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2050 | 58,765,000 = average 161,000 visitors per day, or 3.67% of the County’s projected 2050 Population per day, or 2,120 Visitors/coastal mile/day in 2050. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The number of Visitors is likely to increase beyond the year 2050. There is a common-sense need to increase the amount of Coastal Recreation Land Use in the Proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan for these projected 2050 61% increase, and beyond 2050, increases in Visitor demand for Coastal Recreational Resources. Increasing Coastal Recreation land is a vital and critically supporting Land Use and vital amenity for California’s, the San Diego Region’s and Carlsbad’s Visitor Serving Industry. Ponto sits in the middle of an existing 6-mile regional Coastal Park Gap (no Coastal Park west of Interstate 5). There are thousands of hotel rooms in South Carlsbad that have NO Coastal Park to go to in South Carlsbad. This needs correcting as both a Coastal Act and also a City economic sustainability imperative.

- We request that the as part of the public’s review, the City Staff proposed Draft LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan clearly document if and/or how future forever ‘Buildout’ City, Regional and Statewide population and visitor population demand for Coastal Recreation and City Coastal Parks are adequately provided for both in amount and locational distribution in the Carlsbad proposed Amendment of the LCP Land Use Plan.

8. Carlsbad’s Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment says it plans to a year 2050 buildout of the Coastal Zone. The Draft Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Amendment then is the last opportunity to create a Coastal Land Use Plan to provide “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use, and will forever impact future generations of California, San Diego County, and Carlsbad Citizens and Visitors:

- The Draft LCPA indicates in 2008 only 9% of All Carlsbad was vacant land. Less is vacant now in 2019. Carlsbad’s Coastal Zone is 37% of the City, so vacant unconstrained land suitable for providing Coastal Recreation is likely only 3-4%. The prior request for a full documentation of the remaining vacant Coastal lands will provide a better understanding needed to begin to make the final ‘buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan for Carlsbad. The Draft LCPA does not indicate the amount and locations of currently vacant unconstrained Coastal Land in Carlsbad. This final limited vacant land resource should be clearly documented and mapped in the DLCPA as it represents the real focus of the DLCPA – the Coastal Plan for these remaingn undeveloped

lands. These last remaining vacant lands should be primarily used to provide for and equitably distribute “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Uses consistent with CCA Sections:

- i. Section 30212.5 “... Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, **shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.**”;
- ii. Section 30213 “... **Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. ...**”;
- iii. Section 30222 “**The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development,** but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.”
- iv. Section 30223 “**Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible**” ,
- v. Section 30251 ... The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by ... 6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by **correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition** and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development”

Adopted City Park Service Area and Park Equity maps discussed earlier document the proposed Draft LCP Amendment’s inconstancy with the above CCA Policy Sections. The locations and small amounts remaining vacant Coastal lands provide the last opportunities to correct the inconsistencies of City proposed Draft “buildout” LCP Land Use Plan Amendment with these Coastal Act Policies.

Currently and since 1996 there has been LCP LUP Policy/regulations for Ponto Planning Area F that require consideration of a “Public Park” prior to changing the existing “unplanned Non-residential Reserve” Land Use designation. A map and data base of vacant developable Coastal land should be provided as part of the Draft LCPA and the Draft LCPA. This map and data base should document the projected/planned loss of Coastal land use due to Sea Level Rise. Draft LCPA projects Sea Level Rise will eliminate several beaches and High-Priority Coastal Land Uses like Coastal Lagoon Trails and the Campground.

- The LCP Land Use Plan should plan and reserve the very limited vacant developable Coastal land for the long-term ‘Buildout’ needs of “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation Land Use. Vacant developable Coastal land is too scarce to be squandered for “low-priority” uses. Sea Level Rise will reduce “High-Priority” Coastal Uses. So how vacant developable Upland area should be preserved for “High-Priority” Coastal Uses is a key requirement to be fully documented and discussed in the Draft LCPA. If not one of two things will eventually happen 1) any new Coastal Park land will require very expensive purchase and demolition of buildings or public facilities to create any new Coastal Park land to meet existing and growing demand; or 2) Coastal Recreation will be hemmed-in by “low-priority” uses and thus force Coastal Recreation to decrease and become increasingly concentrated and overcrowded in its current locations; and thus will promote the eventual deterioration of our current Coastal Recreation resources. A plan that fails to fix Coastal Park deficits and then increase Coastal Parks in pace with increased population/visitor demand is a plan that can


only result in degradation. How the Draft LCPA documents and addresses the land use planning of the last small portions of vacant developable Coastal land is critical for the future and future generations.

9. Citizens of South Carlsbad are concerned about the City's multiple prior flawed Ponto planning processes or 'mistakes' the City has made yet is basing the City Staff's proposed Draft LCP LUP. The concerns being the City is not openly and honestly communicating information to citizens and the public, and not allowing a reasonable and appropriate community-based planning process to address the documented Park, Coastal Recreation and unconstrained open space needs in South Carlsbad. One of these groups of citizens has created a www.peopleforponto.com website to try to research and compile information and hopefully provide a better means for citizens to understand facts and then express their concerns/desires to the City of Carlsbad (City) and CA Coastal Commission (CCC). Over 2,000 emails have sent to the City and CCC regarding Coastal Land Use Planning Issues at Ponto. The San Pacifico Planned Community (i.e. San Pacifico Community Association) has also, since 2015, sent numerous emailed letters to the City and CCC noting the significant concerns about changes in Coastal planning the City is proposing for our Planned Community.

Repeatedly over 90% of surveyed citizens (results emailed prior to both the City and CCC) have expressed the vital need and desire for a Coastal Park at Ponto to serve the current and future Coastal Recreation needs for all both Ponto and South Carlsbad and for larger regional and State Coastal Recreational needs. This desire is supported by data, CA Coastal Act Policy, and also Carlsbad's Community Vision – the foundation for the City's General Plan. Ponto is the last remaining vacant Coastal area available to provide for those needs in South Carlsbad and for a regional 6-mile stretch of coastline. Citizens have expressed deep concern about the City's flawed prior Coastal planning efforts for Coastal Recreation at Ponto, including two repeated LCP Amendment "mistakes" (Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan in 2010 and General Plan Update in 2015) when the City twice failed to publicly disclose/discuss and then follow the Existing LCP requirements at Ponto – specifically for Planning Area F. People for Ponto had to use multiple Carlsbad Public Records Requests in 2017 to find these "mistakes". CCC Staff was helpful in both confirming the City "mistakes" and communicating back to the City. As citizens we are still unclear as to how/why these two repeated "mistakes" happened. There is citizen concern that the City is again repeating these two prior "mistakes" by not at the beginning of the Public Comment Period clearly and publicly disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements to citizens as part of the current LCP Amendment process, and also by not implementing the existing LCP requirement PRIOR to proposing an Amended Coastal Land Use Plan for Ponto. The City in its proposed LCP Amendment process is putting-the-cart-before-the-horse with respect to honest and open consideration, documentation and public discussion of the need for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use required of Planning Area F at Ponto. The City is also not clearly letting all Carlsbad citizens know about the Existing LCP requirements for Ponto's Planning Area F so they can be informed to reasonably participate in public review and comment regarding amending that LCP requirement, and the need for Coastal Recreation land uses in South Carlsbad. Since 2017 there has been repeated citizen requests to the City (copies were provided to the CCC) to fix these multiple fundamental/foundational flaws by in the City's prior Coastal Recreation and Public Parks and Open Space at planning, and the currently Proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. Since 2017 there have also been repeated citizen requests to the City to provide a truly open, honest, inclusive community-based planning process and workshops with the accurate and honest information, prior to forming a proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment. As citizens we believe we can constructively work with the City and CCC towards a consensus or viable options on these important Coastal Recreation issues if the City allows and encourages such an open, honest and inclusive process. We request the City respond to the requests submitted to the City since 2017, and again request such a process from the City before any LCP Amendment is first considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Such a requested process benefits all.


10. Why the Draft LCPA Land Use Plan for Ponto should provide for the current and future Coastal Park and Recreation needs for South Carlsbad, the San Diego Region and California.

- Ponto, is one of last remaining vacant and undeveloped Coastal lands in North County
- Ponto is the last remaining undeveloped Coastal land in South Carlsbad
- Ponto has the last unplanned Planning Area of the Existing Poinsettia Shores Planned Community & Local Coastal Program that can be planned for high-priority Coastal Recreation land use. This Existing LCP requires Planning Area F be considered for a “Public Park”.
- Following is a map of the Ponto area in South Carlsbad:



Following is the LCP Land Use map from the Existing Poinsettia Shores Master Plan & Local Coastal Program adopted in 1996. This is the Land Use map that the City is proposing to change in the proposed LCP Amendment to the Land Use Plan. As the Existing LCP Land Use map shows most all the land is ‘low-priority’ residential use at an RM Residential medium density, a small portion is ‘high-priority’ Visitor Serving TC/C Tourist Commercial. Most all the

Open Space is constrained and undevelopable land (the steep CSS habitat bluffs above Batiquitos Lagoon) or water (the lagoon water). This land/water is owned by the State of California, like the inner lagoon east of I-5. Only Planning Area M at 2.3 acres is unconstrained Open Space and it provides a small private internal recreation facility for the approximately 450 homes and 1,000 people in the Planned Community. This small recreation area is a City requirement for ‘planned developments’ to off-set loss open space from planned development impacts on housing quality. Planned developments can propose designs that reduce normal setback and open space areas – they bunch together buildings to increase development – such as the smaller lot sizes, and extensive use of “zero-setbacks” to reduce typical lot sizes that occurs at Poinsettia Shores. A private recreation facility in any of the City’s planned developments is never considered a replacement for required City Parks. Planned Developments, like unplanned developments, are required to dedicate Park land to the City, or pay a Park In-Lieu fee to the City so the City provide the developer’s obligation to provide City Park acreage to address the population increase of their proposed planned development. For Poinsettia Shores’ population the City’s minimum City Park Standard would require developers set aside 3 acres of City Park land for local park needs. For the larger Ponto area population about 6.6 acres of City Park Land is required. The Existing LCP reserves Planning Area F as an unplanned “Non-residential Reserve” Land Use until the Public Park needs for Ponto are considered and documented. Only then can the NRR land use be changed.



11. Developers have overbuilt in the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone. The City of Carlsbad has under questionable circumstances is currently choosing to ‘exempted’ Ponto developers from providing the minimum amount of unconstrained Open Space according to the City’s developer required Open Space Public Facilities Standard. The legality of these confusing circumstances is subject to a lawsuit against the City. However the City’s computerize mapping system has documented that the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone is missing about 30-acres of Unconstrained Open Space that can be used to fulfill the City’s Open Space Performance Standard that states that

15% of unconstrained and developable land must be preserved by developers as Open Space. Following is a summary of data from the City data regarding the missing Open Space at Ponto (Local Facility Management Plan Zone 9, LFMP Zone 9) in the Coastal Zone pursuant to the City's Open Space Performance Standard. If it is desirable People for Ponto can provide the City GIS map and parcel-by-parcel data base on which the following summary is based:

City of Carlsbad GIS data calculations of Open Space at Ponto area of Coastal Zone:

472 Acres = Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area] per City of Carlsbad GIS data

(197 Acres) = Constrained land/water/infrastructure that is excluded from the City's Open Space Standard

275 Acres = Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 (Ponto) subject to the City's Open Space Standard

X 15% = Minimum unconstrained Open Space requirement per the City Open Space Standard

41 Acres = Minimum unconstrained Open Space required in LFMP Zone 9

(11 Acres) = Actual unconstrained Open Space provided & mapped by City in LFMP Zone 9

30 Acres = Missing unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto area of Coastal Zone] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard. 73% of the required Open Space Standard is missing.

Thus the Ponto area of the Coastal Zone appears overdeveloped with 30 additional acres of "low-priority" residential land uses due to developers' non-compliance to the City's Open Space Public Facility Performance Standard's Minimum developer required Open Space requirement. As noted a citizens group has a pending lawsuit with the City over the City's current 'exempting' Ponto and future developers from meeting the Open Space Standard.

12. The prior pre-1996 LCP for Ponto – the Batiquitos Lagoon Educational Park Master Plan & LCP (BLEP MP/LCP) had significant Open Space and recreational areas. These significant Open Space and Recreational areas were removed with BLEP MP/LCP's replacement in 1996 by the currently existing Poinsettia Shores Master & LCP (PSMP/LCP) and its City Zoning and LCP LUP requirements that reserved Planning Area F with the current "Non-residential Reserve" Land Use designation. Since the BLEP MP/LCP it appears developers and the City of Carlsbad have worked to remove "High-Priority" Coastal land uses (i.e. Coastal Recreation and Park uses) out of the Ponto area and replaced them with more "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses. For example:

- Planning Area F used to be designated "Visitor Serving Commercial" as part of the original 1980's BLEP MP/LCP for Ponto.
- In 1996 the BLEP MP LCP was changed by developer application to the now current PSMP LCP, and the LCP LUP designation changed from "Visitor Serving Commercial" to "Non-Residential Reserve" with the requirement to study and document the need for "High-Priority" Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or Low-cost visitor accommodations prior to any change to Planning Area F's "Non-residential Reserve" LCP land use.
- In 2005 the City started to try to change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use in the City's Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan (PBVVP). At this time the City made its first documented Coastal 'planning mistake' by not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then also not following those LCP requirements. The City's planning process seemed focused on addressing developer's land use desires, and increasing land use intensity to boost "Tax-increment financing" as the City had established a Redevelopment Project Area at Ponto. A short time after the State of CA dissolved Redevelopment Agencies due in part to such abuses by cities. The CCC formally rejected the PBVVP in 2010, citing the City's failure to follow the LCP requirements for Planning Area F.

- Five years later in 2015 the City again adopted a proposed General Plan Update to again change Planning Area F to low-priority residential and general commercial land use. The General Plan Update cited the City's PBVVP that was in fact rejected by the CCC only a few years before. The City again repeated their PBVVP's Coastal land use 'planning mistake' by again not disclosing to the public the existence of Planning Area F's LCP requirements and then not following those LCP requirements. It is unclear why the City did this only 5-years after the CCC specifically rejected the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan for those same reasons.
- In 2017 citizens found and then confirmed these Ponto Coastal 'planning mistakes' by the City through multiple official Carlsbad Public Records Requests and CCC Staff confirmation. The CCC readily identified the mistakes, but the City's 2019 proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan and planning process still has yet fully disclose these prior Coastal 'planning mistakes' to ALL citizens of Carlsbad - the failure to disclose and follow the Planning Area F LCP LUP and City Zoning requirements. Full City disclosure is needed now to try to correct many years of City misrepresentation to citizens on LCP required Coastal land Use planning at Ponto. It is needed now so the public is aware at the start of the Public Comment Period. In 2017 citizens began asking the City fix the City's over 12-years of misinformation and planning mistakes by 'restarting' Coastal land use planning at Ponto with an open and honest community-based Coastal planning process. These citizens' requests have been rejected.
- In 2019 the City Staff proposed citywide Draft LCP land Use Plan Amendment that again proposed to change Planning Area F to "low-priority" residential and general commercial land use, without First disclosing the Planning Area F LCP requirements with corresponding analysis of the Need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or low-cost visitor accommodations at Planning Area F and providing that Documented analysis for public review/Consideration/comment. This seems like another 3rd repeat of the prior two Coastal planning mistakes by the City. In 2019, again citizens asked for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again the City rejected citizens' requests.
- In 2020 thousands of public requests again asked, and are currently asking, for a reset and a true community-based process for the last remaining significant vacant Coastal lands – including Ponto. Again these requests are being rejected. Based on the significant citizen concern and the documented prior 'planning mistakes' at Ponto it appears reasonable and responsible for Ponto's Planning Area F to ether:
 - i. Retain its current Existing LCP LUP land Use of "Non-Residential Reserve" until such time as the City's past Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and General Plan Update planning mistakes and other issues subject to current planning lawsuits against the City are resolved with a true, honest and open community-based Coastal planning process asked for by citizens since 2017. Or
 - ii. Propose in the Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment to re-designated Planning Area F back to a Visitor Serving Commercial and Open Space ("i.e. Public Park") to provide both "High-Priory" coastal uses v. low-priority residential/general commercial uses due to the documented Coastal Recreation and Low-cost visitor accommodation needs for both citizens and visitors at Ponto and South Carlsbad.

13. Questionable logic and inconsistency in proposed Draft land use map and policies: Chapter 2 Figure 2-2B & C on pages 2-19 & 20 proposes to Amend the existing LCP Land Use Plan Map, and policies LCP-2-P.19 and 20 on pages 2-27 to 2-29 propose Amendments to existing LCP policy and create a new added layer of policy referencing a Ponto/Southern Waterfront. The proposed Land Use Map and Policies serve to firmly plan for "low-priority" residential and general commercial land uses at Ponto with a clear regulatory Land Use Plan Map showing these land uses and by specific regulatory policy (LCP-2-20) that clearly requires (by using the words "shall") these "low

priority” uses. In contrast the “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses that would be designated as Open Space are not mapped at all in Figure 2-2B & C; and the proposed policy LCP-2-P.19 is both misleading and specifically does Not Require any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land Use at Ponto and South Carlsbad. In fact page 2-22 specifically indicates two “may” criteria that would first need to occur in the positive before any potential Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land could then theoretically even be possible. It is highly probable that it is already known by the City that the proposed relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard (Coast Highway) is not very feasible and not cost effective, and will not yield (due to environmental habitat constraints, narrowness of the roadway median, and other design constraints) any significant dimensions of land that could potentially be designated Open Space and realistically be used as a Park.

The blank outline map (Figure 2-2B & C) provides no mapped Open Space Land Use designation, other than for the currently existing State Campgrounds’ low-cost visitor accommodations, so the proposed Land Use Plan Map is Not providing/mapping any new Open Space land use to address Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs. The Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment’s proposed/projected/planned Sea Level Rise and associated coastal erosion appears to indicate that this “High-Priority” low-cost visitor accommodation (Campground) land use designated as Open Space will be reduced in the ‘Buildout’ condition due to coastal erosion. So **the Draft LCP Land Use Plan is actually planning for a Reduction in Open Space Land Use in South Carlsbad and Ponto.** Both the blank outline map and the proposed Land Use Map Figure 2-1 DO NOT clearly map and designate both South Carlsbad’s Draft LCP Planned Loss of the Open Space Land Use and also any New or replacement unconstrained land as Open Space land use for Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park. This is an internal inconsistency in Land Use Mapping that should be corrected in two ways:

- 1) Showing on all the Land Use (Figure 2-1), Special Planning Area (Figure 2-2B & C), and other Draft LCP Maps the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land area in those maps due to the Draft LCP’s planned loss of land due to Sea Level Rise and Coastal Land Erosion. This is required to show how land use boundaries and Coastal Recourses are planned to change over time. or
- 2) Provide detailed Land Use Constraint Maps for the current Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way that the City “may” or ‘may not’ choose (per the proposed “may” LCP-2-P.19 policy) use to explore to address the City’s (Park Master Plan) documented Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land use shortages in Coastal South Carlsbad and Ponto. Clearly showing the potential residual Unconstrained Land within a Carlsbad Boulevard relocation that have any potential possibility to add new Open Space Land Use Designations (for Coastal Recreation) is needed now to judge if the policy is even rational, or is it just a Trojan horse.

The proposed internal inconsistency in mapping and policy appears like a plan/policy ‘shell game’. The proposed Land Use Plan Maps and Policies should be consistent and equality committed (mapped-shall v. unmapped-may) to a feasible and actual Plan. If not then there is No real Plan.

There is no Regulatory Policy requirement in LCP-2-P.19 to even require the City to work on the two “may” criteria. The City could choose to bury the entire Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept and be totally consistent with Policy LCP-2-P.19 and the LCP. As such the language on 2-22, Figure 2-2C (and the proposed Land Use Map), and policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 appear conspire to create a shell game or bait-and-switch game in that only “low-priority” residential and general commercial uses are guaranteed (by “shall” policy) winners, and “high-priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Uses are at best a non-committal ‘long-shot’ (“may” policy) that the city is specifically not providing a way to ever define, or commit to implement. The proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park statements for Ponto are just words on paper that are designed to have no force, no commitment, no defined outcome, and no defined requirement to even have an outcome regarding the

documented “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs at Ponto, Coastal South Carlsbad and the regional 6-mile Coastal Park gap centered around Ponto.

Policy LCP-2-P.19 falsely says it “promotes development of recreational use” but does not in fact do that. How is development of ‘recreational use promoted’ when the Use is both unmapped and no regulatory policy requirement and commitment (no “shall” statement) to ‘promote’ that Use is provided? Policy LCP-2-19.19 appears a misleading sham that does not ‘promote’ or require in any way “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Park Land Use at Ponto. There should be open and honest public workshops before the Draft LCP Amendment goes to its first public hearing to clearly define the major environmental constraints and cost estimates involving possible relocation of Carlsbad Boulevard and constructing needed beach access parking, and sufficient and safe sidewalks and bike paths along Carlsbad Boulevard; and then map the amount and dimensions of potential ‘excess land’ that maybe available for possible designation as Open Space in the City General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The City should not repeat the mistakes at the Carlsbad Municipal Golf Course (resulting in the most expensive to construct maniple course in the USA) by not defining and vetting the concept first. A preliminary review of City GIS data appears the amount, dimensions and locations of any potential ‘excess’ land maybe modest at best. However before the City proposes a ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan this critical information should be clearly provided and considered. It is likely the City’s Carlsbad Boulevard relocation concept is unfeasible, inefficient, too costly, and yields too little actual useable ‘excess land’ to ever approach the Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs for South Carlsbad. This may already be known by the City, but it surely should be publicly disclosed and discussed in the DLPCA.

The proposed Coastal Land Use Plan to address Carlsbad’s, San Diego County’s and California’s High-Priority Coastal Recreation Land Use and Coastal Park needs should NOT be vague “may” policy that appears to be purposely designed/worded to not commit to actually providing any “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park land uses on the map or in policy commitments. The Land Use Plan and Policy for High-Priority Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use should be definitive with triggered “shall” policy statements requiring and assuring that the ‘Forever’ “High-Priority” Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park needs are properly and timely addressed in the City’s proposed ‘Buildout’ Coastal Land Use Plan. This “shall” policy commitment should be clearly and consistently mapped to show the basic feasibility of the planned outcomes and the resulting actual Land that could feasibly implement the planned outcome.

Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard: Providing safe and sufficient sidewalks, bike paths, and public parking along Carlsbad Boulevard are Coastal Access and Completes Streets issues. South Carlsbad Boulevard now and has for decades been a highly used Incomplete Street that is out of compliance with the City’s minimum Street Standards for pedestrian and bike access and safety. The Coastal Access portion of the Draft Land Use Plan should strongly address the Complete Street requirements for South Carlsbad Boulevard. Those policy commitments should be reference in Policy LCP-2-P.19 and 20 as Carlsbad Boulevard in **South Carlsbad is the most Complete Street deficient portion of Carlsbad Boulevard**. Forever Coastal Access parking demand and the proposed LCP Amendment’s Land Use Plan to supply parking for those demands should also be addressed as part of the Coastal Access and Complete Streets issues for South Carlsbad Boulevard. If much needed Coastal Access Parking is provided on South Carlsbad Boulevard as part of a “maybe” implemented realignment, most of the “maybe” realignment land left after constraints are accommodated for and buffered will likely be consumed with these parking spaces and parking drive aisles/buffer area needed to separate high-speed vehicular traffic from parking, a buffered bike path, and a sufficiently wide pedestrian sidewalk or Coastal Path. After accommodating these much needed Complete Street facilitates there will likely be little if any sufficiently

dimensioned land available for a Coastal Recreation and a Coastal Park. The needed Coastal Access and Complete Street facilities on South Carlsbad Boulevard are very much needed, but they are NOT a Coastal Park.

As mentioned the proposed Draft Coastal Land Use Plan's Maps and Policies are very specific in providing for the City's proposed LCP Land Use changes to 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial' on Planning Area F (proposed to be renamed to Area 1 and 2). It is curious as to why the proposed Draft LCP Land Use Plan Amendment has no Land Use Map and minor vague unaccountable Land Use Policy concerning 'High-priority Coastal Recreation Land Use' at Ponto, while the very same time proposing very clear Land Use Mapping and detailed unambiguous "shall" land use policy requirements for 'low-priority' Residential and General Commercial land use at Ponto. Why is the City Not committing and requiring (in a Land Use Map and Land Use Policy) to much needed 'High-priority' Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park Land Use' needs at Ponto the same detail and commitment as the City is providing for "low-priority" uses? This is backwards and inappropriate. It is all the more inappropriate given the 'Buildout' Coastal Land Use Plan the City is proposing at Ponto. These issues and plan/policy commitments and non-commitments will be 'forever' and should be fully and publicly evaluated as previously requested, or the Existing LCP Land Use Plan of "Non-residential Reserve" for Planning Area F should remain unchanged and until the forever-buildout Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park issues can be clearly, honestly and properly considered and accountably planned for. This is vitally important and seems to speak to the very heart of the CA Coastal Act, its founding and enduring principles, and its policies to maximize Coastal Recreation. People for Ponto and we believe many others, when they are aware of the issues, think the City and CA Coastal Commission should be taking a long-term perspective and be more careful, thorough, thoughtful, inclusive, and in the considerations of the City's proposal/request to permanently convert the last vacant unplanned (Non-residential Reserve) Coastal land at Ponto to "low-priority" land uses and forever eliminate any Coastal Recreation and Coastal Park opportunities.

14. Public Coastal View protection: Avenida Encinas is the only inland public access road and pedestrian sidewalk to access the Coast at Ponto for one mile in each direction north and south. It is also hosts the regional Coastal Rail Trail in 3' wide bike lanes. There exist now phenomenal coastal ocean views for the public along Avenida Encinas from the rail corridor bridge to Carlsbad Boulevard. It is assumed these existing expansive public views to the ocean will be mostly eliminated with any building development seaward or the Rail corridor. This is understandable, but an accountable ('shall') Land Use Plan/Policy addition to proposed Policy LCP-2-P.20 should be provided for a reasonable Public Coastal View corridor along both sides of Avenida Encinas and at the intersection with Carlsbad Boulevard. Public Coastal view analysis, building height-setback standards along Avenida Encinas, and building placement and site design and landscaping criteria in policy LCP-2-P.20 could also considered to reasonably provide for some residual public coastal view preservation.

15. Illogical landscape setback reductions proposed along Carlsbad Boulevard, and Undefined landscape setback along the Lagoon Bluff Top and rail corridor in Policy LCP-2-P.20: Logically setbacks are used in planning to provide a buffering separation of incompatible land uses/activities/habitats. The intent of the setback separation being to protect adjacent uses/activities/habitats from incompatibility, nuisance or harassment by providing a sufficient distance/area (i.e. setback) between uses/activities/habitats and for required urban design aesthetics – almost always a buffering landscaping. Policy LCP-2-P.20. A.4 and C.3 says the required 40' landscape setback along Carlsbad Boulevard "maybe reduced due to site constraints or protection of environmental resources." The ability to reduce the setback is illogical in that setbacks are intended to protect environmental resources and provide a buffer for constraints. In the Carlsbad Boulevard right-of-way there is documented sensitive environmental habitat, along with being a busy roadway. How could reducing the protective 40' setback in anyway better protect that habitat or provide a better landscaped compatibility or visual aesthesis buffer along Carlsbad Boulevard? It is

illogical. If anything the minimum 40' landscaped setback should likely be expanded near "environmental resources". Regarding reducing the minimum 40' landscape setback for "site constraints" there is no definition of what a "site constraint" is or why it (whatever it may be) justifies a reduction of the minimum landscaped setback. Is endangered species habitat, or a hazardous geologic feature, or a slope, or on-site infrastructure considered a "site constraint"? There should be some explanation of what a "site constraint" is and is not, and once defined if it warrants a landscape setback reduction to enhance the buffering purpose of a landscape setback. Or will a reduction only allow bringing the defined constraint closer to the adjacent uses/activities/habitats that the landscape setback is designed to buffer. It is good planning practice to not only be clear in the use of terms; but also, if a proposed reduction in a minimum standard is allowed, to define reasonably clear criteria for that reduction/modification and provide appropriate defined mitigation to assume the intended performance objectives of the minimum landscape setback are achieved.

Policy LCP-2-P.20.C.4 is missing a critical Bluff-Top landscape setback. It seems impossible that the DLCPA is proposing no Bluff-Top setback from the lagoon bluffs and sensitive habitat. The Batiqitos Lagoon's adjoining steep sensitive habitat slopes directly connect along the Bluff-top. Batiqitos Lagoon's and adjoining steep sensitive habitat is a sensitive habitat that requires significant setbacks as a buffer from development impacts. Setbacks similar to those required for the San Pacifico area inland of the rail corridor, should be provided unless updated information about habitat sensitivity or community aesthetics requires different setback requirements.

Policy LCP-2-P.20 does not include a landscape setback standard adjacent to the rail corridor. This is a significant national transportation corridor, part of the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the USA. Train travel along this corridor is planned to increase greatly in the years to come. Now there is significant noise, Diesel engine pollution, and extensive ground vibration due to train travel along the rail corridor. Long freight trains which currently run mostly at night and weekends are particularly noisy and heavy, and create significant ground vibration (underground noise). These issues are best mitigated by landscape setbacks and other buffers/barriers. A minimum setback standard for sufficient landscaping for a visual buffer and also factoring appropriate noise and ground vibration standards for a buildout situation should be used to establish an appropriate landscape setback that should be provided along the rail corridor. Carlsbad's landscape aesthetics along the rail corridor should be factored into how wide the setback should be and how landscaping should be provided. An example for the landscape aesthetic portion of the setback standard could be landscape design dimensions of the San Pacifico community on the inland side of the rail corridor. However, noise and vibrational impacts at San Pacifico are felt much further inland and appear to justify increased setbacks for those impacts.

Following are 6 key major Growth Management Standards issues of citywide relevance that the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee (CTGMC) needs to act on, and citizen “Suggestions to CTGMC” on how to honestly and responsibly act on these 6 key issues in the CTGMC’s recommendations to the New City Council. This Update includes new information (pp 5-6) on the improved affordability of Ponto Park, and on how GM Open Space shortfall can be repaired. We hope the CTGMC will act honestly to make recommendations that truly and responsibly address known documented shortfalls in both Parks and GM Open Space. Responsible recommendations by the CTGMC can provide a sustainable Quality of Life to future Carlsbad generations and visitors. Only you own your recommendations.

1. The State of CA is forcing Carlsbad and all cities/counties in CA to provide for unlimited or Infinite Population and Visitor growth. So there will be an Infinite population & visitor demands for Parks, Open Space, water, and demands on our roads/transportation systems, and other Growth Management (GM) Quality of Life facilities. These infinite increases in population and visitor demand will come from high density development that requires more public Parks and Open Space to balance the high-densities. **Carlsbad’s new GM Standards will have to provide for a system of Infinite proportional increases in the supply of Parklands, Open Spaces, water, transportation facility capacity, etc. or our Quality of Life will diminish.**
 - a. Suggestions to CTGMC:
 - i. Completely restructure the General Plan, Local Coastal Program and GM Program to clearly recognize these facts and State requirements to proportionately provide public facilities to maintain/improve Carlsbad GM Quality of Life Standards for this Infinite growth of Population and Visitor demands.
 - ii. **Being a Coastal city Carlsbad has an added responsibility to proportionately maintain/improve providing High-Priority Coastal land uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations) needed at a regional and statewide level to address visitor needs for Coastal Recreation, access, and affordable accommodations.** Carlsbad needs to work with the State of CA Coastal Commission to completely restructure Carlsbad’s Coastal Land Use Plan to addresses the State’s requirement to provide an Infinite amount high-priority Coastal land uses for those Infinite Population and Visitor demands.
 - iii. **Trying to ignore these Infinite demands for Carlsbad’s Quality of Life facilities – like Parks and Open Spaces is a path to disaster and the ultimate degradation of Carlsbad’s Quality of Life.**
2. **Carlsbad has a huge Jobs v. Housing supply imbalance – far too many jobs around the airport for our amount of housing. This creates negative and costly land use and transportation planning distortions that radiate from the Airport Central Jobs through Carlsbad in all directions.** CA Housing law penalizes unbalanced cities like Carlsbad by requiring more housing in Carlsbad to bring jobs/housing ratio into balance. Carlsbad can correct this imbalance by 1 of 2 ways: 1) greatly increase housing supply (and thus increase the need and City expense for more GM Quality of Life facilities), or 2) more logically and cost effectively greatly decrease the amount of Jobs land use, so Carlsbad’s housing supply is in balance with jobs. These jobs will move to surrounding Cities that have more housing than jobs. **Rebalancing by reducing jobs land use creates added benefits for Carlsbad and our region by reducing Carlsbad’s peak-hour job commute traffic volumes and**

vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and by reducing the costs Carlsbad (and other cities and the region) have to pay to accommodate inter-city commute traffic. If Carlsbad reduces jobs land use will also reduce the amount of housing the State of California and SANDAG requires Carlsbad provide in its Housing Element thus reducing forcing incompatible high-density development into established neighborhoods and pressure to convert useable GM Open Space lands to housing land use.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Carlsbad can logically and cost effectively balance Jobs/housing supply by updating Growth Management Policy to reduce jobs to be in balance with housing by changing some of Carlsbad's General Plan land use around the airport into several high-density residential mixed-use Villages.** The City has started some of this, but can expand this effort but has not planned creating mixed-use village environments. These high-density villages will reduce jobs and provide both high-quality and high-density (affordable) housing within walking/biking distance to the major job center and new neighborhood commercial and Park uses in the Villages.
- ii. Prioritize transportation investments in safe bike paths, walking paths between Carlsbad's Central Jobs Core around the airport and Carlsbad's housing, particularly strongly connecting these new high-density mixed-use villages with the Central Jobs Core.
- iii. Update General Plan land use and housing policy to reduce concentrations of higher-density housing except around the airport jobs core.
- iv. Recognize the central Airport jobs core is 'Carlsbad's New Urban Downtown and "Transect Plan" accordingly toward lower densities on the City periphery.

3. Although some very critical areas (such as the Coastal lands at Ponto) are still vacant and can be wisely used for critical GM Quality of Life needs, much of Carlsbad is largely developed.

Redevelopment of developed land will require creating increased supplies of Parkland, Open Spaces, transportation capacity, and other Quality of Life facilities.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Completely rethink all City planning on existing vacant lands to assure that remaining vacant land is planned and being used wisely and fairly distributed to address critical Quality of Life needs in those areas, and not squandered on redundant land use.** The location of vacant land to address critical Park & Open Space needs should be preserved with land use planning.
- ii. Work with the State and CA Coastal Commission to preserve our Finite vacant Coastal lands for High-Priority Coastal Land Uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations and services) for the Infinite population and visitor demands both internal and external to Carlsbad that are/will be placed on them.
- iii. Fully and at the very beginning of any Carlsbad General Plan, Local Coastal Program and Growth Management Program actions going forward fully disclose, map and require consideration of the impact of future sea level rise and coastal erosion on Coastal land acres and land uses. Carlsbad has lost and will accelerate losing acres of Coastal land and High-priority Coastal Land Uses. Carlsbad must know, see, and discuss these losses BEFORE making any land use decisions in Carlsbad's Coastal Zone and any vacant Coastal Land.

4. **Carlsbad General Plan & Growth Management Plan do not provide a fair distribution of adequately sized City Parks for all Carlsbad families.** Veterans Park is a classic example. What will

be the City's largest park is only about 1-mile away from three other major City Parks (Zone 5, and the future Robinson Ranch and Hub Parks). This is a poor and unfair distribution and a misallocation City Park land resources. Saying Veterans Park is 'the park to serve SW, SE, and NE Carlsbad families' (the overwhelming major/majority funders of veterans Park) when those families are upwards of 6-miles away on major commercial arterials that kids can't logically/safely use is false and unfair. Most all the funding (developer fees) to build Veterans Park come from the SW, SE and NW Carlsbad but those areas are denied the Park the paid for. Veterans Park is inaccessible by almost all its intended users except by driving their cars and then storing their cars in parking lots on Parkland thus making less park land available for actual park use – this makes little common sense and is a great waste of tax-payer funds. This is dysfunctional along with being very unfair to families in SW, SE and NE Quadrats that are denied park acres near their homes which they funded. **Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps 'Park Service' areas of existing known Park Inequity or Unfairness (dysfunction), to show where new City Park investments should be made (See City map image with notes below).**

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

The Trust for Public Land provides a Park-Score to compare both a City's amount of park acres and the 'fairness' of access (within a 10-minute walk) to parks. **Carlsbad is below national averages in both park acres and fair access to parks. Carlsbad is also well below what our adjacent Coastal cities of Encinitas and Oceanside provide. Carlsbad only requires 3 acres of Park land per 1,000 population, while Encinitas and Oceans require 5 acres - 67% more than Carlsbad – of parkland. Also, Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be within a 10-minute walk to their citizens and families. Carlsbad has no such requirement.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

Carlsbad should change its General Plan, Parks and Growth Management Standards and CMC 20.44 to:

- i. **Be Above Average Nationally in both providing park acreage and in locating adequate park acreage to be within a 10-minute walk to all neighborhoods.**
 - ii. **Raise its minimum park acreage standard to 5 acres per 1,000 population, versus the current low 3 acres per 1,000. Carlsbad should be at least as good as Encinitas and Oceanside in requiring 5 acres, not 40% below what our adjacent Cities require/provide.**
 - iii. **Raise its park location standard to require an adequately sized park be provided to serve the neighborhood population within a 10-minute walk for all neighborhoods.**
 - iv. **Prioritize City Policy and Park Budgets and investments to achieve park fairness in 'Park Unserved areas' identified by Carlsbad's Park Master Plan.**
 - v. **Per Carlsbad's Municipal Code Chapter 20.44- DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES to require developers in 'Park Unserved areas' and in areas that do not have an adequately sized (5 acres per 1,000 population) park within a 10-minute walk to provide their developments required Park land acre dedication in actual Park land within a 10-minute walk to their development.**
 - vi. **Update the City's Park-in-lieu fee to assure the fee is adequate to actually buy the amount of park land a developer is to provide within a 10-minute walk of their development. The City's current 'Park-in-lieu-fee' is far too low and inadequate to actually buy land in area surrounding the proposed development.**
 - vii. **Only allow developers to pay a Park-in-lieu-fee where there is an adequately sized park (provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk of their development, and growth management planned future development in that area will not require more park land to provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk.**
 - viii. Consider updating Park policy to provide more multi-use flexibility in park land acres and development on Parks. Many Carlsbad Park acres are developed/dedicated to a single-purpose use, and unavailable for other park uses.
 - ix. Consider eliminating car parking lots from land that can be counted as parkland; or by significantly limiting park land used for parking to around 5%.
 - x. **Eliminate the counting of 'GM Constrained and Unusable land' and Protected Endangered Species Habitat land as Park land. GM Constrained/Unusable lands are undevelopable. Protected Habitat lands are by definition not useable for development by people. Habitat is dedicated for plants and animals. Parks are open spaces dedicated intended for people. Parkland calculations should exclude Unusable lands and Protected Habitat lands and only count 100% people Useable land as Park land. Where Park land abuts Habitat land a sufficient buffer space shall be provided to prevent people mixing with animals (ex. Rattlesnakes, etc.) and animals from people (habitat disturbance or destruction). This buffer area should not be counted as Park or Habitat acres, but as natural/developed buffer open space acres, and can be counted as part of the City's 15% Growth Management 'Aesthetic open Space'.**
5. Carlsbad's Coast is the most, if not the most, important feature of Carlsbad; and is consistently identified by citizens and businesses and our Community Vision. **Carlsbad's Coastal Parks (west of the I-5 corridor) are grossly unfairly distributed. Carlsbad's Coastal Parks do not fairly match the**

locational needs of the population. North Carlsbad that is 38% of Carlsbad's population and has 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37+ acres in size. South Carlsbad that is 62% of Carlsbad's population has 0 [ZERO] Coastal Parks totaling 0 [ZERO] acres. Again, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps this citywide unfairness (dots show park locations and circles show the area served by each park) and says that the City should look at buying and building New Parks in these areas that are unserved by City Parks (are not covered by a circle). The GM Update should correct this citywide unfair distribution of City Parks by making plans for new Park purchases to create City Parks in these unserved areas of Park Inequity.

To address citywide Coastal Park unfairness the current City Council wants to spend \$60-85 million in Carlsbad tax-payer funds to Relocate 2.3 miles of constrained Pacific Coast Highway median to try to make some of the narrow PCH median 'useable' by people. 2001 and 2013 City PCH Relocation studies identified only a small amount of 'people-useable acres' would be created next to PCH. The \$60-85 million tax-payer cost (\$26-37 million per mile) does NOT add one single square foot of new City land, it only inefficiently rearranges a small amount PCH median. The City can most tax-payer cost effectively provide needed sidewalks and bike improvements along the outside edges of PCH without PCH Relocation. The City's 2001 PCH Relocation Financial Study and 2013 PCH Relocation Design both indicated minimal useable land could be achieved by Relocation, and that the very high tax-payer cost to do so would be very difficult to fund. The City has known for well over 20-years that PCH Relocation is a high-cost and a poor solution to address the Citywide Coastal Park unfairness in South Carlsbad.

However, a **better and far less costly solution to correct Citywide Coastal Park unfairness and provide a much needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park is to simply buy currently vacant land that is for sale.** The City did this (although the City actually bought existing homes) when it expanded Pine Park. **Carlsbad tax-payers have used the City's own data to compare the tax-payer Cost/Benefits of simply purchasing vacant land v. trying to rearrange existing City owned land at PCH. Simply buying vacant land saves tax-payers saves tax-payers over \$32.7 to \$7.7 million.** Please read the following data files:

- 2022-June General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, 2.3 miles of PCH Modification (Island Way to La Costa Ave.), and 14.3 acre Ponto Park (Kam Sang) to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto in South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2.
- City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input: Part 2 of 2
- The most recent (9/19/22) land sale of 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F was less than \$8 million (less than \$706,000 per acre).
- **Buying and developing this 11.1 acre Ponto Park would cost less than \$20 million assuming a 10% profit to the new land-owner, and \$1 million per acre park construction cost like our newest Buena Vista Reservoir Park.** The cost to help correct a Citywide Coastal Park unfairness by simply buying & building a much needed **11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park would cost tax-payers less than the recently approved Measure J City Monroe Street Pool Renovation.** Investing less than \$20 million (\$1.8 million per acre) to buy and build an 11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park is a great tax-payer value v. \$65-80 million in tax-payer funds to rearrange 15.8 acres of narrow strips of constrained PCH median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 &5") for some minimal people use at a tax-payer cost of \$4-5 million per acre. **The overall and per acre costs of buying/building Ponto Park are over 2 to 3 times better value for tax-payers than PCH Relocation/rearrangement.**

- The City Council could/can buy land for Open Space (Parks are the most useable of the City's 4 Open Space categories) under voter approved Prop C Open Space land acquisition authority. **The City has been advised to buy Ponto Park under Prop C per the City's settlement of a Growth Management law suit.**

The Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is clearly a citywide issue. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad as it is unfair to the vast majority of Carlsbad citizens and their families as 62% of Carlsbad is in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is unfair to our major Visitor serving industries (and tax generators) in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad are clearly inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act, Carlsbad's Community Vision, and common sense. The Coastal South Carlsbad Park Inequity is also unfair to North Carlsbad because South Carlsbad's Coastal Park demand is being forced into Coastal North Carlsbad and congesting those parks, and adding to Coastal North Carlsbad traffic and parking impacts. It also increases greenhouse gases and VMT as it forces longer vehicle trips.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F has a specific Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy that says The City of Carlsbad must for the Ponto Area LCP 'Consider and Document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and or Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations west of the railroad tracks (at Ponto) prior to any Land Use change. **The discussion of Parks by the CTGMC is such a situation that requires the CTGMC to consider this adopted LCP Land Use Policies. Official public records requests have shown the City never followed this LCP Land Use Policy Requirement during the 2005 Ponto Vision Plan and 2015 General Plan Update, and in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission rejected the Ponto Vision Plan and told the City in 2017 that that land uses at Ponto could change based on the need for Coastal Recreation and/or Low Cost Visitor Accommodations.** The Mello II LCP that covers most of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone also has Land Use Policy 6.2 for the City to consider a major park in the Batiquitos (Ponto/South Carlsbad) area. The City has only implemented 1/6 to 1/3 of this policy. **The CTGMC should fully evaluate the citywide/South Carlsbad and local Ponto need for Coastal Parks as required by the City's adopted LCPs and CA Coastal Act.**
- ii. Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan Update and Growth Management Plan (GMP) did not, and was not updated to, consider the 2017 Sea Level Rise (SLR) Impact report showing the loss/impact on 32+ acres of Carlsbad's Coastal Land Use acreage in South Carlsbad – primarily Open Space Land Use (beach and Campground). **Both the General Plan (and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan) and GMP should be updated to account for the loss and replacement of these 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Use due to SLR.** The updates and the CTGMC should use the newest CA Coastal Commission SLR Guidelines/science, not the old guidelines used in 2017. Carlsbad's LCP and CA Coastal Act Land Use Polies call for 'upland relocation' to replace the SLR loss of high-priority Coastal Land Uses.
- iii. **The availability over the past several years of the last two sufficiently sized vacant lands suitable for a Ponto/South Carlsbad Coastal Park is a citywide issue. If these last two vacant lands are lost to development forever future generations will have lost the last opportunity for the needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park.** The 5/3/22 Citizen requests for the City to jointly study acquisition of one or both these last vacant lands for a needed (and only possible) true and meaningful Coastal Park for

South Carlsbad should be recommended by the CTGMC. **The CTGMC should recommend Carlsbad’s GMP be updated to incorporate Parkland acquisition of these last opportunities to provide the needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad.**

6. Carlsbad Growth Management Open Space Standard is that 15% of all the Useable (unconstrained and fully buildable) areas is to be preserved as Useable Open Space, and that all the 25 Local Facility Management Plans (LFMP) show how that 15% is provided. The City says:

OPEN SPACE


A. Performance Standard

Fifteen percent of the total land area in the Local Facility Management Zone (LFMZ) exclusive of environmentally constrained non-developable land must be set aside for permanent open space and must be available concurrent with development.

Yet the City has mapped and documented that this 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard was not complied with. The City also acknowledges that without changes to current City planning the 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard will never be complied with. The City acknowledges that only 13% has/will under current plans ever be provided. This missing 2% equals 501 acers of lost GM Open Space the GMP promised citizens. **Carlsbad law the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90, and section ‘21.90.130 Implementation of facilities and improvements requirements’; provide guidance on how non-compliance with a Performance Standards is to be handled.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. Retain the GM Open Space Standard of 15% of all unconstrained and developable land is maintained as Open Space. If the City removes the Open Space Standard, it will allow and encourage land use changes to remove GM Open Space and replace with development.
- ii. **The CTGMC should make a recommendation that an inventory of all 25 LFMP Zones be conducted and an inventory of each LFMP Zones provision of at least 15% Useable Open Space shall be compiled. No LFMP Zone shall be allowed to be “exempt” from this inventory.** The City’s computerized GIS mapping system makes it easy and clear as shown in the following City GIS map for LFMP Zone 9 (aka Ponto).



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara includes the same lagoon.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were not required to comply with the 15% Useable Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the Growth Management Standard of 15% Useable Open Space at Ponto

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from Growth Management (GMP) Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data |

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

- iii. In instances like LFMP Zone 9 (above image) that clearly did not provide at least 15% Useable Open Space and/or were falsely “exempted” the CTGMC should recommend that a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** shall be developed that explores the GM Open Space use/reuse of City land, land use planning requirements, and/or possible acquisitions of remaining vacant land acres to make up for any shortfall in meeting the 15% Useable Open Space in that a Zone. An example of this in LFMP Zone 9 is that the City’s regional Rail Trail will convert 2-lanes of almost all of Avenida Encinas to wider buffered bike lanes and an adequate portion of the converted 2 vehicle lanes can be landscaped (v. just painting strips as a buffer) to provide a safer/better bike lane buffer within a GM compliant Open Space. 2 vehicle lanes in Windrose Circle could also be similarly landscaped and converted to GM complaint Open Space. This is just one example of a cost-effective means to add GM Open Space that developers were falsely allowed to remove.
- iv. A **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** should involve a Citizens Advisory Committee composed of citizens within the impacted Zone and appointed by the Council Members representing the Zone, and a representative of each vacant land owner over of over 1-acre in size.
- v. Consistent with the Growth Management Ordinance land use changes and development applications within a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** Zone shall be deferred until the applications can considered with (or after adoption of) a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan**.



March 11th, 2022

Carlsbad City Council
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Re: Support creation of Ponto Park – a needed park for South Carlsbad

Dear Mayor Hall,

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is strongly supporting the efforts of ‘People for Ponto’ and thousands of Carlsbad residents to build Ponto Park in the 11-acre coastal parcel known as ‘Planning Area F’ in South Carlsbad. For over 40-years TPL has been designing and building parks in California and although we have world-class parks and beaches, the fact remains 3.2 million Californians don’t have access to a park, and some of those Californians are residents of South Carlsbad. While the National Recreation and Park Association calls for 10-acres of park lands per 1000 residents as standard metric for healthy and vibrant cities, Carlsbad has a comparatively and relatively low park standard of only 3-acres/1,000 population and no requirement to provide accessible parks within walking distance.

And according to our own Trust for Public Land 2020-21 ‘City Parkscore’, Carlsbad is also below national averages both providing park land acreage and in providing residents a park within a 10-minute walk.

The City of Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan on pages 86-89 documents park service and park equity/inequity. Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan documents that Ponto area has no park and all of South Carlsbad (over 61% of the entire city population) has no Coastal Park while . Carlsbad provides 10 City Coastal Parks (totaling over 35-acres) in North Carlsbad, while South Carlsbad has no coastal parks to serve the 64,000 residents, many of which are children. Ponto Park at 11-acre Planning Area F is the last remaining reasonable bit of vacant and currently unplanned Coastal land to provide a Coastal Park for South Carlsbad. Ponto Park would also be in the middle of a 6-mile long section of North San Diego County coastline without Coastal Park, and would help address a regional need for a Coastal Park for these 6-miles of coastline.

The CA Coastal Act has numerous policies that support the creation of Ponto Park and Coastal Recreation land use. The City of Carlsbad’s history of following these CA Coastal Act polies now and over the past 40-years in its Local Coastal Program should be considered now in the City’s proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment. Over the past 40-years Carlsbad and California residents have forever

lost numerous opportunities to create vital Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation for our growing population.

In addition to the clear need for coastal parks in South Carlsbad, the citizens are overwhelmingly supporting the creation of Ponto Park in Planning area F. As you know during the past 2-years during the City Budget and Local Coastal Program Amendment processes, residents strongly demonstrated their desire that the City Council purchase and build Ponto Park. In 2019, 2020 and 2021 over 90% of citizen input expressed need was for Ponto Park, along with extensive verbal and written citizen testimony.

As COVID-19 vividly pointed out, parks are not an amenity, but a key component to human physical and mental health. Parks also provide environmental benefits and contribute to cleaner air and water, climate adaptation and social cohesion. TPL think you have a great opportunity to address equity and access to park space and improving the lives of thousands of Carlsbad residents and strongly urge you to support the building of Ponto Park for families and community.

Sincerely,

Rico Mastrodonato
Government Relations Director

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, Park Master Plan and Growth Management Plan Updates
Attachments: Ponto Park City-State donor-supporter presentation- With Videos - 2023 May.pdf
Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 9:13 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; CarlsbadLCPA@coastal.ca.gov; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: 'People for Ponto' <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: Public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, Park Master Plan and Growth Management Plan Updates

Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad City Council and Park-Planning-Beach Preservation Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission and State Parks:

Please receive and consider this email and attached "Ponto Park City-State donor-supporter presentation" file as public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment, Park Master Plan and Growth Management Plan Updates.

The "Ponto Park City-State donor-supporter presentation" file summarizes/visualizes some key points and how People for Ponto Carlsbad/regional Citizens are willing to help support Carlsbad and/or State of CA to create the much needed Ponto Park. But the City Council of Carlsbad and/or State of CA must lead in advancing Ponto Park.

As has been well documented and extensively communicated by well over 5,500 citizen petitions to the City of Carlsbad and CCC about the clear/fact-based need for a significant, adequately sized and dimensioned Coastal Park in the 6-miles of coastline centered around Ponto – a Coastal Park free from SLR/Coastal Erosion loss

A significant Coastal Park is needed for all the inland population along this 6-mile stretch of coastline and also for the many (hotel) visitors to the area. The 6-mile length of Coast at Ponto is 8% of San Diego County's entire coastline and these 6-miles have no Coastal Park. Ponto is the Only area of adequate vacant useable land along this 6-mile section of coast. All other land is developed (primarily with residential land use). Ponto has over 26 vacant acres of land available for providing this much needed Coastal Park. 11.1 acres of Ponto vacant land is specifically required to address Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) needs and/or Low-cost Visitor Accommodation needs.

Alone Ponto's 2020 population of a bit over 2,100 has a Local Park demand of 6.5 acres per Carlsbad's minimal 3 acre per 1,000 population Park Acreage Standard. The City is not providing for this Local Park demand at/near Ponto. Since 2012 the SW Quadrant of Carlsbad has been deficient of Park acres relative the population of SW Carlsbad. Nor is the City providing for the much larger demand for a South Carlsbad Coastal Park to address the Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) needs for over 64,000 South Carlsbad citizens (and visitors) and the larger population of inland San Diego County residents.

There is a critical need to provide more than just Local Park needs, but to provide for a larger Coastal Park for the over 64,000 people in South Carlsbad that have no Coastal Park, and for the tens of thousands more in adjacent inland cities so they have a Coastal Park to go to. The vacant land at Ponto is the last chance to provide this needed Coastal Park. The 2019 and most recent 2023 July 'Coastal Recreation data files' previously sent to the City, CCC and CA State Parks documents some key Coastal Recreation(i.e. Public Park) facts.

Please read the attached "Ponto Park City-State donor-supporter presentation" file that summarizes/illustrates what people are basically asking for. It has some key implementation/cost data that you will find interesting.

Since Carlsbad citizens 1st sent a 2017 letter to the City/CCC People for Ponto Citizens have asked for an open/honest/inclusive/Citizen-based Planning Process to address the documented need for Ponto Park and are ready and able to be positive contributors to solving the Ponto Park needs as noted in the attached file.

Sadly Carlsbad's Old Mayor and City Council refused to address the 2017 citizen request/help in creating a consensus solution. Hopefully Carlsbad's New Mayor and Council will listen to the data and represent citizen desires.

Hopefully the CCC can be the entity that can provide the process for honestly and opening addressing the critical, and last opportunities, for needed Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) at Ponto in South Carlsbad.

With love for our Coast and Carlsbad and future generations,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Ponto Park

the last and best opportunity to
address Sea Level Rise impacts to
Carlsbad & State Coastal Recreation
(i.e. Public Park) per CA Coastal Act

Presented by

Ponto Beachfront Park 501c

May 2023

- * Planning Area F (11-acres) & Planning Area G&H (14.3 –acres)
- * Across PCH & inland from South Carlsbad State Campground
- * Most tax-payer efficient solutions for ‘managed retreat’ from Sea Level Rise impacts to Carlsbad State Campground



What's at stake

Planning Area G & H

- * Planning Area G & H (PAGH) – 14.3 acre site is for sale Now and landowner will work with City/State/citizens on selling for a Park
- * Next to CA State owned Batiquitos Lagoon Preserve
- * Site includes Federally protected habitat
- * Next to CA State Campground to allow Campground's managed retreat from Sea Level Rise
- * Limited window of opportunity for City and/or State and Federal governments to acquire site for Coastal Park and expand State Preserve and Campground



Ponto Planning Area G-H:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto State Park
Connection to beach

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

What's at stake Planning Area F

- * Planning Area F (PAF) - last vacant 'unplanned coastal property' next to CA State Campground to allow Campground's managed retreat from Sea Level Rise
- * For Planning Area F the CA Coastal Commission (CCC) requires the City, both 1) Citywide and 2) for PAF and Ponto area, to study and document the "buildout" need for 'High-Priority' Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation" land uses as part of Carlsbad's proposed LCP Amendment # LCP-6-CAR-21-0087-3
- * Site includes Federally protected habitat with a yet to be started 5-year habitat restoration requirement

Ponto Planning Area F: from center looking north



Ponto Planning Area F: from center looking south & beyond



What's at stake for Ponto, Carlsbad & CA

- * Based on City/State population 'Buildout Need', the CA Coastal Commission may require the City to provide more Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) & Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land uses in the City's proposed LCP Amendment
- * The 'Buildout Need Study' will have to factor in unlimited population growth per State Housing Law
- * Carlsbad has historically significantly underperformed in providing both Coastal Recreation & Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land uses

What's at Stake –Timing is critical as vacant land could be gone

- * 14.3 acre Planning Area G&H is available Now to buy and provide needed Coastal Recreation and Low-cost Visitor Accommodation land uses and mitigate the planned loss of South Carlsbad State Campground
- * Buying this site saves tax-payers many millions more than City's proposed realignment of narrow strips of Historic Old Coast Highway (PCH).
- * PCH Realignment add zero (0) acres of new public land, only rearranges thin strips of existing City land.
- * Realignment can serve as a future SLR mitigation area



Ponto Planning Area G-H:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto State Park
Connection to beach

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise

- * Carlsbad SEA LEVEL RISE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT, of Dec 2017 not considered by City & CCC in City's proposed 2015 General Plan
- * 2 meter SLR will eliminate 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space:
 - * All sandy beaches at South Carlsbad State Beach
 - * Most all of the State Campground sites and Campground
- * See following images of areas to be lost to SLR

Ponto State Park

Scenarios – Sea Level Rise



Figure 5: CoSMoS Bluff Erosion Projections by 2100
(CoSMoS-COAST 2015)

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise



Figure 7: Southern Shoreline Planning Area – Year 2050

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise



Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise

1. Planning Area G & H is “Upland” site for Managed Retreat:
 1. Provides State a site for Campground relocation due to SLR
 1. 14.3 acres = around 200 campsites, + day-use park and habitat
 2. Provides some City Coastal Recreation Parkland
2. If not used for Managed Retreat of key Coastal land uses
 1. State Campground has no or only one very limited, expensive and suboptimal “Upland” option; or be forced to be lost due to SLR.
3. Federal, State, County and Carlsbad opportunity to share costs on the most cost-efficient solution – **Buy vacant land**

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise

1. Planning Area F is “Upland” site for Managed Retreat:
 1. Provides State a site for Campground relocation due to SLR
 1. 11.1 acres = around 100 campsites, + day-use park and habitat
 2. Provides some City Coastal Recreation Parkland
2. If not used for Managed Retreat of key Coastal land uses
 1. State Campground has no or only one very limited, expensive and suboptimal “Upland” option; or be forced to be lost due to SLR.
3. Federal, State, County and Carlsbad opportunity to share costs on the most cost-efficient solution – Buy vacant land

Ponto & State Park Scenarios – Sea Level Rise

1. Planning Area F existing LCP Land Use Policy requirement
 1. Carlsbad must “consider and document the need for both Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations” in the City’s proposed land use for Planning Area F s part of City’s LCP Amendment
 2. Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan documents in maps that Ponto is ‘unserved by Parks’ and an area the City should make new Park investments.

City's Ponto Planning mistakes & CCC direction to City 1 of 2

- * Following is from a 7/3/17 CCC letter to City Staff on the City's proposed land use changes at Planning Area F. City Staff provided this to City Council on 1/28/20:

“The existing LUP includes policies that require certain visitor-serving developments and/or studies relevant to the Ponto/Southern Waterfront area. **For example, Planning Area F requires the city and developer to "consider and document the need for the provision of lower cost visitor accommodations or recreational facilities (i.e., public park) on the west side of the railroad. ... and this study should be undertaken as a part of the visitor serving use inventory analysis described above. If this analysis determines that there is a deficit of low cost visitor accommodations or recreation facilities in this area, then Planning Area F should be considered as a site where these types of uses could be developed.”**

City's Ponto Planning mistakes & CCC direction to City 2 of 2

- * CCC Staff acknowledged the City has not yet complied with the LCP and in an 8/16/2017 email said:

“The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive update to their LCP funded in part through a CCC grant. As a part of this process the City will be consolidating all previous LCP segments into a single, unified LCP. **The City has received direction from both the Commission (May 2016 CCC hearing) and Commission staff, that as a part of this update the City shall undertake an inventory of visitor serving uses currently provided within the City's Coastal Zone which will then serve to inform updates to the City's land use and zoning maps as necessary. This inventory could have future implications for the appropriate land use and zoning associated with the Ponto area.**”

Ponto & State Park

Carlsbad's Park Master Plan

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away



Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps showing park locations (blue dots) and areas served by parks (blue circles). Blank areas are unserved by Parks' and an area the City should make new Park investments.

Ponto Coastal Park beach connection

- * Ponto Coastal Park provides a direct planned pedestrian connection to the Campground and beach
- * Under north-bound Carlsbad Boulevard and then signalized pedestrian crossing (like those in Downtown Carlsbad) or under future south-bound



Ponto

A Special Place for all is needed Now

- * In the middle of a 6-mile long section of coastline without a Coastal Park – over 8% of San Diego's coast without a Park
- * Southern Coastal gateway to Carlsbad
- * On iconic and old historic 101 Coastal Highway
- * Ocean Views and Beach Access
- * Batiquitos Lagoon Preserve and Public lagoon trails connect a Coastal Park with habitat lands
- * City's Park Master Plan already says Ponto an area Unserved by Parks or Park Inequity and should be an area the City makes new Park Investments
- * Saves tax-payers tens of millions of dollars



Ponto Planning Area G & H:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto State Park
Connection to beach

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

An aerial photograph of a coastal area. In the foreground, there is a large, green, vegetated area with a dirt path. A road runs along the right side of this area. In the middle ground, a bridge crosses a body of water. To the left of the bridge, there is a residential area with houses and palm trees. To the right, a beach and the ocean are visible under a clear blue sky.

Ponto Planning Area G & H:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto State Park
Connection to beach

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

Funding Needs & Tax-payer Benefits


- * \$38 million to purchase 14.3 acre Planning Area G &H at current 'list price'
- * Around \$8 million to purchase 11.1-acre Planning Area F based on recent 2023 sale and purchase by Fenton
- * Park development costs about \$ 1million per acre
- * Most all Fed-State-City 'soft environmental study costs' may have already been paid for at both these two sites
- * Saves tax-payers \$60.9 to \$12.7 million compared to Carlsbad's proposed 'PCH Relocation' that adds zero land
- * Opportunity for private 501c3 donations and Bequests to help fund acquisition and operations

Funding Needs & Tax-payer Benefits

- * Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation's proposed Coastal Science and Cultural Center adds funding opportunities
- * Permanent Donor Recognition in world-class bronze whale sculpture already offered for donation to Park
- * Your legacy for future generations of public use at a very special & vanishing part of California's Coastline
- * Opportunity to fund Coastal Science Education for future generations

Donor Recognition Sculpture

- * Permanente Donor Recognition in bronze whale sculpture & base plaque
- * Artwork to be donated for Ponto Coastal Park



Working Together to make Ponto Coastal Park a reality

- * People for Ponto researches, informs and works to protect Ponto for all generations to come
- * Ponto Beachfront Park 501c3 receives tax-deductible donations for initial Ponto Coastal Park acquisition, and refund of initial donations.
- * Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation 501c3 receives donations for the Science/Cultural Center within a Ponto Park

An aerial photograph showing a coastal area. On the left is a sandy beach. A multi-lane highway runs parallel to the coast. To the right of the highway is a large, flat, green field. In the background, a residential area with houses and trees is visible under a blue sky with some clouds.

Ponto Planning Area F:
A future Coastal Park?

Ponto Planning Area G & H:
A future Coastal Park?

Subject: Public input for 9-18-23 Parks Commission & 9-26-23 City Council meeting agenda items on Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates and Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment
Attachments: CTGMC key issues and suggestions -2022-12-6.pdf

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 10:20 AM
To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; CarlsbadLCPA@coastal.ca.gov
Subject: Public input for 9-18-23 Parks Commission & 9-26-23 City Council meeting agenda items on Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates and Proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment

We again ask the New Mayor and City Council, Parks Commission and City staff to acknowledge, discuss and honestly consider the attached Suggestions for honestly, responsibly, and most beneficially and cost effectively address the known Park and Unconstrained/Useable Open Space Standard deficits at Ponto and for other such areas in the City.

Ponto is the last significant vacant Coastal land in South Carlsbad. The City allowed (and appears to be continuing to allow) Ponto developers to 'falsely be "exempted" from providing both Useable Open Space at Ponto and providing a Park IN SW Carlsbad for SW Carlsbad families. That is why Ponto is currently developed at a density 40% higher than the rest of the City.

Because of the False Exemptions there is NO Coastal Park for all of inland South Carlsbad (62% of Carlsbad's population) and Ponto is the last remaining adequately sized/dimensioned vacant land that can address these Ponto, SW Carlsbad, and South Carlsbad Park and Coastal Park needs.

City Councils have known since 2001 that PCH Median Relocation is not needed to use most of PCH land for needed sidewalks. The Surplus Areas identified in the City's two (URS & ERA) 2001 Studies show significantly less acreage than the 50-acres (mostly narrow constrained area) being advertised. And the tax-payer costs for these narrow strips is much more expensive than simply buying better vacant land at Ponto. Buying Ponto Vacant land for the needed Park saves tax-payers tens of millions of dollars.

Failure of the Parks Commission and New Mayor and Council to correct past Mayor/Council policy errors would be both wasteful and a forever tragedy for future generations of Carlsbad citizens, families, and visitors.

Please Parks Commission, New Mayor and Council, and CA Coastal Commission do the right thing.

Sincerely,
Lance

From: Lance Schulte [<mailto:meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 11:17 AM
To: committee@carlsbadca.gov; 'Michele Hardy'; council@carlsbadca.gov; 'City Clerk'; 'Kyle Lancaster'; 'Eric Lardy'; 'Smith, Darren@Parks'; Homer, Sean@Parks; 'Moran, Gina@Parks'; Carrie Boyle; 'Prahler, Erin@Coastal'; Ross, Toni@Coastal; melanie@melanieforcarlsbad.com
Cc: info@peopleforponto.com
Subject: Public input to the next upcoming meetings of Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council and Parks and Planning Commissions - LCPA and Growth Management-Parks Master Plan Updates - Parks & Open Space

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, , CA Coastal Commission and CA State Parks:

As the City has requested specific reference regarding public input, I ask you to please deliver to the those address this email and attachment as public input for:

1. the CTGMC's 12/15/22 meeting,
2. the next Carlsbad Council meeting,
3. the next Carlsbad Planning and Parks Commission meetings on the Parks Master Plan and Growth Management Program Updates, Ponto Planning Area F and Site 18 land use changes, and Local Coastal Program Amendments, and
4. as public input to the CCC on Carlsbad proposed Local Coastal Program, and
5. as public input to Carlsbad's proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment.

The initial version of attached file was sent to you 8/8/22. The attached updated file should replace that older file as there is new data on significant tax-payer cost savings from Pronto Park relative to PCH Relocation, and updated examples of how Coastal Open Space can be cost-effectively persevered and increased. Both Coastal Parks and Open Space are important Carlsbad and State of CA issues.

- Parks: Updated data shows that a 11.1 acre Ponto Park would now cost less \$20 million to buy and build. This is less than a City Pool Renovation. Carlsbad's Old City Council planned to spend \$65 to \$80 million in Carlsbad tax-payer dollars to address the Citywide need for a significant Coastal Park in South Carlsbad with a 2.3 mile PCH Relocation. The City identified in 2001 other pay-payer funds were highly unlikely. \$65 to \$80 million would only 'free-up' 15.8 acres of narrow PCH Median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 & #5"). As People for Ponto Citizens have been saying for years that Ponto Park is the better Park solution to the documented Coastal South Carlsbad Park needs – a citywide need. The CTGMC should include that citywide Park need and the logical, better and tax-payer responsible Ponto Park solution to that citywide Park need in your CTGMC recommendations to City Council.
- Open Space: Updated data shows how documented GM Open Space shortfalls can be properly and responsibly address in a collaborative citizen-based "Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan" approached. Also the need to maintain the 15% GM (Useable) Open Space Standard will be critical in the future to maintain Open Space and prevent future conversion of Open Space to residential land use as part of Housing Plan updates.

For the CTGMC; Parks and Open Space are the 2 most critical/special of 6 Key Growth Management Program Update Issues and Suggestions the CTGMC should take to properly address these 6 key Growth Management Issues.

- Please read the Updated data and Suggestions.
- Please responsibly address the Growth Management issues of a citywide Park need for Coastal South Carlsbad as listed in the attached Suggestions. Include a South Carlsbad Coastal Park in your recommendations to the City Council. Acknowledge Ponto Park as the best and most tax-payer efficient solution to address that documented citywide park need.
- Please in your recommendations to City Council retain and enforce the Open Space Standard, and fix past errors made in falsely exempting certain developers in certain areas in the City from complying with the Growth Management Open Space Standard that other developers in other areas are required to provide.

Please consider this email and attachments, and know P4P Carlsbad Citizens are here to help assure we sustain and enhance our quality of life for future generations. People for Ponto love deeply Carlsbad and want to assure we leave a better Carlsbad to future generations.

Happy holidays and with Aloha Aina,
Lance Schulte

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Following are 6 key major Growth Management Standards issues of citywide relevance that the Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee (CTGMC) needs to act on, and citizen “Suggestions to CTGMC” on how to honestly and responsibly act on these 6 key issues in the CTGMC’s recommendations to the New City Council. This Update includes new information (pp 5-6) on the improved affordability of Ponto Park, and on how GM Open Space shortfall can be repaired. We hope the CTGMC will act honestly to make recommendations that truly and responsibly address known documented shortfalls in both Parks and GM Open Space. Responsible recommendations by the CTGMC can provide a sustainable Quality of Life to future Carlsbad generations and visitors. Only you own your recommendations.

1. The State of CA is forcing Carlsbad and all cities/counties in CA to provide for unlimited or Infinite Population and Visitor growth. So there will be an Infinite population & visitor demands for Parks, Open Space, water, and demands on our roads/transportation systems, and other Growth Management (GM) Quality of Life facilities. These infinite increases in population and visitor demand will come from high density development that requires more public Parks and Open Space to balance the high-densities. **Carlsbad’s new GM Standards will have to provide for a system of Infinite proportional increases in the supply of Parklands, Open Spaces, water, transportation facility capacity, etc. or our Quality of Life will diminish.**
 - a. Suggestions to CTGMC:
 - i. Completely restructure the General Plan, Local Coastal Program and GM Program to clearly recognize these facts and State requirements to proportionately provide public facilities to maintain/improve Carlsbad GM Quality of Life Standards for this Infinite growth of Population and Visitor demands.
 - ii. **Being a Coastal city Carlsbad has an added responsibility to proportionately maintain/improve providing High-Priority Coastal land uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations) needed at a regional and statewide level to address visitor needs for Coastal Recreation, access, and affordable accommodations.** Carlsbad needs to work with the State of CA Coastal Commission to completely restructure Carlsbad’s Coastal Land Use Plan to addresses the State’s requirement to provide an Infinite amount high-priority Coastal land uses for those Infinite Population and Visitor demands.
 - iii. **Trying to ignore these Infinite demands for Carlsbad’s Quality of Life facilities – like Parks and Open Spaces is a path to disaster and the ultimate degradation of Carlsbad’s Quality of Life.**
2. **Carlsbad has a huge Jobs v. Housing supply imbalance – far too many jobs around the airport for our amount of housing. This creates negative and costly land use and transportation planning distortions that radiate from the Airport Central Jobs through Carlsbad in all directions.** CA Housing law penalizes unbalanced cities like Carlsbad by requiring more housing in Carlsbad to bring jobs/housing ratio into balance. Carlsbad can correct this imbalance by 1 of 2 ways: 1) greatly increase housing supply (and thus increase the need and City expense for more GM Quality of Life facilities), or 2) more logically and cost effectively greatly decrease the amount of Jobs land use, so Carlsbad’s housing supply is in balance with jobs. These jobs will move to surrounding Cities that have more housing than jobs. **Rebalancing by reducing jobs land use creates added benefits for Carlsbad and our region by reducing Carlsbad’s peak-hour job commute traffic volumes and**

vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and by reducing the costs Carlsbad (and other cities and the region) have to pay to accommodate inter-city commute traffic. If Carlsbad reduces jobs land use will also reduce the amount of housing the State of California and SANDAG requires Carlsbad provide in its Housing Element thus reducing forcing incompatible high-density development into established neighborhoods and pressure to convert useable GM Open Space lands to housing land use.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Carlsbad can logically and cost effectively balance Jobs/housing supply by updating Growth Management Policy to reduce jobs to be in balance with housing by changing some of Carlsbad's General Plan land use around the airport into several high-density residential mixed-use Villages.** The City has started some of this, but can expand this effort but has not planned creating mixed-use village environments. These high-density villages will reduce jobs and provide both high-quality and high-density (affordable) housing within walking/biking distance to the major job center and new neighborhood commercial and Park uses in the Villages.
- ii. Prioritize transportation investments in safe bike paths, walking paths between Carlsbad's Central Jobs Core around the airport and Carlsbad's housing, particularly strongly connecting these new high-density mixed-use villages with the Central Jobs Core.
- iii. Update General Plan land use and housing policy to reduce concentrations of higher-density housing except around the airport jobs core.
- iv. Recognize the central Airport jobs core is 'Carlsbad's New Urban Downtown and "Transect Plan" accordingly toward lower densities on the City periphery.

3. Although some very critical areas (such as the Coastal lands at Ponto) are still vacant and can be wisely used for critical GM Quality of Life needs, much of Carlsbad is largely developed.

Redevelopment of developed land will require creating increased supplies of Parkland, Open Spaces, transportation capacity, and other Quality of Life facilities.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. **Completely rethink all City planning on existing vacant lands to assure that remaining vacant land is planned and being used wisely and fairly distributed to address critical Quality of Life needs in those areas, and not squandered on redundant land use.** The location of vacant land to address critical Park & Open Space needs should be preserved with land use planning.
- ii. Work with the State and CA Coastal Commission to preserve our Finite vacant Coastal lands for High-Priority Coastal Land Uses (Coastal Recreation {i.e. Public Parks} and Low-cost Visitor Accommodations and services) for the Infinite population and visitor demands both internal and external to Carlsbad that are/will be placed on them.
- iii. Fully and at the very beginning of any Carlsbad General Plan, Local Coastal Program and Growth Management Program actions going forward fully disclose, map and require consideration of the impact of future sea level rise and coastal erosion on Coastal land acres and land uses. Carlsbad has lost and will accelerate losing acres of Coastal land and High-priority Coastal Land Uses. Carlsbad must know, see, and discuss these losses BEFORE making any land use decisions in Carlsbad's Coastal Zone and any vacant Coastal Land.

4. **Carlsbad General Plan & Growth Management Plan do not provide a fair distribution of adequately sized City Parks for all Carlsbad families.** Veterans Park is a classic example. What will

be the City's largest park is only about 1-mile away from three other major City Parks (Zone 5, and the future Robinson Ranch and Hub Parks). This is a poor and unfair distribution and a misallocation City Park land resources. Saying Veterans Park is 'the park to serve SW, SE, and NE Carlsbad families' (the overwhelming major/majority funders of veterans Park) when those families are upwards of 6-miles away on major commercial arterials that kids can't logically/safely use is false and unfair. Most all the funding (developer fees) to build Veterans Park come from the SW, SE and NW Carlsbad but those areas are denied the Park the paid for. Veterans Park is inaccessible by almost all its intended users except by driving their cars and then storing their cars in parking lots on Parkland thus making less park land available for actual park use – this makes little common sense and is a great waste of tax-payer funds. This is dysfunctional along with being very unfair to families in SW, SE and NE Quadrats that are denied park acres near their homes which they funded. **Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps 'Park Service' areas of existing known Park Inequity or Unfairness (dysfunction), to show where new City Park investments should be made (See City map image with notes below).**

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

The Trust for Public Land provides a Park-Score to compare both a City's amount of park acres and the 'fairness' of access (within a 10-minute walk) to parks. **Carlsbad is below national averages in both park acres and fair access to parks. Carlsbad is also well below what our adjacent Coastal cities of Encinitas and Oceanside provide. Carlsbad only requires 3 acres of Park land per 1,000 population, while Encinitas and Oceans require 5 acres - 67% more than Carlsbad – of parkland. Also, Encinitas and Oceanside require parks to be within a 10-minute walk to their citizens and families. Carlsbad has no such requirement.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

Carlsbad should change its General Plan, Parks and Growth Management Standards and CMC 20.44 to:

- i. **Be Above Average Nationally in both providing park acreage and in locating adequate park acreage to be within a 10-minute walk to all neighborhoods.**
 - ii. **Raise its minimum park acreage standard to 5 acres per 1,000 population, versus the current low 3 acres per 1,000. Carlsbad should be at least as good as Encinitas and Oceanside in requiring 5 acres, not 40% below what our adjacent Cities require/provide.**
 - iii. **Raise its park location standard to require an adequately sized park be provided to serve the neighborhood population within a 10-minute walk for all neighborhoods.**
 - iv. **Prioritize City Policy and Park Budgets and investments to achieve park fairness in 'Park Unserved areas' identified by Carlsbad's Park Master Plan.**
 - v. **Per Carlsbad's Municipal Code Chapter 20.44- DEDICATION OF LAND FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES to require developers in 'Park Unserved areas' and in areas that do not have an adequately sized (5 acres per 1,000 population) park within a 10-minute walk to provide their developments required Park land acre dedication in actual Park land within a 10-minute walk to their development.**
 - vi. **Update the City's Park-in-lieu fee to assure the fee is adequate to actually buy the amount of park land a developer is to provide within a 10-minute walk of their development. The City's current 'Park-in-lieu-fee' is far too low and inadequate to actually buy land in area surrounding the proposed development.**
 - vii. **Only allow developers to pay a Park-in-lieu-fee where there is an adequately sized park (provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk of their development, and growth management planned future development in that area will not require more park land to provide 5 acres per 1,000 population) within a 10-minute walk.**
 - viii. **Consider updating Park policy to provide more multi-use flexibility in park land acres and development on Parks. Many Carlsbad Park acres are developed/dedicated to a single-purpose use, and unavailable for other park uses.**
 - ix. **Consider eliminating car parking lots from land that can be counted as parkland; or by significantly limiting park land used for parking to around 5%.**
 - x. **Eliminate the counting of 'GM Constrained and Unusable land' and Protected Endangered Species Habitat land as Park land. GM Constrained/Unusable lands are undevelopable. Protected Habitat lands are by definition not useable for development by people. Habitat is dedicated for plants and animals. Parks are open spaces dedicated intended for people. Parkland calculations should exclude Unusable lands and Protected Habitat lands and only count 100% people Useable land as Park land. Where Park land abuts Habitat land a sufficient buffer space shall be provided to prevent people mixing with animals (ex. Rattlesnakes, etc.) and animals from people (habitat disturbance or destruction). This buffer area should not be counted as Park or Habitat acres, but as natural/developed buffer open space acres, and can be counted as part of the City's 15% Growth Management 'Aesthetic open Space'.**
5. **Carlsbad's Coast is the most, if not the most, important feature of Carlsbad; and is consistently identified by citizens and businesses and our Community Vision. Carlsbad's Coastal Parks (west of the I-5 corridor) are grossly unfairly distributed. Carlsbad's Coastal Parks do not fairly match the**

locational needs of the population. North Carlsbad that is 38% of Carlsbad's population and has 10 Coastal Parks totaling 37+ acres in size. South Carlsbad that is 62% of Carlsbad's population has 0 [ZERO] Coastal Parks totaling 0 [ZERO] acres. Again, Carlsbad's Park Master Plan maps this citywide unfairness (dots show park locations and circles show the area served by each park) and says that the City should look at buying and building New Parks in these areas that are unserved by City Parks (are not covered by a circle). The GM Update should correct this citywide unfair distribution of City Parks by making plans for new Park purchases to create City Parks in these unserved areas of Park Inequity.

To address citywide Coastal Park unfairness the current City Council wants to spend \$60-85 million in Carlsbad tax-payer funds to Relocate 2.3 miles of constrained Pacific Coast Highway median to try to make some of the narrow PCH median 'useable' by people. 2001 and 2013 City PCH Relocation studies identified only a small amount of 'people-useable acres' would be created next to PCH. The \$60-85 million tax-payer cost (\$26-37 million per mile) does NOT add one single square foot of new City land, it only inefficiently rearranges a small amount PCH median. The City can most tax-payer cost effectively provide needed sidewalks and bike improvements along the outside edges of PCH without PCH Relocation. The City's 2001 PCH Relocation Financial Study and 2013 PCH Relocation Design both indicated minimal useable land could be achieved by Relocation, and that the very high tax-payer cost to do so would be very difficult to fund. The City has known for well over 20-years that PCH Relocation is a high-cost and a poor solution to address the Citywide Coastal Park unfairness in South Carlsbad.

However, a **better and far less costly solution to correct Citywide Coastal Park unfairness and provide a much needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park is to simply buy currently vacant land that is for sale.** The City did this (although the City actually bought existing homes) when it expanded Pine Park. **Carlsbad tax-payers have used the City's own data to compare the tax-payer Cost/Benefits of simply purchasing vacant land v. trying to rearrange existing City owned land at PCH. Simply buying vacant land saves tax-payers saves tax-payers over \$32.7 to \$7.7 million.** Please read the following data files:

- 2022-June General Comparative tax-payer Costs/Benefits of Completing PCH, 2.3 miles of PCH Modification (Island Way to La Costa Ave.), and 14.3 acre Ponto Park (Kam Sang) to address planned loss of 30+ acres of Coastal Open Space Land Use at Ponto in South Carlsbad: Part 1 of 2.
- City's PCH Modification Proposal Area Map with notes on usability Constraints and Issues: P4P Input: Part 2 of 2
- The most recent (9/19/22) land sale of 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F was less than \$8 million (less than \$706,000 per acre).
- **Buying and developing this 11.1 acre Ponto Park would cost less than \$20 million assuming a 10% profit to the new land-owner, and \$1 million per acre park construction cost like our newest Buena Vista Reservoir Park.** The cost to help correct a Citywide Coastal Park unfairness by simply buying & building a much needed **11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park would cost tax-payers less than the recently approved Measure J City Monroe Street Pool Renovation.** Investing less than \$20 million (\$1.8 million per acre) to buy and build an 11.1 acre Ponto Coastal Park is a great tax-payer value v. \$65-80 million in tax-payer funds to rearrange 15.8 acres of narrow strips of constrained PCH median (City documented "Surplus Land Area #4 &5") for some minimal people use at a tax-payer cost of \$4-5 million per acre. **The overall and per acre costs of buying/building Ponto Park are over 2 to 3 times better value for tax-payers than PCH Relocation/rearrangement.**

- The City Council could/can buy land for Open Space (Parks are the most useable of the City's 4 Open Space categories) under voter approved Prop C Open Space land acquisition authority. **The City has been advised to buy Ponto Park under Prop C per the City's settlement of a Growth Management law suit.**

The Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is clearly a citywide issue. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad as it is unfair to the vast majority of Carlsbad citizens and their families as 62% of Carlsbad is in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad is unfair to our major Visitor serving industries (and tax generators) in South Carlsbad. Park and Coastal Park Inequity at Ponto and Coastal South Carlsbad are clearly inconsistent with the CA Coastal Act, Carlsbad's Community Vision, and common sense. The Coastal South Carlsbad Park Inequity is also unfair to North Carlsbad because South Carlsbad's Coastal Park demand is being forced into Coastal North Carlsbad and congesting those parks, and adding to Coastal North Carlsbad traffic and parking impacts. It also increases greenhouse gases and VMT as it forces longer vehicle trips.

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. 11.1 acre Ponto Planning Area F has a specific Local Coastal Program Land Use Policy that says The City of Carlsbad must for the Ponto Area LCP 'Consider and Document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and or Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations west of the railroad tracks (at Ponto) prior to any Land Use change. **The discussion of Parks by the CTGMC is such a situation that requires the CTGMC to consider this adopted LCP Land Use Policies. Official public records requests have shown the City never followed this LCP Land Use Policy Requirement during the 2005 Ponto Vision Plan and 2015 General Plan Update, and in 2010 the CA Coastal Commission rejected the Ponto Vision Plan and told the City in 2017 that that land uses at Ponto could change based on the need for Coastal Recreation and/or Low Cost Visitor Accommodations.** The Mello II LCP that covers most of Carlsbad's Coastal Zone also has Land Use Policy 6.2 for the City to consider a major park in the Batiquitos (Ponto/South Carlsbad) area. The City has only implemented 1/6 to 1/3 of this policy. **The CTGMC should fully evaluate the citywide/South Carlsbad and local Ponto need for Coastal Parks as required by the City's adopted LCPs and CA Coastal Act.**
- ii. Carlsbad's 2015 General Plan Update and Growth Management Plan (GMP) did not, and was not updated to, consider the 2017 Sea Level Rise (SLR) Impact report showing the loss/impact on 32+ acres of Carlsbad's Coastal Land Use acreage in South Carlsbad – primarily Open Space Land Use (beach and Campground). **Both the General Plan (and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan) and GMP should be updated to account for the loss and replacement of these 32+ acres of high-priority Coastal Open Space Land Use due to SLR.** The updates and the CTGMC should use the newest CA Coastal Commission SLR Guidelines/science, not the old guidelines used in 2017. Carlsbad's LCP and CA Coastal Act Land Use Polies call for 'upland relocation' to replace the SLR loss of high-priority Coastal Land Uses.
- iii. **The availability over the past several years of the last two sufficiently sized vacant lands suitable for a Ponto/South Carlsbad Coastal Park is a citywide issue. If these last two vacant lands are lost to development forever future generations will have lost the last opportunity for the needed South Carlsbad Coastal Park.** The 5/3/22 Citizen requests for the City to jointly study acquisition of one or both these last vacant lands for a needed (and only possible) true and meaningful Coastal Park for

South Carlsbad should be recommended by the CTGMC. **The CTGMC should recommend Carlsbad’s GMP be updated to incorporate Parkland acquisition of these last opportunities to provide the needed Coastal Park for South Carlsbad.**

6. Carlsbad Growth Management Open Space Standard is that 15% of all the Useable (unconstrained and fully buildable) areas is to be preserved as Useable Open Space, and that all the 25 Local Facility Management Plans (LFMP) show how that 15% is provided. The City says:

OPEN SPACE


A. Performance Standard

Fifteen percent of the total land area in the Local Facility Management Zone (LFMZ) exclusive of environmentally constrained non-developable land must be set aside for permanent open space and must be available concurrent with development.

Yet the City has mapped and documented that this 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard was not complied with. The City also acknowledges that without changes to current City planning the 15% Useable Open Space Performance Standard will never be complied with. The City acknowledges that only 13% has/will under current plans ever be provided. This missing 2% equals 501 acers of lost GM Open Space the GMP promised citizens. **Carlsbad law the Growth Management Ordinance 21.90, and section ‘21.90.130 Implementation of facilities and improvements requirements’; provide guidance on how non-compliance with a Performance Standards is to be handled.**

a. Suggestions to CTGMC:

- i. Retain the GM Open Space Standard of 15% of all unconstrained and developable land is maintained as Open Space. If the City removes the Open Space Standard, it will allow and encourage land use changes to remove GM Open Space and replace with development.
- ii. **The CTGMC should make a recommendation that an inventory of all 25 LFMP Zones be conducted and an inventory of each LFMP Zones provision of at least 15% Useable Open Space shall be compiled. No LFMP Zone shall be allowed to be “exempt” from this inventory.** The City’s computerized GIS mapping system makes it easy and clear as shown in the following City GIS map for LFMP Zone 9 (aka Ponto).



City GIS map of Ponto's (LFMP Zone 9) Open Space:

- Light green areas meet the City's 15% unconstrained Growth Management Program Open Space Standard
- Most Ponto Open Space (pink hatch & blue [water] on map) is "Constrained" and does not meet the Standard
- **Aviara - Zone 19, Ponto - Zone 9 and Hanover/Poinsettia Shores – Zone 22 all developed around the same time and had similar vacant lands.**
- **City required Aviara - Zone 19 east of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto? Aviara includes the same lagoon.**
- **City required Hanover & Poinsettia Shores area Zone 22 just north of Ponto to provide the 15% Standard Open Space. Why not Ponto?**
- Why Ponto developers were not required to comply with the 15% Useable Open Space Standard is subject to current litigation
- Below is City GIS data from this map

City GIS map data summary of the Growth Management Standard of 15% Useable Open Space at Ponto

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 472 Acres | Total land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>(197 Acres)</u> | Constrained land excluded from Growth Management (GMP) Open Space |
| 275 Acres | Unconstrained land in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] |
| <u>X 15%</u> | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space requirement |
| 41 Acres | GMP Minimum Unconstrained Open Space required |
| <u>(11 Acres)</u> | GMP Open Space provided & mapped per City GIS data |
| 30 Acres | Missing Unconstrained Open Space needed in LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto] to meet the City's minimum GMP Open Space Standard per City's GIS map & data |

73% of the City's minimum 15% required Open Space Standard is missing due to over development of LFMP Zone 9 [Ponto]

- iii. In instances like LFMP Zone 9 (above image) that clearly did not provide at least 15% Useable Open Space and/or were falsely “exempted” the CTGMC should recommend that a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** shall be developed that explores the GM Open Space use/reuse of City land, land use planning requirements, and/or possible acquisitions of remaining vacant land acres to make up for any shortfall in meeting the 15% Useable Open Space in that a Zone. An example of this in LFMP Zone 9 is that the City’s regional Rail Trail will convert 2-lanes of almost all of Avenida Encinas to wider buffered bike lanes and an adequate portion of the converted 2 vehicle lanes can be landscaped (v. just painting strips as a buffer) to provide a safer/better bike lane buffer within a GM compliant Open Space. 2 vehicle lanes in Windrose Circle could also be similarly landscaped and converted to GM complaint Open Space. This is just one example of a cost-effective means to add GM Open Space that developers were falsely allowed to remove.
- iv. A **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** should involve a Citizens Advisory Committee composed of citizens within the impacted Zone and appointed by the Council Members representing the Zone, and a representative of each vacant land owner over of over 1-acre in size.
- v. Consistent with the Growth Management Ordinance land use changes and development applications within a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan** Zone shall be deferred until the applications can considered with (or after adoption of) a **Local Facilities Zone Useable Open Space Correction Plan**.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, August 7, 2023 11:02 AM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>;

CarlsbadLCPA@coastal.ca.gov; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>

Cc: 'People for Ponto' <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: Public input for upcoming Carlsbad LCPA-Parks Master Plan & Growth Management Plan Updates - Parkland losses not considered in minimal 3 acre Parkland dedication for new unlimited development

Dear City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission:

Please read the data below and attachments in your upcoming Growth Management and Park Master Plan Update processes, and for Carlsbad's proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.

This data was previously provided to the City on 2/6/23, but apparently not adequately discussed or considered as it documents the New City Council will lose 20.6 acres of free Parkland or \$20.6 million in Park-in-lieu-fees by not using a 5 acres/1,000 Parkland Dedication requirement over the next 8-years of the (2021-2029) Housing Element cycle, and continue to lose both Parkland and Park-in-lieu-fees every 8-year Housing Element cycle.

The loss in Park land and fees is a significant issue relative to City Budget and Quality of Life that seems should be of great importance to the City Council regarding the benefits and impacts of a 3 or 5 acre per 1,000 population Parkland Dedication requirement in Updating the Growth Management Park Standard, Park Master Plan, Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan, and Housing Element.

Since staff prevented a thorough comparative discussion of the 3 to 5 acre Parkland dedication requirement for new developers relative to the impacts to City finances by the CTGMC, that thorough comparative discussion of the 3 to 5 acre Parkland dedication requirement rests with the New City Council. Not fully considering the impacts of a 3 v. 5 acre per 1,000 population Park land dedication Standard to City finances and to the Quality of Life would be irresponsible.

Following is a base calculation of the Parkland and/or Park money lost by the New City Council by not Updating new developer Parkland dedication requirements to be consistent with the 5 acre per 1,000 population requirements of Encinitas and Oceanside. Carlsbad not matching and keeping up with new Parklands created by Encinitas and Oceanside will over time, and a several Housing Element (and required land use changes to higher-density) Updates, retard Carlsbad's desirability and Quality of Life. Remember CA law prevents any city from being 'Buildout', and future land use changes to create more new housing units will be required of Carlsbad (and every other city) at every eight year Housing Element Cycle.

It is folly to not consider these growth/Parkland impacts of more unlimited new high-density housing and lower relative new developer required Parkland dedication vis-à-vis adjoining Cities. Not considering the significant loss of free Parkland and/or free Park-in-lieu-fees from new development and the impact on City finances and Quality of Life is folly and mismanagement of Carlsbad Tomorrow.

[2021-29 Housing Element \(and required land use changes\) Update for ONLY to 2029 or next 7-years](#)

HCD required new Housing Units to be accommodated to 2029 = 3,900
Average population per housing unit in Carlsbad (2020 Census) = 2.64
Required new population to be accommodated until 2029 = 10,296 (8.9% City pop. increase)
For simplicity of comparison reasonably assume Carlsbad Land costs \$1 million per acre, so:

New developer Parkland Dedication and/or Park-in-lieu-fee (free to City) for 2021-29 period:
3 acres per 1,000 = 30.9 free to City Park acres or \$30.9 million in free Park-in-lieu-fees to add parks
4 acres per 1,000 = 41.2 free to City Park acres or \$41.2 million in free Park-in-lieu-fees to add parks
5 acres per 1,000 = 51.5 free to City Park acres or \$51.5 million in free Park-in-lieu-fees to add parks

Free to City Park acres or free Park-in-lieu-fees LOST to City by only requiring new developers provide 3 acres of Parkland per 1,000 in only 8-years (2021-29) Housing Element Cycle:

City loses 10.3 acres of free Parkland or \$10.3 million in Park-in-lieu-fees by not using 4 acres/1,000
City loses 20.6 acres of free Parkland or \$20.6 million in Park-in-lieu-fees by not using 5 acres/1,000

For an 8-year period losing 10.3 to 20.6 acres of free City Parkland or \$10.3 to \$20.6 million in free Park-in-lieu-fees are significant developer giveaways and impacts to City finances and future Quality of Life.

This loss of free Parkland and/or Park fees will repeat every 8-year Housing Element Update Cycle as CA HCD requires more land use changes to add more high-density housing units. These high-density housing units are most in need of City Parks to balance their high-density. Every 8 years there will be more increases City population and high-density development Parkland demands. City staff has indicated to the CTGMC that in the next 2030-38 Housing Element (and required land use changes) Update for that 8-year period that HCD will likely require be similar or more units to be provided in the 2030-2038 period as required in the 2021-29 period.

The New Mayor and City Council fully consider these issues and had a fair comparative consideration of the 3, or 5 acre Parkland dedication issues.

The New Mayor and City Council should now require new development to dedicate 5 acres of free Parkland. This is common sense, wise land use/Park planning and prudent City fiscal policy.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte

Dear Carlsbad Tomorrow Growth Management Committee, Carlsbad City Council and Parks Commission

Apparently on 1/26/23 the CTGMC did not have a discussion considering the impacts of a 3 or 4 or 5 acre per 1,000 population Parkland Dedication requirements as recommend Updates to the City Council.

Since there was no comparative discussion of the 3 to 4 to 5 acre Parkland dedication requirement for new developers the CTGMC did not compare/consider the relative impacts to City finances from the lost Parkland and/or Park-in-lieu-fees new developers would be giving to the City. Not considering the impacts to City finances and to the Quality of Life for the future seems somewhat irresponsible.

Following is a base calculation of the Parkland and/or Park money lost by the City by not Updating new developer Parkland dedication requirements to be consistent with the 5 acre per 1,000 population requirements of Encinitas and Oceanside. Carlsbad not matching and keeping up with new Parklands created by Encinitas and Oceanside will over time, and a several Housing Element (and required land use changes to higher-density) Updates, retard Carlsbad's desirability and Quality of Life. Remember CA law prevents any city from being 'Buildout', and future land use changes to create more new housing units will be required of Carlsbad (and every other city) at every eight year Housing Element Cycle.

It is folly to not consider these growth/Parkland impacts of more unlimited new high-density housing and lower relative new developer required Parkland dedication vis-à-vis adjoining Cities. Not considering the significant loss of free Parkland and/or free Park-in-lieu-fees from new development and the impact on City finances and Quality of Life is folly and mismanagement of Carlsbad Tomorrow.

2021-29 Housing Element (and required land use changes) Update for ONLY to 2029 or next 7-years

HCD required new Housing Units to be accommodated to 2029 = 3,900

Average population per housing unit in Carlsbad (2020 Census) = 2.64

Required new population to be accommodated until 2029 = 10,296 (8.9% City pop. increase)

For simplicity of comparison reasonably assume Carlsbad Land costs \$1 million per acre, so:

New developer Parkland Dedication and/or Park-in-lieu-fee (free to City) for 2021-29 period:

3 acres per 1,000 = 30.9 free to City Park acres or \$30.9 million in free Park-in-lieu-fees to add parks

4 acres per 1,000 = 41.2 free to City Park acres or \$41.2 million in free Park-in-lieu-fees to add parks

5 acres per 1,000 = 51.5 free to City Park acres or \$51.5 million in free Park-in-lieu-fees to add parks

Free to City Park acres or free Park-in-lieu-fees LOST to City by only requiring new developers provide 3 acres of Parkland per 1,000 in only 8-years (2021-29) Housing Element Cycle:

City loses 10.3 acres of free Parkland or \$10.3 million in Park-in-lieu-fees by not using 4 acres/1,000

City loses 20.6 acres of free Parkland or \$20.6 million in Park-in-lieu-fees by not using 5 acres/1,000

These are significant developer giveaways and impacts to City finances and future Quality of Life. The lost free Parkland and/or Park fess will repeat every 8-year Housing Element Update Cycle as more land use changes are required to add more high-density housing units (that most need City Parks to balance the high-density) increases City population and Parkland demands. City staff has indicated to the CTGMC that in the next 2030-38 Housing Element (and required land use changes) Update for that 8-year period that HCD will likely require be similar or more units to be provided in the 2030-2038 period as required in the 2021-29 period. CTGMC and City Council should now require new development to dedicate 5 or 4 acres of free Parkland. This is common sense, wise land use/Park planning and prudent City fiscal policy.

Carlsbad losses from not requiring new developers dedicate 4 or 5 acres of Parkland

Subject: Public comment - Carlsbad's Parkland Imbalance & resulting VMT increase
Attachments: TPL Support for Ponto Park - 2022-3-11.pdf; CARB Dashboard - Tracking Progress - Sustainable Communities California Air Resources Board - Carlsbad - 2022 Sep 11.pdf

Importance: High

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 7, 2023 10:43 AM
To: CarlsbadLCPA@coastal.ca.gov; Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; City Clerk <Clerk@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; Tom Frank <Tom.Frank@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: 'People for Ponto' <info@peopleforponto.com>
Subject: Public comment - Carlsbad's Parkland Imbalance & resulting VMT increase
Importance: High

Dear City Council, Parks, Planning and Traffic Commissions; and CA Coastal Commission:

Please read the data below and attachments in your upcoming Growth Management and Park Master Plan Update processes, and for Carlsbad's proposed Draft Local Coastal Program Amendment.

This data was previously provided to the City on 9/19/22, but was ignored and not discussed or considered.

Please review and consider this email and data on regional VMT data and your considerations of Carlsbad General Plan/LCPA, Growth Management Standards and Park Master Plan Updates. As has been provided in many data supported Citizen desires (and Trust for Public Land ParkScore data), Carlsbad's Parkland distribution Imbalance creates multiple negative impacts to current and future generations and the environment. As documented in People for Ponto's "Coastal Recreation" data file and extensive public input Carlsbad's Parkland Imbalance is in conflict with CA Coastal Act Policy. As Carlsbad citizens have repeatedly told you Carlsbad's Parkland Imbalance is increasing Carlsbad's VMT for Park access, or by requiring high VMT restricting Park access for citizens. The City's restrictive Park access and high VMT requirements to access City Parks is in conflict with State law to reduce VMT, and CA Coastal Act Policies. As the Trust for Public Land Parkscore data show Carlsbad is a relatively poor performer in regards to both providing Park acres and fairly distributing Park acres so more Citizens and their families can walk to Parks.

Carlsbad is also below average nationally in both providing Park acres and in fairly distributing Park acres. Carlsbad has one park for 2,797 residents with 2.95 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) data show that Carlsbad is 20% below what is typical in providing the number of parks, and Carlsbad is 72% below what is typical in providing acres of parkland (<https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/research-papers/agency-performance-review/>). The Trust for Public Land (TPL) also measures a City's Park performance (<https://www.tpl.org/city/carlsbad-california>). TPL data show Carlsbad total Park land acres (including counting State Park land acres) is 26% below the Median for the TPL's 100 ParkScore® cities, and 7% below the Median for the 14,000 cities and towns in the TPL ParkServe® database. The TPL also maps if a City provides/has Parks within a 10-minute walk to a Park; and Carlsbad is 33% below the Median for the TPL's 100 ParkScore® cities and 9% below the Median for the 14,000 cities and towns in the TPL ParkServe® database. This comparative information has not been publicly addressed by Council or in the 2015 General Plan Update. As noted both the Cities of Encinitas & Oceanside and many others have a 10-minute walk to Park Standard. Carlsbad does not and thus makes Carlsbad Parks less accessible and forces more VMT on Carlsbad roadways.

The CARB data so the SANDAG Regional average for Parks within walking distance is 71%, and the Statewide average is 72%. Carlsbad's Trust for Public Land Parkscore as noted above shows Carlsbad is only 50% or almost ½ worse than both the Regional and Statewide averages for walkable access to Parks. Carlsbad requires about 50% more VMT than the Region and State for Park access. This is the Imbalance People for Ponto Citizens have repeatedly shown the City but is being ignored.

Simply look at the following image from the City's own Park Service Area Maps in the Carlsbad Park Master Plan to see the unfairness, added VMT and gross Imbalance in the Land Use Plan. The blue dot is a Park and the light blue circle is that Park's service area. Even a 5-year child can see the unfairness and Imbalance.

No Coastal Park in South Carlsbad

- Appx. 6 miles of Coast without a Coastal Park is a City & Regional need
- South Carlsbad has 64,000 residents & thousands of hotel visitors without a Coastal park
- Closest park to Ponto is Poinsettia Park, approx. 2.5 miles across I-5
- Proposed Veterans Park is approx. 6 miles away

Special Use Areas Map
Prepared by the Department of Planning & Economic Development
City of Carlsbad, California
Title: 2015-2016 General Plan
Adopted: 12/15/2015

There is no Coastal Park to serve South Carlsbad Citizens-Visitors-Businesses. There are 20 Coastal Parks in North Carlsbad. The lack of Coastal Parks in South Carlsbad seems both unfair to South Carlsbad Citizens-Visitors-Businesses; and is unfair to North Carlsbad by forcing congestion into North Carlsbad & Encinitas/Solana Beach where there are Coastal Parks.

I hope you consider this data. Our future depends on it.

Lance

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dashboard - Tracking Progress - Sustainable Communities

IN THIS SECTION

CONTACT

Sustainable Communities & Climate Protection Program

Email sustainablecommunities@arb.ca.gov

Phone (800) 242-4450

Note: This beta dashboard is a draft. Do not cite.

Introduction

In 2008, the California Legislature passed the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375). SB 375 is a first-of-its-kind law to recognize the critical role of integrating transportation, land use, and housing decisions. The law requires each of California's 18 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to include a sustainable communities strategy (SCS) in its long-range regional transportation plan. The SCS identifies strategies to meet regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

In 2017, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 150 (SB 150), tasking CARB with issuing a progress report every four years that assesses progress each MPO has made in meeting the regional GHG emission reduction targets set by CARB. This dashboard showcases over two dozen data-supported metrics that CARB analyzed to support the Draft 2022 Progress Report.

How to Use This Dashboard

The purpose of this dashboard is to highlight transportation, land use, and housing metrics that CARB analyzed to support the 2022 Progress Report. Users can interact with the visualizations below to filter data or reveal additional information.

Filter Data

Use filters at the top of each visualization to narrow down data of interest. Most visualizations allow filtering by MPO region. Some visualizations also allow filtering by year.

Find Additional Information

Hover or click on a chart or graphic to reveal additional information about a given metric. For details on how a metric was calculated, see the linked methodology below each visualization.

Progress Toward SB 375 GHG Emission Reduction Targets

Changes in transportation, land use, and housing are essential to meeting the State's climate and equity goals. Despite

California’s aggressive work on vehicle technology, advancing vehicle electrification alone will not be enough to get to carbon neutrality.

CARB estimated passenger vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and associated GHG emissions compared to each MPO’s regional GHG emission reduction targets (which are set relative to a 2005 baseline). This comparison shows that California is not on track to reduce GHG emissions from personal vehicle travel under SB 375. Actual per capita GHG emissions and VMT continue to increase throughout the state. However, per capita VMT and GHG increases have slowed down since 2017.

DRAFT - DO NOT CITE

Select Region 1

Statewide


Select Region 2 (optional)

San Diego Association of Governments (S...

Select Metric

GHG
 VMT

GHG and VMT Compared to SB 375 Targets



Methodology (Appendix A)

Shifting Travel Patterns

Transportation and land use development can reduce GHG emissions by making it easier for people to get around on foot, by bike, or by transit. Travel indicators such as vehicle ownership, transit ridership, commute mode share, and commute time paint a picture of how transit, carpooling, and active transportation usage have changed relative to driving. In general, Californians continue to drive alone more and carpool less to work. Household vehicle ownership is growing, transit ridership is falling, and the small percentage of people that walk or bike to work is declining.

DRAFT - DO NOT CITE

Select Region 1

None

Select Region 2 (optional)

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

Select Year

2019



Drive Alone



SANDAG
76% Drive Alone



Carpool



SANDAG
9% Carpool



Transit



SANDAG
3% Use Transit



Walk or Bike



SANDAG
4% Walk or Bike




Methodology (Appendix A)

Sustainable Regional Growth

One way to reduce the need to drive long distances is to build homes, jobs, and other key destinations closer together. CARB examined changes in land use to assess whether development patterns were becoming more compact. This included evaluating changes in three types of land use: developed acres, agricultural acres, and conserved acres. Developed acres are areas that have been converted from other uses to urban land. Agricultural acres lost are areas that have been converted from agriculture to other uses. Conserved acres are areas that are protected from development of any kind. All three of these indicators vary by region, as illustrated in the maps below.

DRAFT - DO NOT CITE



Methodology (Appendix A)

Accessible Communities

When people live near shops, schools, parks, and transit, they can meet many of their daily needs without having to drive long distances. They may even be able to walk, bike, or ride a bus to their destination.

For each region, CARB evaluated the percentage of the population that lived within a 15-minute walk to four key destination types: park/open space, educational facilities, transit stops, and grocery stores. Unfortunately, most residents in California lack good accessibility to key destinations: less than half of the population in every region can access all four destination types by walking.

DRAFT - DO NOT CITE


Select Region 1

Statewide (18 MPO regions combined) ▼

Select Region 2 (optional)

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) ▼

Percent of Population With Access to Destinations by Foot



Methodology (Appendix A)

A Growing Housing Market

Housing development is an essential component for achieving SB 375 goals. For example, housing policies that promote multi-family units and equitable development can improve transit accessibility and help reduce trip length.

CARB compared permitted new housing construction to each region's housing need by income group as defined by the State Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) 5th planning cycle. Housing permitting and constructions were significantly behind regional housing allocations, especially for low-income housing.

CARB also analyzed the growth rate in single-family and multi-family housing units. The state continues to build more single-family housing than multi-family housing. However, since 2013 the growth rate of new housing has started to rebound, and the share of multi-family housing units has outpaced the percentage of single-family housing units.

Housing costs can be a substantial financial burden to predominantly low-income households. CARB analyzed the percentage of households that are overburdened by housing costs (defined as households that spend more than 35% of their income on housing). The percentage of overburdened households increased from 2010 to 2014 and slowly decreased in recent years.

DRAFT - DO NOT CITE

Select Region 1



Statewide

Select Region 2 (optional)

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)


New Housing Permits and Housing Need

Regional Housing Needs Allocation - 5th Planning Cycle




Housing Cost Burden

% Households Spending Over 35% Income on Housing



Growth in Housing Units by Type

Units Added Since 2005



Methodology (Appendix A)

Funding and Delivering Travel Choices

Funding for SCS projects comes from local, regional, state, and federal funding programs. Planned financing can explain whether a region is implementing projects and programs that reduce VMT and GHG emissions.

The charts below illustrate planned spending by mode in each region according to the MPOs most recent Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). RTPs typically cover a period of two or three decades and must cover at least 20 years. MPOs have discretionary authority over only a portion of the funds in RTPs, and that portion differs by region. Local governments, County Transportation Commissions, and transit agencies are examples of authorities with decision-making power over funds in the RTPs. Certain funding sources also have constraints attached.

With a few notable exceptions, most regions have more spending dedicated to roads than transit or active travel. Many regions continue to include significant funding for road expansion.

DRAFT - DO NOT CITE

Select Region 1


San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) ▼

Select Region 2 (optional)

None ▼

Regional Transportation Plan Expenditures

- Active Travel
- Other
- Roads
- Transit



Methodology (Appendix A)

Additional Information

For additional information, please see:

- Draft 2022 Progress Report for details on CARB's findings and methodology

For assistance with web accessibility, please email webaccessibility@arb.ca.gov.

(800) 242-4450 | helpline@arb.ca.gov
1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
P.O. Box 2815, Sacramento, CA 95812



Copyright © 2022 State of California



March 11th, 2022

Carlsbad City Council
1200 Carlsbad Village Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Re: Support creation of Ponto Park – a needed park for South Carlsbad

Dear Mayor Hall,

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is strongly supporting the efforts of ‘People for Ponto’ and thousands of Carlsbad residents to build Ponto Park in the 11-acre coastal parcel known as ‘Planning Area F’ in South Carlsbad. For over 40-years TPL has been designing and building parks in California and although we have world-class parks and beaches, the fact remains 3.2 million Californians don’t have access to a park, and some of those Californians are residents of South Carlsbad. While the National Recreation and Park Association calls for 10-acres of park lands per 1000 residents as standard metric for healthy and vibrant cities, Carlsbad has a comparatively and relatively low park standard of only 3-acres/1,000 population and no requirement to provide accessible parks within walking distance.

And according to our own Trust for Public Land 2020-21 ‘City Parkscore’, Carlsbad is also below national averages both providing park land acreage and in providing residents a park within a 10-minute walk.

The City of Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan on pages 86-89 documents park service and park equity/inequity. Carlsbad’s Park Master Plan documents that Ponto area has no park and all of South Carlsbad (over 61% of the entire city population) has no Coastal Park while . Carlsbad provides 10 City Coastal Parks (totaling over 35-acres) in North Carlsbad, while South Carlsbad has no coastal parks to serve the 64,000 residents, many of which are children. Ponto Park at 11-acre Planning Area F is the last remaining reasonable bit of vacant and currently unplanned Coastal land to provide a Coastal Park for South Carlsbad. Ponto Park would also be in the middle of a 6-mile long section of North San Diego County coastline without Coastal Park, and would help address a regional need for a Coastal Park for these 6-miles of coastline.

The CA Coastal Act has numerous policies that support the creation of Ponto Park and Coastal Recreation land use. The City of Carlsbad’s history of following these CA Coastal Act polies now and over the past 40-years in its Local Coastal Program should be considered now in the City’s proposed Local Coastal Program Amendment. Over the past 40-years Carlsbad and California residents have forever

lost numerous opportunities to create vital Coastal Parks and Coastal Recreation for our growing population.

In addition to the clear need for coastal parks in South Carlsbad, the citizens are overwhelmingly supporting the creation of Ponto Park in Planning area F. As you know during the past 2-years during the City Budget and Local Coastal Program Amendment processes, residents strongly demonstrated their desire that the City Council purchase and build Ponto Park. In 2019, 2020 and 2021 over 90% of citizen input expressed need was for Ponto Park, along with extensive verbal and written citizen testimony.

As COVID-19 vividly pointed out, parks are not an amenity, but a key component to human physical and mental health. Parks also provide environmental benefits and contribute to cleaner air and water, climate adaptation and social cohesion. TPL think you have a great opportunity to address equity and access to park space and improving the lives of thousands of Carlsbad residents and strongly urge you to support the building of Ponto Park for families and community.

Sincerely,

Rico Mastrodonato
Government Relations Director

Subject: pickleball courts/poinsetta/lack of!

From: john houston <jbuster1951@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, August 21, 2023 3:37 PM

To: Help <Help@CarlsbadCA.gov>

Subject: pickleball courts/poinsetta/lack of!

dear management of carlsbad.i'm sure you're tired of hearing about the lack of available pickleball courts at poinsetta park.lets review the situation...there are 6 courts: 2 for very good players and 4 for the rest of us.on most days it can take a 45 minute wait to play a 10 minute game.people are waiting inappropriate amounts of time.meanwhile on most days there are many tennis courts sitting empty.so what I envision is pickleball players will take it upon themselves and take over some tennis courts with their portable nets and removable tape.then when the tennis players show up...there will be a confrontation,the police will be called,the newspapers will get a story, give us some options.so why not avoid this potential problem. when is a rich city like carlsbad going to acquire some more land and develop more pickleball courts??.why do i have to wait 45 minutes to play a game of pickleball or drive 1/2 hr to bobby riggs to play there .??why is carlsbad,a very rich city unable to create more pickleball courts for a rapidly growing sport??.come on ...what is the answer??john houston 2953 avenida valera,carlsbad(jbuster1951@aol.com)

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Lance Schulte <meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, August 28, 2023 6:43 PM

To: Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>; CarlsbadLCPA@coastal.ca.gov; Eric Lardy <Eric.Lardy@carlsbadca.gov>; 'Smith, Darren@Parks' <Darren.Smith@parks.ca.gov>; 'Moran, Gina@Parks' <Gina.Moran@parks.ca.gov>; Homer, Sean@Parks <Sean.Homer@parks.ca.gov>

Cc: 'People for Ponto' <info@peopleforponto.com>

Subject: Public input to next Carlsbad Council & Parks Commission meetings on Growth Management Plan & Park Master Plan Updates; and Carlsbad Local Coastal Program Amendment and State Park Planning

Importance: High

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Parks and Planning Commissions, & CA Coastal Commission and State Parks:

Please read, discuss and consider this public input of 5 requests and 20 facts that support and justify the requests at each of your respective meetings on the Growth Management Plan & Park Master Plan Updates; and Carlsbad Local Coastal Program Amendment.

Since 2017 People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens have provided documented facts and over 5,500 citizen petitions requesting: **Carlsbad's City Council and/or CA Coastal Commission (CCC) honestly look at the facts and provide a much needed Ponto Park.**

The over 5,500 petitions from Carlsbad citizens and other People for Ponto are still asking the Carlsbad City Council and Commissions; and/or State of California to:

- Provide a 6-7 acre Ponto Park to for the minimal neighborhood needs of Ponto's population.
- Provide more Ponto Park acreage for the Coastal recreation (i.e. Public Park) needs for South Carlsbad (64,000 people & 62% of City) per Carlsbad Local Coastal Program & CA Coastal Act
- Ponto Park must be wide, flat and fully useable. A multi-use grassed area to allow kids/families space to informally play/picnic at the coast is what is needed. No thin/leftover strips along PCH.
- Replace the 32+ acres of Coastal Open Space (State beach/campground) to be lost from sea level rise in the next 70-years by allowing the Campground (Carlsbad's only Low-cost Visitor Accommodations) to move inland, allow bluff erosion and beach sand to preserve the beach.
- Use the People for Ponto Citizens plan to help replace Ponto's missing 30 acres of Useable Open Space, and fund Ponto Park while at the same time saving tax-payers tens of millions of dollars.

20 key facts documented by over 65 official Carlsbad Public Records Requests:

1. A 12.8 acre Commercial Recreation land use (Useable Growth Management Open Space) was planned at Ponto (BLEP MP/LCP) in mid-1980s. In early 1990s developers, City, and CA Coastal Commission (CCC) replaced it with a 11.1 acre Planning Area F "Non-Residential Reserve" land use that requires the City to consider/document the need for Coastal Recreation (i.e. Pubic Park) and/or the State Campground Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations (L-CVA) at Ponto.

2. Developers and City in the late-1990s Ponto Vision Plan tried to change Planning Area F to high-density residential. In 2010 the CCC rejected this Local Coastal Program Amendment because the City failed to comply with the Ponto Planning Area F regulations – consider a Public Park, et. al.
3. The CCC informed the City in 2016/2017 that the City’s proposed Ponto and Planning Area F land use changes may not be approved based on the need for “Coastal Recreation (i.e. Public Park) and/or L-CVA land uses”. The CCC will soon act on the land use for Planning Area F and City’s Draft LCPA.
4. The City never considered Sea Level Rise impacts on providing Coastal Recreation, and impacting existing Low-Cost Visitor Accommodation land use in the City’s Ponto Vision Plan, current 2015-2017 proposed General Plan and Draft LCPA. Only in 2017 and 2020 did the City conduct Sea Level Rise Impact Assessments that show the eventual loss of 32 acres of beach and L-CVA (Campground) land use within 70 years. In 2023 State Parks started to consider Sea Level Rise Impacts. Due the Campground’s road configuration sea level rise and erosion will eliminate the Campground use (Carlsbad’s only L-CVA) by 2100. Current demand at the Campground and for L-CVA is very high, and will only grow in the future. A clear and funded plan to move the Campground inland and increase the number of campsites is needed and logical.
5. Most of Carlsbad’s Visitor Accommodations and hotel taxes are in South Carlsbad; yet they have no Coastal Park in South Carlsbad. South Carlsbad Visitor industry has supported Ponto Park.
6. Carlsbad’s ONLY Low-Cost Visitor Accommodations (Campground) are in South Carlsbad. There’s no grassy Day-Use Park at the Campground, or in Coastal South Carlsbad.
7. Since 2012 there has been a 6.5 acre Park deficit in the SW Quadrant area that includes Ponto. That deficit has since grown to around 7 acres based on development approvals. The City GM Park Standard requires Parks to be provided concurrent with development and within the Quadrant where Park demand is created. This Standard has not been, and still is not being complied with.
8. CA Coastal Act Policy also supports equitable distribution land uses such as high-priority Public Park uses. Carlsbad provides 37 Park acres within 10 Coastal Parks in/for North Carlsbad (38% of the City) and 0 (zero) Park acres within 0 (zero) Coastal Parks in/for South Carlsbad (62% of the City).
9. The City’s 2015 Park Master Plan maps Park locations and Park service areas. It provides City Park Master Plan Policy and documents that the Ponto area and much of the SW Quadrant is ‘unserved by Parks’, and that ‘unserved areas’ should be locations to provide future City Parks (pp 86-88).
10. The Trust for Public Land’s ParkServe data documents Carlsbad is the worst Coastal city in providing 10-minute walk access to Parks in Southern CA. Carlsbad is the worst of 29 cities from Santa Barbara to Imperial Beach that includes over 250 miles of So. CA coastline and 5 million residents in providing Parks with a 10-minute walk. The Trust for Public Land supports a Ponto Park.
11. Carlsbad has one park per 2,797 residents and 2.95 acres of Park land per 1,000 residents. National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) data show that nationally Carlsbad is 20% below what is typical in providing the number of parks, and Carlsbad is 72% below what is typical in providing the amount of Park acres. The Trust for Public Land data base shows that Carlsbad’s total Park land acres (including counting State Park land acres) is 26% below the Median for the TPL’s 100 ParkScore® cities, and 7% below the Median for the 14,000 cities and towns in the TPL ParkServe® database of USA cities.
12. Encinitas and Oceanside require/provide 5 acres of Park per 1,000 population that is 67% more than Carlsbad requires/provides (only 3 acre/1,000). Encinitas and Oceanside also plan/require their Parks to be within a 10-minute walk to their citizens and families.
13. In just 8-years Carlsbad loses 20.6 acres of Free Parkland or \$20.6 million in Free Park-in-lieu-fees by not using a 5 acres per 1,000 population Parkland dedication Standard for just the new development in the year 2021-29 Housing Element. Every 8-year Housing Element will add more population in high-density developments and the more Free Parkland or Free Park-in-lieu-fees Carlsbad loses by not increasing the Parkland dedication Standard to 5 are per 1,000 population.
14. Ponto is in the center of a 6-mile length San Diego County coastline (8% of the County’s coast) without a significant Coastal Park west of the rail/I-5 corridors. Inland of these 6-miles are likely over 100,000 Carlsbad and San Diego County residents and visitors that do not have a Coastal Park.
15. Ponto has the last remaining vacant land (Planning Areas F, G, & H) suitable for a viable Coastal Park in this 6-mile length of coast. The cost to buy these vacant lands saves tax-payers tens of millions of dollars. 11.1 acre Planning Area F recently sold for under \$8 million or about \$ 720,000 per acre. 15 acre Planning Area G & H is listed for \$38

million or about \$2.5 million per acre. The City's 2001 URS and ERA Studies identified 3 South Carlsbad "Surplus Areas" totaling about 15 existing acres of narrow/constrained developed infrastructure land south of Island Way that could be converted to other uses. The City said the cost to do that would be \$65 to \$80 million, or \$ 4.3 to \$5.3 million per existing acre of narrow land, and the City's 2001 ERA Study said funding was problematic.

16. Past Carlsbad Councils Falsely "exempted" Ponto developers from providing the 15% Unconstrained & Useable Growth Management Open Space other developers were required to provide. City data/maps confirm this. Ponto needs 30 more acres of Unconstrained/Useable Open Space to meet the Standard. The False "Exemption" is why Ponto is already developed at 40% higher density than the rest of Carlsbad.
17. People for Ponto Citizens continue to try to work with multiple Ponto land owners to affect a land swap with the city, similar to the successful Poinsettia 61/Buena Vista Reservoir Park solution. The City has Surplus Sites it is working on disposing to land-swap with Ponto land owners. A win-win- win solution is possible if City Council would take lead of the opportunity.
18. Ponto Park 501c3 can help the City or State Parks in acquiring donations /funding for Ponto Park.
19. People for Ponto Carlsbad Citizens provided the New Mayor and Council with "6 Growth Management Issues and Suggestions" summarizing logical, doable, cost-effective, sustainable, and collaborative solutions to address these facts.
20. People for Ponto Carlsbad are here to help the New Mayor & Council succeed for Carlsbad's future.

Thank you for reading and considering these facts, and taking affirmative action to fulfill these citizen desires to provide the best and most tax-payer efficient Coastal Park at Ponto on the last reasonable sized/dimensioned vacant land left for 6-miles of San Diego County Coastline missing a Coastal Park. Buying vacant Ponto land for a much needed Ponto Coastal Park is rational, justified by the data, saves taxpayers tens of millions of tax-dollars, and will be forever remembered by future generations as wise action by you as decision makers in this once and only opportunity.

You have one last chance to be remembered now and in history as wise or foolish. Please be wise and recognize your place in history.

Thank you,
Lance Schulte



City of Carlsbad California

2023 - 2030

APPENDIX F - COMMENTS
VIA EMAILS & WEBSITE
PART 2



APPENDIX F – COMMENTS VIA EMAILS AND CARLSBADPARKSPLAN.COM

REST OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Neelay Bhatt

To: Mike Pacheco
Subject: RE: Parks & Recreation Master Plan Community Workshops

From: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>
Date: February 19, 2020 at 6:34:18 PM PST
To: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Parks & Recreation Master Plan Community Workshops

Begin forwarded message:

From: City SC Carlsbad <info@ourcitysc.com>
Date: February 19, 2020 at 4:35:19 PM PST
To: media@ourcitysc.com
Subject: Parks & Recreation Master Plan Community Workshops
Reply-To: info@ourcitysc.com

Attention City SC Carlsbad Members:

Please help us in communicating the need for additional field space by attending one of these two Parks and Recreation workshops tomorrow night or Saturday. Our voices need to be heard to address overcrowding, poor field conditions, safety at Pine Ave Park, late practice times for young children, new school start times that will exacerbate these issues, housing growth that hasn't generated the supporting infrastructure, etc.

Youth sports within our city is at an all time high. Our partners in football, baseball, softball, lacrosse, rugby, adult sports leagues and other soccer clubs that serve this city are feeling the pinch too. Please help Parks and Recreation understand that the youth of Carlsbad are underserved. For those competitive parents seeking to fulfill their volunteer hours, here is the perfect chance.

If you would like additional information or want to discuss our talking points, please call me.
I hope to see you there.

All the best-



Jim Barnhill
VP Recreational Soccer
t. (714) 350-5096
e. jim@ourcitysc.com

Community Invited to Provide Input on Future of City's Parks and Recreation Offerings



As the City of Carlsbad kicks off a process to update its Parks & Recreation Department Master plan, community members are invited to share their ideas at one of two upcoming workshops this week.

Thursday, Feb. 20, 6 to 8 p.m.
Alga Norte Community Park
6565 Alicante Road

Saturday, Feb. 22, 10 a.m. to noon
Pine Avenue Community Center
3209 Harding Street

The city's Parks & Recreation Department Master Plan update is a blueprint that will guide priority investments in parks and recreation facilities and services for the next five years. The city's previous parks and recreation master plan was completed in 2015. The update will cover:

- Assessment of current parks, facilities and recreational programs
- Demographic and industry trends

- Community needs and priorities
- Funding needs and revenue opportunities
- A five year action plan

In addition to the February workshops, the process will include online and mailed surveys, interviews with community members and other outreach.

More Information

- Mick Calarco, special projects manager, mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov, 760-434-2859

Visit the webpage



Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2020 2:00 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name LISA PORRO
E-mail lmy2000@verizon.net
Comments I am hoping for the sake of our kids' health that there are plans to replace the rubber crumb fill on the fields with coconut or cork fiber. The rubber gives off fumes in the heat and ends up in our kids' eyes and noses and down their shorts. The City of LA has banned the rubber crumb during the unknown long term effects on health. We can do the same. Thank you!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2020 8:35 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Stephen Brendel
E-mail brendel4776@gmail.com
Comments I would like the plan to include upgrades to street landscapes that are under control of Parks. An example is improvement to the landscaping of the Village - potted plants, benches, trash cans, etc. Together with Public Works and Public Arts the streetscapes could be very special and make a positive statement. Also, please include in the plan - to work with Public Arts to turn the trunks of diseased/old tree into pieces of art. Additionally, freeway off ramp landscape improvements should be added to the plan - work with Cal Trans. Thank you

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2020 3:56 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Jane
E-mail whwtsf@gmail.com
Comments It would be so wonderful to have a labyrinth in a Carlsbad park. A labyrinth walk is for meditation or prayer or to reduce stress, and they are found worldwide. Learn more at <https://labyrinthsociety.org/>
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2020 2:21 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name
E-mail

Michael Townsend
mwtleysite@gmail.com

Comments

I would like to request that 5G small cell towers not be placed within or near any of our Carlsbad parks. This is a new technology that emits millimeter-wavelength microwave energy from small cell towers (or larger pole-mounted units) positioned in an array. These towers will generate a higher energy density around them than from the previous 1 - 4G technologies. The safety of this new 5G technology has not been proven by long term toxicology or epidemiological studies in either animals or humans. The biological effects of 5G radiation are unknown and may jeopardize the health of those exposed to them, especially children. Implementing 5G technology before investigating its effects on human health makes us lab rats in an unnecessary experiment. Please protect the health of our children by preventing the placement of 5G small cell towers (and larger towers) within or near parks.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2020 2:31 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name
E-mail

Debbie Tanner
markdebbietanner@hotmail.com

Comments

Dear City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Department,
Just a preface to my remarks: We LOVE the Alga Norte Aquatic Center!! My husband and I swim there usually six mornings a week. It is an amazing facility. I was a swim instructor at Alga Norte when the facility first opened six years ago. We have been disappointed, though, with some of the maintenance that DOESN'T happen. The spa was out of order for probably seven months and seems to have ongoing problems. The other problem is the card readers. They don't work. They haven't worked in MONTHS!! This causes a back up in the morning when the swimmers first arrive. Instead of having the outside reader, the inside reader and an employee checking the card, everyone has to wait in line for the slow check in process. If this was a privately owned facility with paying members, these scanners would have been fixed within a week or within days. It is unacceptable that these card readers have been broken for months. We don't think it's an unreasonable request to expect that the repairs get done now. I attended the February 20th meeting at Alga Norte and was able to express my concerns after the meeting. Please consider this request as I know I'm not alone in wanting this problem to be taken care of! Thank you so much, Debbie Tanner

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 29, 2020 2:21 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Rita issa
E-mail Tootayeh@gmail.com
Comments We need lighted sand Vball courts. I go all the way to SORRENTO Valley and pay 25\$ to be able to play. I'm a resident of Carlsbad and would love to play in my home town. We're ready to help make this happen.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 29, 2020 5:58 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Vaughn spethmann
E-mail Friends4em@gmail.com
Comments I'd like lighted Vball courts.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 29, 2020 12:36 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Kate
E-mail kateanthony@msn.com
Comments Carlsbad should have lighted beach volleyball courts.
And none of our courts should EVER be pay-to-play.
Keep our beaches free -- and lit at night.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 29, 2020 5:37 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mikaila woodward
E-mail mikailawoodward@yahoo.com
Comments Let's add lighted sand volleyball courts to the master plan!! There's a huge community that would want this desperately.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 5:56 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Jessica alice
E-mail Wdaffodilsw@gmail.com
Comments Lighted beach vball courts

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Doren Curtiss
Subject: RE: Poinsettia Park

From: Doren Curtiss <dalcourt@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2020 6:51 PM
To: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: Mike Pacheco <Mike.Pacheco@carlsbadca.gov>; Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Poinsettia Park

Kyle,

I'm forwarding to you correspondence I've had with Mick Colarco and Mike Pacheco regarding Poinsettia Park... the tennis courts in particular. I haven't heard anything from Mike about a meeting but I want to make sure you are aware of the background. I would appreciate a meeting to discuss the issues before recommendations go to the council.

In brief, both the tennis courts and pickleball courts are well used, particularly during the mornings, late afternoons and weekends. According to the consultant and the results of the 2015 master plan, Carlsbad is short on needed tennis facilities. The best solution for additional pickleball courts is not converting existing tennis courts but rather in planning for future parks [Veterans Memorial and/or Robertson Ranch]. Facilities there could allow for expansion should the need be demonstrated.

I look forward to meeting with you,

Doren Curtiss

[answering machine 760-431-1213]

Begin forwarded message:

From: Doren Curtiss <dalcourt@roadrunner.com>
Subject: Re: Poinsettia Park
Date: February 28, 2020 at 12:09:38 AM PST
To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>

Hello Mick,

Thanks for the reply. Mike and I have been trading answer machine messages. Hopefully we can set up something for next week. I heard that it was recognized that the restrooms disappeared when the 11th tennis court was dropped and that parking on the upper level is now not sufficient. I'm interested to see how those changes are being planned. There is hazard on the ingress/exit road that should also be addressed.

I'm also concerned about the future of the tennis courts. We've been through the "converting tennis courts" before and I hope we don't have to repeat that exercise. If you look back at the 2015 final plan you'll see that at that point of time we had the right number of courts and it forecasted we'd be 3 courts

short by 2018 if no more were built. If the error in the inventory of courts is corrected, the shortage of courts is now 5 or more.

I don't doubt that the 6 pickle ball courts at Poinsettia are crowded. Shoehorning them into Poinsettia was maybe not the best choice and has complicated planning for that area of the park. There have to be better alternatives for increasing the number of courts.

Hope to see you next week,

Doren

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2020 3:28 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Geoff Weathersby
E-mail gbweathersby@gmail.com
Comments Please add Lighted sand volleyball courts. This would be much appreciated.
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2020 5:39 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Lorelee I Evans
E-mail lorelee7@gmail.com
Comments PLease add more garden plots to Carlsbad. There is a lot of need and even more as time goes on. thank you
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2020 3:55 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Erin Kozai
E-mail ecouron@yahoo.com
Comments I'm hoping the community gardens continue to be a goal in development. The gardens are a wonderful way to add to a healthy and positive community.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 12:39 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Ofelia
E-mail oescarzaga@sbcglobal.net
Comments I would love to see a new community garden in South Carlsbad. We need a lot to grow vegetables/ fruits. The wait in the other gardens is very long, If I just wait I won't have a chance to garden with my 3 daughters while they are still home. Gardening in a small condo with many HOA restrictions is extremely difficult. It is important to teach this valuable skill to the rising generation and to complement our food with a garden. It is necessary to become more self sufficient and to work together. If a new garden is opened, please give first choice to condo and apartment families that have no back yard. I love living in this beautiful city. Thank you for the amazing job keeping it safe and beautiful.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 11:49 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Rachel Duhome
E-mail rachelduhome@gmail.com
Comments I would love to see more community garden space!
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 11:33 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Victoria Ross
E-mail vickieross9@gmail.com
Comments We need more community garden space. I live in a townhome with little room to garden. Desperately want a little space for my family. My adult daughter has special needs and this would make her so happy.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 5:08 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name L. Oliver
E-mail dimsdale45@hotmail.com
Comments Hi there! I really hope that in the new planning will include more community gardens. I have been on the list for one for approximately 2 years and am still at #134 . They are such a wonderful thing. Thank you.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 4:58 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Charlene J.
E-mail charlene_j@yahoo.com
Comments Hi - I'm a Carlsbad resident (La Costa area) and would like to see more community gardens, especially in south Carlsbad. Thank you!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Sharon McKeeman <sharonmckeeman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2020 12:12 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: garden space needed

Hello,

My family is new to Carlsbad and we live near the two community gardens in Old Carlsbad. I was excited to sign up for a plot, but then disappointed to hear how long it may take to get one. I know that you are in the midst of a new master plan and I wanted to urge you to add a new community garden space. Now more than ever sustainability is crucial. Gardening is also good for physical and mental health and children's development.

I'm sure you may have heard from others who feel the same since there are over 200 on the waiting list. I know it may be late in the planning process, but I hope you will consider adding a garden to the plan. It would mean so much to those of us who want to join in.

Thanks for your time and feel free to contact me, Sharon McKeeman
760-468-8866

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Kyle Lancaster
Subject: RE: Concern

From: Carlsbad Web Team <webmaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 4, 2021 1:11 AM
To: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Concern

Message submitted from the <Carlsbad, CA> website.

Site Visitor Name: Taylor Lehmer
Site Visitor Email: Taylorlehmer@gmail.com

Hi Kyle, you've done a wonderful job since taking over the Carlsbad parks. Poinsettia Park in particular is a wonderful Park. Probably the best tennis courts of all San Diego. I heard a rumor that pickleball might be taking over two of the tennis courts on top. I plead with you not to let this happen, if it's even true. Please keep the tennis courts as they are. There is already plenty of people waiting every day for tennis everyday between the hours of 3 p.m. and 7 p.m. EVERY DAY!! Taking away any tennis courts/or converting them would add further wait times and go against what you guys have done so wonderfully at poinsettia Park. Please help keep the tennis courts intact!!

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 11:13 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Eric Jew
E-mail Ericjew@hotmail.com

Comments I understand that there is a desire for more Pickleball courts. I agree that the city could use more but please don't do it at the expense of the tennis courts. We are already seeing long lines at certain times and it would be a detriment to those who play tennis. Thank you.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 21, 2021 12:40 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Taylor Strack
E-mail taylorjeffstrack@gmail.com
Comments I understand new parks are being built off of faraday In Carlsbad. Currently no park in Carlsbad offers disc golf recreational activities. At the moment disc golf courses are available in Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, Escondido, San Diego. Please add disc golf to our new parks this is a great sport for all ages and is gaining popularity. Thank you! From Carlsbad Resident - Taylor Strack

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Larry Irwin <sevenfootpicker@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 9:17 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Pickleball courts

There is a big push for players who play at poinsettia Park to get involved with your webinars, hopefully the city will be able to vet the participants and only allow residents of Carlsbad to be involved. I mentioned to council member Keith Blackburn that parking meters be installed at the parks and residents of Carlsbad wouldn't have to pay to park. Are parks and facilities should be a benefit to residents, currently most residents have to wait to play while outsiders hold the courts.

A couple things we need shade over the sitting area. The challenge courts should also have a 2 game max, we get professional players who team up and hold the court for hours.

Larry Irwin

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Mary Real <anewday4me2020@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 2:50 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Mary Real
Subject: Getting Feedback for Senior Center

Hi Mick,

Most seniors are able to attend Zoom meetings or are on Facebook or some social media and there are seniors who prefer talking in person and hearing what is going on? Could you have an event in the park near Pine Ave. community center and senior center to gather opinions and have staff ask questions? Or perhaps, the downtown merchants would like to have seniors come to the downtown shopping areas to get discounts on merchandise and fill out a card on what they want or find needs to be improved at the Center since Mark Olson and M. Hamer have been "running" the Senior Center?

Thanks,

Mary Lucid

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 9, 2021 9:22 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name
E-mail

Jared Senese
jrdsenese@gmail.com

Comments

As a Carlsbad resident, and pretty active person, I love outdoor activities! I play tennis, swim, hike, rock climb, surf, and mountain bike. I have access to pretty much all of these areas, except good mountain biking. Getting an excellent bike park similar to Sapwi Bike Park in Los Angeles would be great! The current parks, such as the Greg Cox park, Sweetwater, and Velocity pump track, are all subpar. There needs to be a bike park built by bikers where everyone will have fun! A beginner track for users to learn, an intermediate track where riders can progress, and a truly advanced track that weeds out the less experienced riders and provides advanced riders the ability to push their limits. Though the advanced track may have higher consequence features, I believe this is safer since it means advanced riders won't be interfering with less experienced riders. Currently, I see a lot of issues with fast riders catching up to slower riders. Even though crashes don't occur, I view this as a safety hazard. Giving advanced users their own track will reduce potential collisions.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Douglas Gore <douglasgore4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 2:45 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Pickleball

Dear Mick,

I am very concerned and disappointed with the initial approach being taken by PROS Consulting in assessing the future parks and recreation needs in our city. In 2013 this same group was hired to assist and advise the city in identifying and planning for then current and future recreational needs.

At that time, the sport of pickleball was the fastest growing sport in America. Even so, PROS, for the most part, appeared unaware of or chose to ignore this fact. Their initial assessment of possible future needs in Carlsbad did not even mention this sport. It was not until members of the Carlsbad pickleball community questioned this omission did the matter come to the attention of PROS. As the result of the resolve of pickleball players within the community, not PROS, that pickleball was finally acknowledged and became part of the city survey and subsequent recommendations.

Very recently, it seems the current approach of PROS is a rerun of their efforts in 2013. Again, on December 9 and December 11, 2021 during the Master Plan Workshop, "Pickleball" was nowhere to be seen. This is the case in the "General Sports MPI" bar chart. Pickleball is not shown in the slide asking citizens to "Choose The Top 3 New Facilities/Amenities You Want The City To Provide."

Given the significance of this sport, it's rate of growth, PROS previous experience regarding Pickleball in their last engagement in Carlsbad and the under representation of outdoor Pickleball facilities in Carlsbad, it appears PROS is out of touch or has no record of the February 18, 2020 meeting they conducted at Alga Norte Park, with more than 70 Pickleball players in attendance. At that meeting, PROS Consulting showed this exact same "General Sports MPI" slide. When many attendees complained that Pickleball was not listed on any of their slides, PROS Consulting said "We hear you, we will add Pickleball to the slide deck" obviously they did not.

One would think that any professional consulting group would review past files on a "repeat client" to ensure that the Project Manager on the engagement is familiar with the history of the engagement(s). How can Pros Consulting present a 2022 statically correct report to the city when Pickleball is not specifically addressed on any of the data gathering media or presentation material?

By this letter I am requesting that PROS make the necessary updates to their material(s) regarding Pickleball that reflects the status of this sport and the needs in Carlsbad to address the serious lack of outdoor Pickleball Facilities.

"Is the city of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation going to send out a questionnaire/survey to the general public without Pickleball being listed?"

"Is the city of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation going to present and or send to the city council of Carlsbad a statistically correct survey that didn't include pickleball?"

Should you have any questions or need any additional information please contact me by e-mail or telephone 760-717-2286

Douglas Gore

Carlsbad Pickleball Support Group

CAUTION: *Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.*

Neelay Bhatt

From: Lynda McDonell <lyndamcdonell@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 30, 2021 9:27 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Carlsbad parks and play structures

Hello,

I am reaching out after just completing the community survey regarding our city parks and recreational services. Thank you for your part in asking for input.

The topic of play structures in our city is one I've been grappling with for some time. I find that other cities have made significant progress in building innovative playgrounds for a wide range of ages. However, I find our Carlsbad structures lacking.

We have grandchildren in the Midwest who have access to gorgeous parks in their hometowns and in nearby communities. On a scale of 1-10 these parks are 10+ while ours might be a 2 or 3. As the special projects director, I'm sure you have goals to upscale our parks for our kids and their future kids. Although we have beautiful beaches, parks are year round venues for family fun and getting fresh air and exercise. We all know the stress these last few months have added to our lives. Why not set higher goals for our parks as a means to relieve stress?

I'm reaching out not to complain but to offer insight to what is available in other states. Our daughter created an entire Instagram account just to inform other families of each of the parks in her Missouri community. It made me realize how deeply lacking we are here in So Cal. And to think their parks are uninhabitable several months each year due to weather. And yet, their parks and aquatics centers are ten fold what ours are.

I am a retired elementary school principal so have knowledge of legal and practical limitations regarding playgrounds. I believe I could be helpful in supporting selections for future playgrounds should you desire additional community input. In the meantime, we will continue to take our three year old granddaughter to Agua Norte Park even though we live within walking distance to Holiday Park. I know the city has the money to provide excellent parks for all neighborhoods and look forward to seeing the master plan as it evolves.

Kindly,

Lynda McDonell

--

Lynda McDonell

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 12:44 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Sue Buller
E-mail Dansuebuller@gmail.com
Comments Hello, I recently joined the (very long) waiting list for a Carlsbad Community Garden plot. I am very much looking forward to getting a plot, but since there are over 350 people on the waiting list, I imagine it will be many years before my name comes up. As you are creating the new Carlsbad master parks plan, please consider devoting some space to new community gardens. Thank you for your time, Sue Buller

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 3:40 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Eric Have
E-mail Emhave50@gmail.com
Comments Disc Golf is a great family activity and it has grown substantially in popularity. Please consider it is a nature-friendly sport.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 1:53 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Alexander jones
E-mail Ajone89@gmail.com
Comments I'd like to see a discgolf course somewhere in carlsbad. All of the cities near us have some form of discgolf course in their respective cities. Even if we could have something like a course that plays alongside the golf course at the crossings similar to what reidy creek or goat hill. Both of these courses have major tournaments held that each bring international attention to the sport and city.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 2:55 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Joshua Lofgren
E-mail Joshlofgren@gmail.com
Hi, lifeline resident of Carlsbad here, abs disc golf player.
Comments I think Carlsbad should create a course. They don't need maintained greens, wild land is adequate. Just space for walking and baskets are required. I think the land near hidden canyon park/where Marron ends would be cool.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 7:10 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Brad S
E-mail Brad.schade@gmail.com
Comments I disc golf course in Carlsbad would be great! I live here in town and travel all over SD to play. I would love to see a course put in somewhere in the city. Thanks!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 2:09 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Stephanie Smith
E-mail sas008@ucsd.edu
Comments We would really love a disc golf course at a park. Most North County cities have one except Carlsbad.
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 2:16 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Taylor Strack
E-mail Taylorjeffstrack@gmail.com
Comments Would like to inquire on why Carlsbad doesn't have a disc golf course? This sport is growing rapidly and all cities with the exception of Carlsbad and Encinitas have courses. Oceanside, San Marcos, vista and Escondido all have courses. There are a lot of open space the city has that is not being fully utilized that would be great for a course! Under the transmission line off of chestnut, hosp grove, the veterans park off of cannon, not to mention existing gold courses that could easily add disc golf. I am a city of Carlsbad resident. Thanks!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 7:24 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name James Guerrero
E-mail jamesguerrero464@gmail.com
Comments City of Carlsbad, please look into building a disc golf course!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 8:27 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Bobby
E-mail Bobbygarcia244@gmail.com
Comments Disc Golf is a great family activity rising in popularity. I would love to see anew course in Carlsbad!
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 12:58 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name
E-mail

Nicholas De Meo
N.demeo1@gmail.com

Comments

Hello, I've lived in the San Diego region for 8+ years now, 6 of which were in Carlsbad. I am a disc golf enthusiast and am writing here in hopes that the city will consider investing in this booming sport. Disc golf is easy to learn, inexpensive, brings people together, and gets people outside and moving. The only difficult part about the sport is finding land and installing disc golf baskets, especially in SD county where land is at a premium. However, the county as a whole and Carlsbad are in desperate need of a disc golf course in my opinion. It would help tourism as well as physical and mental health of residents. Please consider installing a course in the city. The sport is seeing rapid growth and the region has a desperate demand for more disc golf. Thank you for your consideration.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 2:31 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Joseph Hernandez
E-mail jocity85@gmail.com
Comments I'd really like to see an expansion in disc golf. This is a great and supportive community and would only help grow the parks department and add an activity for all to get out and enjoy

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 1:24 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Junior Neri
E-mail jneri79@yahoo.com
Comments We need more free to play Disc Golf courses!! The sport is growing at a rapid pace and our few local courses we have are getting congested. Please consider!!!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 7:12 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Cristian
E-mail Cristianfig21@gmail.com
Comments I think the community would benefit a lot if there was a disc golf course open in Carlsbad. It's a growing sport and more and more people are really getting into it. I have no doubt that the disc golf , in SoCal, community would be extremely grateful.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 5:06 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Matt Ellis
E-mail ellisism@gmail.com
Comments Disc Golf is a rapidly growing sport and is a great way to bring people outdoors. It is very low-maintenance as well. Hope we can get a course set up in Carlsbad, adding to the allure of the great city!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 7:00 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Justin Ferguson
E-mail jus2slk@yahoo.com
Comments Hi, Disc Golf has become very popular in San Diego. Would love to have a course in Carlsbad. All you need are 9 baskets and some tee pads.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 10:48 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Jonathan koong
E-mail Jkoong1990@gmail.com
Comments Hello, I know there is a massive disc golf community in all of San Diego county. An 18 hole disc golf course at a park or golf course would make the community very happy!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 2:53 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name
E-mail

Jimmy Towey
jim_towey@yahoo.com

Comments

Hi! I'm an avid Disc Golfer in Oceanside that would LOVE to see Carlsbad become apart of the rapidly growing number of cities that have added a disc golf course into their repertoire of outdoor activities. Vista, Oceanside, Escondido and plenty more have with the help of local disc golf groups and companies installed courses at parks like Kit Carson and Brengle Terrace that have added to the foot traffic and interest in the city through the thousands of Southern California disc golfers that have come to enjoy the property. I would suggest reaching out to Innova Discs or on the smaller scale Matt at the SDSF Pro Shop at Kit Carson for information on how they suggest the most cost effective and appropriate approach would be going forward. I hope these comments help to build a lasting tradition of Disc Golf in the beautiful city of Carlsbad!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 9:11 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Michael White
E-mail mwhite32985@gmail.com
Comments Please construct a disc golf course PLEASE!!!!
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 5:22 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Kevin McLeaster
E-mail kmcleaster@gmail.com
Comments A Disc Golf course would be nice. The ones in Vista and Oceanside are pretty much pro-only.
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 4:30 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Jay runyan
E-mail Jrunyan1908@gmail.com
Comments Adding in a disc golf course would be awesome!
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2022 1:47 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Mary Bernard
E-mail meameemer@gmail.com
Comments Great presentation last night! There is a group of senior citizens in San Diego who have organized activities for themselves. You can visit their website at getoffyourrockers.org. I think that this type of group would be of great benefit to the citrusy of Carlsbad.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2022 11:25 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Catherine Nolan
E-mail Cwnolan.1985@gmail.com
Comments We need more gardens! I am on the waiting list and want to garden and compost!
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 12:31 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name James Orrell
E-mail jaorrell@san.rr.com
Comments A disc golf course in Carlsbad would be fantastic! Several disc golf courses have already been successfully implemented in neighboring north county public parks such as Kit Carson in Escondido and Brengle Terrace in Vista. Disc golf has exploded in popularity during the pandemic and our communities are starved for more disc golf courses. Disc golf offers a fun, outdoor recreational activity with minimal negative impacts to the environment

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Parks and Recreation
Subject: RE: Padel Courts

From: Elaine Lu <changel09@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 6:10 PM

To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Tom Frank <Tom.Frank@carlsbadca.gov>

Subject: Padel Courts

Hello! Thank you for asking for community input for the South Carlsbad Coastline Project. I feel so lucky to live in Carlsbad where community voices matter and so much thought is put into developments.

I was wondering if there were any plans for installing Padel Courts in Carlsbad? There are currently 3 courts at the Barnes Tennis Center which is a far drive from Carlsbad. I think it is a great sport that the whole Carlsbad community would enjoy. Another great option to offer the community in addition to pickle ball and tennis.

Please let me know if there are plans for padel in the near future. Many thanks for your time!

Elaine Lu
Carlsbad Resident
2003-current

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2022 9:23 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name
E-mail

Jeffrey Lee
jeffrey.lee@rollingtennis.com

Comments

I'm a member of the board of the San Diego District Tennis Association, as well as Youth Tennis San Diego, and the manager of Wheelchair Tennis San Diego. Over the years, and especially recently, we've run into a lot of issues with Pickleball. In fact, approximately 5 years ago, a group of Pickleball players attempted to have courts at Laguna Rivera converted to Pickleball - claiming that they were grossly underused. This, of course, was untrue. Similar things have taken place within the greater San Diego region recently. I want to ensure that Tennis does not become a victim of the dishonesty of some Pickleball Groups. On another note, I wanted to also point out that any assertion of the tennis courts from the High School being included in the numbers is unfair. The courts at the High School require players to climb stairs to access outside of school hours. This renders them unavailable for wheelchair players, and thus, IMO, should not be considered in any such count.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Liam Dunfey
Subject: RE: Pickleball Court Question

From: Liam Dunfey <ldunfey@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2022 12:37 PM
To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Subject: Pickleball Court Question

Hi,

I'm a Carlsbad resident and interested to know how many exclusive pickleball courts the City offers versus how many tennis courts have been painted with pickleball lines. Please let me know at your earliest convenience. Thanks.

Warm regards,

Liam Dunfey

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Joanne McGhee
Subject: RE: attention: Kyle Lancaster and Scott Chalwid

-----Original Message-----

From: Bartels Sandra <sbartels@sandi.net>
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 8:11 PM
To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Subject: attention: Kyle Lancaster and Scott Chalwid

Hello,

Aviara Park often has several soccer camps throughout the seasons and sometimes LaCrosse, and one area for baseball.

BUT there is no area designed for Youth Football. Whoever made the decision to allow the largest number of attendees we've ever seen crowded into the all areas of the park, also hopefully attended and realized they made a mistake.

By mistake I am not sure of the numbers allowed at the site at any given time, nor do we have bleachers to hold crowds like Poinsettia Park. There was a constant barrage of drivers looking for places to park, a heavy flow of attendees that resulted in congestion, irritated drivers, and two dead squirrels on the road that had played in that area for years. There had to be thousands in and out throughout the event that ran into the evening. There were kids in uniforms practicing everywhere. Heavy cleats running on the turf, but also newly planted grass areas.

Maybe the city government should develop fields for football and bleachers for Youth Football, as I'm not sure if the local high schools would let these groups on their fields. But the intense, large number of people really need to be serviced in a much larger setting appropriate for that sport.

*Did anyone on your staff monitor the use of the field on July 22nd?

Do you get rent from this group, and will it cover the maintenance and turf replacement?

Sandy Bartels

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Kyle Lancaster
Subject: RE: Disc Golf in Carlsbad

From: Steven Jantz <outlook_F31E62E0093869F5@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2022 8:53 AM
To: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: Steven.Jantz@yahoo.com; ajrisley@yahoo.com
Subject: Disc Golf in Carlsbad

Good morning Kyle,

This is Steve Jantz, hope you are doing well.

Recently I've had a few conversations with Allen Risley, President of the San Diego Aces Disc Golf Club ([San Diego Aces Disc Golf Club | Promoting The Sport of Disc Golf In San Diego](#)), regarding providing a new disc golf course in northern San Diego county. We would like to meet with the City of Carlsbad Parks staff to discuss the opportunities, constraints and process to install and maintain a course within a Carlsbad city park. Would you please let me know who I should coordinate with (maybe you?).

Thanks for your help. Feel free to call me if you would like to discuss further 760-277-3051.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Mick Calarco
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 2:44 PM
To: sarab@cal.berkeley.edu
Cc: Todd Reese
Subject: RE: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Hi, Sara!

Thanks for your message. My name is Mick Calarco, I am the recreation services manager with the City of Carlsbad Parks & Recreation Department.

Good news! There is a community garden coming [relatively] soon to Stagecoach Community Park. We expect planning and construction to take approximately two years to complete. Although the city doesn't utilize volunteers for planning or construction, in the meantime, you may volunteer with the [Carlsbad Community Gardens Collaborative](#) if you'd like to get involved.

Todd Reese (copied herein) is the Parks Services Manager, and he or a member of his parks maintenance/parks planning team will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Best,

Mick



Mick Calarco
Special Projects Manager
Parks & Recreation Department
City of Carlsbad
799 Pine Ave
Suite 200
Carlsbad, CA 92008
www.carlsbadca.gov

442-339-2859 | mick.calarco@carlsbadca.gov

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [You Tube](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Enews](#)

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2022 1:35 PM
To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>; Neelay Bhatt <neelay.bhatt@prosconsulting.com>
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name
E-mail

Sara Bakhtary
sarab@cal.berkeley.edu

Comments

Our family would love to participate in a community garden in South Carlsbad. We recently moved to the South Carlsbad area 92009 and want to be more involved in our community.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing.

No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2022 10:56 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Ryan Case
E-mail rcase217@gmail.com
Comments Definitely need disc golf!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2022 12:49 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Matthew Orchard
E-mail mat.tortured@gmail.com
Comments I recently moved to the area from Atlanta and one thing I don't see enough of is disc golf courses.
If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2022 12:02 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Katie
E-mail katiekrip@yahoo.com
Comments Add disc golf course!

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2022 3:48 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Gary W Kendy
E-mail gkendy1@hotmail.com
Comments We need a Disc Golf course. Very inexpensive to install and fun for all ages.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. No

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Admin <admin@carlsbad.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2022 5:42 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Neelay Bhatt
Subject: City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

City of Carlsbad - Your Comments Input

Name Steven Thomas
E-mail fujithomas1979@icloud.com
Comments Good afternoon, I grew up in Carlsbad and am a long time resident of this City. I have 2 kids in the CUSD, both playing in sports clubs in this town. One of the outdoor activities I wish we had here is Disc Golf. I have been an avid player for over 20 years and have to travel out of town to play the sport I love. This is a great outdoor, physical activity that has helped keep me in shape and it's a great use of land that may be under utilized. The game of disc golf has grown over the years and we need more courses in North County. If you build it, people will come.

If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please check the box, and you will be removed from our mailing. Yes

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Charlene Buckalew
Subject: RE: Query-Bocce Club

From: Donna <djhathome@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2022 9:49 AM
Subject: Query

How would I approach creating a similar bocce project for Carlsbad at one of our parks? Can you head me in the right direction? This has been so popular in Encinitas they have a waiting list to join. There are likely many businesses in our area that would contribute to the project, if the city could provide the space. Thanks for your help and any referrals. <https://www.encinitasbocceclub.net/about>

Sent from my iPad, 🌻 Donna Hunt, CFP. Phone #s: cell (707) 338-3931 (800)817-4868 fax (707)773-5558

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Leslie Monteath <lmonteath1106@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 8:29 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Carlsbad Senior Services

Right now the only classes and events for seniors in Carlsbad are held in the village of Carlsbad.

Since most of the Carlsbad Senior population lives south and east of the village, it's my concern that, as a senior myself, and others I know here in LaCosta, we are at a disadvantage in attending these events due to distance and traffic issues.

I live 3 miles from the Encinitas Community Center on Balour, which I cannot attend as a LaCosta resident.

When will planning for the rest of Carlsbad, especially South Carlsbad and LaCosta, include some Senior activities locally?

I look forward to hearing from you and any ideas you may have for me to collaborate and/or volunteer to develop plans and goals for more senior activities here locally.

Leslie Monteath
An Active , Healthy Senior

2941 Sombrosa St, Carlsbad, CA 92009

--

"Ours is essentially a tragic age, so we (I) refuse to take it tragically."

DH Lawrence

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Krippner Ron <ronkrippner@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 9:01 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Disc Golf for Carlsbad
Attachments: Disc Golf Growth Report.pdf

Hi Mick-

Thanks for sending out an e-mail regarding the status of the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. You, your team and consultants have done a thorough job creating this plan.

I wish Disc Golf would be mentioned more in the plan.

I have attached a 2021 Disc Golf Growth Report. There are some great statistics that may surprise you within the report. My hope is that Carlsbad would consider Disc Golf a little more seriously.

Recently, me and a group of about 25 players from San Diego County created a "temporary course" one day at a very unused section (East side) of East Hosp Grove Park. The layout we created was incredible. If we were allowed to create a permanent course there, it would be unlike any other course in Southern California because of the trees and terrain. I think it is a unique opportunity to create something amazing.

Disc Golf offers many advantages verses traditional ball golf for a community:

- easier to learn
- faster to play a round
- same pressure and adrenaline
- serves entire community, young/old, m/f, all socio-economic demographics
- less expensive (about 5% of the cost of ball golf-rounds are free and equipment is not a big investment)

I would love to set up a time where we could discuss Disc Golf for Carlsbad further.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Ron Krippner
3195 Falcon Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Parks and Recreation
Subject: RE: Comment on agenda item #1. REPORT ON DATA COMPILED FOR THE PARKS & RECREATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE

From: joseph bradshaw <josephbradshaw7@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 11:02 PM

To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>

Subject: Comment on agenda item #1. REPORT ON DATA COMPILED FOR THE PARKS & RECREATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Hello

I am happy to see that the city is interested in updating the parks and recreation Master plan after the long COVID break. I think a lot has changed in that time frame. Carlsbad has approached it's Parks and recreation from a very conservative and traditional perspective. The city relies heavily on its beach access and it's traditional development of parks to include baseball diamonds, soccer fields, and play structures. These access points and recreational developments are amazing and world class but I would like to see the city move towards an all-encompassing outdoor lifestyle approach. Carlsbad has near perfect weather and I would love to see the city capitalize on this with hiking trails, biking trails, and an adventure approach towards accessing all of the nooks and crannies of the city. I visit other cities that don't have half of the resources that Carlsbad has but I see the emphasis they put in on creating citywide trail systems and city parks that Foster adventure beyond soccer and baseball. From skate parks to bike parks to rock climbing and everything in between, these other cities have developed a culture that fosters our youth to explore all avenues of adventure and athleticism. Our beaches are amazing and our parks are great but the city of Carlsbad can do better and should look to what other cities have done like St George, Moab, Tahoe, Mammoth Lakes, Sedona, etc.

Thank you
Joey Bradshaw

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Charlene Buckalew
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 5:03 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: MSG

Matt Spolsky called and wanted to know if there was a designated spot for archery. I told him I did not think so however, at one time we did offer classes. He is interested in finding out how designating a spot could work. Maybe this is a master plan thing? 714-308-8401

Thanks,

Char Buckalew
Administrative Secretary


City of
Carlsbad
Pine Ave. Ste 200
Carlsbad, CA. 92008
442-399-2985

Neelay Bhatt

From: Mary Kay <mary_kay22@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 2, 2023 6:47 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: save the tennis courts!

Dear Mr. Calarco,

It has come to my attention that Carlsbad Parks & Recreation is considering a proposal to convert two Poinsettia Park tennis courts into pickleball courts. I have been playing tennis at these courts for years and it has become increasingly impossible to get on a court particularly at peak times and at other times as well. It is especially difficult when waiting for a court with children who don't have the patience to wait for an hour or more, not to mention that when the court finally opens up the children have lost interest or have to attend another commitment.

I have been informed that Parks & Recreation hired a consultant to monitor tennis court usage and determined that the courts are underutilized. However, they were apparently not aware that a group I play with (with 30+ tennis players) moved last year from Poinsettia Park to Carlsbad High School because of the difficulty in reserving courts at Poinsettia Park. It should also be mentioned that the last few months have seen much lower usage with the rainy weather. In addition, seasonal usage is very different, with summer visitors causing extended wait times. Finally, in my experience, the tennis courts are not underutilized and especially not during peak pickleball hours. As a player of both tennis and pickleball at Poinsettia Park, peak playing times for both overlap. So converting tennis courts to pickleball courts would only serve to increase the already extended wait times for tennis courts. It isn't equitable to reduce pickleball wait times at the expense of tennis wait times.

Please don't take away our precious tennis courts!

Sincerely,

Mary Kay Romero

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Victoria Krysova <info@sandiegodom.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 11:34 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Re: proposal to convert two Poinsettia tennis courts into pickleball courts.

Dear Mick,

I am writing to express my concern about the potential loss of tennis courts to pickleball. As a tennis player in the Carlsbad community, I have enjoyed playing on the Poinsettia tennis courts and would be disappointed to see them converted to pickleball courts.

While I understand the growing popularity of pickleball and the need to accommodate the demand for the sport, I believe it's important to consider the impact on other recreational activities in the community. Tennis is a beloved sport with a strong following, and it would be a shame to see fewer opportunities for tennis players to enjoy the game.

I urge you to consider other options for accommodating the demand for pickleball, such as building new courts or converting other facilities. It's important to strike a balance between different recreational activities to ensure that everyone in the community has access to the sports and activities they enjoy.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Victoria Krysova

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: jae chung <jae_chung@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 6:16 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Todd Reese; Nick Stupin
Subject: Please stop converting two Pointsettia tennis courts into pickleball courts.

Dear Officials,

Please do not take away our precious tennis courts. I always enjoy playing tennis with my friends and families all the time. I usually wait it about 30mins to 40mins during the weekend, but if you take away our tennis courts, it is going to be devastating. Please do not convert two tennis courts into pickleball courts.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Amanda Clardy <akclardy@usa.net>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 6:13 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Todd Reese; Nick Stupin
Subject: Poinsettia tennis courts

Hello,

I'm a resident of Carlsbad, and I often use the tennis courts at Poinsettia Park. I recently heard that the city may be planning on converting some of the tennis courts to pickle ball courts. I am writing to voice my strong opinion against this.

I have nothing against Pickleball, except perhaps the noise, but we already have so few public tennis courts in the Poinsettia/aviara area, that it would be a huge shame to lose more of them. The poinsettia park tennis courts serve a very large area of Carlsbad, and as it stands, you often have to wait an hour or more to get a court.

I strongly hope that the City will not take away any of the existing tennis courts at Poinsettia Park.

Thank you,
Amanda Clardy
Aviara resident

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Sales <sales@bazmsolutions.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 10:41 AM
To: Mick Calarco; Todd Reese; Nick Stupin
Subject: Poinsettia Tennis Courts

Hello

The word on the street is Carlsbad City is considering converting two tennis courts at Poinsettia Park to pickle ball courts.

If this is actually true, I would like to ensure the decision makers are aware of my experience. I play both tennis and Pickleball and regardless of which I am going to play, I must arrive before either courts are opened or I will be waiting for availability.

I suggest that two tennis courts not be converted to pickleball and instead let commercial endeavors offer more pickleball courts if needed.

From Brian Kingston
(408) 887-6132
Carlsbad resident

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Brooke Knopp <brookeknopp@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 6:51 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Poinsettia Tennis Courts

Hi Mick!

I wanted to express my opinion on the proposal to convert two Poinsettia tennis courts into pickleball courts. Please do not do this. I live in the Seaside Heights community, just a couple of blocks away from the park and it was a big part of why we chose to raise our family here as we are a tennis family. We have three boys that enjoy walking/riding to the park. Since the park has added the pickleball courts and the dog park it has gotten a lot more crowded and has drawn a lot of people to our community and up the street into our neighborhood. We live on Bluebonnet Drive, just off Plum Tree Road that has just recently held a meeting with the city regarding the dangerous driving and lack of stopping at the stop sign on Plum Tree and Bluebonnet as people are flying down and into Poinsettia Park. I believe adding more pickleball courts will draw even more people to an already very crowded park and more traffic to an already dangerous road to our children on bikes, scooters, etc.

In addition to the increased traffic, it seems to me to be an unnecessary conversion. I've seen people play pickleball on a tennis court as it CAN be modified to do this. Many communities have a set up for pickleball to play on their tennis courts. Tennis on the other hand CAN NOT play on a pickleball court. This would eliminate the option for this sport on those courts. There is often a line to play as it is and taking away two courts would make this wait a lot longer. Tennis is a popular sport too and it's rare to have a court sitting empty.

Noise is also a concern. It is already very loud with the pickleball courts that are there. Because the sport is loud, the players are too. I'm sure neighbors that don't even play tennis would oppose this as well.

Please don't take away our courts. They are hard to come by and enjoyed by many. Please consider adding pickleball courts in another location... Zone 5? Alga Norte? etc. This would help decrease an already very crowded park and help to reduce some of the issues that have increased since adding the pickleball and dog park.

I appreciate you hearing me out and I will continue to follow up on this proposal. If you have any questions for me, please feel free to reach out.

Thank you!

--

Brooke Knopp
Broker/Property Manager
BRE#01440513
[Knopp Coastal Realty](#)
760-263-4321

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Cheryl McBride <cherylinteriors@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 10:21 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Tennis courts

Please reconsider converting our tennis courts into pickleball courts. I understand it's popular now but it is also less expensive to join a pickleball club than a tennis club. Having been a member of several tennis clubs over the past 40 years, I can no longer afford the dues and rely on public courts. There are always people waiting for our court. Pickleball moves much faster than tennis, and is a "drop in" game, so the wait is not as long! Tennis has been around much longer than pickleball, so what happens if the trend changes? It's a fun sport for those that don't move as well as they used to, but you need to think of the younger generation. I believe they prefer to hone their tennis skills

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Christie Sweaney <christiecarlson03@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 7:40 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Tennis Courts at Poinsettia Park

Dear Mr. Calarco,

It has come to my attention that Carlsbad Parks & Rec is considering converting two of the tennis courts at Poinsettia Park into pickleball courts. As an avid tennis player, but also a pickleball player, I would like to strongly protest this move.

I use the tennis courts regularly at Poinsettia and for the past 3 years (since the pandemic began) they have been full to capacity 90% of the time I've been there to play. I play socially with friends in the week, as well as with my family on the weekends. I'm there at various times of day, and the courts are incredibly well used, often to the point of people waiting at the top of the stairs to get onto a court as soon as one frees up.

While I understand that pickleball is a rapidly growing sport, and I encourage and support its growth, tennis players should not be put at a disadvantage by removing our playing space.

Having moved here 6 years ago, and also having lived all over the United States, I can honestly say we were hugely impressed by the Parks & Rec facilities in Carlsbad. City planning has been done well when we compare to other places we've lived. That being said, the better solution for pickleball would be to invest in developing new facilities as city parks continue to be renovated, planned and built (for instance in the new Veterans Memorial Park or in other parks that may be developed or remodeled in the future). It's clear the demand for pickleball is high in Carlsbad and beyond, but equally other towns should be picking up the slack and accommodating the demand. It would be unfair to take resources away from tennis players who are using the available space to capacity a large majority of the time.

I implore you to please come up with other alternatives. Don't take away our already limited free tennis space.

Kind regards,
Christie Sweaney
Carlsbad Resident since 2016

Sent from my

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Claudio Garcia <claggarcia@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 3:36 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: My opposition to the planned tennis courts conversion at Poinsettia Park

To: City of Carlsbad Parks and Recreation Department,

It has come to my attention that the City of Carlsbad is considering to convert two tennis courts at Poinsettia Park to pickleball courts. As a longtime neighbor of the park and avid tennis player I would like to express my opposition to the project given the following:

- 1) Lately, I have experienced long lines at the tennis courts in the park at many times during the day and the situation got worse when the tennis courts hours were shortened due to the noise emanating from the pickleball courts which led to a complaint from many of my neighbors. More pickleball courts will increase the noise level which is already annoying and disturbing the peaceful neighborhood we used to live in.
- 2) By the way, the noise coming from the pickleball courts is also bothering us tennis players, especially when we play in the upper courts next to theirs. Tennis is a sport that appreciates and respects silence, and expanding the pickleball courts, will make things worse for us.
- 3) Although we understand the popularity of pickleball, there have been an explosion of places to play it within 10 minutes from Poinsettia Park. Why do we need to sacrifice our tennis courts to a new sport that maybe popular now, but may not be in the future?
- 4) Some of our tennis friends who also play pickleball at our park, have told us that most people come from other cities as far as Chula Vista to play pickleball here. It does not seem fair that Carlsbad is planning to sacrifice our tennis players to accommodate pickleball players from outside our city limits.
- 5) Finally, there should be other options to expand pickleball access if that was the decision to be explored. Our park has some other open spaces that could accommodate new pickleball courts, or even find other spaces in the other Carlsbad parks.

I hope that you reconsider your options and do not take our tennis courts away at Poinsettia Park.

Thank you for your time!

Claudio Garcia
6593 Bluebonnet Dr.
Carlsbad

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Dominique Gambale <dominiquégambale@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 7:11 PM
To: Nick Stupin; Todd Reese; Mick Calarco
Subject: Tennis court change

To the recreation service management -

It was just brought to my attention that there has been talk of converting two of the Poinsettia tennis courts into pickleball courts.

As an avid tennis player, I truly enjoy the availability of all of your current tennis courts. There are not many public tennis facilities with so many available courts, this is why all of us tennis people love Poinsettia so much!

The popularity of tennis still exists! Come any morning of the week and see how many people are waiting to play. Often, people think that “the tennis players” dislike pickle ball. This is absolutely false. What we don’t like is the pattern we’re seeing everywhere, in which the conversion of tennis courts become pickle ball courts. Slowly the tennis courts disappear.

It would be so devastating to see this happen at Poinsettia park with so many current and new tennis players enjoying the courts.

Please re consider this plan

Much appreciated,

Dominique Gambale

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Todd Reese
Subject: RE: Tennis courts

-----Original Message-----

From: Fred Heymann <fredheyman@me.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 3:21 PM
To: Todd Reese <Todd.Reese@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Tennis courts

Hello Mr Reese

Please reconsider taking away any tennis courts at Poinsettia Park! We are a tennis family with grandsons that are playing and practicing tennis at Poinsettia! The park is two blocks from their home! Taking just one court would cut down time and availability! Please reconsider!

Thank you

Fred Heymann

Carlsbad resident

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Fred S Reitman <fsreitman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 8:51 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Pickleball courts

Hi Mike. I am contacting you regarding the proposed pickleballs courts. As an avid tennis player who uses the courts, the court time is limited due to the volume of players. We have had pickleballers take over the courts in spite of the signage saying tennis only. Pickleball is not compatible with tennis courts due to the loud noise due to the plastic ball. Tennis player cannot concentrate with that racket. You add two courts and they will eventually lobby for all courts to be accessed. Tennis and pickleball are two completely different sports, like skiing and snowboarding. Pickleballers have their own courts at poinsettia park. Sincerely Fred

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: GREG SMITH <smithgandc@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 4:45 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Tony Navarro
Subject: Tennis/Pickleball courts

Both Tennis and Pickleball courts are both busy during the morning hours with wait times experienced by both groups. Pickleball match times run around 15-20 minutes and then players rotate in. Tennis matches run around an hour and a half which leads to greater wait times when courts are full. With Pickleball players waiting times are minimal and they get to play several times. Increasing the number of Pickleball courts will not change the wait times significantly. With more Pickleball courts more players will show up and the crowd situation will continue. With tennis the number of people waiting for courts would also lead to more wait times which is significantly longer than for Pickleball participants. Penalizing one group to please the other is not a viable solution. Both groups do not utilize the courts in the afternoons. A good solution would be to encourage more afternoon play. Greg Smith/participant of both sports.

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: mark medina <moxamark@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 1:25 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Tennis courts

Hi Mr Mick Calarco,

Please DO NOT convert any of the tennis courts to pickle ball courts in Poinsettia park. There aren't enough tennis courts as it is. If I may I would like to suggest putting a pickle ball court in other parks like Alga Norte or Aviara park as there is space there and to decrease the congestion in poinsettia park.

Thanks,
Mark Medina
2894 Rancho Pancho
Carlsbad CA 92009

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Michelle <mgranieri@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 7:42 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: No more pickle courts

I am a tennis player and pickleball player, please do not take away tennis courts for pickleball, should have build them where the new parking lot is.

Michelle Granieri
(760) 533-8787

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Tisha Carney <tishacarney@me.com>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2023 5:46 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Poinsettia Tennis Courts

Dear Sir,

Our family plays tennis and we often play at Poinsettia Park and we would be so disappointed if the City took away courts from this location. We are Carlsbad residents. Please do not remove any of the Poinsettia tennis courts as there's often already long wait times for a court.

Thank you,

TISHA CARNEY
7927 Terraza Disoma
Carlsbad Ca 92009
619-889-7750
tisha@tishacarney.com

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Tony Navarro <navarr7@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 6:28 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Pickle ballCourts

To whom it may concern:

I would like to oppose the suggestion to take two tennis courts and convert them into pickle ball courts. The waiting time for both are not the same. Pickle ball matches last around 20 minutes, then players rotate in. They get to play several times. Tennis matches last between 1 hr to 1:30, unless you're playing doubles which will take longer. It's even greater if the courts are full, especially during Spring and Summer seasons. If you increase the number of pickle ball courts it will only increase the number of people coming in from all around and it won't decrease the waiting time for either sport. If you penalize tennis players to please pickle ballers I don't think this is a good solution. If you want to increase the pickle ball courts, please consider another alternative or site to do this.

Sincerely,

A. Navarro

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Martha Y Torres <tmartha2005@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 9:47 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Please do not close more tennis courts

Dear Mick, we need your help, due to the heavy rains we have experienced this year, most of us tennis players have not been able to go play at Poinsettia Park.

Because the courts are not as busy due to the weather, it's my understanding that the city wants to take two courts for pickle ball, this will be very hard for all of us tennis players.

At times when it is not raining, we must wait for hours to get an empty tennis court, due to the lack of courts in the area.

I am asking you Mick to please do not close the few tennis courts we have left in the Carlsbad area.

Respectfully yours,

Martha Y Torres
619.339.8166

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Kyle Lancaster
Subject: RE: Poinsettia Park tennis

-----Original Message-----

From: keithrtill@gmail.com <keithrtill@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 4:25 PM
To: Kyle Lancaster <Kyle.Lancaster@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Poinsettia Park tennis

Hello Kyle. I'm writing because I'm told of a proposal to convert two tennis courts into pickle ball courts. The tennis community, of which I am a member, is alarmed. This is unadvisedly being approached as a zero sum game — a winner and a loser. That's bad public policy.

We're all for the city keeping up with the rising demand for tennis courts. So identify vacant properties and increase the supply. The tennis courts are loved and used by lots of your citizens. You have such a beautiful facility that we wait 30 minutes often times to get a court. This is not underutilized. You should not consider it underutilized because it isn't fully used at all times.

Even if they're more pickle ballers, it's a loser of a move for the city to take away from another group that loves what you've provided for them.

You really should not recommend this to the city council. It's a loser.

Sincerely,
Keith Till,
Carlsbad resident

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Marianne Townsend <2mernie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 8:40 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Todd Reese; Nick Stupin
Subject: Please DON'T convert tennis courts to pickle ball @ Poinsettia

We have been residents of Carlsbad for 26 years.
Usually when we use the Poinsettia tennis courts they are busy and we have to wait for about 20 minutes to get a court.

I heard you are considering a proposal to convert two Poinsettia tennis courts into pickleball courts.

I urge you not to do this conversion before you study the resident use of the courts.

What I see at Poinsettia is that the pickleball courts appear to be used by mostly Encinitas, San Marcos and Oceanside residents.

The tennis courts appear to be used by mostly Carlsbad residents.

Why does Carlsbad have to supply the pickleball recreation for neighboring towns??!! Our neighboring towns need to step up their game!

Carlsbad is spending taxes so that Encinitas residents (in particular) do not have to devote taxes to recreation.

UNFAIR -- Taxation without representation (on the pickleball courts)!!

In addition, children under ten often use the tennis courts--I have not seen young children on the pickleball courts.

So, currently, Carlsbad taxes are being used to satisfy Encinitas adults. UGH
To convert tennis courts into pickleball courts would not be fair to Carlsbad children.

Many thanks for your time and attention.

Marianne and Michael Townsend
1241 Belleflower Rd. in Carlsbad

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Todd Reese
Subject: RE: Poinsettia Park Tennis and Pickleball Courts

From: Paul Wagner <castekpaul@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 6:52 PM
To: Todd Reese <Todd.Reese@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Poinsettia Park Tennis and Pickleball Courts

Hi Todd,

I am a 23-year resident of Carlsbad who utilizes the tennis courts at Poinsettia Park multiple times per week. I understand that there is a proposal to convert two of the ten tennis courts at Poinsettia Park into additional Pickleball courts. While I understand that the existing Pickleball courts are very popular and wait times are the norm, I can attest that the same is true of the tennis courts. Myself and my playing partners typically wait between 15-60 minutes for a tennis court to become available. It is not unusual to find Pickleball players on the tennis courts, in spite of the prominent signage that expressly prohibits this. Losing 20-percent of the highly utilized tennis courts at Poinsettia is a poor option.

There are several other parks in Carlsbad which have tennis courts that are far less utilized than Poinsettia Park's courts are. These include Calavera Park and Laguna Riviera Park, both of which have tennis courts which are utilized far less than Poinsettia Park's tennis courts. I would propose converting the tennis courts (2) at one of those parks to Pickleball, to alleviate the demand at Poinsettia Park.

Please feel free to reach out to me if follow-up is requested.
Best,

Paul L Wagner
2169 Dickinson Dr.
Carlsbad CA 92008

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Rosanna <rcbalbo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 6:00 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Petition - Poinsettia Park Tennis courts

Hello there!

I am writing a quick note to let you know that I am an avid tennis player who enjoys playing at Poinsettia Park quite a lot. Even though sometimes I've had to wait long for a court to open, especially in the mornings.

I heard there is a proposal to convert 2 of the courts to pickleball, which will make the wait even longer. Myself and many of my tennis friends would really like it if this proposal doesn't happen.

Thank you very much for the attention to this matter,

R.Balbo
Carlsbad Resident

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Andrea Ashbacher <andreaashbacher@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 11:48 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Tennis Courts

Hi. Please add more Pickleball courts but there are not enough tennis courts for those who want to play.

Thank you,
Andrea Ashbacher

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: James J Y Hsu <jyhsu@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:04 PM
To: Mick Calarco; todd.reese@carlsbadca.gov; Nick Stupin
Subject: [tennis courts]

Dear Carlsbad Officials:

I am concerned that Carlsbad is considering to replace two tennis courts with pickleball courts.

We are the seniors who play tennis at the Poinsettia Community Park every weekday: Monday through Friday. Sometimes with 12 players on 3 courts, we still have more than 10 people waiting. Moreover, cutting down the court hours to 8am has also greatly reduced the availability of the courts, and making the usage of the courts less effective particularly in summer time since the temperature could turn up quickly in the mid-morning. Moreover, it is expensive to build the tennis courts, let alone tearing them down and building pickleball courts over them.

May I suggest to open the tennis courts at 7:30am, and develop the pickleball courts in the vacant land. Some parking lots and pet park , in my opinion, have much less usage in comparison to the tennis courts.

Thanks for your kind consideration.

**Regards,
James J Y Hsu**

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Yadira Navarro <yyaleana@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 1:10 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Poinsettia park tennis courts

Good evening,

My name is Yadira Navarro. I live in Carlsbad and enjoy the use of the tennis courts in poinsettia park for years. I have been told there is a consideration to take two of our tennis courts to convert them into pickle ball courts. Have you see the waiting line in the evenings?

We have to wait up to an hour and some times even more to get our turn.

If the people that enjoy pickle ball are asking for more courts and you want to help them. Please take their parking lot in front of their courts and provide them more courts but don't take our tennis courts. I see kids playing with their parents. The entire family inside the tennis court enjoying together. I don't see that in the pickle ball courts. It's obviously pickle ball participants are more adult retired crowd that have more time to be in the courts all the time. The tennis players is a different crowd. People that still works and has different schedules. That doesn't mean the tennis courts are not being used.

I hope this helps for whoever is considering to take tennis courts into something else no to do it.

There is a very high demand for them already.

Thank you for your time.

Yadira Navarro

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Sanem Ahearn <sanemahearn@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 4:06 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: In support of keeping Poinsettia tennis courts

Hi Mick,

I'm a Carlsbad resident and a tennis player (both my children play as well) and I wanted to send this email to show my support for keeping all Poinsettia tennis courts vs. converting them into pickleball courts.

It is already very tough to get tennis courts at Poinsettia during peak times and there are very few public court alternatives in Carlsbad. Tennis was one of the fastest growing sports during the pandemic where people of all ages have got started and we need more courts, not less to support the need for affordable access to this sport. Private courts around the area have hiked up their prices knowing public court access is very limited.

I do play pickleball as well and fully support this wonderful new sport but pickleball needs must be met separately without taking away facilities from another sport.

Thank you for your consideration!

Best,

Sanem Ahearn

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Diana A <dra805@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2023 5:47 PM
To: Nick Stupin; Mick Calarco; Todd Reese
Subject: Save Carlsbad Poinsetta Tennis Courts

Good afternoon,

I am an avid tennis player and have been coached by Coach Frank through the City of Carlsbad tennis lessons. One main reason I moved to this part of Carlsbad is because of Poinsettia Park and the amazing amenities.

Playing tennis has been a great way to stay in shape and meet other community members. Frank offers great lessons. The ability of being able to walk to the tennis courts makes it accessible. I frequently use the tennis courts to meet friends to play during the evenings.

Please take into consideration that there is an uptick in tennis players during the spring/summer as there is more light and it's warmer. Oftentimes when meeting friends to play Friday and Saturday mornings; there are lines for the courts. In addition, the evenings there are classes (Tues, Wed, Thurs) this also removes use of 2 courts for the lessons.

We are very fortunate to live in a City with well maintained tennis courts equivalent to any private tennis club.

As a tax paying homeowner of poinsettia community I am asking to leave the tennis courts as they are today. Tennis can be a high cost entry sport and having public (free) access to tennis courts is important to making this sport accessible.

Thank you so much!

Diana Aguirre, MBA, PMP®, LSSBB
she/her/hers mobile: 760.402.4759
dra805@gmail.com
Carlsbad District 3 resident

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Beril Ancel <berilancel@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2023 3:27 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Don't convert tennis court to Pickleball

Hello Mick

Hope you're well.

We would appreciate if you don't consider converting our tennis courts to Pickleball court.

It would be amazing if you could add more to another empty space. Taking from one to give to another one doesn't seem fair. It's difficult to find open tennis courts as it is.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Roadrunner <jmezzullo@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 9, 2023 11:27 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Pickle ball courts

Dear Mick, Please do not convert Poinsettia tennis courts to pickle ball courts. There are not enough tennis courts now to satisfy demand. Also, please take into consideration the additional noise 32 pickle ball players will make versus 8 tennis players. Nearby neighbors will definitely complain. Pickle ball is noisy. Thank you. Judi Mezzullo

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Ellen Roston <elletennis@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 9, 2023 6:00 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Pickleball courts

Dear Mick,

I love playing tennis at Poinsettia Park. We usually have to wait to get on a court. The pickle ball courts make a lot of noise and would be disruptive to the tennis players.

Please do not take away any of our courts. We were here first and we love to play.

Maybe you could find somewhere else to add the courts. It's really not fair to all of the tennis players.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ellen Roston

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Mezzullo, Louis <Louis.Mezzullo@withersworldwide.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 9, 2023 2:02 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Cc: jay.davidson@gmail.com
Subject: Pickle Ball Courts

Dear Mick, Please do not convert Poinsettia tennis courts to pickle ball courts. There are not enough tennis courts now to satisfy demand. Also, please take into consideration the additional noise 32 pickle ball players will make versus 8 tennis players. Nearby neighbors will definitely complain. Pickle ball is noisy. Thank you. Lou Mezzullo

With best regards,
Lou

Louis A. Mezzullo
Of Counsel
Wealth Planning & Tax
T+1 858 400 1323
e louis.mezzullo@withersworldwide.com
withersworldwide.com [my profile](#)

Secretary: Melissa Burgos t 26124

Withers Bergman LLP
12830 El Camino Real, Suite 350, San Diego, CA 92130

P.O. Box, Withers Bergman LLP - P.O. Box 2329 6050 El Tordo, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

Physical Address (Fed Ex, etc.), Withers Bergman LLP - 6050 El Tordo, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067 T: +1 858 756 4410

Withersworldwide
[London](#) | [Cambridge](#) | [Geneva](#) | [Milan](#) | [Padua](#)
[Hong Kong](#) | [Singapore](#) | [Tokyo](#) | [British Virgin Islands](#)
[New York](#) | [Boston](#) | [Greenwich](#) | [New Haven](#) | [Texas](#)
[San Francisco](#) | [Los Angeles](#) | [Rancho Santa Fe](#) | [San Diego](#)

This email (and any attachments) is confidential and may also be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please immediately notify the sender then delete it from your system. You should not copy it or use it for any purpose nor disclose its contents to any other person.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: ROSEMARY SZYMCZAK <rszymc3260@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2023 12:36 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Courts at Pointsettia

Hello Mr Calarco,

The tennis courts at Pointsettia Park are absolutely in high demand!

My Grandson and his friend have to wait to use a court after school and I also use them periodically.

If pickle ball courts are needed, please place them where the noise of paddle and ball are far from tennis courts as it unpleasant!

Thank you for consideration
Rosemary Szymczak
Carlsbad tax participant!

Sent from my iPhone.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Chris Berg <cberg1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2023 9:45 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Todd Reese; Nick Stupin
Cc: Jeff Jaureguy
Subject: Poinsettia Park Tennis ball courts into pickle ball is a bad idea

To whom it may concern:

I just heard about a proposal to convert tennis courts to pickle ball at Poinsettia Park. I wait in line a minimum of a half hour up to an hour for Tennis courts regularly on M, Tu, Thurs, and Fridays late afternoons. I'm not sure how to explain what a bad idea this is, since I have never seen a line of people that overtakes our line waiting for Tennis courts. I realize there is an interest in pickle ball at this time, but I doubt this will last 10, 15, or 20 years and I have played at public courts regularly in Carlsbad, much longer than pickle ball was around.

I play on a USTA Tennis team at Rancho Del Oro, but only because Poinsettia does not allow teams due to no reservation. We wanted to start a team at your facility much like Kit Carson, but we simply can't. The interest for more team competition and court reservation has always been there. Now, we have less courts to challenge and practice singles / doubles tennis. Please don't let this happen! We need more public Tennis courts!

Sincerely,
Chris Berg

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Mark Moosburner <mark.moosburner@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 1:48 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Keep Tennis Courts at Poinsettia Park

Hi Mick,

I am writing to advocate for the retention of all tennis courts at Poinsettia Park in Carlsbad, CA and to reject the proposal to convert a tennis court to two pickleball courts.

Poinsettia Park is a wonderful place to play tennis. I play there two to three times a week, either as a small group or with my USTA Tennis Team. Regardless, there are long wait times for tennis courts at all times of the day and every day of the week. Sometimes, I have to wait up to an hour for a court, but I am please to do so because I love the sport. If one tennis court is converted, the wait times for courts will be increased, which will discourage players and myself from playing tennis at Poinsettia.

Unlike tennis, there are no wait-times to play pickleball at Poinsettia Park. There are six pickleball courts and the players rotate in-and-out. This allows pickleball players to drop in and play whenever they choose.

There is a large tennis community in Carlsbad and many people that are part of that community rely on Poinsettia Park and the reliability to play tennis there without unreasonable wait times. By taking away a court, you would discourage people from visiting the park to play tennis. Tennis is a time-tested sport that many generations benefit from. Sure, pickleball is new and exciting as an emerging hobby, but do not mistake it as having the staying power as tennis does. Please keep tennis a priority at Poinsettia Park. Thank you.

Mark Moosburner

--

Mark Moosburner, Ph.D.

mark.moosburner@gmail.com

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Vicki Urzetta <vurzetta@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2023 4:49 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Tennis courts at poinsettia park

Please don't take away any of our tennis courts. Can't you please find someplace else to put more pickle ball courts.

Sincerely,
Vicki Urzetta
BRE# 01475764
Coldwell Banker Res-Encinitas
1472 Encinitas Blvd.
Encinitas CA, 92024 CalBRE# 01475764
Phone: (760) 390-9056
Email: Vurzetta@aol.com

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Audrey Mae <audreymae521@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2023 6:23 PM
To: Mick Calarco; nickstupin@carlsbad.gov; toddreese@carlsbad.gov
Subject: Poinsettia Park Tennis courts

Please do not convert two of the Poinsettia Park Tennis courts into pickleball courts. The tennis courts are used daily by Carlsbad residents, including myself. Pickleball courts are already provided for pickleball players at Poinsettia park. Tennis is a long standing sport, while pickleball may or may not withstand the test of time.

Audrey Mae
Carlsbad resident and home owner

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: yume eng <yume.eng@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 1:28 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Nick Stupin; Todd Reese
Subject: Please don't remove tennis courts at Poinsettia park

Hi all,

I'm a regular player 3x a week at Poinsettia Park. I've heard yal are thinking about converting some tennis courts into pickle ball courts?

Tennis courts there are high lights of my retirement, I love the park and how they're maintained.

There are alot of tennis players and we have to wait sometimes, can be up to 45 mins if they're full or in the weekend. I hope you're considering other options instead of take away tennis courts. Please. Add more pickle ball courts instead. There's still plenty room and I don't think it will save that much to convert. 😞

Thank you for hearing me out.

Everyone I know from out of town love Carlsbad and I'm proud of it, too. I think the city is taking care of things well.

Cheers,
Yume

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Lisa Hyndman <lisathyndman@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 2:27 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Nick Stupin; Todd Reese
Subject: Keep Poinsettia Courts for tennis

Gentlemen:

I understand that Carlsbad is considering Transitioning the Poinsettia tennis courts to pickleball courts. This is a big mistake!

I play tennis at the Poinsettia courts and I often have to wait for a court since they are all full. These courts are in high demand!

I am happy that so many people are enjoying pickleball but that doesn't mean that tennis players should be penalized. If more pickleball courts are needed then they should be built. Also, the Old Macys building at the Carlsbad mall is being turned into a pickleball facility.

Please don't accommodate the enthusiastic and possibly tunnel-vision views of pickleballers by taking away courts from calm and agreeable tennis players. We can all get along.!

Thank you,
Lisa Hyndman

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Randy Roberts and Ellen Fales <ellenandrandy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2023 11:53 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Do NOT covert TENNIS courts to pickleball

Please stop the assault on tennis players.

When I go to Poinsettia Park to play tennis, I have to wait a minimum of 40 minutes to get a tennis court as it is. There's a lot of demand.

Just because a tennis court sometimes sits idle is no reason to take courts away from tennis players. Ball fields take up huge amounts of space - more than tennis courts, and involve less players relative to the space AND ball fields are NOT USED all day. --Yet I don't hear people trying to convert ball fields into pickleball courts. You think baseball players would like random lines painted all over their fields?

You should not be considering messing up, or taking away tennis courts!!!

Pickleball players are not being good community members when they see an empty tennis court and think it should be theirs.

And pickleball has noise issues that tennis does not. No one ever complains about noise from tennis courts, but all over the country, pickleball play is being restricted to certain times, or being forced to MOVE courts because the noise is so obnoxious. I learned that the reason the Poinsettia Park TENNIS courts are not open until 8:00 am is because you had to locked the pickleball courts because of the complaining neighbors and then the picklers went to the TENNIS courts and made noise while waiting for the pickleball courts to be unlocked!

Picklers have already screwed tennis at Poinsettia because the 8am start has put even more pressure and demand on the tennis courts. In the past, many people started around 7:15 and could play before work. Now that's impossible. a total turn over occurred at around 9:00 am - now the turnover occurs around 10:00.

Tennis is an established professional sport. California produces great professional and amateur tennis players. Don't take opportunity away from the general public. That's how many students and professionals get their start. Students get tennis scholarships, just as other sports. It's not dying, so don't kill it.

You should BUILD more pickleball courts in a DIFFERENT location.

Thank you for your public service.

Respectfully,

Ellen Fales

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: alice Cooney <alcooney28@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 12:35 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: Tennis court conversion at Poinsettia Park

Mr. Calarco,

Please note my opposition as a resident of Carlsbad for over 36 years and as an avid tennis player to any conversion of the existing tennis courts at Poinsettia Park to either part-time or full-time pickleball use. The tennis courts are well-used and players often face wait times to obtain a court.

Tennis and pickleball have both seen significant growth in the last few years. The solution to the needs of one sport is not to detract from the needs of another.

Thank you,

Alice Cooney
7042 Snapdragon Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92011

Sent from [Outlook](#)

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Patrick Coughlin <ptcoughlin81@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 1, 2023 1:27 PM
To: Mick Calarco; Nick Stupin; Todd Reese
Subject: Opposition to more pickle ball courts at Poinsettia Park

Hello,

Please consider my opposition to adding more pickle ball courts at poinsettia park by converting 2 existing tennis courts.

I have no problem with pickleball courts. However they should not take away tennis courts - just build new pickleball courts! There are already people waiting in line for tennis courts in the AM, PM and weekends

Thanks

Patrick Coughlin

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Stasys Tara <stara@chicagobooth.edu>
Sent: Monday, May 1, 2023 1:18 PM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: No to Poinsettia Tennis Court conversions

Dear Mr. Calarco,

I'd like to voice my concern over any conversion of any public tennis court in Carlsbad, including Poinsettia.

I play tennis at Poinsettia several days per week, as does my family who own property and pay property taxes in Carlsbad. We nearly always have to wait in a que. There are already and insufficient number of courts. More are needed. Not less!

If additional pickleball courts are desired, then build new ones at Alga, Laguna Riveria or elsewhere. You should also charge an access fee to cover the expense of the new courts.

Regards,

S. Tara

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Kyle Lancaster
Subject: RE: Poinsettia Park Courts

From: Jeremy Horton <jhorto11@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2023 9:59 PM
To: Mick Calarco <Mick.Calarco@carlsbadca.gov>; Todd Reese <Todd.Reese@carlsbadca.gov>; Nick Stupin <Nick.Stupin@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Poinsettia Park Courts

I live a short distance from the Poinsettia Pickle ball courts @ 6454 Topmast Drive. When we purchased the home in 2006 the masterplan called for a stadium tennis court and tennis shop to be built in the Northeast corner of the park.

When the city was considering building pickle ball courts I voiced my concerns at City Council meeting regarding the noise and additional traffic. The city reassured that additional sound proofing was being put in and there would be a requirement for quiet pickle ball paddles 'Green Zone Approved'.

I do not believe any formal noise studies were ever conducted and on a daily basis I can hear pickle ball from both front/back yards and inside the house with the windows open.

This noise is an irritating nuisance that was never a part of the original park master plan. I have played on the pickle ball courts and am aware that the use of Green Zone Approved paddles is not being enforced.

I am especially concerned because I have heard that the city is considering expanding pickle ball into the existing tennis courts. This will only further the noise, constrain the tennis courts, and increase traffic, both around and within the park.


I would like to strongly recommend:

- That any additional pickle ball courts be located at a park other than Poinsettia.
- A comprehensive survey of the tennis courts be conducted, as when I go to play tennis other than the middle of the day, the courts are occupied with most times a waiting line at the top of the stairs. There are a number of tennis players that have relocated to Carlsbad HS public tennis courts because of scheduling difficulty at Poinsettia.
- The city devise a means to enforce the use of Green Zone Approved pickle ball paddles.
- Residents within 1000ft of the park formally approve of proposed revisions to the master plan that will increase noise and/or traffic.
- Carlsbad partner closely with neighboring cities in having each develop out pickle ball courts in respective areas. There are a significant number of the pickle ball participants who come to play at Poinsettia from areas outside of Carlsbad because there are no and or limited public courts.
- Given a significant number of Carlsbad residents pay a MelloRoo to support Parks and Schools, non residents who access Carlsbad parks pay a small fee.

On a separate note, I went to play tennis this late afternoon and noticed that one of the tennis courts now has unauthorized permanent markings for pickle ball dimensions with chalk connecting the lines (pictures

below). Worth a mention as well that all of the courts, pickle ball and tennis, were full and I had to wait 30m for a tennis court.

Jeremy



CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Charlene Buckalew
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2023 11:10 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Cc: Kyle Lancaster; Todd Reese
Subject: FW: Pickleball Courts @ Poinsettia Park

From: Jamie Kennedy <Jamie.Kennedy@carlsbadca.gov> **On Behalf Of** Parks and Recreation
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2023 8:05 AM
To: Charlene Buckalew <Charlene.Buckalew@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: FW: Pickleball Courts @ Poinsettia Park

Tennis court/ pickleball request.

From: Armen Dabaghian <armen424@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 13, 2023 12:23 PM
To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Subject: Pickleball Courts @ Poinsettia Park

Dear City of Carlsbad -

I have been playing tennis in North County San Diego for 35 years and I can tell you it is only getting harder to find courts to play on. Bobby Riggs has completely converted to pickleball. San Dieguito High School is locked to outsiders. Carlsbad High is in serious need of resurfacing. Some nights (usually Wednesdays and Thursdays around 5pm) I've waited over an hour to get a court at Poinsettia Park. Please reconsider any conversion of the precious few tennis courts that are still available in North County.

Thank You -

Armen Dabaghian

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Parks and Recreation
Subject: RE: Poinsettia Park Tennis Courts

From: Corey Jung <cwjung_9@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 13, 2023 1:59 PM
To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Subject: Poinsettia Park Tennis Courts

Hi,

I understand that the Carlsbad Parks & Rec department is considering removing some of the tennis courts at Poinsettia Park and replacing them with pickleball courts. While I am not against more pickleball courts, removing tennis courts will put a huge strain on the already limited resource. I play tennis at Poinsettia 3-4 times a week and I always have to wait for a court - sometimes as long as an hour. The tennis courts at Poinsettia are a heavily utilized resource - go by after 5pm on a weekday or on the weekend and you will see all the tennis courts are in use.

Again, I understand that pickleball, at the moment, is incredibly popular, but there are ways to expand the pickleball courts without taking away a heavily utilized resource like the tennis courts. For instance, the parking lot next to the current pickleball courts could be leveraged to expand the number of courts. In addition, the number of tennis courts in the area is incredibly limited. There are also fewer options for public play for tennis in the area. For pickleball, there are several nearby options at Bobby Riggs, which has 22 pickleball courts, and the Pickleball Club of Carlsbad, which has 6 courts available.

I hope you will consider the tremendous impact taking away tennis courts will have on a large tennis community here in North County. I think there can be some creative ways to allow for the growth of both sports. This does not have to be a zero sum game, where one group has to lose something in order for another to gain.

Thank you for your consideration.

Corey Jung
404-793-4517

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Parks and Recreation
Subject: RE: Save our tennis courts at Poinsettia Park!

From: Lisa B <lisaburnon@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 13, 2023 8:00 PM
To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Subject: Save our tennis courts at Poinsettia Park!

Hi Carlsbad Parks and Rec,

I'm a Carlsbad resident and an avid tennis player who loves playing at Poinsettia Park. I'm writing to urge you not to convert two of the tennis courts at Poinsettia into Pickle Ball courts. I grew up relying on public tennis courts as an affordable, accessible way to play the sport. As an adult, I continue to play exclusively on public courts and see them as a great benefit to our community.

When I moved to Carlsbad 5 years ago, I didn't have many friends or connections in the area. I knew I could find community through playing tennis. I began taking the classes taught by Frank Arlen on Tuesday and Thursday evenings at Poinsettia Park and quickly found a group of people that love the game of tennis as much as I do. We love using the courts outside of our class time and play bi-weekly doubles games after work. We almost always have to wait for a court to open up. We're all fine with a short wait and often connect with other tennis players who are also waiting in line. Some have even joined our weekly games! If the tennis players have to wait for courts, so should the pickleball players. In the past week, I've played at Poinsettia three times and have had to wait for a court for at least 25 minutes.

One thing is true about both tennis and pickleball: it brings a diverse group of people from the community together and differences that we may have outside of the court are forgotten while we're enjoying our respective matches. In 2023, 'third spaces' like public courts are crucial for people to be able to actively participate in their communities and forge connections with others. However, tennis is a sport that has stood the test of time and benefits the mind and body in ways that pickle ball doesn't. Tennis reduces stress, encourages self discipline and a strong work ethic and helps you learn from mistakes and problem solve. Children who play tennis perform better in school. Tennis has also been shown to activate neural connections in the brain and encourage lifelong brain development. Tennis players live ten years longer than non-tennis players on average. Carlsbad must continue to make tennis accessible and affordable for the betterment of our community!

Sincerely,

Lisa Burnon

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

To: Parks and Recreation
Subject: RE: Converting tennis to pickle ball courts

-----Original Message-----

From: Raj Murali <rajmurali023@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 14, 2023 5:55 PM
To: Parks and Recreation <parksandrec@CarlsbadCA.gov>
Subject: Converting tennis to pickle ball courts

I strongly oppose this idea.
There are too many tennis players already and not enough courts Raj Murali

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Neelay Bhatt

From: Randy Roberts and Ellen Fales <ellenandrandy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 14, 2023 11:03 AM
To: Mick Calarco
Subject: pickleball courts at Poinsettia - important info about petition

Hii Mick,

I wrote you a while back about my concern that tennis courts might be converted to pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park.

You wrote back a very informative note explaining that that is/was not being considered. Thank you.

The tennis community is running scared and circulating a lot of unsubstantiated rumor. This is because in fact, SO MANY public tennis courts HAVE BEEN converted to tennis courts and or had ridiculous lines painted all over them.

Now, there's a petition circulating among the tennis community (link below) in advance of your upcoming public meeting:

[No additional pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park](#)

https://sign.moveon.org/petitions/no-additional-pickleball-courts-at-poinsettia-park?source=rawlink&utm_source=rawlink&share=730f6bea-4b8f-416e-98c0-23f7000e3865

Unfortunately, dozens of women have signed this petition without knowing that what they are signing. And the creators of this petition are obviously not stating the truth about what you intend to do. Either *they're* completely misinformed, or it's intentional -- to get more people to sign the petition.

The second paragraph of the petition states:

"If you are a tennis player and are concerned about **tennis courts getting converted to pickleball courts** then also pls sign up to let the city official know your disapproval by signing this petition"

Of course people who read the petition immediately assume that Carlsbad Parks and Rec are going to convert tennis courts to pickleball.

All of the women that signed, that I've spoken to, had NO IDEA that you do not intend to convert tennis courts to pickleball.

They are NOT opposed to the construction of new and separate pickleball courts.

I hope you find this helpful.

You well know that being in government means that half of the people will oppose what you're doing no matter how hard you're trying to help them!

Sincerely,

Ellen

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sophie Ding
4670 Telescope Avenue
Carlsbad, CA 92008
sophieding@yahoo.com

April 14, 2023

Messrs. Mick Calarco, Todd Reese, Nick Stupin
Carlsbad Park & Recreation
799 Pine Avenue #200
Carlsbad, CA 92008

RE: Save the Poinsettia Park Tennis Courts

Dear Mick, Todd, and Nick,


I was disappointed and quite distraught to hear that some of the tennis courts in Poinsettia Park might be converted into pickleball courts.

I am a home owner in Carlsbad and tennis player. Poinsettia Park is my main venue of play. The tennis courts there are in high demand. In weekday mornings the courts are usually full; on weekends there are almost always a long queue with players lined up for courts to free up, as more players come to play, and the City instructors often take up some courts for public lessons which leads to fewer courts available. Many times I have seen players, often families with kids, walk back to the parking lot, never found a court available to play because they couldn't come earlier.


As a tennis player, I feel it is already quite difficult to get a court to play as is. Taking away some of these courts would only worsen the situation. Therefore I plead with you to keep the tennis courts as they are.

I would support the idea of developing more sports and recreational facilities in our city, but don't think it should be done by sacrificing the existing ones, particularly when they are in high demand. To me it would be like rob Peter to pay Paul.

Thank you and kind regards.



Sophie Ding
Carlsbad resident



City of Carlsbad California 2023 - 2030


APPENDIX N -
ONLINE SURVEY



Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update Online Survey

Q1 Do you visit City of Carlsbad parks?

Answered: 1,766 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Yes, all the time | 52.94% 935 |
| Yes, occasionally | 43.43% 767 |
| No | 3.62% 64 |
| IF YES, What do you enjoy most about going to city parks? What would make going to city parks even better? | 0.00% 0 |
| Total Respondents: 1,766 | |

| # | IF YES, WHAT DO YOU ENJOY MOST ABOUT GOING TO CITY PARKS? WHAT WOULD MAKE GOING TO CITY PARKS EVEN BETTER? | DATE |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| | There are no responses. | |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

Answered: 1,176 Skipped: 590

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | If there was something closer to the beach in South Carlsbad that would be great | 1/11/2022 5:36 AM |
| 2 | Good parking lot structure, lots of green space, shade for a hot day | 1/10/2022 3:23 PM |
| 3 | More of them--especially open space. Playing fields and open space can be difficult to find. Also, more shaded areas. | 1/10/2022 12:49 PM |
| 4 | Closer parks, within walking distance of Ponto and Avenida Encinitas. | 1/10/2022 12:36 PM |
| 5 | More shade and Community classes and activities | 1/10/2022 12:34 PM |
| 6 | More of them. Like everything in SoCal these days, it's very crowded at our parks. | 1/10/2022 12:22 PM |
| 7 | Need a park with a running track surface that is well lit. | 1/10/2022 12:17 PM |
| 8 | Restrooms at every park. And maybe a coffee cart ;). | 1/10/2022 11:19 AM |
| 9 | We need more parks with bigger play structures for older kids/tweens. | 1/10/2022 11:08 AM |
| 10 | Allow dogs at all parks | 1/10/2022 11:00 AM |
| 11 | closer park to Ponto beach, otherwise we often go to Encinitas parks | 1/10/2022 9:47 AM |
| 12 | more parks by the ocean, please build Ponto Park | 1/10/2022 7:54 AM |
| 13 | A park by the ocean. Please please please build Ponto Park. Do we REALLY need to build housing on EVERY INCH of dirt??? | 1/9/2022 6:11 PM |
| 14 | Safety, cleanliness, openness | 1/9/2022 12:39 PM |
| 15 | Coastal corridor access parks such as proposed Ponto Park | 1/9/2022 12:07 PM |
| 16 | clean restrooms and facilities, convenience, good parking | 1/9/2022 10:09 AM |
| 17 | Closer park to me in southwest Carlsbad | 1/8/2022 6:21 PM |
| 18 | We have no park near our home that we can walk to. We live near Ponto Beach. Hoping for the addition of a city park near Aveneida Encinias and Coast Highway, along Ponto Road. | 1/8/2022 5:35 PM |
| 19 | More pickleball courts, tennis courts and playground equipment for children would make it better for my family. | 1/8/2022 4:47 PM |
| 20 | Do not develop Ponto beach area. Reserve this for a park | 1/8/2022 2:36 PM |
| 21 | If we had a costal access Park at Ponto Creek | 1/8/2022 2:34 PM |
| 22 | having one closer | 1/8/2022 2:31 PM |
| 23 | If people would read and follow the rules. | 1/8/2022 1:58 PM |
| 24 | More seating available | 1/8/2022 1:10 PM |
| 25 | more of them | 1/8/2022 1:08 PM |
| 26 | I would like to see a park by the ocean near Ponto that is open space and walking paths. Having a quiet place without souvenir shops, housing, or skateboards would be great. | 1/8/2022 10:29 AM |
| 27 | closer to our home | 1/8/2022 10:23 AM |
| 28 | More Park area | 1/8/2022 9:52 AM |
| 29 | More of them! | 1/8/2022 9:42 AM |
| 30 | More open space around beaches | 1/8/2022 9:13 AM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31 | More pickle ball courts Better beach sand | 1/8/2022 8:57 AM |
| 32 | Having more parks, especially in the southwest area of Carlsbad. | 1/8/2022 8:56 AM |
| 33 | More coastal parks | 1/8/2022 8:28 AM |
| 34 | More parks by the ocean! There's already so much development on the PCH and it will ruin the natural environment that's barely left :(| 1/8/2022 8:24 AM |
| 35 | More pickle ball courts | 1/8/2022 7:47 AM |
| 36 | If they were within walking or biking distance to our home in San Pacifico | 1/8/2022 7:34 AM |
| 37 | If there was a coastal park in south Carlsbad | 1/8/2022 7:20 AM |
| 38 | If there was a park that was closer to where I live. | 1/8/2022 7:17 AM |
| 39 | More parks located in south Carlsbad along the coast | 1/8/2022 6:57 AM |
| 40 | More parks close to the beach; particularly Ponto area. | 1/8/2022 6:34 AM |
| 41 | I wish there were some parks that were walkable from my home honestly. | 1/7/2022 11:46 PM |
| 42 | Build one in our neighborhood, the Ponto beach area. | 1/7/2022 9:21 PM |
| 43 | Closer with walkable access to the park. Nice grassy area. | 1/7/2022 9:20 PM |
| 44 | Being able to enjoy sunsets at our unmatched beaches and coastal open spaces. | 1/7/2022 9:19 PM |
| 45 | Parks by the ocean. Build Ponto Park! | 1/7/2022 8:59 PM |
| 46 | Less Rules and more Open spaces | 1/7/2022 8:52 PM |
| 47 | More coastal locations | 1/7/2022 8:39 PM |
| 48 | A park at Ponto. It's such an amazing opportunity to give all South Carlsbad residents and people from all over to enjoy equitable access to the coast. Do not give in to private development here. | 1/7/2022 8:28 PM |
| 49 | Skateparks | 1/7/2022 7:56 PM |
| 50 | More parks by the ocean. Build Ponto park. | 1/7/2022 7:55 PM |
| 51 | To have more parks in neighborhoods do we can walk to them. This is important for veterans and elderly. | 1/7/2022 7:48 PM |
| 52 | I like parks to be walkable and to have both passive and active features. | 1/7/2022 7:38 PM |
| 53 | More parks by the ocean and less high density housing | 1/7/2022 7:21 PM |
| 54 | A park near the ocean would provide open space for all of the community to enjoy instead of high density condos or resorts that do not. A park at Ponto would be a perfect way to preserve coastal land and provide a wonderful park for ALL to enjoy. Carlsbad has the opportunity to become a model for other cities by preserving areas now and for future generations. | 1/7/2022 7:20 PM |
| 55 | Having more of them! | 1/7/2022 7:15 PM |
| 56 | If we had a linear park behind the state campground. Linear Park is a much better option than the Ponto Park idea. Ponto Park will serve just a privileged few who are fighting to retain their ocean views at the expense of the greater population group. | 1/7/2022 7:08 PM |
| 57 | Coastal/beach park space | 1/7/2022 7:05 PM |
| 58 | Building a linear park on the narrow strip behind the campground. | 1/7/2022 7:04 PM |
| 59 | A linear park behind the state campground. Linking the city to the beach and making it more accessible to all. Stretching from Palomar Road to Avenue Encinas. | 1/7/2022 7:01 PM |
| 60 | Newer equipment, more garden area to sit and walk through, enough parking, activites offered. | 1/7/2022 6:58 PM |
| 61 | Please build a "Linear Park" behind the state campground. It will transform the city to a world class city. That is a much better idea than a small Ponto Park. | 1/7/2022 6:57 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 62 | More Coastal Parks. Especially the large open space by Ponto beach / Avenida Encinas | 1/7/2022 6:49 PM |
| 63 | If we had one in walking distance of our home. | 1/7/2022 6:47 PM |
| 64 | I am an older woman, and the greatest need for me and my friends is comfortable seating in the shade, and well kept walkways. | 1/7/2022 6:47 PM |
| 65 | We need more parks. So many families have small yards and the need for parks is critical for children to have areas to run and play. | 1/7/2022 6:33 PM |
| 66 | There is really no need for a Ponto Park. Developing the space behind the campground is a better option and will serve a broader community and is a better alternative. They People for Ponto group do not represent the community, they are just a small vocal group, trying to protect the ocean views of a privileged few. | 1/7/2022 6:29 PM |
| 67 | If there was a coastal park in South Carlsbad. We have very limited parks in the southern/coastal region of our city. | 1/7/2022 6:28 PM |
| 68 | More park space in South Carlsbad coastal region please! | 1/7/2022 6:25 PM |
| 69 | Bike/walk trails to connect them, and more parks. | 1/7/2022 6:09 PM |
| 70 | More parks!! Build Ponto Ocean Park!! We need more open space not high density housing or strip malls. | 1/7/2022 6:03 PM |
| 71 | Having more of them especially a coastal park in South Carlsbad | 1/7/2022 6:00 PM |
| 72 | If there was a city park within walking distance of my home in South Carlsbad. | 1/7/2022 5:54 PM |
| 73 | One that was on the COAST! | 1/7/2022 5:49 PM |
| 74 | open spaces with trash receptacles to keep them clean | 1/7/2022 5:49 PM |
| 75 | More of them | 1/7/2022 5:43 PM |
| 76 | More trails that allow for a view - especially of the coastline. | 1/7/2022 5:43 PM |
| 77 | Create Ponto Park and do not increase density in the area. There are fewer parks in our area vs. surrounding (e.g., Oceanside and Encinitas). | 1/7/2022 5:40 PM |
| 78 | Views of ocean | 1/7/2022 5:30 PM |
| 79 | Clearing out homeless people from thwm | 1/7/2022 5:12 PM |
| 80 | Ponto park close by | 1/7/2022 5:02 PM |
| 81 | Access — our home is in south carlsbad and we don't have reasonable access to a local park. Our kids can't bike or walk to a park...everything is miles away and requires crossing very busy streets and the freeway overpass. Only way to reach a park is by car. | 1/7/2022 4:46 PM |
| 82 | I would have answered "all the time" in question #1, however I live in southwest Carlsbad and we don't have convenient access to a park like the other 3 quadrants of Carlsbad have. Would prefer a park in open space and not next to high density housing, and near the ocean like other cities have. However I don't like at all the concept of a linear park along 101. This design would restrict the design and the amenities you can offer and be too close to traffic. This is not what the people of Carlsbad want. A more traditional square space but still near the ocean works best. | 1/7/2022 4:39 PM |
| 83 | Whiffle ball games | 1/7/2022 4:37 PM |
| 84 | More access to lighted fields for my kids to play in the local rec lacrosse program. Last spring and this past fall the teams were practicing on top of each other. | 1/7/2022 4:35 PM |
| 85 | Parks closer to my home location...parks by the ocean...Ponto Park! | 1/7/2022 4:31 PM |
| 86 | More of them . Sitting areas for picnics, concerts in the park, play areas for children , spaces for dogs to run and play, walking paths | 1/7/2022 4:31 PM |
| 87 | If they were more accessible | 1/7/2022 4:26 PM |
| 88 | We live in the San Pacifico area and have no park within walking distance. A coastal park near Ponto would be great! | 1/7/2022 4:19 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 89 | Putting one near the coast in the SW quadrant WHERE WE DO NOT HAVE ONE! | 1/7/2022 4:18 PM |
| 90 | More natural parks, more nature, more trees, good trails and a section for dogs on beaches | 1/7/2022 4:18 PM |
| 91 | A Park at Ponto for access and use for those citizens in the area and others. I currently have to drive to other city parks | 1/7/2022 4:14 PM |
| 92 | The Southwest quadrant requires equal amount of parks as Northwest. We do not even have an indoor gym | 1/7/2022 4:05 PM |
| 93 | Open areas | 1/7/2022 4:02 PM |
| 94 | We need a Costal park in south Carlsbad. The last remaining open space at Avenida Encinas and PCH should be made into a park! | 1/7/2022 4:01 PM |
| 95 | If there was a coastal park in South Carlsbad. Like that perfectly beautiful area Ponto. Please don't turn it into south Orange County. We are a beach community, we need a coastal park! | 1/7/2022 4:01 PM |
| 96 | As much open space as possible. Walking trails, views of the ocean, etc. | 1/7/2022 3:59 PM |
| 97 | If there was a park located in south Carlsbad by the beach/Ponto. | 1/7/2022 3:57 PM |
| 98 | Having a park nearby at South Pinto where I could walk to with my very young grandchildren. Taking them to the beach just doesn't cut it and a park would be much safer. Please?! | 1/7/2022 3:55 PM |
| 99 | More parks closer to my home. Walking distance. | 1/7/2022 3:54 PM |
| 100 | One that is near my home | 1/7/2022 3:53 PM |
| 101 | More turf and lights at the parks for Lacrosse. Soccer dominates and doesn't give local lacrosse players field space | 1/7/2022 3:53 PM |
| 102 | More of them. | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 103 | A park along the coast near Ponto | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 104 | It would be better if there were more parks near ocean, I understand there is potential to build a park at Ponto. | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 105 | We need an additional park in southwest coastal Carlsbad. | 1/7/2022 3:50 PM |
| 106 | More parks in South Carlsbad near the coast. There are no parks in the coastal area. We could use a park that could hold events and create picnic areas for families. | 1/7/2022 3:50 PM |
| 107 | Bring back TGIF concerts. | 1/7/2022 3:09 PM |
| 108 | More activity space for younger (aged 5-10) kids sports. Basketball courts with lower hoop options, flat easy bike and gravel trails/loops, soccer fields. | 1/7/2022 8:35 AM |
| 109 | Add bike parks. Connect short trails together across the city. | 1/7/2022 8:26 AM |
| 110 | Dog friendly | 1/7/2022 7:19 AM |
| 111 | More pickleball courts for playing rather than more time waiting | 1/7/2022 5:25 AM |
| 112 | more pickleball | 1/6/2022 6:34 PM |
| 113 | More pickleball courts, please! More parking at Poinsettia Park. | 1/6/2022 1:51 PM |
| 114 | Carlsbad does an excellent job!!!! | 1/6/2022 12:12 PM |
| 115 | More pickleball courts in south Carlsbad. Stagecoach Park would be a perfect spot! | 1/6/2022 9:53 AM |
| 116 | More of them. Especially coastal S CBad. | 1/6/2022 8:42 AM |
| 117 | Having a dog park near the coast | 1/6/2022 8:17 AM |
| 118 | There are more people playing pickleball at Poinsettia Park than any other sport. The courts are always overcrowded. We need more courts to accommodate all players. | 1/5/2022 11:57 PM |
| 119 | More PICKLEBALL courts! We don't have enough. The wait is always so long. | 1/5/2022 11:35 PM |
| 120 | having one closer and by the ocean! BUILD PONTO PARK | 1/5/2022 6:24 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 121 | It would be great to have more shade from trees in our parks and interpretative signage about the trees and plants in our parks. | 1/5/2022 9:16 AM |
| 122 | Dog area (or dogs allowed) at stagecoach. | 1/5/2022 7:08 AM |
| 123 | Update & repurpose unused areas in Old Carlsbad area: such as the unused horseshoe pit at Laguna Riviera Park and designate a small and large dog run at Holiday Park. | 1/5/2022 12:12 AM |
| 124 | Safety is important. As well as diverse activities for others to enjoy. | 1/4/2022 9:27 PM |
| 125 | More parks by the ocean - Ponto park! | 1/4/2022 7:13 PM |
| 126 | More pickle ball courts | 1/4/2022 6:51 PM |
| 127 | More pickle ball courts | 1/4/2022 5:36 PM |
| 128 | Ability to bring my four legged family member. | 1/4/2022 5:26 PM |
| 129 | More Pickleball courts! | 1/4/2022 4:52 PM |
| 130 | More pickleball courts. | 1/4/2022 4:49 PM |
| 131 | More Pickleball space | 1/4/2022 4:48 PM |
| 132 | More locations | 1/4/2022 4:25 PM |
| 133 | More tennis courts | 1/4/2022 3:35 PM |
| 134 | More parks. | 1/4/2022 3:12 PM |
| 135 | More natural spaces, more trails/open space, more playgrounds that are not primary color plastic - more organic structures | 1/4/2022 2:28 PM |
| 136 | Holiday park really needs a sidewalk that wraps around the entire park, and the bathrooms need toilet seat covers and a baby changing station. Safety is a huge issue at Pine Park, the homeless are always next to the playground, and fights break out amongst them, or the mentality unstable/drugged out ones are on the playground walking around shouting. Pine park also needs some shade over the playground, it's unusable on hot days (which is all the time in Southern California). Holiday park has a beautiful tree in the center that keeps it cool, and Pine needs something to the same effect. | 1/4/2022 2:16 PM |
| 137 | More dog-friendly parks. | 1/4/2022 1:06 PM |
| 138 | Clean bathrooms, shade coverings over all playgrounds | 1/4/2022 12:33 PM |
| 139 | Classes at Poinsettia park | 1/4/2022 12:31 PM |
| 140 | More dog recreation areas | 1/4/2022 12:31 PM |
| 141 | Trees for shade in the more open areas. | 1/4/2022 12:22 PM |
| 142 | Even more trails, paths, hiking. Open views. A long, one-way paved bike path. | 1/4/2022 12:21 PM |
| 143 | more pickleball | 1/4/2022 8:39 AM |
| 144 | More pickleball courts. | 1/4/2022 8:28 AM |
| 145 | More pickleball courts. | 1/4/2022 8:27 AM |
| 146 | WiFi. Charging Station benches. | 1/4/2022 7:40 AM |
| 147 | Shaded playgrounds. Walking paths. Skateboarding/scooter ramps | 1/3/2022 11:58 PM |
| 148 | Add meditation gardens like self realization gardens in encinitas, an activity center for classes like Zumba, and Zumba gold, gentle yoga, cooking, art classes all ages. Was disappointed the community center was eliminated from Poinsettia Community Park. We needed an indoor activity center to meet needs of seniors and families in south Carlsbad besides sports. Transportation shuttles for concerts. | 1/3/2022 10:47 PM |
| 149 | More pickleball courts - there are so few courts and lots of people who want to play. | 1/3/2022 8:00 PM |
| 150 | more of them - especially near the ocean - Carlsbad should accept the 15 minute walk challenge and ensure there are parks in every neighborhood - Especially a Park at Ponto | 1/3/2022 7:03 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 151 | Bike trails | 1/3/2022 4:02 PM |
| 152 | More Pickleball courts | 1/3/2022 4:00 PM |
| 153 | more pickleball courts and parking | 1/3/2022 3:36 PM |
| 154 | Variety of playgrounds that appeal to more ages. More skate parks. | 1/3/2022 2:14 PM |
| 155 | Having dog bags available in all of them | 1/3/2022 1:37 PM |
| 156 | I don't find it difficult going to any city parks...thank goodness. Are there bus stops near all the parks? | 1/3/2022 1:12 PM |
| 157 | More Pickleball courts and exercise equipment | 1/3/2022 12:23 PM |
| 158 | More of them! | 1/3/2022 12:06 PM |
| 159 | More dog park areas with grass | 1/3/2022 10:58 AM |
| 160 | bigger play structure at Stagecoach Park | 1/3/2022 10:53 AM |
| 161 | More parks and another pool. | 1/3/2022 10:49 AM |
| 162 | Some on-leash, dog-friendly spots where families can gather for picnics and kids can play on equipment. | 1/3/2022 9:58 AM |
| 163 | More Pickle ball courts. please add more courts to Poinsettia Park. Fastest growing sport in the US. | 1/3/2022 9:39 AM |
| 164 | More frequent monitoring for litter and volunteer trash cleanup events. | 1/3/2022 9:33 AM |
| 165 | More dedicated outdoor pickleball courts. | 1/3/2022 9:04 AM |
| 166 | more native plantings and sustainable practices to show P&R is actively working to help address climate change and support local ecosystems, more community gardens, sharing of facilities/fields/courts to the extend possible to limit cost and waste of resources (thus also addressing climate change) (ie, dual marked tennis/pickelball courts) | 1/3/2022 8:09 AM |
| 167 | New playgrounds | 1/3/2022 8:05 AM |
| 168 | Park features for older youth, such as what is at Buccaneer Park in Oceanside. | 1/3/2022 7:19 AM |
| 169 | Trees | 1/3/2022 6:00 AM |
| 170 | increased awareness of park locations and recreation opportunities | 1/3/2022 5:08 AM |
| 171 | more pickleball courts | 1/2/2022 10:38 PM |
| 172 | More climbing structures for kids. It would be nice to have a wall to hit tennis balls against so you can practice hitting. | 1/2/2022 8:15 PM |
| 173 | discount in classes or events for Carlsbad residents. bike routes within parks or around them. | 1/2/2022 7:55 PM |
| 174 | More pickleball courts. Pickleball is the only activity at Poinsettia Park which is seemingly always over-capacity. | 1/2/2022 6:21 PM |
| 175 | More public pool space | 1/2/2022 5:47 PM |
| 176 | More pickleball courts | 1/2/2022 5:24 PM |
| 177 | Off leash dog Beach and beach parks | 1/2/2022 4:10 PM |
| 178 | More Pickleball courts. | 1/2/2022 3:58 PM |
| 179 | Shade & sitting areas for parents while kids play | 1/2/2022 3:54 PM |
| 180 | So far, I have been well pleased, can't think of anything | 1/2/2022 3:32 PM |
| 181 | More small, passive neighborhood parks | 1/2/2022 3:29 PM |
| 182 | Allowing pickleball to be played on empty tennis courts | 1/2/2022 2:51 PM |
| 183 | More pickleball courts | 1/2/2022 2:14 PM |
| 184 | Restrooms | 1/2/2022 1:55 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 185 | Regular maintenance. | 1/2/2022 1:51 PM |
| 186 | Clean & safe | 1/2/2022 1:49 PM |
| 187 | More pickle ball courts | 1/2/2022 1:27 PM |
| 188 | More pickleball courts | 1/2/2022 12:58 PM |
| 189 | Parks should be within a short walking distance. Parks should have plentiful flat grassy areas for formal or informal gatherings. | 1/2/2022 12:24 PM |
| 190 | Swimming at Alga Norte seems too expensive. Consider more resident discounts. We also despise going to Poinsettia during large events because the parking situation is so challenging. | 1/2/2022 12:23 PM |
| 191 | Pickleball!! | 1/2/2022 12:15 PM |
| 192 | More pickle ball courts | 1/2/2022 11:42 AM |
| 193 | A bathroom at the new Buena Vista Park and more shade at all parks (especially playground areas). | 1/2/2022 11:23 AM |
| 194 | Safety - the skateboarders at Alga Norte are all over the place - including the parking lot. Reinforce the helmet law. | 1/2/2022 10:22 AM |
| 195 | More events held in the parks (like we went to an art pop-up craft at the library in the garden, but those kind of pop-up events in the parks would be cool too) | 1/2/2022 10:02 AM |
| 196 | Less homeless people. More dog friendly parks. | 1/2/2022 9:29 AM |
| 197 | Pickle ball courts that are accessible without ridiculous wait times. Better dog park facilities, get rid of the wood chips. | 1/2/2022 9:19 AM |
| 198 | Free electric car charging stations. More dog friendly and dog parks. More pickleball courts | 1/2/2022 9:02 AM |
| 199 | More Pickleball courts especially for challenge level play | 1/2/2022 8:56 AM |
| 200 | Making village H a leash-free area. It's ridiculous how long this new plan will take. We used to enjoy it all the time, but never go anymore. Very sad... | 1/2/2022 8:51 AM |
| 201 | Until more City pool lifeguards are hired, rotate lifeguards between Alga Norte Pool and Monroe Street Pool (MSP) so that MSP patrons do not bear the entire burden of the lifeguard shortage. Alga Norte Pool patrons can drive to the MSP between 6:00am and 3:00pm for the next four months since MSP patrons have been driving to the Alga Norte Pool during those hours since September 2021. | 1/2/2022 8:37 AM |
| 202 | More pickleball courts | 1/2/2022 8:22 AM |
| 203 | Not sure | 1/2/2022 8:20 AM |
| 204 | Dog runs, Pickleball courts | 1/2/2022 8:12 AM |
| 205 | More skateparks, enforce the rules about scooters and bikes and helmets. Maintain the concrete at the parks and sweep the bowls each morning | 1/2/2022 6:37 AM |
| 206 | Mountain biking trails. | 1/2/2022 5:23 AM |
| 207 | I would love to see more pickleball courts. The public courts get quite crowded with lengthy wait times. | 1/1/2022 11:34 PM |
| 208 | Actually have Parks & Recreation DO THEIR JOB! Like keeping Aqua Norte's Spa working for more than a few weeks a year! | 1/1/2022 10:41 PM |
| 209 | most parks are in good shape | 1/1/2022 9:10 PM |
| 210 | Pickleball courts and sand volleyball courts. | 1/1/2022 8:51 PM |
| 211 | Shade and better seating for parents. | 1/1/2022 8:48 PM |
| 212 | more pickle ball | 1/1/2022 8:42 PM |
| 213 | More pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 8:38 PM |
| 214 | more pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 8:33 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 215 | More play areas for kids | 1/1/2022 8:27 PM |
| 216 | More pickle ball and tennis courts | 1/1/2022 8:20 PM |
| 217 | More Tennis And Pickleball courts. | 1/1/2022 6:59 PM |
| 218 | More of them and bear the coast | 1/1/2022 6:56 PM |
| 219 | More pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 6:39 PM |
| 220 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 6:09 PM |
| 221 | More Pickle ball courts. One near Kelly Park. | 1/1/2022 5:53 PM |
| 222 | shaded places to sit water fountains | 1/1/2022 5:51 PM |
| 223 | More Pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 5:44 PM |
| 224 | More pickles ball courts | 1/1/2022 5:43 PM |
| 225 | More Pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 5:42 PM |
| 226 | no dogs off lease enforced | 1/1/2022 5:14 PM |
| 227 | Better use of Space. Lots of areas not being utilized, where you could put a pump track/ Bike park/ or Skate Park. | 1/1/2022 5:05 PM |
| 228 | Either enforce no dogs sign or change the rules | 1/1/2022 5:01 PM |
| 229 | pickle ball courts | 1/1/2022 4:58 PM |
| 230 | More pickleball courts More open school fields | 1/1/2022 4:40 PM |
| 231 | Having a Coastal Park at Ponto with space to watch the sunsets, have picnics, possible 2 story building for cafe and viewing deck. | 1/1/2022 4:39 PM |
| 232 | Game room | 1/1/2022 3:51 PM |
| 233 | More pickleball courts (after sports fields for children of Carlsbad) | 1/1/2022 3:11 PM |
| 234 | Pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 2:14 PM |
| 235 | More shade around equipment | 1/1/2022 1:23 PM |
| 236 | More pickleball courts, more dog parks | 1/1/2022 1:13 PM |
| 237 | more off leash doggie play areas | 1/1/2022 1:03 PM |
| 238 | have some dog-free parks | 1/1/2022 12:12 PM |
| 239 | Safety, clean, flexible schedules, more afternoon activities, weekend activities | 1/1/2022 11:43 AM |
| 240 | More pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 11:42 AM |
| 241 | I think going to the parks currently is already pretty great. | 1/1/2022 11:38 AM |
| 242 | More pickleball courts. | 1/1/2022 10:49 AM |
| 243 | More free time | 1/1/2022 10:38 AM |
| 244 | More pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 10:36 AM |
| 245 | More Pickleball courts and less noisy 'blowers'!! | 1/1/2022 10:34 AM |
| 246 | Having one within walking distance of my home. Please work on the proposed Veteran's Park off Cannon and Faraday. | 1/1/2022 9:46 AM |
| 247 | Less Homeless people residing in the parks. | 1/1/2022 9:34 AM |
| 248 | Pickle ball and senior activities | 1/1/2022 9:29 AM |
| 249 | Trees shade and green space | 1/1/2022 9:25 AM |
| 250 | More Pickleball courts so I didn't have to wait until people leave. | 1/1/2022 9:15 AM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 251 | Adding more pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 8:57 AM |
| 252 | No vagrants. Updated bathrooms. | 1/1/2022 8:43 AM |
| 253 | Pickleball courts and lots of them | 1/1/2022 8:42 AM |
| 254 | Maintenance | 1/1/2022 8:32 AM |
| 255 | Please build a dedicated bicycle park. I know Veterans is on the books but it's going far to slow. It's been how many years since the city recognized the need? | 1/1/2022 7:57 AM |
| 256 | pickle ball courts | 1/1/2022 7:55 AM |
| 257 | Convert some of the under utilized tennis courts to dedicated pickleball courts. | 1/1/2022 7:53 AM |
| 258 | more walking trails | 1/1/2022 7:43 AM |
| 259 | More Pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 7:38 AM |
| 260 | More pickleball courts so that they aren't so crowded. Allowing dogs on leash. Outdoor fitness classes | 1/1/2022 7:38 AM |
| 261 | More easy walking trails within the parks. | 1/1/2022 7:27 AM |
| 262 | Permanent removal of homeless individuals. For example, Pine Park and McGee, the situation was cleaned up and as of this week, worse than ever. What is the homeless task force and millions of \$\$\$ doing.????? | 1/1/2022 7:01 AM |
| 263 | Pickleball courts at more parks. There is often a wait to play at Poinsettia. | 1/1/2022 6:59 AM |
| 264 | Handicap accessible and special needs equipment for kids in wheelchairs | 1/1/2022 6:42 AM |
| 265 | open play pickle ball courts. | 1/1/2022 5:34 AM |
| 266 | Sometimes crowded | 1/1/2022 3:15 AM |
| 267 | Indoor basketball and rec center at Poinsettia park. Double the pickleball courts at least. | 1/1/2022 1:26 AM |
| 268 | More Pickleball courts die to extreme demand | 12/31/2021 11:42 PM |
| 269 | Outdoor tennis and pickle ball | 12/31/2021 10:29 PM |
| 270 | More Pickleball courts! | 12/31/2021 9:45 PM |
| 271 | Shade Trails that are connected (the hiking and biking trails are super short and disconnected). safe pathways for kids to walk and bike to parks. | 12/31/2021 9:34 PM |
| 272 | More pickle ball families 👍😊 | 12/31/2021 9:13 PM |
| 273 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 8:47 PM |
| 274 | 1. Replace benches to Models homeless and transients cannot sleep. 2. Enforce to keep off dogs unless it's a dog park. | 12/31/2021 8:44 PM |
| 275 | add pickleball courts to Alga norte or nearby that area | 12/31/2021 8:39 PM |
| 276 | No homeless people | 12/31/2021 8:12 PM |
| 277 | more running trails | 12/31/2021 6:39 PM |
| 278 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 6:38 PM |
| 279 | Employees who know how to greet & interact with the public. | 12/31/2021 6:12 PM |
| 280 | Bike paths that are off the road to get to the parks. | 12/31/2021 6:02 PM |
| 281 | Allow dogs | 12/31/2021 5:41 PM |
| 282 | More parking, more sun protection. | 12/31/2021 5:40 PM |
| 283 | Outdoor pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 5:33 PM |
| 284 | I use Poinsettia Park all the time and with the improvements currently in the works, it's PERFECT!! | 12/31/2021 4:56 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 285 | More Pickleball Courts | 12/31/2021 4:35 PM |
| 286 | Allow leashed dogs | 12/31/2021 4:25 PM |
| 287 | Getting rid of the homeless who spoil it for the rest of us. | 12/31/2021 4:22 PM |
| 288 | I go for pickleball at Poinsettia Park | 12/31/2021 4:18 PM |
| 289 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 4:15 PM |
| 290 | More pickleball courts outside and available. | 12/31/2021 4:13 PM |
| 291 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 3:55 PM |
| 292 | Adequate parking | 12/31/2021 3:52 PM |
| 293 | more pickleball cts | 12/31/2021 3:49 PM |
| 294 | Safe bike paths to get to the parks, bike racks in the parks | 12/31/2021 3:47 PM |
| 295 | Voting at Alga Norte was great. | 12/31/2021 3:44 PM |
| 296 | Aviara community park needs to have another exit route. | 12/31/2021 3:26 PM |
| 297 | More seating near shade trees | 12/31/2021 3:24 PM |
| 298 | More Pickleball Courts | 12/31/2021 3:05 PM |
| 299 | Relaxing areas with pleasant surroundings. | 12/31/2021 3:05 PM |
| 300 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 2:59 PM |
| 301 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 2:58 PM |
| 302 | more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 2:58 PM |
| 303 | more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 2:55 PM |
| 304 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 2:55 PM |
| 305 | covered picnic areas | 12/31/2021 2:53 PM |
| 306 | to keep clean avoid hazards such as those skate boarding on sidewalks as their error causes other suffering. | 12/31/2021 2:43 PM |
| 307 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 2:26 PM |
| 308 | More lifeguards at Monroe st pool! Less homeless in downtown parks...a sad situation for all! | 12/31/2021 2:23 PM |
| 309 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 2:20 PM |
| 310 | more parking at some of the athletic fields | 12/31/2021 2:15 PM |
| 311 | More of them within walking or biking distance. Large parks. | 12/31/2021 2:09 PM |
| 312 | more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 1:43 PM |
| 313 | more pickle ball courts | 12/31/2021 1:40 PM |
| 314 | More Pickleball Courts | 12/31/2021 1:40 PM |
| 315 | We used to enjoy the Jazz festivals during the summer. But it was a little bit of a hassle to attend at a park other than the one near me. | 12/31/2021 1:34 PM |
| 316 | Trails or walkable connections between parks. | 12/31/2021 1:33 PM |
| 317 | Clean bathrooms, a broader range of activities (splash pads, frisbee golf, bocce ball, ninja course) | 12/31/2021 1:15 PM |
| 318 | Beach volleyball courts | 12/31/2021 1:14 PM |
| 319 | More tennis courts, dog parks, bike trails, exercise trails and play structures. Keeping them free of homeless and safe for kids. | 12/31/2021 1:03 PM |
| 320 | clean, open toilets | 12/31/2021 1:00 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 321 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 12:59 PM |
| 322 | More Pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:52 PM |
| 323 | More pickelball courts | 12/31/2021 12:40 PM |
| 324 | More outdoor Pickleball courts throughout the park system. | 12/31/2021 12:24 PM |
| 325 | Clean bathrooms, places to bike and skateboard off the street, shade, structures for older kids 10+, I hate to say it but less homeless people sleeping in the parks. :(| 12/31/2021 12:14 PM |
| 326 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 12:13 PM |
| 327 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 12:08 PM |
| 328 | more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 12:07 PM |
| 329 | Coastal Park in South carlsbad. | 12/31/2021 11:54 AM |
| 330 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 11:45 AM |
| 331 | More pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:43 AM |
| 332 | more picnic tables. | 12/31/2021 11:35 AM |
| 333 | More Pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 11:31 AM |
| 334 | More parking spaces | 12/31/2021 11:31 AM |
| 335 | No new ideas | 12/31/2021 11:30 AM |
| 336 | Pickleball's Local Popularity Is Outgrowing Available Facilities. I would like to see more pickleball courts and more multipurpose tennis courts that would allow you to play pickleball on the tennis courts. | 12/31/2021 11:24 AM |
| 337 | More shade. More tables with benches. | 12/31/2021 11:20 AM |
| 338 | Keep them open! Keep events | 12/31/2021 11:19 AM |
| 339 | Open beyond 10pm | 12/31/2021 11:15 AM |
| 340 | i can't think of anything | 12/31/2021 11:10 AM |
| 341 | more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 11:06 AM |
| 342 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 11:05 AM |
| 343 | Put a park in at s Ponto | 12/31/2021 11:02 AM |
| 344 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 10:57 AM |
| 345 | pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 10:54 AM |
| 346 | Allow leashed dogs. More baseball fields. Our baseball fields are often used by soccer and lacrosse instead of baseball. | 12/31/2021 10:46 AM |
| 347 | Pickleball courts! | 12/31/2021 10:44 AM |
| 348 | More Pickleball court | 12/31/2021 10:42 AM |
| 349 | Most are well planned and kept clean and neat for various activities. | 12/31/2021 10:41 AM |
| 350 | If your ads would feature the white people that actually paid for all these parks. | 12/31/2021 10:38 AM |
| 351 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 10:30 AM |
| 352 | nothing. they are fine as is | 12/31/2021 10:24 AM |
| 353 | Better surface on Calavera pedestrian/bike trail bridges. Too slippery. | 12/31/2021 10:22 AM |
| 354 | More pickleball courts with better spacing between courts, air circulation, and sound dampening on the courts. | 12/31/2021 10:19 AM |
| 355 | Pickle ball courts, dog parks, bathrooms | 12/31/2021 10:12 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 356 | More designated pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 10:11 AM |
| 357 | If you built more places for kids to skateboard, that would be great. | 12/31/2021 10:11 AM |
| 358 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 10:04 AM |
| 359 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 9:59 AM |
| 360 | More pickleball courts please. The wait time for a game can be over 30 minutes at times. | 12/31/2021 9:58 AM |
| 361 | More Pickelball courts | 12/31/2021 9:56 AM |
| 362 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 9:47 AM |
| 363 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 9:43 AM |
| 364 | Less home challenged individuals | 12/31/2021 9:41 AM |
| 365 | Outdoor pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 9:35 AM |
| 366 | nice and great pickleball courts!! | 12/31/2021 9:28 AM |
| 367 | Walking trails or walking track, community centers with activities | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 368 | More pickleball courts and restrooms | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 369 | Free parking - increased toilet facilities. | 12/31/2021 9:11 AM |
| 370 | more swimming pools | 12/31/2021 9:11 AM |
| 371 | More facilities for sports activities, especially more Pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 9:08 AM |
| 372 | No homeless people Allowing dogs on leash More art | 12/31/2021 9:06 AM |
| 373 | Ensuring they are clean and kept up | 12/31/2021 9:05 AM |
| 374 | Less aggressive dogs at the Alga Norte dog park | 12/31/2021 9:03 AM |
| 375 | We need lots more public pickleball courts with lights so working people can enjoy playing pb aftr work and play til 10pm!!! | 12/31/2021 9:03 AM |
| 376 | Food vendors, maybe. I'd like to see what we would get if we allowed food trucks. | 12/31/2021 9:02 AM |
| 377 | maybe an adults section? | 12/31/2021 8:54 AM |
| 378 | Letting me take my dog into more parks | 12/31/2021 8:53 AM |
| 379 | more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 8:52 AM |
| 380 | more pickle ball courts and at various locations. These are the most used of the city's sports facilities. | 12/31/2021 8:51 AM |
| 381 | More pickleball courts please! If they can't be built then at least turn some tennis courts into pickleball courts please! | 12/31/2021 8:45 AM |
| 382 | Pickle ball courts | 12/31/2021 8:37 AM |
| 383 | They're nice now | 12/31/2021 8:34 AM |
| 384 | 1. More native plants, making native plants a priority over exotic plants. This supports native wildlife, and essentially expands the usable area of local preserves. 2. I really like the outdoor workout area currently being installed at Calavera Community Park. Great use of outdoor space. 3. Holiday Park is a lovely outdoor space with the huge downside of noise pollution from the freeway. It would be great to collaborate with State resources to build a wall along the freeway at that location in order to reduce the significant noise pollution that makes that park unpleasant to visit. | 12/31/2021 8:33 AM |
| 385 | More skateboard facilities | 12/31/2021 8:31 AM |
| 386 | More dedicated pickleball courts!!!!!! | 12/31/2021 8:30 AM |
| 387 | More pickleball courts and dog parks. | 12/31/2021 8:29 AM |
| 388 | Ample parking Updated, clean facilities | 12/31/2021 8:26 AM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 389 | A bike park, pump track, another city pool. | 12/31/2021 8:26 AM |
| 390 | More tennis courts | 12/31/2021 8:24 AM |
| 391 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 8:23 AM |
| 392 | Connection to and extension of trails. Bocce Ball courts available at nearby park. | 12/31/2021 8:21 AM |
| 393 | Improved lighting (LED) is needed at the Valley St and Basswood CHS courts. There is more per person usage on these tennis courts over the course of a year than the 2 high school football fields that we all paid millions to fund. Secondly, a large acre off leash dog park is desperately needed. | 12/31/2021 8:20 AM |
| 394 | More bathrooms. More pickleball courtr | 12/31/2021 8:16 AM |
| 395 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 8:14 AM |
| 396 | Additional pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park | 12/31/2021 8:14 AM |
| 397 | More parks with hiking trails, more pickleball courts, more play equipment for children, and a dog beach. | 12/31/2021 8:08 AM |
| 398 | More shade, more trail maps | 12/31/2021 8:07 AM |
| 399 | Pickleball Courts | 12/31/2021 8:07 AM |
| 400 | more public pools. more dog parks. more pickle ball courts | 12/31/2021 8:05 AM |
| 401 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 8:04 AM |
| 402 | If homeless people didn't leave trash and drug paraphernalia. Some parks are very clean, but some have homeless problems. | 12/31/2021 8:03 AM |
| 403 | Not enough pickle all courts in the city always a wait | 12/31/2021 8:01 AM |
| 404 | having a park within a 10-minute walk from my home. Carlsbad's parks are not very very accessible. | 12/31/2021 7:58 AM |
| 405 | Additional Pickleball Courts | 12/31/2021 7:57 AM |
| 406 | No homeless | 12/31/2021 7:55 AM |
| 407 | We would like more pickleball courts. The Poinsettia Park courts are very crowded and you have to wait so long to play. | 12/31/2021 7:54 AM |
| 408 | More recreational pickleball courts. It's the fastest growing sport in America for young and old alike | 12/31/2021 7:53 AM |
| 409 | Nothing, they are already great! | 12/31/2021 7:52 AM |
| 410 | More pickleball courts at Poinsettia park | 12/31/2021 7:51 AM |
| 411 | more pickleball courts. because the challenge courts are monopolized by the the best players for 2 to 3 hours at a time until they are too tired to play many players do not go there anymore because of that. because the wait time to play on challenge courts is usually 20 to 30 mins or more while the same 4 people have a great day the rest wait then lose and then wait forever that sucks. no oter courts allow that around the country i have played many states and places carlsbad is the only place that would allow the same players to monopolize courts for as long as they please. usually you play 2 with your partner then split up or stay together and sit and wait for next game together this way it keeps things fair and equitable! for all players to enjoy your parks. i dont think you all know how bad it is and never intended it to be dominated by 4 or 5 players that are the best and therefore play continuously for hours i cant tell you how many times i and many others have showed up to play and left in disgust after sitting for 30 mins then losing to them only to sit for 30 again so we just leave if this policy changed it would be a much improved and happier place to play. because now what it means is wait and lose all day long its the least fun place i have ever played and dread going there. so keep the 2 courts as advanced players but you cannot allow unlimited play for the 4 winners it does not work! play 2 and split up or sit and stay with your partner andwait for next game like everyone else...this is how it is done at all other courts i have played i have played many places im still amazed the city would allow this kind of selfish domination of its public facilities its awe full. | 12/31/2021 7:50 AM |
| 412 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:43 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 413 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:40 AM |
| 414 | More parks in general and more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:37 AM |
| 415 | Better childrens facilities | 12/31/2021 7:36 AM |
| 416 | More pools pickle ball courts and hiking trails. | 12/31/2021 7:36 AM |
| 417 | Concert the Poinsettia tennis courts to pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 7:36 AM |
| 418 | More nature trails | 12/31/2021 7:33 AM |
| 419 | More pickle ball courts | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 420 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 421 | more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:31 AM |
| 422 | Pump tracks, mountain bike flow and jump trails. | 12/31/2021 7:31 AM |
| 423 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:30 AM |
| 424 | more of them! | 12/31/2021 7:28 AM |
| 425 | More pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 7:22 AM |
| 426 | More pools | 12/31/2021 7:19 AM |
| 427 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:17 AM |
| 428 | More pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:57 AM |
| 429 | More pickleball courts More walking trails | 12/31/2021 6:55 AM |
| 430 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 6:53 AM |
| 431 | Regular visits by security / safety personnel | 12/31/2021 6:48 AM |
| 432 | More pickelball courts | 12/31/2021 6:47 AM |
| 433 | More pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:45 AM |
| 434 | Nothing. I am happy with the current parks. | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 435 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 436 | More pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 437 | We stopped going to the parks in the village- too many homeless. Never know who is wasted or just plain unstable. Creepy houseless persons with their decrepit RVs. We do NOT feel safe. Pre covid, I even stopped sending them to camps at the village parks. | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 438 | Additional pickleball facilities | 12/31/2021 6:39 AM |
| 439 | More Pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 6:33 AM |
| 440 | The one I go to by the beach at Tamarack is perfect | 12/31/2021 6:26 AM |
| 441 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:21 AM |
| 442 | If have hiking trails connected to them. | 12/31/2021 6:21 AM |
| 443 | More pickleball courts A lot more.. | 12/31/2021 6:20 AM |
| 444 | More Pickleball courts in Carlsbad | 12/31/2021 6:15 AM |
| 445 | Better parking and more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 6:15 AM |
| 446 | More Pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 6:09 AM |
| 447 | Safety. Clear out the vagrants. | 12/31/2021 6:09 AM |
| 448 | Ability to take dogs to more of the parks | 12/31/2021 6:02 AM |
| 449 | Keep ensuring the equipment is maintained well & modernized, and that the parks are safe for | 12/31/2021 5:59 AM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

visitors, i.e., no drugs, homeless camps, etc.

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 450 | 25 more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 5:51 AM |
| 451 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 5:51 AM |
| 452 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 5:50 AM |
| 453 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 5:45 AM |
| 454 | More pickleball courts, more parking. | 12/31/2021 5:40 AM |
| 455 | A place to get away from urbanization. | 12/31/2021 5:25 AM |
| 456 | A better system for housing homeless people (available homeless shelter and prohibition of over night sleeping in our parks and hiking areas) We need restroom facilities in our open area hiking areas (Hosp grove and calaveras lake. | 12/31/2021 5:20 AM |
| 457 | More Pickleball and kid zones (water features during summer for them to get wet) | 12/31/2021 5:12 AM |
| 458 | More pickle all courts, more enclosed dog parks | 12/31/2021 5:06 AM |
| 459 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 5:06 AM |
| 460 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 5:06 AM |
| 461 | Keeping the kids play equipment clean and working. Not excusing dogs from the perimeter of most Carlsbad parks | 12/31/2021 4:54 AM |
| 462 | Adding a bathroom to the Hosp Grove Park! If possible (and reasonable), having more areas for dogs would be great, since we are such a dog-friendly city. | 12/31/2021 4:49 AM |
| 463 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 4:09 AM |
| 464 | More available pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 3:09 AM |
| 465 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 2:37 AM |
| 466 | The Poinsettia pickleball courts are to crowded. It would be better if some of the many unused tennis courts were converted to pickleball. Or new outdoor courts opened in North Carlsbad. | 12/31/2021 2:05 AM |
| 467 | More Pickleball courts. Open spaces for dogs and owners to roam. More dedicated baseball fields. | 12/31/2021 12:46 AM |
| 468 | more pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 12:30 AM |
| 469 | Remove all sand. | 12/31/2021 12:21 AM |
| 470 | More pickleball courts please :) !! | 12/31/2021 12:09 AM |
| 471 | More trees, trails, pickleball courts, soccer fields, football field goal posts, old kid (teen) play structure. | 12/30/2021 11:41 PM |
| 472 | Trails or sidewalks especially for the larger properties | 12/30/2021 11:34 PM |
| 473 | Additional parking spots. | 12/30/2021 11:31 PM |
| 474 | The European style of a series exercise equipment challenges. | 12/30/2021 11:30 PM |
| 475 | Specific things for sports, like lines, goals, goalposts, and courts for pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:29 PM |
| 476 | Our south western section of Carlsbad is underserved from a parks&rec point of view. | 12/30/2021 11:20 PM |
| 477 | More shade, more walking areas (like track material), clean bath facilities | 12/30/2021 11:20 PM |
| 478 | More pickleball courts please. | 12/30/2021 11:12 PM |
| 479 | Less homeless people hanging out at them. Cleaner restrooms | 12/30/2021 11:11 PM |
| 480 | More outdoor pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:07 PM |
| 481 | Less wait time at the courts pickle ball. And more shade | 12/30/2021 11:05 PM |
| 482 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 11:04 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 483 | Having a city park in the south Carlsbad beach area | 12/30/2021 11:01 PM |
| 484 | public pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 11:00 PM |
| 485 | More out door Pickkebalk courts | 12/30/2021 10:59 PM |
| 486 | Not sure | 12/30/2021 10:54 PM |
| 487 | Parking at Stagecoach needs to be improved. There is not enough parking on either side. Also, please make sure to adjust the water on the grass, because there are times when it is just too muddy - the grass is not getting a chance to get dry (even in summer). Also, the park next to La Costa Heights Elementary School is not a dog park, but there are always too many dogs there! And the dog owners do not pick up after their pets :(| 12/30/2021 10:54 PM |
| 488 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 10:45 PM |
| 489 | Pickleball courts and dedicated dog parks | 12/30/2021 10:31 PM |
| 490 | Pickleball courts, hiking trails, clean bathrooms, trees | 12/30/2021 10:28 PM |
| 491 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 10:20 PM |
| 492 | Off road parking and toilets | 12/30/2021 10:20 PM |
| 493 | More plays for big kids | 12/30/2021 10:19 PM |
| 494 | They're pretty great as they are. We don't have an archery range in north county. That would be awesome. | 12/30/2021 10:16 PM |
| 495 | More trash cans / less trash around. Removal of agressive skaters or vagrants. | 12/30/2021 10:12 PM |
| 496 | Completion of Veterans Park! Larger and cleaner restrooms. | 12/30/2021 10:11 PM |
| 497 | Young grandkids. Mine are all grown now!! | 12/30/2021 10:10 PM |
| 498 | Encouraging people to clean up trash after them on Saturdays & Sunday's or have crews clean on Sunday morning particularly when there is a large park event such as a softball tournament. | 12/30/2021 10:09 PM |
| 499 | Better animal control | 12/30/2021 10:07 PM |
| 500 | Less restrictions to use recreation facilities | 12/30/2021 10:04 PM |
| 501 | Walking trails without bikes | 12/30/2021 10:02 PM |
| 502 | Trees, grass, pickleball courts, | 12/30/2021 10:01 PM |
| 503 | More community gardens in the parks, like the Pine Avenue Park. | 12/30/2021 9:57 PM |
| 504 | dog parks organized clean and so nice! | 12/30/2021 9:53 PM |
| 505 | More hiking trail access leading to, in and around the parks. Pull-up bars at each trailhead near the park! Balance of trails and open spaces. Keep the area within the parks open and dispersed (i.e. not crowded). | 12/30/2021 9:53 PM |
| 506 | Outdoor pickleball courts available at more of the parks | 12/30/2021 9:51 PM |
| 507 | Hard to say, they're pretty darn good. | 12/30/2021 9:51 PM |
| 508 | If dogs would not be there. People bring their dogs, disregarding the sighs. | 12/30/2021 9:50 PM |
| 509 | More shaded areas | 12/30/2021 9:45 PM |
| 510 | No dogs, or at least enforced leashing and curbing. It is disgusting to have little kids run into dog waste when playing in the grass at a park. | 12/30/2021 9:36 PM |
| 511 | More walking paths. | 12/30/2021 9:35 PM |
| 512 | Bathrooms, shade, maybe splash pads. | 12/30/2021 9:31 PM |
| 513 | Walking trails, and fewer dog parks. | 12/30/2021 9:23 PM |
| 514 | Ply structures and climbing structures for older kids too. Bike parks bike parks bike parks!!!! Bmx and mountain bikes. Trails | 12/30/2021 9:20 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 515 | MORE PICKLEBALL COURTS!!!! | 12/30/2021 9:19 PM |
| 516 | Make more dog friendly parks. A new park or open public space should be the priority at South Ponto and Avenida Encinas instead of commercial development. | 12/30/2021 9:17 PM |
| 517 | More activities for the kids and a skate park at every park | 12/30/2021 9:16 PM |
| 518 | More of them | 12/30/2021 9:09 PM |
| 519 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 8:55 PM |
| 520 | More of them and connected to existing trails | 12/30/2021 8:52 PM |
| 521 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 8:51 PM |
| 522 | Less emphasis on dogs. Parks should be focused on people. | 12/30/2021 8:50 PM |
| 523 | More off-leash dog parks, without wood chips. | 12/30/2021 8:47 PM |
| 524 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 8:43 PM |
| 525 | More trees | 12/30/2021 8:43 PM |
| 526 | More Pickleball courts and parking as it's getting busy! Lighting for parking so it's safe. | 12/30/2021 8:39 PM |
| 527 | Nothing I think they're great | 12/30/2021 8:35 PM |
| 528 | Bike parks | 12/30/2021 8:35 PM |
| 529 | Installation of more pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 8:33 PM |
| 530 | More tennis and basketball courts and soccer fields | 12/30/2021 8:31 PM |
| 531 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 8:26 PM |
| 532 | More pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 8:25 PM |
| 533 | Dogs allowed. | 12/30/2021 8:23 PM |
| 534 | More Pickelball courts | 12/30/2021 8:19 PM |
| 535 | Pickleball courts! | 12/30/2021 8:19 PM |
| 536 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:18 PM |
| 537 | Lots of trees, water features | 12/30/2021 8:16 PM |
| 538 | Water bottle refill stations, bike maintenance station, | 12/30/2021 8:16 PM |
| 539 | More pickleball courts with a bathroom close by. We are old most of us. This is the most healthy thing we can do. | 12/30/2021 8:12 PM |
| 540 | Fewer homeless people | 12/30/2021 8:10 PM |
| 541 | Where absent, bathroom facilities so I'm not concerned about going to a park with kids. | 12/30/2021 8:08 PM |
| 542 | More Pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 8:05 PM |
| 543 | We love city parks but don't go as much any more since my kids are older | 12/30/2021 7:58 PM |
| 544 | Nothing. Love our parks! | 12/30/2021 7:54 PM |
| 545 | More Pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:53 PM |
| 546 | more pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 7:50 PM |
| 547 | More pickleball courts, and Paddletennis courts | 12/30/2021 7:49 PM |
| 548 | More pickleball courts and parking | 12/30/2021 7:48 PM |
| 549 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 7:48 PM |
| 550 | Nonsmoking/ vaping at skatepark. More free swim at pools. It is full with lessons most days. | 12/30/2021 7:42 PM |
| 551 | Bigger dog park in Carlsbad. | 12/30/2021 7:41 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 552 | Cleaner parks, including more consistent trash removal from receptacles | 12/30/2021 7:41 PM |
| 553 | If they were safe. While I sympathize with the homeless situation their presence makes me feel afraid. | 12/30/2021 7:41 PM |
| 554 | More trees and shade maybe. More art events after the pandemic | 12/30/2021 7:38 PM |
| 555 | More restrooms that are kept clean. More pickleball courts - it's the fastest growing sport in the US - has been for at least 4 years running yet Carlsbad is WAY behind in representing the sport. The number of tennis courts that sit idle is ridiculous. At the very least, double line half of the courts & have nets available just like they do at Cottonwood. At Poinsettia have one day a week that is men only & one for women only. Innovative & INCLUSIVE playgrounds | 12/30/2021 7:30 PM |
| 556 | Additional parking More comfortable seating in bleachers | 12/30/2021 7:28 PM |
| 557 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:25 PM |
| 558 | Bike paths to each one | 12/30/2021 7:23 PM |
| 559 | Quieter settings. Fewer homeless. | 12/30/2021 7:14 PM |
| 560 | More pickleball courts!!! | 12/30/2021 7:11 PM |
| 561 | More pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 7:08 PM |
| 562 | More pickleball courts! | 12/30/2021 7:07 PM |
| 563 | Parking meters for those who don't live in carlsbad. Are parks are full from people outside our city | 12/30/2021 7:03 PM |
| 564 | Shady areas, bathrooms | 12/30/2021 7:02 PM |
| 565 | Allow leashed dogs at all parks | 12/30/2021 7:01 PM |
| 566 | Up to date schedules available on your website. Holiday hours | 12/30/2021 6:59 PM |
| 567 | Tennis courts, Walking trails | 12/30/2021 6:58 PM |
| 568 | clean bathrooms | 12/30/2021 6:58 PM |
| 569 | the city coordinate personel to develop pickleball leagues or other kind of activities. | 12/30/2021 6:55 PM |
| 570 | A lighted walking/running track | 12/30/2021 6:50 PM |
| 571 | Better trail maintenance | 12/30/2021 6:48 PM |
| 572 | If I had more time | 12/30/2021 6:46 PM |
| 573 | More native plants and perhaps a butterfly garden ie plant milkweed for monarch butterflies. More trees and natural areas. | 12/30/2021 6:45 PM |
| 574 | More accessible features | 12/30/2021 6:43 PM |
| 575 | More shade over the play structures | 12/30/2021 6:41 PM |
| 576 | There needs to be more pickle ball courts at Poinsettia. Some of the existing tennis courts need to be predesignated for pickle ball. It would also be nice to have pickle ball courts at other park locations throughout the city. | 12/30/2021 6:34 PM |
| 577 | Easier parking at some | 12/30/2021 6:34 PM |
| 578 | More pickle ball courts. | 12/30/2021 6:33 PM |
| 579 | Pickleball courts at Calavera would be nice. | 12/30/2021 6:29 PM |
| 580 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 6:27 PM |
| 581 | Yes | 12/30/2021 6:26 PM |
| 582 | Have a non concrete walking path around the perimeter. | 12/30/2021 6:21 PM |
| 583 | ore dog parks | 12/30/2021 6:17 PM |
| 584 | More dog parks. | 12/30/2021 6:17 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 585 | More Masters swimming times with coaches | 12/30/2021 6:14 PM |
| 586 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 6:14 PM |
| 587 | More parking | 12/30/2021 6:12 PM |
| 588 | More pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 6:10 PM |
| 589 | remove homeless drug addicts | 12/30/2021 6:10 PM |
| 590 | cleaner restrooms especially at Pine ave & Magee | 12/30/2021 6:10 PM |
| 591 | Accommodations for the wheelchair bound | 12/30/2021 6:09 PM |
| 592 | Not sure I can think of anything. | 12/30/2021 6:09 PM |
| 593 | More pickleball courts Designated soccer field hours for adults | 12/30/2021 6:07 PM |
| 594 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 6:06 PM |
| 595 | Less homeless people. More open space for hiking and walking | 12/30/2021 6:06 PM |
| 596 | Bike parks and another swim facility. Alga Norte is now like a private facility for NCA swimmers. There are never enough lanes. | 12/30/2021 6:03 PM |
| 597 | More parks and more green spaces | 12/30/2021 6:01 PM |
| 598 | More of them | 12/30/2021 5:59 PM |
| 599 | Pretty good now but opening Monroe would be great | 12/30/2021 5:59 PM |
| 600 | I swim at Alga Norte at least once every week. I would go more often if the pool opened earlier. It opens at 6 AM during the week. I wish it opened much earlier on the weekends - it's too late for me to use. | 12/30/2021 5:56 PM |
| 601 | 20 more pickleball courts!!! | 12/30/2021 5:52 PM |
| 602 | Well-maintained playgrounds and lawn for playing. | 12/30/2021 5:52 PM |
| 603 | More pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 5:51 PM |
| 604 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 5:50 PM |
| 605 | Fewer humans | 12/30/2021 5:48 PM |
| 606 | pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 5:47 PM |
| 607 | more dog parks, with more cover/shade and grass | 12/30/2021 5:44 PM |
| 608 | Pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 5:44 PM |
| 609 | More seating in the shade. | 12/30/2021 5:44 PM |
| 610 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:43 PM |
| 611 | Find homes for the homeless. | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 612 | More Pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 613 | more tennis courts at some of the parks such as Calavera Hills park. | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 614 | If my dog could go with me | 12/30/2021 5:40 PM |
| 615 | The parks are great, the Alga Norte spa is a problem staying operational. | 12/30/2021 5:33 PM |
| 616 | Enforce no smoking and cameras at night | 12/30/2021 5:33 PM |
| 617 | More regularly scheduled programs like bird and plant ID at different parks | 12/30/2021 5:33 PM |
| 618 | Barbeques | 12/30/2021 5:31 PM |
| 619 | Clean tables to eat on | 12/30/2021 5:29 PM |
| 620 | No Dogs and enforcing no dogs allowed policy | 12/30/2021 5:29 PM |
| 621 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 5:26 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 622 | better parking | 12/30/2021 5:25 PM |
| 623 | More PICKLEBALL courts, PLEASE! | 12/30/2021 5:22 PM |
| 624 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 5:21 PM |
| 625 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 5:16 PM |
| 626 | More trails connected to parks or nearby | 12/30/2021 5:16 PM |
| 627 | I love them being open, bathrooms open. I like the open space, lots of benches helps. | 12/30/2021 5:16 PM |
| 628 | Prosecute the riff raff thugs who consistently give security, families, and young kids trouble without any real consequences. This is mainly a skate park issue at Alga. The same handful bad apples ruin the park experience over and over for the vast majority of residents and visitors. | 12/30/2021 5:15 PM |
| 629 | They are already great | 12/30/2021 5:14 PM |
| 630 | Clear signage, parking info | 12/30/2021 5:12 PM |
| 631 | More community gardens nearby to keep attracting community minded peoples attention to those amenities and parks. | 12/30/2021 5:11 PM |
| 632 | More shade and community events | 12/30/2021 5:10 PM |
| 633 | Safety is essential, they are clean and well maintained. | 12/30/2021 5:10 PM |
| 634 | Fewer homeless people using the parks inappropriately | 12/30/2021 5:08 PM |
| 635 | Occasional patrols for safety | 12/30/2021 5:08 PM |
| 636 | Active live web cam of (pickleball) courts to determine how busy it is prior to driving to Poinsettia. | 12/30/2021 5:08 PM |
| 637 | Bike trail @ Veterans' Park | 12/30/2021 5:07 PM |
| 638 | Access to dog friendly space. Walking paths Cleaner and safer bathrooms Shade/covered dugouts at Poinsettia park. Better more organized parking lots | 12/30/2021 5:07 PM |
| 639 | More shade on play structures. More parking at some parks. Water play areas for kids. | 12/30/2021 5:06 PM |
| 640 | Less homeless | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 641 | Parking at Poinsettia | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 642 | Pickleball courts are always so crowded. I like to play on competitve courts and the wait is too long. The sport is growing faster than anyone can keep up so now I belong to Castle Creek. It sucks because Poinsettia is a 10 minute drive and CC is 30. | 12/30/2021 5:04 PM |
| 643 | Removing the homeless that live there. | 12/30/2021 5:04 PM |
| 644 | More pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 5:03 PM |
| 645 | Safety | 12/30/2021 5:02 PM |
| 646 | Additional trails | 12/30/2021 5:01 PM |
| 647 | More open swim time. | 12/30/2021 4:59 PM |
| 648 | More natural spaces (keep the natural ecosystem rather than turn it all into a developed park) | 12/30/2021 4:54 PM |
| 649 | More Skateboard parks. More MOuntain bike trails. | 12/30/2021 4:53 PM |
| 650 | Outdoor work out equipment, more events | 12/30/2021 4:52 PM |
| 651 | Not much. I think Carlsbad has already done a great job. At least, for the area within a couple of miles from my home. | 12/30/2021 4:52 PM |
| 652 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 4:51 PM |
| 653 | later swim times at Alga Norte swim complex. Turning more of the tennis courts into Pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park or add courts to other parks. | 12/30/2021 4:49 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 654 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 4:47 PM |
| 655 | Allowing dogs in more parks. | 12/30/2021 4:46 PM |
| 656 | Improved/updated playgrounds and clean bathrooms with soap. | 12/30/2021 4:46 PM |
| 657 | More benches and places where small groups (5 and less) can meet. Also, prohibiting sleeping in the park. | 12/30/2021 4:46 PM |
| 658 | Allowing dogs | 12/30/2021 4:45 PM |
| 659 | It would be great if there were some beach parks. It would be nice if the homeless had their own areas so that they wouldn't disturb those who find them bothersome. | 12/30/2021 4:45 PM |
| 660 | More solar panels that provide shaded parking. | 12/30/2021 4:45 PM |
| 661 | Better, safer and more abundant parking. Better and cleaner drinking fountains and restrooms. | 12/30/2021 4:44 PM |
| 662 | permission to walk my dog on leash | 12/30/2021 4:43 PM |
| 663 | More trails | 12/30/2021 4:42 PM |
| 664 | Green space, walkways | 12/30/2021 4:41 PM |
| 665 | Allow leased dogs to be walked. | 12/30/2021 4:40 PM |
| 666 | Volleyball courts. I'm not sure why you dedicated so much space to the dog park at poinsettia. That was disappointing | 12/30/2021 4:38 PM |
| 667 | More swim lap lanes. More hiking trails and easy parking at trailheads. | 12/30/2021 4:37 PM |
| 668 | Having the park grass area's for families. All I see is youth groups out ripping the park open area's up playing soccer. | 12/30/2021 4:34 PM |
| 669 | Within walking distance. Can't drive to them. | 12/30/2021 4:31 PM |
| 670 | I'm a swimmer, and use the Alga Norte Aquatic facility. | 12/30/2021 4:31 PM |
| 671 | Open 50m lanes at Alga Norte Aquatic Center | 12/30/2021 4:30 PM |
| 672 | It would be better if it felt safer. Some of the parks have people doing drugs. | 12/30/2021 4:29 PM |
| 673 | please do not let homeless take over a portion of a park | 12/30/2021 4:28 PM |
| 674 | Food trucks, wine bar, local arts and stuff | 12/30/2021 4:27 PM |
| 675 | Some grills at poinsettia park. | 12/30/2021 4:26 PM |
| 676 | Skateparks Trees | 12/30/2021 4:25 PM |
| 677 | More walking paths that add mileage | 12/30/2021 4:24 PM |
| 678 | More trees | 12/30/2021 4:24 PM |
| 679 | Speed up completion of construction projects (e.g. Poinsettia park) | 12/30/2021 4:24 PM |
| 680 | Safe play apparatus for children under 8. | 12/30/2021 4:20 PM |
| 681 | More availability of handicap parking spots. | 12/30/2021 4:19 PM |
| 682 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 4:17 PM |
| 683 | Re-open lap swimming hours at Monroe Street Pool | 12/30/2021 4:17 PM |
| 684 | If there was a park for meditation or mind clearing. One with a fountain and quiet zone. No kids. | 12/30/2021 4:16 PM |
| 685 | All dogs on leashes & an alternative for houseless people | 12/30/2021 4:15 PM |
| 686 | Safer | 12/30/2021 4:13 PM |
| 687 | More recreation and play equipment | 12/30/2021 4:13 PM |
| 688 | More pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 4:12 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 689 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 4:08 PM |
| 690 | More pickleball courts! | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 691 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 692 | More bike trails More tennis courts | 12/30/2021 4:05 PM |
| 693 | Need more community garden spaces. | 12/30/2021 4:05 PM |
| 694 | More frequent trash pickup | 12/30/2021 4:04 PM |
| 695 | More PICKLEBALL courts | 12/30/2021 4:04 PM |
| 696 | Bathrooms at every park- Buena vista community park sadly missed the mark on this | 12/30/2021 4:00 PM |
| 697 | more interesting play structures. Other parks in other cities that I have gone to have balance, spinning and climbing structures that are very fun. There are also building toys (like large Lego) or large rafts with long poles to get across large but shallow ponds. There are treehouse type structures that the children can run across rope bridges and climb down rope ladders. We need more creative structures in our city parks! | 12/30/2021 4:00 PM |
| 698 | More pickleball courts that are free and lit at night | 12/30/2021 3:59 PM |
| 699 | More Pickleball courts An additional indoor gym (what ever happened to gym at Poinsettia?) | 12/30/2021 3:59 PM |
| 700 | More parking options....I know, that's a tough one. | 12/30/2021 3:58 PM |
| 701 | More tennis courts | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |
| 702 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |
| 703 | Water fountains tenth of a mile markers Chairs with backs Picnic tables | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |
| 704 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 705 | Having a park nearer to my residence. Nearest park is almost three miles away and across the freeway. | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 706 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 707 | More pickleball courts, please. | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 708 | Less crowded facilities. | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 709 | More Pickelball courts | 12/30/2021 3:54 PM |
| 710 | More pickleball courts please! | 12/30/2021 3:54 PM |
| 711 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 712 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 713 | sand volleyball courts at Poinsettia Park | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 714 | Access to Agua Hedionda would be a plus. Very disappointed that Coruso's project didn't go through | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 715 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 716 | Adult facilities, e.g., trails of longer than 3 miles in length, track and field facilities (they exit for students but not for the public). | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 717 | More Pickleball courts at Poinsettia | 12/30/2021 3:51 PM |
| 718 | Allowing pets in all areas on leash; have walks with poop bag drop off; | 12/30/2021 3:51 PM |
| 719 | Additional pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:51 PM |
| 720 | More pickleball courts! | 12/30/2021 3:50 PM |
| 721 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:49 PM |
| 722 | Evening masters swim option | 12/30/2021 3:49 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 723 | as long as we can bring our dogs there, they're good! | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 724 | The woody area at Stagecoach park used to be one of our favorite areas. We'd visit the giant tree, and walk a beautiful path through the trees. But at some point the park stopped maintaining the pathways. I understand the need for the fencing at the top of the hill, but people would ideally still be able to access the area through the main entrance. Would just take someone clipping the branches periodically. It's such a beautiful nature area, and I would love to be able to take my family into it again. | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 725 | More mountain biking parks | 12/30/2021 3:47 PM |
| 726 | More tennis and pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 3:47 PM |
| 727 | Need "warm water" aquatic pools for older residents, like the Arthritis Assoc warm water exercise classes. | 12/30/2021 3:47 PM |
| 728 | More Pickleball Cardiff | 12/30/2021 3:44 PM |
| 729 | Extended hours for the dog park park and more more after school and not school day options for elementary age youth | 12/30/2021 3:43 PM |
| 730 | MORE PICKLEBALL COURTS | 12/30/2021 3:43 PM |
| 731 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:42 PM |
| 732 | open space, natural settings, interesting attractions like the zip line and grass slides at the Encinitas park north of the freeway and south of La Costa Avenue. | 12/30/2021 3:41 PM |
| 733 | My kids enjoy outdoor park | 12/30/2021 3:41 PM |
| 734 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:39 PM |
| 735 | More seating. | 12/30/2021 3:38 PM |
| 736 | A pump track or place for kids to ride bikes on a bigger trail. More concert in park events. Dog park with grass not bark in north Carlsbad. Indoor pool. | 12/30/2021 3:36 PM |
| 737 | Less homeless people | 12/30/2021 3:36 PM |
| 738 | More parks, more swimming options, more mountain biking and hiking options | 12/30/2021 3:36 PM |
| 739 | Probably more Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:34 PM |
| 740 | More hiking trails | 12/30/2021 3:33 PM |
| 741 | More pocket parks that people can walk to. Also more dog parks. | 12/30/2021 3:33 PM |
| 742 | Closer parking in some cases. | 12/30/2021 3:32 PM |
| 743 | We occasionally feel unsafe at Pine Park, so we appreciate all the city is doing to help minimize inappropriate use of the park. | 12/30/2021 3:31 PM |
| 744 | Less cars. After all they should be parks not car- parks | 12/30/2021 3:29 PM |
| 745 | More walking trails & better lite trails | 12/30/2021 3:28 PM |
| 746 | Grass dog parks. | 12/30/2021 3:28 PM |
| 747 | Increase shaded areas with hard surfaces for exercises such as Taiji, line dancing, qigong and yoga. | 12/30/2021 3:28 PM |
| 748 | Bike Park and More Dedicated Pickleball Courts | 12/30/2021 3:27 PM |
| 749 | Native trees and habitat islands. Basket ball courts reserved for girls. The young males dominate the courts. Walls to bounce balls off. Security cameras. I am afraid to walk the canyon walk alone. Areas for seniors to exercise that don't have a fee. | 12/30/2021 3:27 PM |
| 750 | Enforcement of dog excrement & leash laws | 12/30/2021 3:26 PM |
| 751 | Would feel safer if there were no homeless folks in the parks and no dogs. People unleash their dogs so they can run free, not thinking that others might be concerned for their safety. | 12/30/2021 3:25 PM |
| 752 | not allowing dogs. Their owners let them crap all over the trails.....disgusting.....@ Lake | 12/30/2021 3:25 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| Calavera | | |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 753 | Ore pickleball courts and dog parks. | 12/30/2021 3:23 PM |
| 754 | More pickleball, less tennis courts | 12/30/2021 3:22 PM |
| 755 | Less homeless (any police enforcement whatsoever) and people picking up after their pets. | 12/30/2021 3:21 PM |
| 756 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:18 PM |
| 757 | More restrooms | 12/30/2021 3:16 PM |
| 758 | Lately I've noticed less trash cans. The ones that are there are usually full. Also the grass between the tennis courts are ridiculously long. | 12/30/2021 3:16 PM |
| 759 | More walking trails, more parking, benches or covered seating along the way, water fountains | 12/30/2021 3:15 PM |
| 760 | More off leash areas with separated small and large dog areas | 12/30/2021 3:13 PM |
| 761 | 1. My own discipline; 2. Meet up group | 12/30/2021 3:12 PM |
| 762 | Obviously MORE: more trails, more pickle ball courts, safe parking at Poinsettia & Calavera, more bathrooms etc. | 12/30/2021 3:11 PM |
| 763 | More walking/ running trails | 12/30/2021 3:10 PM |
| 764 | More pickleball courts all collocated so there could be multiple levels of play at one venue. | 12/30/2021 3:10 PM |
| 765 | enjoy greenery | 12/30/2021 3:08 PM |
| 766 | Homeless people removed. | 12/30/2021 3:07 PM |
| 767 | Seating for parents and parties, shaded play equipment. Enclosures so kids can't take off towards danger. | 12/30/2021 3:05 PM |
| 768 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 3:03 PM |
| 769 | More pickleball courts. Maybe 16 or 20 in one venue. Like other cities have. Build the courts the people will come. | 12/30/2021 3:03 PM |
| 770 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:02 PM |
| 771 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:01 PM |
| 772 | Nothing | 12/30/2021 3:01 PM |
| 773 | more walking trails and tennis courts :) | 12/30/2021 3:00 PM |
| 774 | Restroom facilities | 12/30/2021 3:00 PM |
| 775 | more knowledgeable trail maintenance workers | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 776 | nice as is | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 777 | More open space, better parking. | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 778 | If we could walk dogs on leash through the parks. | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 779 | More pickelball courts | 12/30/2021 2:58 PM |
| 780 | more shade doggy walking areas (leashed) | 12/30/2021 2:57 PM |
| 781 | More Pickleball Courts | 12/30/2021 2:56 PM |
| 782 | Allowing dogs and opening the snack shacks or cafes for quick snacks and drinks or things we may have forgotten like sunscreen or water | 12/30/2021 2:56 PM |
| 783 | More Pickleball courts like Pointsettia | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 784 | Swimming pools and tennis courts. | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 785 | Trails easy to walk | 12/30/2021 2:54 PM |
| 786 | Being able to find parking. | 12/30/2021 2:54 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 787 | Can't wait for the Poinsettia dog park! More pickleball & tennis courts. | 12/30/2021 2:54 PM |
| 788 | More trails and open space along lagoon. We definitely need more sports parks and parking. | 12/30/2021 2:54 PM |
| 789 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 790 | There great; I personally don't have enough free time | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 791 | more events, like the summer music series | 12/30/2021 2:51 PM |
| 792 | A less restrictive pandemic policy. | 12/30/2021 2:51 PM |
| 793 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:50 PM |
| 794 | recycle bins | 12/30/2021 2:50 PM |
| 795 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:47 PM |
| 796 | Pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 2:45 PM |
| 797 | clean and easily accessible restrooms clean sources of water | 12/30/2021 2:45 PM |
| 798 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 799 | More pickleball courts! | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 800 | More PickleBall courts!!! 😊 | 12/30/2021 2:42 PM |
| 801 | Trails, picnic tables, more pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 2:41 PM |
| 802 | Good food being available at a snack bar or food truck. | 12/30/2021 2:40 PM |
| 803 | More pickle ball courts and bathroom | 12/30/2021 2:40 PM |
| 804 | Pickle ball courts! | 12/30/2021 2:40 PM |
| 805 | More options/locations More walking/running trails Safer and more enjoyable environment. Less homeless, vagrants, and people hanging out and drinking would be nice | 12/30/2021 2:39 PM |
| 806 | Bike paths | 12/30/2021 2:38 PM |
| 807 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:37 PM |
| 808 | More local spots that aren't overcrowded. The big parks are nice, too, but it's nice to have small community centers and youth sports at parks that are close to your house and that you see/meet neighborhood friends at. | 12/30/2021 2:37 PM |
| 809 | Trails, dog parks, tennis, swimming pools skateparks at more of them. | 12/30/2021 2:36 PM |
| 810 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:36 PM |
| 811 | More fields and tennis/pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 812 | Additional Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 813 | More pickleball courts! The ones at poinsettia are WAY overcrowded. A simple fix would be to convert a couple tennis courts. We are waiting up to half hour for a single game! | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 814 | Fewer dogs. | 12/30/2021 2:32 PM |
| 815 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:31 PM |
| 816 | more pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:31 PM |
| 817 | Off leash dog trails | 12/30/2021 2:31 PM |
| 818 | Less dogs walking around! | 12/30/2021 2:29 PM |
| 819 | More parks by the beach. Easily accessible and connected to bike paths. More tennis courts. | 12/30/2021 2:29 PM |
| 820 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 821 | More skateboard friendly areas for smaller kids and beginners because they feel intimidated being forced to skate only in their skateparks due to HOAs banning skateboarding and threatening preschoolers who are learning to balance and glide on their boards with hefty fines. | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 822 | Clean restrooms, no vagrants, safe for families | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 823 | Indoor and outdoor fitness area with training equipment. | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 824 | Pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 2:27 PM |
| 825 | Picnic areas, walking paths, benches for sitting | 12/30/2021 2:26 PM |
| 826 | NO pesticide or chemical spraying of grass or plants | 12/30/2021 2:25 PM |
| 827 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:23 PM |
| 828 | A lot more permanent Pickleball courts and multi-purpose courts; tennis courts with Pickleball lines. | 12/30/2021 2:23 PM |
| 829 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:22 PM |
| 830 | More pickleball courts so less waiting time | 12/30/2021 2:22 PM |
| 831 | Dogs allowed on leash. | 12/30/2021 2:21 PM |
| 832 | Better control of people camping in the parking lot. Better sanitation. | 12/30/2021 2:21 PM |
| 833 | Enforcing the "No Dog Rules". It's not acceptable that the city put this rule on a sign as a "CYA" but do nothing to enforce it. Every park and beach access has it on the sign. It's not fair for those of us who want to be good citizens and follow codes and rules while others feel the rules of society are for others and not them | 12/30/2021 2:20 PM |
| 834 | Bathrooms | 12/30/2021 2:20 PM |
| 835 | Flatter lawns | 12/30/2021 2:18 PM |
| 836 | Extended hours at the Monroe Street Pool. Or even keeping the pool open during the day so the community can use it. | 12/30/2021 2:18 PM |
| 837 | Fields at Magnolia and Valley are super bumpy | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 838 | Fix the jacuzzi at Agua Norte | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 839 | More shading, natural vs artificial is better. | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 840 | Better choices for water for athletes, thank you! | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 841 | City staff test | 12/30/2021 2:14 PM |
| 842 | Old age-friendly such as bench for sitting. | 12/30/2021 2:14 PM |
| 843 | Keeping it clean and green | 12/30/2021 2:13 PM |
| 844 | More pools!! Alga is overloaded. It's a shame so many kids and teams need pool time and have to grovel at odd hours to get pool time... that's not ok for such a well Funded city in an affluent community | 12/30/2021 2:13 PM |
| 845 | more dedicated pickleball courts with shade for the people waiting to play | 12/30/2021 2:12 PM |
| 846 | Enforcement of no dogs. Dogs everywhere and off leash. | 12/30/2021 2:10 PM |
| 847 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 848 | More shade and pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 849 | Reluctant to go to a few parks because homeless make me feel unsafe in the bathrooms/ make me worried about my kids | 12/30/2021 2:08 PM |
| 850 | Possible snack stand | 12/30/2021 2:07 PM |
| 851 | Eliminate all homelessness and vagrancy | 12/30/2021 2:07 PM |
| 852 | Allow dogs. On leash. Dog parks are not the best way to safely socialize dogs | 12/30/2021 2:06 PM |
| 853 | work out equipment/ circuit type exercises for adults | 12/30/2021 2:06 PM |
| 854 | More pickleball courts! | 12/30/2021 2:05 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 855 | Keep drug users out of public areas. | 12/30/2021 2:04 PM |
| 856 | Better layout, landscaping and park benches | 12/30/2021 2:04 PM |
| 857 | Additional outdoor pickleball courts and the ability to reserve a pickleball court for private play. | 12/30/2021 2:04 PM |
| 858 | Clean and safe facility, many recreation options for kids and affordable, family event and special events for kids, build more new Otho of park in residential area | 12/30/2021 2:03 PM |
| 859 | No homeless people Dogs allowed | 12/30/2021 2:02 PM |
| 860 | Repair of Abha Norte spa pool pump! | 12/30/2021 2:02 PM |
| 861 | Convenient location and plenty of parking | 12/30/2021 2:02 PM |
| 862 | Nothing, they are beautiful and well maintained. | 12/30/2021 2:01 PM |
| 863 | Following your City rules! | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 864 | Dog parks | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 865 | Updated restrooms | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 866 | Bathrooms, more modern equipment like kids rope climbing and sliding hill like Olympus park | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 867 | Enforcing tickets for drivers idling in red curb zones; large open area to fly kites | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 868 | More pickleball courts! | 12/30/2021 1:58 PM |
| 869 | More paths, picnic tables, gazebos | 12/30/2021 1:58 PM |
| 870 | Shade. The new park, Buena Vista Reservoir Park really needs more shade! | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 871 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 872 | More restrooms and more parking | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 873 | More of them. | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 874 | Restrooms always need to be clean, well ventilated, and fully equipped with soap, paper, etc. Doggie poo bags available. Signs to clean up after your pet--if needed. I have not been to a park in awhile--so this is not a criticism. | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 875 | Improved restroom facilities. Updating playground equipment, walking paths | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 876 | More Pickleball court options. | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 877 | More pickle ball courts as numerous tennis courts are not being utilized. Just paint pickle ball lines on all tennis courts as nets are same for both sports. | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 878 | Additional pickleball courts at Poinsetta Community Park. | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 879 | A Real Dog park | 12/30/2021 1:55 PM |
| 880 | Improved safety - no criminal activity | 12/30/2021 1:54 PM |
| 881 | Sports in poor weather | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 882 | More courts for Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 883 | A small area to practice golf chipping and putting in these parks remote from The Crossings. | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 884 | More small benches to rest or have peace. | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 885 | Clean and convenient bathrooms at all parks | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 886 | More Pickleball courts that you could reserve | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 887 | More Pickleball courts please! | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 888 | running trails with wood chips like in eugene oregon. | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 889 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 1:51 PM |
| 890 | More biking areas | 12/30/2021 1:50 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 891 | More exercise options. Bike trails, pickle ball & hiking trails. | 12/30/2021 1:50 PM |
| 892 | Concert in the park | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 893 | Allowing dogs on leashes | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 894 | The playground equipment offered is outdated and uninteresting for all ages. I have family in the Midwest and their parks have endless options in their play structures. Our children deserve interesting, challenging and developmentally appropriate structures. I know they are available and the city has plenty of money to purchase, install and maintain them. It's embarrassing what other communities offer their children compared to Carlsbad. I am happy to offer examples. | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 895 | More concerts in the park | 12/30/2021 1:48 PM |
| 896 | More rest rooms and places to sit | 12/30/2021 1:48 PM |
| 897 | Better dog control in the dog parks. More holiday events. | 12/30/2021 1:47 PM |
| 898 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 1:46 PM |
| 899 | We need more mountain bike trails and bike-specific parks | 12/30/2021 1:45 PM |
| 900 | I can't think of anything. | 12/30/2021 1:45 PM |
| 901 | Quiet nature with babbling brooks. | 12/30/2021 1:45 PM |
| 902 | More trails and open grassy space for relaxing or picnicking. | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 903 | Grass is too wet to play on. | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 904 | Officially allow dogs | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |
| 905 | Community gardens | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |
| 906 | - A running track! - More trees and more grass areas are always nice. - Less space dedicated to dogs areas and more for people. | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |
| 907 | A grass dog park | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 908 | More parks and parks that are actually parks not a picnic bench on a plot next to the freeway that is called a park and added into the footage to achice the required total | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 909 | More outdoor music events, even small acoustic ones... LOVED the TGIF series! | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 910 | I would love a frisbee/disc golf course | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 911 | Having more native plants | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 912 | The online pool system schedule was awful, I changed to Oceanside as a result | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 913 | Less entitled Carlsbad privileged brats cussing and acting like they own it. | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 914 | I live be pointsettia park and I already love so much about it. Very clean and well kept. I am excited for the dog park | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 915 | More parking | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 916 | Less non-Carlsbad residents using the parks | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 917 | Ensuring that parks are clean and safe are of outmost importance. I think it will be good if you can offer group activities, e.g., Zumba, and outdoor events to attract more people. | 12/30/2021 1:37 PM |
| 918 | No ebikes. No motorized vehicles. | 12/30/2021 1:36 PM |
| 919 | clean | 12/30/2021 1:36 PM |
| 920 | More security | 12/30/2021 1:35 PM |
| 921 | They are crowded w youth sports teams and parking lots crowded | 12/30/2021 1:35 PM |
| 922 | More swim lanes | 12/30/2021 1:34 PM |
| 923 | fewer dogs | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 924 | Making separate bicycle routes as kids on bikes are careless about relinquishing sidewalk space to walkers | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 925 | more benches | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 926 | South Carlsbad needs a community pool - Stagecoach area would be great. Then LCC and other local schools could rent the pool for practices and sports events. | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 927 | Parking is difficult at some parks during sports events | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 928 | more runny/walking trails | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 929 | If the rule regarding no dogs allowed was enforced | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 930 | More parks in the Village area. Beach boardwalk/park needs benches with backs for seniors. Also, concrete on the boardwalk needs to be replaced. Ocean Avenue/beach parking needs more handicapped parking spaces. | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 931 | Security guards | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 932 | Have some type of regulations from homeless camping there overnight and taking over the sitting areas with there personal possessions | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 933 | More swimming facilities | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 934 | Enhanced pool hours at Monroe St pool | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 935 | Having s bike park with beginner, intermediate and expert dirt jumps | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 936 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 937 | Dog park | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 938 | Lights and not having the grass saturated | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 939 | Limiting the number of non residents. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 940 | BAN DOGS FROM GRASSY AREAS. KIDS CAN'T PLAY ON THE GRASS BECAUSE OF DOG POOP - EVEN IF PICKED UP, THERE ARE SMEARS AND SMALL DROPPINGS. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 941 | Bigger and better play grounds. More kids type educational events. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 942 | more running trails | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 943 | Allow leashed dogs to walk on side walks through the parks. I've been stopped by the park ranger for doing just that. | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 944 | Parks and Recreation Management doing a poor job of enforcing policy. All talk. Dogs in parks, off leash on trails, do not enforce community garden policy. Lots on waiting list but no action on inactive gardeners or those violating policy | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 945 | Making sure the bathrooms are always clean | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 946 | More poop bag dispensers for dogs. | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 947 | Monitoring homeless so that it does not feel unsafe to walk alone or take children. | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 948 | Abundant seating and shade | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 949 | maybe more dogs parks, more green space | 12/30/2021 1:24 PM |
| 950 | Having more pickleball courts including courts with lights (since I work during the day). | 12/30/2021 1:24 PM |
| 951 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 952 | more parks | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 953 | Parking | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 954 | They are safer, no shootings or a homeless problem. They are cleaner, remove graffiti and trash. | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 955 | No dogs allowed. | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 956 | Better/ More turf fields | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 957 | Plenty of walking space and trails, trees, native landscaping. | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 958 | One that I could walk to. | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 959 | If the playgrounds weren't so busy, more shaded areas, bathrooms at the smaller parks, an race track/field area for kids/adults | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 960 | Dog friendly and more shade structures | 12/30/2021 1:21 PM |
| 961 | Trees for shade, or areas with shade and seating. | 12/30/2021 1:21 PM |
| 962 | ample parking and clean restrooms | 12/30/2021 1:20 PM |
| 963 | More parks | 12/30/2021 1:20 PM |
| 964 | Allowing residents to bring along their beloved dogs, and offering MANY more off-leash friendly dog parks and trails - as most other cities do. Carlsbad comes off as very unfriendly toward family-member pets. This issue needs to be rectified quickly. It mustn't be left up to other nearby cities to offer Carlsbad pets fun places to play and explore, off-leash. The two bark-covered dog parks available in Carlsbad are highly inadequate, and cause paw injuries and veterinary expenses. | 12/30/2021 1:20 PM |
| 965 | Maintaining a clean and SAFE environment. | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 966 | more gardens | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 967 | Space and fresh air | 12/30/2021 1:18 PM |
| 968 | Continued upkeep/refurbishment of facilities | 12/30/2021 1:18 PM |
| 969 | Pet friendly, athletic opportunities like pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 970 | Have more shaded patio area for doing activities like Taichi or dance | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 971 | Clean/functioning bathrooms. | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 972 | More meeting places and party places | 12/30/2021 1:16 PM |
| 973 | Ample parking (including handicap spaces) and clean, accessible restrooms | 12/30/2021 1:16 PM |
| 974 | more bike areas | 12/30/2021 1:15 PM |
| 975 | N/A | 12/30/2021 1:14 PM |
| 976 | More dog parks, allowing dogs on leashes to walk the perimeter of the parks; a park west of I-5 in the southeast quadrant of the city | 12/30/2021 1:13 PM |
| 977 | More events | 12/30/2021 1:13 PM |
| 978 | walking path softer than concrete | 12/30/2021 1:12 PM |
| 979 | Bigger better playgrounds and skate parks | 12/30/2021 1:11 PM |
| 980 | Maybe more shaded play areas | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 981 | More versatile use tennis/pickle ball courts (we use pickle ball equipment to play "tennis") | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 982 | More shade trees and less over-pruning of the shrubs we have. Being able to walk my dogs on leash. | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 983 | Build a disc golf course at Hosp Grove | 12/30/2021 1:09 PM |
| 984 | If dangerous drug-dealing vagrants weren't there | 12/30/2021 1:09 PM |
| 985 | Our family uses the pool at alga Norte. More lanes for free swim would help. When I get off work and go to pool there's usually full lanes | 12/30/2021 1:09 PM |
| 986 | Maybe a sitting area that is a little more not so out in the open - an area where you can go to read, enjoy the sunshine etc. just not a park bench right in t he middle of everything. | 12/30/2021 1:08 PM |
| 987 | More pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 1:08 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 988 | Good the way they are. | 12/30/2021 1:06 PM |
| 989 | Adequate parking for dog park and soccer fields | 12/30/2021 1:06 PM |
| 990 | Love the parks. Sounds crazy but a rec room where people can check out items (board games, frisbee, bocce ball, etc..) This will bring in jobs | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 991 | A system whereby you could sign up late for a class, at least 2 weeks after a 4-5 week class has started, if the class is not full | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 992 | Clean facilities, accessible bathrooms | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 993 | being able to walk our dogs as we do in the city of O'side, Encinitas and Del Mar. Responsibly, of course | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 994 | I appreciate when the parks are geared for all ages. I love it when there's a walking path with exercise stations. I love playgrounds, skate parks, picnic areas with shade, and multi use fields. I find that the one thing the city is lacking is enough pools. Pools meet the demands of all ages and currently the 2 pools we have are impacted with the various user groups. Another thing that would make the parks better is if we had some beach volleyball courts with nets that were always up. The courts at the beach are always controlled by the tamarack beach volleyball club. | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 995 | If my grandchildren lived close and visited often | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 996 | Open space for off leash dogs. Pickle ball courts/ | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 997 | Shade and playground equipment that stays cool in summer. Some slides would cause a burn injury | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 998 | A concern is how to keep children's play equipment as virus-free as possible. If something could be done to address that concern, going to city parks would be even better. But our parks are very nice. | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 999 | More dog-friendly parks | 12/30/2021 1:02 PM |
| 1000 | More parks by the beach to enjoy our ocean. | 12/30/2021 1:02 PM |
| 1001 | Turn over the tennis and pickle ball courts to private management under contract with the city. Similar to Rancho Penasquitos | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1002 | Making a dog park like "Power line dog park" in Encinitas | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1003 | More varieties of botanicals with QR signs to download info, like at the Batiguitos Lagoon. More interactive stations. Meandering paths. Ample parking. | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1004 | Walking paths and nature trails that are non concrete paths, offering dog poop bags, trash cans , community gardens , more seating areas . Better lighting at Poinsetta tennis courts specifically the lower courts #1-4. Having bathroom built will be better too (close to the courts). | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1005 | Water bottle filling stations at all parks, more play structures intended for climbing (like rope climbing courses, climbing domes) | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1006 | I would like to see better "picnic" and "small event" facilities, such as outdoor or enclosed food prep stations where hand washing and serving counters with electrical outlets. In addition, small performance platforms with electrical outlets for gatherings. | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1007 | Less transients | 12/30/2021 1:00 PM |
| 1008 | If parks included culture like theater etc. | 12/30/2021 1:00 PM |
| 1009 | Vending machines | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1010 | More swimming pools | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1011 | Less drug dealers, esp. in the bathrooms | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1012 | Detailed maps | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1013 | Safety (homeless population) Age appropriate restrictions (fewer teenagers overtaking the park on their ebikes) | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1014 | They are great but maybe sanitizer stations | 12/30/2021 12:57 PM |
| 1015 | Keeping dogs off of fields that say "no dogs allowed". Dog shit and kids do not go together. | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1016 | More places to take dogs. More hiking trails. | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1017 | better parking and more pickleball courts. Also, upgrading the Dog park to grass instead of the bark that is currently used. | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1018 | concerts and gatherings with grass and picnic tables | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1019 | Allowing dogs | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1020 | Skateparks (or skateboard-friendly areas/features) in more parks. Restroom facilities in all parks. Water-bottle filling stations in all parks. Bike-friendly trails. | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1021 | We definitely need more pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1022 | Bathrooms | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 1023 | More sports areas, convert Stagecoach field 1 to turf so it can be used year round | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 1024 | More parks | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1025 | I enjoy hiking and walking. Emphasizing trails and inter-connected trails would be a benefit | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1026 | Better all around lighting, solution for muddy areas during and after rain, all dog parks be grass, more Rest Rooms and drinking fountains. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1027 | Clean bathrooms at all parks. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1028 | I would love to see some more variety of use spaces. Trails/tracks for riding non-motorized bikes with banked turns and small rolling hills. Level Asphalt or concrete trails for families to go on long bike rides or roller blading together (maybe with bathrooms and picnic tables at the halfway point). Dirt tracks for driving RC cars, maybe with small scale terrain features. This could be a great opportunity for youth to practice filmmaking and a tremendous resource for kids who desperately need ways to engage outdoors that aren't part of a competitive sports league. One thing all of north county lacks is a dedicated area for flying drones. This could adjoin RC car tracks and miniature filmmaking Towns and become a skill building hub that could lead to future careers for lots of youth. Perhaps an amphitheater for scout troops and other outdoor education purposes. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1029 | Nothing | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1030 | Parking for sporting events | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1031 | Can't think of anything. They are perfect | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1032 | Grassy dog park instead of wood chips. | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1033 | Not approving Severely Mentally Ill housing within close proximity to parks and schools. Patrolling parks to keep them free of undesirable elements...Holiday and Pine Parks | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1034 | Some fields (baseball) are not open because they will be used for organized sports in future, I would like to see them not locked up when not in use, since this is a public park, not only for paid sporting activities. | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1035 | more pickleball courts! | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1036 | Dogs in parks on leash to be changed | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1037 | More parking for events like FNL and soccer tournaments. | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1038 | Great lighting for night time walking & to enjoy the park in the evening. | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1039 | Less Homeless | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1040 | I would love to see native plantings and areas for kids to experience wildlife | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1041 | I prefer San Marcos and Vista parks because they are more natural and graceful. They have more trees, incorporate walking trails that not just dead, and have no homeless people. The playgrounds are more organic too. Carlsbad parks are very sterile. | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1042 | Less homeless people and vagrants. | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1043 | Snack bar, more benches for us old decripid people | 12/30/2021 12:49 PM |
| 1044 | more kid activities/play areas | 12/30/2021 12:49 PM |
| 1045 | My kids say: "bigger slide and zip line" calisthenics Stations | 12/30/2021 12:49 PM |
| 1046 | More pools | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 1047 | Having more pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 1048 | No sand. More table/benches. Shade. | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 1049 | Allow Dogs | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1050 | Skate or water features | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1051 | Less homeless people | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1052 | Bike park | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1053 | Opportunities for pickle ball. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1054 | If they had enough pickleball courts I would go every day! | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1055 | Natural features for kids to climb on. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1056 | I'm older and there isn't much in the parks for me. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1057 | Besides making them larger and more of them, not much. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1058 | More Pickleball courts. Cheaper access to swimming pools for adult residents. | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |
| 1059 | 1. More passive use pocket parks with nearby parking so older individuals can easily access an outdoor space, 2. allowing dogs on lease to visit the park in the passive use areas, 3. more soft scape; large trees and grass and less hard scape | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |
| 1060 | More softball parks | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |
| 1061 | More cleanliness and maintenance of structures | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1062 | more open field dog parks, more bike parks for teens, tennis or pickle ball courts, handball courts | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1063 | Having trails around the parks | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1064 | Designated dog areas Low noise areas Let skate parks have an area to themselves | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1065 | A better trail system in the open spaces. | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1066 | Dogs on leashes, and owners of dogs being more responsible, especially around kids, and knowing the rules. Also more open times for fields, seems as soccer rules all fields and has more times and it limits the fields availability too much. Or, post the times that are unavailable to the public, or even post times that are open on the fields for the kids to play beyond the limited green spaces | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1067 | More Theater Plays events. | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1068 | More bench space for sporting events | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1069 | More sports fields | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1070 | More walking paths | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1071 | Events. Live music performances. Food trucks (well, part of an event.) | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1072 | Nothing I can think of. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1073 | Quiet benches and areas. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1074 | Just making sure it's safe for all (no homeless living in the bathrooms, ext.) | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1075 | Actually, I feel you have done a good job. Wish the dog park closest to me separated the smaller dogs then I would use it | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1076 | If they were free of the homeless and we felt safe going there. | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1077 | shady place to walk | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1078 | More community events | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1079 | Having more planned activities | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1080 | Covered picnic and barbecue shelters | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1081 | Deal with homeless in the village. More bathrooms. | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1082 | Allowing dogs on a leash in the parks with notes to pick up after your pet. | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1083 | I think as we move forward past the pandemic, we have learned to appreciate multi-use outdoor opportunities vs. single-use ball fields, dog parks, etc. Moving forward, it would be great to think of park space as opportunities for all types of users, with park benches, small entertainment venues, walking paths, places for outdoor festivals and similar events, pop-up food kiosks, and perhaps even cafes or other dining options as part of the available offerings. I would love to see areas that are also designed just for the experience of enjoying space outside, which could include hard surfaces such as piazzas with fountains, etc. Finally, I think it important to not only "design" the park spaces, but also look at public access to get to and from the spaces, with consideration for well-designed, pedestrian-friendly opportunities. | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1084 | Easier access to parking. | 12/30/2021 12:40 PM |
| 1085 | Allowing dogs on a leash | 12/30/2021 12:40 PM |
| 1086 | More shade areas | 12/30/2021 12:40 PM |
| 1087 | Walking dogs there. | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1088 | More bike trails & bike skills areas | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1089 | More pickleball Courts | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1090 | Greener initiatives | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1091 | Would love a park closer to the beach near Ponto! | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1092 | less use by out-of-town residents. Sometime, due to Yelp ratings, the park and full of loud non-residents | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1093 | Meditation spaces, rock formations and statuary in a variety of forms. | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1094 | MOre parking at Poinsettia Park | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1095 | Clean and kept maintained | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1096 | More volleyball nets and outdoor Pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1097 | views, landscaping, tranquility | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1098 | Me having more time. Lol | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1099 | Pickle ball courts. Mini botanic gardens to walk through | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1100 | Bathrooms in all parks. I'm a parent of a toddler and we don't get to stay long at some of the parks because there is no bathroom for her to use! | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1101 | A better attention to detail. Cleanliness and anticipating patron needs is often lacking | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1102 | Pickleball players access of tennis courts | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1103 | Homelessness prevalence at parks near Village is unsafe for children. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1104 | Wish there were practice walls for tennis. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1105 | More Places to sit with shaded areas and some tables to picnic. Trash receptacles and recycle bins too. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1106 | Alga Norte pools are pretty close to perfect! | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1107 | A return to the original nature of parks . . . more shade trees, rocks, lawn, etc. , far less emphasis on athletic fields and competitive sports. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1108 | Keeping mentally unstable people with drug and/or violent behavior away from park users. More programs and careful monitoring are needed to help them and to safeguard the community. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1109 | greater availability of parking | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1110 | More shade for parents to sit in at playgrounds | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1111 | Special activities such as TGIF or other organized activities | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1112 | Keeping electric bikes off the trails. They are still motorized vehicles and they're dangerous. | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1113 | Dog parks adjacent with lighting and extended hours. More basketball courts. | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1114 | Activities for seniors | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1115 | getting Monroe St pool back up and running in the morning to lessen the morning swimmer burden at Alga del Norte Aquatic Center | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1116 | More pickle ball courts. (Could easily share with tennis courts, (like Harding Center shares with basketball). | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1117 | Dogs being allowed on leash | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1118 | Mountain Bike Park | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1119 | More lights | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1120 | More walking trails | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1121 | Bike parks. More pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1122 | Restrooms and more Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1123 | Improving the bathrooms or more cleaner pots potties | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1124 | More adult features: workout stations, walking tracks, disc golf, mountain bike parks | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1125 | More detail to picking up trash in the landscaping, weeding in the planter beds, and enforcement of dogs off leash at the park. | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1126 | No complaints | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1127 | More trails and bicycle friendly amenities like bike parks. | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1128 | More facilities for group gatherings. Indoor is less practical these days. | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1129 | Have more fenced in dog parks. Have a hand washing station at the dog park. I really like the Alga dog park and it would be nice if there was a hand washing station within the dog park area itself. | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1130 | More seating to watch our kids play, preferably with some shade. Better access by bike and walking. Streets and cross walks are not pedestrian friendly. | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1131 | A crackdown on the speed electric bikes. | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1132 | Events | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1133 | Open space for the dog to run | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1134 | more open spaces (greenways) | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1135 | Convert field 1 @ Stagecoach to synthetic turf | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1136 | Skate park. Dog park | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1137 | More lighting, more amenities - ex clean restrooms | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1138 | Clear signage re. when the bathrooms open /close in the morning / night. Better control of outside boot camps and yoga lessons in the park. These seem to pop up unexpectedly. | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1139 | Remove the homeless hanging out there | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1140 | They are great as they are | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1141 | Walking paths | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1142 | allowing dogs | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1143 | Fewer dogs. More soccer fields, more tennis courts, running track | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1144 | Don't let people spend all their time there. The park is for everyone to enjoy | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1145 | More parks and trails Safer bike roads, preferably separately from car streets More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1146 | Walking and shade area.relax and fresh air. | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1147 | Enforce dog leash and skateboard/bicycle rules at Poinsettia. | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1148 | If I had one walking distance from my house. Feel that we need perhaps smaller and more accessible (more quantity) of them. There is nothing to walk to by my area Luciernaga St. Carlsbad 92009. I have three little girls. | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1149 | Less number of club sports taking over parks during their practices. | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1150 | more parking availability | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1151 | Have more closer to home. Mini parks for kids in walking distance of each neighborhood. Take a lesson from Palo Alto, CA. | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1152 | well maintained bathrooms, well lit parking | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1153 | More parking during youth season | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1154 | Regular police and ir security checks on the skateparks. | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1155 | allow dogs ON LEASH to walk through the parks | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1156 | Expedite the bike park please. Then do more public private partnerships. | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1157 | Nicer grass areas to hang out on, more shade and trees | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1158 | creating a variety of terrain and experiences. Also providing more indoor sports space (for volleyball, gymnastics, etc) | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1159 | Nothing! Carlsbad has more parks with recreational activities than I could ever imagine. | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1160 | More shade / playgrounds/ skateparks / pump tracks | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1161 | Shaded areas, walking paths, creative/inclusive playgrounds. We moved here in 2016 from San Jose/Santa Clara. They have amazing parks. | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1162 | clean bathrooms, safe environment. | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1163 | Having a designated dog area so dog owners do not allow their pets to relieve themselves on the baseball and soccer fields. | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1164 | More Pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1165 | Dogs allowed | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1166 | Having a bathroom at every park. | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1167 | rid them of homeless, improve public safety, clean up the trash more often | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1168 | Connected to a city wide system of trails/bike paths. More trash cans and off leash dog areas | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1169 | not having to worry about the homeless who live at the park | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1170 | Less homeless people | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1171 | closer to my home, trees, picnic areas of quiet without noise and activity | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1172 | It would be good if the masters swimming coaches were there at each workout | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |

Q2 What would make going to city parks even better?

| | | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1173 | Better parking management (at Poinsettia Park) when there are large scale sports events like football and soccer. | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1174 | More covered shelter as it get too sunny or rainy | 12/30/2021 12:23 PM |
| 1175 | NO HOMELESS. Less garbage. | 12/30/2021 12:23 PM |
| 1176 | More lighting | 12/30/2021 10:24 AM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

Answered: 1,215 Skipped: 551

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Lack of congestion and crowded sidewalks. Fresh air. Coastal foliage and green spaces. | 1/11/2022 5:36 AM |
| 2 | My kids can run around and play on the playground | 1/10/2022 3:23 PM |
| 3 | Open space and equipment for children. | 1/10/2022 12:36 PM |
| 4 | Green and garden space | 1/10/2022 12:34 PM |
| 5 | Great facilities and maintenance. | 1/10/2022 12:22 PM |
| 6 | They are clean! Each one is different and there are so many options! | 1/10/2022 11:19 AM |
| 7 | Being outdoors with my family. | 1/10/2022 11:08 AM |
| 8 | Open space and fields available for public use | 1/10/2022 11:00 AM |
| 9 | playgrounds | 1/10/2022 9:47 AM |
| 10 | the natural open space and no high density housing | 1/10/2022 7:54 AM |
| 11 | No high rises or high density housing so we can enjoy the natural open space. And to enjoy an ocean view if we build Ponto Park! | 1/9/2022 6:11 PM |
| 12 | Freedom and beauty of where we live | 1/9/2022 12:39 PM |
| 13 | Family and community atmosphere | 1/9/2022 12:07 PM |
| 14 | great areas that have been kept up | 1/9/2022 10:09 AM |
| 15 | The peace and open spaces | 1/8/2022 6:21 PM |
| 16 | Access, close proximity to our home so we can enjoy picnics, open space, walkability. | 1/8/2022 5:35 PM |
| 17 | Pickleball and tennis. | 1/8/2022 4:47 PM |
| 18 | Nature and the beauty of the Calif.Coast, | 1/8/2022 2:34 PM |
| 19 | Watching the kids | 1/8/2022 2:31 PM |
| 20 | cleanliness, restrooms, parking | 1/8/2022 1:58 PM |
| 21 | Enjoying nature and sunlight, taking my dog out, open space | 1/8/2022 1:10 PM |
| 22 | recreational opportunity | 1/8/2022 1:08 PM |
| 23 | nature | 1/8/2022 10:29 AM |
| 24 | open space | 1/8/2022 10:23 AM |
| 25 | The open space and enjoyment in knowing it will remain | 1/8/2022 9:52 AM |
| 26 | Relaxation | 1/8/2022 9:42 AM |
| 27 | Open space. We live in a dense area where houses are right next to each other's. We need places To decompress | 1/8/2022 9:13 AM |
| 28 | Outside recreation | 1/8/2022 8:57 AM |
| 29 | Open space, lack of traffic. | 1/8/2022 8:56 AM |
| 30 | Being outdoors in a coastal community | 1/8/2022 8:28 AM |
| 31 | the natural open space and no high density housing, open space especially with COVID, a place to get away from cookie cutter spaces/suburbia | 1/8/2022 8:24 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 32 | Open spaces | 1/8/2022 7:47 AM |
| 33 | concerts | 1/8/2022 7:37 AM |
| 34 | The open space. The room to enjoy the natural beauty of the area without the intrusion of cars and dense housing | 1/8/2022 7:34 AM |
| 35 | The open space, no congestion, taking kids. There seems to be some space in the Ponto area for a park, near the campground. That would be amazing. | 1/8/2022 7:20 AM |
| 36 | Being with family and youth sports | 1/8/2022 7:17 AM |
| 37 | Great play areas for younger children | 1/8/2022 6:57 AM |
| 38 | Open space makes our area less dense. | 1/8/2022 6:34 AM |
| 39 | Seeing my kids enjoy themselves in sports or just playing in the playground. | 1/7/2022 11:46 PM |
| 40 | A place to walk the dog, relax, recreate, play with my grandkids. | 1/7/2022 9:21 PM |
| 41 | Having Picnics, small playground, playing with my dog | 1/7/2022 9:20 PM |
| 42 | The native habitats and recreational opportunities for all ages. | 1/7/2022 9:19 PM |
| 43 | Natural open space. Preserve and keep and protect natural environments and maintain as much open space as possible. Save nature and it's beauty. | 1/7/2022 8:59 PM |
| 44 | Playing with my grandkids!!! Hiking and getting into nature! | 1/7/2022 8:52 PM |
| 45 | Clean, well maintained facilities | 1/7/2022 8:39 PM |
| 46 | Being outdoors. Views. Birds. Seeing neighbors. | 1/7/2022 8:28 PM |
| 47 | Walk dog, family get-togethers, playing sports. | 1/7/2022 7:56 PM |
| 48 | the natural open space and no high density housing | 1/7/2022 7:55 PM |
| 49 | We can enjoy the day with our families and have a picnic. Please visit Moonlight beach in Encinitas and Fletcher Cove. We use parks in Encinitas due to lack of parks in South west Carlsbad. | 1/7/2022 7:48 PM |
| 50 | Natural surroundings, quiet, peaceful, fun activities like pickle ball | 1/7/2022 7:38 PM |
| 51 | Open spaces with views of the ocean | 1/7/2022 7:21 PM |
| 52 | We enjoy being in a natural space where everyone is happy, relaxed, playing, and enjoying nature. Watching kids playing in playgrounds, and sports fields. Adults hiking, biking, playing with their kids and grand kids. There is nothing better and we need more parks and open space. | 1/7/2022 7:20 PM |
| 53 | Walking, playgrounds, picnic space | 1/7/2022 7:15 PM |
| 54 | Fresh air and open space | 1/7/2022 7:08 PM |
| 55 | Open space, easy walking for elderly parents | 1/7/2022 7:05 PM |
| 56 | Uncrowded spaces | 1/7/2022 7:04 PM |
| 57 | Shady trees and turf areas | 1/7/2022 7:01 PM |
| 58 | Outside place to enjoy as a family. | 1/7/2022 6:58 PM |
| 59 | Open spaces and trees | 1/7/2022 6:57 PM |
| 60 | Being able to get outside in the sunshine (and even when cloudy) | 1/7/2022 6:47 PM |
| 61 | Walking and watching children play. | 1/7/2022 6:47 PM |
| 62 | Knowing my child can run and play in safe area. Letting my child meet and play with other children, the feeling of community when meeting other parents. | 1/7/2022 6:33 PM |
| 63 | Open grass spaces. | 1/7/2022 6:29 PM |
| 64 | Events, such as concerts at the park. Playing pickleball at Pointsettia park. | 1/7/2022 6:28 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 65 | Open space, nature, fresh ocean air... have we not learned the importance of these things especially during our pandemic? | 1/7/2022 6:25 PM |
| 66 | Visual relief from monotonous beige housing tracts | 1/7/2022 6:09 PM |
| 67 | Birds and wildlife, peaceful places to relax. | 1/7/2022 6:03 PM |
| 68 | The open space to play and recreate with my kids. | 1/7/2022 6:00 PM |
| 69 | the green open space, trees, vegetation and birds | 1/7/2022 5:54 PM |
| 70 | Open space & fresh air!! | 1/7/2022 5:49 PM |
| 71 | nature and open spaces; spending time with friends and family | 1/7/2022 5:49 PM |
| 72 | Being outdoors | 1/7/2022 5:43 PM |
| 73 | The open space. | 1/7/2022 5:43 PM |
| 74 | Being able to be out doors and experiencing nature vs. sprawl. | 1/7/2022 5:40 PM |
| 75 | Playground & soccer with my grandkids | 1/7/2022 5:30 PM |
| 76 | Usually to watch and play sports | 1/7/2022 5:12 PM |
| 77 | grandchildren playing | 1/7/2022 5:02 PM |
| 78 | Open space that was thoughtful planned out so residents and visitors can enjoy our beautiful city! We need space for our kids to play outdoors! | 1/7/2022 4:46 PM |
| 79 | Open space, large grassy areas, equipment for young kids to play on and get exercise. Swim facilities are nice. A park in the Ponto area could also serve 101 bikers, group training classes, etc. | 1/7/2022 4:39 PM |
| 80 | Get out | 1/7/2022 4:37 PM |
| 81 | Watching my kids get exercise and enjoy their friends. | 1/7/2022 4:35 PM |
| 82 | natural open green spaces, trees, trails, being in/with nature | 1/7/2022 4:31 PM |
| 83 | Get outside in the beautiful sunshine, converse with the people of the community and love to be a part of nature . | 1/7/2022 4:31 PM |
| 84 | The open area | 1/7/2022 4:26 PM |
| 85 | Watching my kids play sports (and being off their electronics!). Being outside away from the high-density housing areas | 1/7/2022 4:19 PM |
| 86 | Peace and quiet | 1/7/2022 4:18 PM |
| 87 | nature. fresh air, grounding | 1/7/2022 4:18 PM |
| 88 | Open spaces and events | 1/7/2022 4:14 PM |
| 89 | Being active and outdoors in communion with our neighbors | 1/7/2022 4:05 PM |
| 90 | I like the open space and trees | 1/7/2022 4:02 PM |
| 91 | I do not have a city park walking distance to my community. Ponto Park should be built for the southwest community! | 1/7/2022 4:01 PM |
| 92 | Family time! | 1/7/2022 4:01 PM |
| 93 | The outdoors, fresh air, the ability to get away from crowded areas, and just enjoy nature. | 1/7/2022 3:59 PM |
| 94 | Open space, natural landscaping, views of the ocean/surrounding geography. | 1/7/2022 3:57 PM |
| 95 | I love having a safe place for my grandkids to play with other kids and to meet with neighbors. We love outdoor sports! | 1/7/2022 3:55 PM |
| 96 | The open space to play games with my family | 1/7/2022 3:54 PM |
| 97 | Trees grass open space and serenity | 1/7/2022 3:53 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 98 | Seeing my girls play lacrosse and sports at the parks. It is good for their self esteem and confidence. | 1/7/2022 3:53 PM |
| 99 | Being in the community in a beautiful spot. | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 100 | Walking in a beautiful area and watching families enjoy the space | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 101 | I most enjoy the natural open space and scenery. Its nice to get away from the fast paced life and visit a park, and again, near the beach would be much needed, especially in South Carlsbad where I live. The worst would be doing high density housing at Ponto | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 102 | I enjoy the open space and landscaping. We must drive to our closest park since we live in southwest coastal Carlsbad. | 1/7/2022 3:50 PM |
| 103 | Peace and quiet. Open area to picnic and hang out with my family, play bocce ball. Provides open space instead of more density. Let's protect our coastal areas with parks, not more high-density condos near the beach. | 1/7/2022 3:50 PM |
| 104 | Well maintained. | 1/7/2022 3:09 PM |
| 105 | Accessibility, close to home. | 1/7/2022 8:35 AM |
| 106 | Quality of the structures and layout is great. | 1/7/2022 8:26 AM |
| 107 | Variety | 1/7/2022 7:19 AM |
| 108 | Recreation, social, exercise | 1/7/2022 5:25 AM |
| 109 | pic kleball | 1/6/2022 6:34 PM |
| 110 | Playing pickleball. Meeting friends for walks. Watching my kids play flag football games. | 1/6/2022 1:51 PM |
| 111 | Hiking with my dog and family | 1/6/2022 12:12 PM |
| 112 | Being outside | 1/6/2022 9:53 AM |
| 113 | Variety of activities. Open grassy areas to kick a ball, jungle gyms, courts, ball fields, pools, skate park etc | 1/6/2022 8:42 AM |
| 114 | Being outdoors | 1/6/2022 8:17 AM |
| 115 | They are well maintained. | 1/5/2022 11:57 PM |
| 116 | Playing pickleball | 1/5/2022 11:35 PM |
| 117 | open space and trails | 1/5/2022 6:24 PM |
| 118 | The ability to participate in active and passively recreational opportunities. | 1/5/2022 9:16 AM |
| 119 | Space to run dogs. Concerts. | 1/5/2022 7:08 AM |
| 120 | I enjoy useful & upgraded facilities like tennis & basketball courts. But the city has neglected the parks in old Carlsbad for too long! The city is constantly upgrading and improving parks like Bressi & Poinsettia. Enough is enough, the city needs to stop playing favorites to areas they think are more affluent and deserving of quality park services. More people are purchasing in the Old/Olde Carlsbad area. Many of us are affluent too and deserve to have updated parks for our children instead of the old neglected parks in our neighborhoods. | 1/5/2022 12:12 AM |
| 121 | The pickleball courts | 1/4/2022 9:27 PM |
| 122 | The Natural open space | 1/4/2022 7:13 PM |
| 123 | Pickle ball | 1/4/2022 6:51 PM |
| 124 | The open space and the pickle ball courts | 1/4/2022 5:36 PM |
| 125 | The concerts, bit I DO wish Parks would require some sound abatement. | 1/4/2022 5:26 PM |
| 126 | Playing pickle ball | 1/4/2022 4:52 PM |
| 127 | Playgrounds for kids and pickleball courts | 1/4/2022 4:49 PM |
| 128 | Pickleball | 1/4/2022 4:48 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 129 | Feeling of Open Space, respect for nature/environment, sense of community/tradition (national past time historic values of simple life) large undeveloped green areas | 1/4/2022 4:25 PM |
| 130 | Tennis courts, clean, safe, well-lit, bathrooms available. | 1/4/2022 3:35 PM |
| 131 | Enjoying the outdoors. | 1/4/2022 3:12 PM |
| 132 | Playgrounds, greenery and open spaces for calm and exercise | 1/4/2022 2:28 PM |
| 133 | Many are within walking distance. The spacious lawns for activities and picnics. I love how Holiday Park has all the sand, the kids love it. | 1/4/2022 2:16 PM |
| 134 | The diversity of activities available. | 1/4/2022 1:06 PM |
| 135 | Playgrounds for kids and areas for dogs | 1/4/2022 12:33 PM |
| 136 | Open spaces | 1/4/2022 12:31 PM |
| 137 | Being outdoors and enjoying our fabulous weather! | 1/4/2022 12:31 PM |
| 138 | The various trails, seeing people enjoying picnics, games, sports, seeing friends. | 1/4/2022 12:22 PM |
| 139 | Walking, hiking. Different ecosystems. Grass fields. | 1/4/2022 12:21 PM |
| 140 | pickelball | 1/4/2022 8:39 AM |
| 141 | Playing pickleball. | 1/4/2022 8:28 AM |
| 142 | Facilities | 1/4/2022 8:27 AM |
| 143 | Carlsbad has done a nice job with the playgrounds & they seem to always be clean. Also I always feel that my family is safe | 1/3/2022 11:58 PM |
| 144 | Green space and trees, activities | 1/3/2022 10:47 PM |
| 145 | Being able to play pickleball and not having to wait for upwards of an hour. | 1/3/2022 8:00 PM |
| 146 | open space, getting away from over development | 1/3/2022 7:03 PM |
| 147 | Being outdoors in a safe and clean environment with minimal traffic concerns | 1/3/2022 4:02 PM |
| 148 | Playing on the Pickleball court | 1/3/2022 4:00 PM |
| 149 | pickleball | 1/3/2022 3:36 PM |
| 150 | Well kept parks, different types of parks | 1/3/2022 2:14 PM |
| 151 | dog friendly | 1/3/2022 1:54 PM |
| 152 | Natural beauty, playgrounds, open space | 1/3/2022 1:37 PM |
| 153 | Beautiful outdoors, our weather and the friendly folks | 1/3/2022 1:12 PM |
| 154 | The open space | 1/3/2022 12:23 PM |
| 155 | The amenities, safety, green places, innovative place spaces for the kids | 1/3/2022 12:06 PM |
| 156 | cleanliness, dog friendly, lots of sports courts and activities | 1/3/2022 11:35 AM |
| 157 | open space; activities | 1/3/2022 11:35 AM |
| 158 | The open spaces with trees and kids playing on equipment and general sports activities. Walking paths, both wide concrete walks and some natural trails | 1/3/2022 10:58 AM |
| 159 | clean, accessible, open, safe | 1/3/2022 10:53 AM |
| 160 | Having green space available. | 1/3/2022 10:49 AM |
| 161 | I love talking to fellow dog owners and generally being out with people. My Girl Scout troop occasionally meets for special events in parks, esp with COVID | 1/3/2022 9:58 AM |
| 162 | Playing pickle ball and walking some of the paths. | 1/3/2022 9:39 AM |
| 163 | I enjoy the option to be outside in our beautiful city. | 1/3/2022 9:33 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 164 | Playing pickleball. | 1/3/2022 9:04 AM |
| 165 | enjoying natural open space, community gardens, tennis/pickleball courts | 1/3/2022 8:09 AM |
| 166 | Playgrounds, restrooms, cleanliness, trails | 1/3/2022 8:05 AM |
| 167 | The lovely landscape | 1/3/2022 7:19 AM |
| 168 | Walking trails | 1/3/2022 6:00 AM |
| 169 | recreation and exercise | 1/3/2022 5:08 AM |
| 170 | They are very well kept and beautiful. I go for the pickleball courts most of the time. | 1/2/2022 10:38 PM |
| 171 | Easy parking, lots of open space to run around, great play structures, good shade. | 1/2/2022 8:15 PM |
| 172 | size and diversity at each park. | 1/2/2022 7:55 PM |
| 173 | Clean, well kept | 1/2/2022 5:47 PM |
| 174 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 5:24 PM |
| 175 | Off leash dog parks and beach and walking paths -also soft ball fields for my husband | 1/2/2022 4:10 PM |
| 176 | Playing pickleball | 1/2/2022 3:58 PM |
| 177 | Outdoor space for kids to play | 1/2/2022 3:54 PM |
| 178 | The greenery and peace. Thanks for the upkeep and for caring. | 1/2/2022 3:32 PM |
| 179 | The open space and people | 1/2/2022 3:29 PM |
| 180 | Being outside and exercising through tennis, pickleball or hiking | 1/2/2022 2:51 PM |
| 181 | Playing pickleball and jazz in the park. | 1/2/2022 2:14 PM |
| 182 | Outside, open air | 1/2/2022 1:55 PM |
| 183 | Open space and swimming pools. | 1/2/2022 1:51 PM |
| 184 | Be in the outdoor space with my grandchildren | 1/2/2022 1:49 PM |
| 185 | Walking trails | 1/2/2022 1:27 PM |
| 186 | Making friends at the pickleball courts | 1/2/2022 12:58 PM |
| 187 | Being out of doors away from the inherent hazards of motor vehicles, e.g., noise, pollution and negligent drivers. | 1/2/2022 12:24 PM |
| 188 | So many great parks to enjoy our beautiful climate. | 1/2/2022 12:23 PM |
| 189 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 12:15 PM |
| 190 | Pickle vall | 1/2/2022 11:42 AM |
| 191 | being outside in a clean, safe environment | 1/2/2022 11:23 AM |
| 192 | The areas to walk and exercise. Pool access and the opportunity for sports teams. | 1/2/2022 10:22 AM |
| 193 | The play structures (the kiddo likes), the cleanliness, being able to enjoy a well designed outdoor spot. | 1/2/2022 10:02 AM |
| 194 | Getting our kids outside. | 1/2/2022 9:29 AM |
| 195 | Not seeing homeless people sleeping in them. | 1/2/2022 9:19 AM |
| 196 | Beautiful outdoor areas! The alga Norte pool! Play space for kids. Walking trails. | 1/2/2022 9:02 AM |
| 197 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 8:56 AM |
| 198 | With the exception of Pine, Holiday, and Magee parks, most parks are safe public spaces to enjoy open space and park amenities. | 1/2/2022 8:37 AM |
| 199 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 8:22 AM |
| 200 | Alga Norte pool | 1/2/2022 8:20 AM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 201 | Spaciousness, cleanliness | 1/2/2022 8:12 AM |
| 202 | Skateparks | 1/2/2022 6:37 AM |
| 203 | Being outside | 1/2/2022 5:23 AM |
| 204 | Meeting people in our neighborhoods and playing and socializing with them. | 1/1/2022 11:34 PM |
| 205 | I would enjoy using the spa If it was actually properly maintained! Since it is Not maintained I CAN'T ENJOY IT SINCE IT IS RARELY OPEN! | 1/1/2022 10:41 PM |
| 206 | open space | 1/1/2022 9:10 PM |
| 207 | Fields and play structures | 1/1/2022 8:51 PM |
| 208 | My kids enjoy the play structures. | 1/1/2022 8:48 PM |
| 209 | the beautiful green parks, pickle ball and dog parks | 1/1/2022 8:42 PM |
| 210 | Pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 8:38 PM |
| 211 | open-air, but not waiting in line to play pickleball. Courts are too crowded, obviously, we need more. | 1/1/2022 8:33 PM |
| 212 | The play structures for children | 1/1/2022 8:27 PM |
| 213 | Tennis | 1/1/2022 8:20 PM |
| 214 | Tennis and Pickleball games. | 1/1/2022 6:59 PM |
| 215 | Youth sports activities | 1/1/2022 6:56 PM |
| 216 | Play & socializing w people | 1/1/2022 6:39 PM |
| 217 | Trees | 1/1/2022 6:09 PM |
| 218 | Playing tennis, playing on the lawn, and walking the trails. | 1/1/2022 5:53 PM |
| 219 | the beauty | 1/1/2022 5:51 PM |
| 220 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 5:44 PM |
| 221 | Yes | 1/1/2022 5:43 PM |
| 222 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 5:42 PM |
| 223 | open space | 1/1/2022 5:14 PM |
| 224 | Baseball fields and currently because of the age of my children, the play equipment. | 1/1/2022 5:05 PM |
| 225 | Green grass and the opportunity to be in an outside setting with trees/open spaces to enjoy | 1/1/2022 5:01 PM |
| 226 | Seeing happy kids. Wonderful outdoor space with trees. | 1/1/2022 4:58 PM |
| 227 | Playing pickleball Walking and running around the school fields | 1/1/2022 4:40 PM |
| 228 | Safe, well lit spaces where everyone of every age can access the outdoors. So many of todays new townhomes, condos and apartment buildings lack a yard of any kind. | 1/1/2022 4:39 PM |
| 229 | Playground, sand box | 1/1/2022 3:51 PM |
| 230 | Playing pickleball | 1/1/2022 3:11 PM |
| 231 | Wonderful places for my grandchildren to play. | 1/1/2022 2:18 PM |
| 232 | Pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 2:14 PM |
| 233 | outdoors, fresh air, beauty | 1/1/2022 1:25 PM |
| 234 | outdoor activities for kids | 1/1/2022 1:23 PM |
| 235 | the swimming at Alga Norte | 1/1/2022 1:03 PM |
| 236 | hiking, sitting | 1/1/2022 12:12 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 237 | Cleanliness, safety, exercise, learning, meeting new friends and seeing the old ones. | 1/1/2022 11:43 AM |
| 238 | Playing pickleball | 1/1/2022 11:42 AM |
| 239 | The outdoor space. | 1/1/2022 11:38 AM |
| 240 | Open spaces. Well designed. | 1/1/2022 10:49 AM |
| 241 | Cleanliness | 1/1/2022 10:38 AM |
| 242 | Pickle ball community and beautiful outdoor park | 1/1/2022 10:36 AM |
| 243 | The open green areas secluded from baseball fields and playgrounds. | 1/1/2022 10:34 AM |
| 244 | The playgrounds. | 1/1/2022 9:46 AM |
| 245 | Open space, green grass, children's joy, places for gathering friends/families for parties, bbq, outdoor sporting games | 1/1/2022 9:34 AM |
| 246 | Exercise and meeting new people | 1/1/2022 9:29 AM |
| 247 | Kids play areas. | 1/1/2022 9:25 AM |
| 248 | Activities | 1/1/2022 9:15 AM |
| 249 | playing pickleball | 1/1/2022 8:57 AM |
| 250 | Kids sports, family fun, open space, walking trails. | 1/1/2022 8:43 AM |
| 251 | Spending time with people in our community doing something we all love and have passion for! Pickleball! | 1/1/2022 8:42 AM |
| 252 | location | 1/1/2022 8:32 AM |
| 253 | They are clean and well kept. | 1/1/2022 7:57 AM |
| 254 | tennis | 1/1/2022 7:55 AM |
| 255 | Nice and clean. Friendly staff. | 1/1/2022 7:53 AM |
| 256 | the green and serenity | 1/1/2022 7:43 AM |
| 257 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 7:38 AM |
| 258 | The amenities | 1/1/2022 7:38 AM |
| 259 | Walking, pickle ball, scenery and tranquillity. | 1/1/2022 7:27 AM |
| 260 | Open spaces with beautiful grass areas. | 1/1/2022 7:01 AM |
| 261 | Parks are clean, safe, and well maintained. | 1/1/2022 6:59 AM |
| 262 | Seeing my kids have fun | 1/1/2022 6:42 AM |
| 263 | Meeting new people playing pickle ball. | 1/1/2022 5:34 AM |
| 264 | Large, clean | 1/1/2022 3:15 AM |
| 265 | Facilities. | 1/1/2022 1:26 AM |
| 266 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 11:42 PM |
| 267 | Above | 12/31/2021 10:29 PM |
| 268 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:45 PM |
| 269 | Variety | 12/31/2021 9:34 PM |
| 270 | How the city of Carlsbad is always willing to improve everyone's experience. Especially the upcoming sports like Pickle Ball ❤️ | 12/31/2021 9:13 PM |
| 271 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:47 PM |
| 272 | Quiet time | 12/31/2021 8:44 PM |
| 273 | Pool at Alga Norte | 12/31/2021 8:39 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 274 | Trees | 12/31/2021 8:12 PM |
| 275 | running trails | 12/31/2021 6:39 PM |
| 276 | Playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:38 PM |
| 277 | Being outdoors & learning something new. | 12/31/2021 6:12 PM |
| 278 | Walking | 12/31/2021 6:02 PM |
| 279 | Open space | 12/31/2021 5:41 PM |
| 280 | They are clean, safe, modern, and offer many amenities. | 12/31/2021 5:40 PM |
| 281 | Walking, birdwatching and pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:33 PM |
| 282 | The open options to use fields/space early morning quietly/peacefully | 12/31/2021 4:56 PM |
| 283 | Exercise in a social environment | 12/31/2021 4:35 PM |
| 284 | Playgrounds, tennis courts, pickle ball courts, walking paths | 12/31/2021 4:25 PM |
| 285 | Greenery and quiet. | 12/31/2021 4:22 PM |
| 286 | concerts | 12/31/2021 4:21 PM |
| 287 | Nice people | 12/31/2021 4:18 PM |
| 288 | Pickleball,large green areas and concerts | 12/31/2021 4:15 PM |
| 289 | Playing picklebal lwith all age groups. | 12/31/2021 4:13 PM |
| 290 | Pickleball and kids flagfootball games | 12/31/2021 3:55 PM |
| 291 | The different types of playground and cleanliness. People are kind and respectful. | 12/31/2021 3:55 PM |
| 292 | Fun for picnics, gatherings and bringing grandchildren to play. | 12/31/2021 3:52 PM |
| 293 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 3:49 PM |
| 294 | Being outside in natural settings | 12/31/2021 3:47 PM |
| 295 | Activity for seniors. Have no kids, so those activities not relevant to us. | 12/31/2021 3:44 PM |
| 296 | Well kept, easy parking, clean & maintained facilities | 12/31/2021 3:36 PM |
| 297 | All of it, green space, trees, programs at recreation centers | 12/31/2021 3:24 PM |
| 298 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 3:05 PM |
| 299 | Peace and quiet | 12/31/2021 3:05 PM |
| 300 | Play pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:59 PM |
| 301 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:58 PM |
| 302 | picikleball | 12/31/2021 2:58 PM |
| 303 | Areas for children to play. Sports, playgrounds | 12/31/2021 2:57 PM |
| 304 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:55 PM |
| 305 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:55 PM |
| 306 | pickle ball concerts | 12/31/2021 2:53 PM |
| 307 | being able to walk or relax in a safe and clean environment | 12/31/2021 2:43 PM |
| 308 | Playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:26 PM |
| 309 | Swimming... | 12/31/2021 2:23 PM |
| 310 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:20 PM |
| 311 | facilities are in good shape and diverse | 12/31/2021 2:15 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 312 | Hiking, open space, native plants and wildlife | 12/31/2021 2:09 PM |
| 313 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 1:43 PM |
| 314 | playing tennis, soccer, pickle ball | 12/31/2021 1:40 PM |
| 315 | Playing Pickleball at Poinsettia Park. | 12/31/2021 1:40 PM |
| 316 | Sport fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, etc. | 12/31/2021 1:34 PM |
| 317 | Exposure to nature/outdoors. Allowing our children to play our participate in sports. | 12/31/2021 1:33 PM |
| 318 | getting my kids out of the house and active | 12/31/2021 1:15 PM |
| 319 | Hanging out assuming it's safe and there aren't a bunch of drug addicts around. | 12/31/2021 1:14 PM |
| 320 | Being outside | 12/31/2021 1:03 PM |
| 321 | sitting on benches and watching children play | 12/31/2021 1:00 PM |
| 322 | Playing pickleball. | 12/31/2021 12:59 PM |
| 323 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:52 PM |
| 324 | Engaging with friendly fellow community members! | 12/31/2021 12:40 PM |
| 325 | Pickleball is the primary reason, but my wife and I have attended concerts on occasion. | 12/31/2021 12:24 PM |
| 326 | Seeing neighbors, safe place for kids to play, keeping kids active, multi use, fresh air, there are so many different types of parks in the city. I love living in Carlsbad. | 12/31/2021 12:14 PM |
| 327 | The great friends I see playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:13 PM |
| 328 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:08 PM |
| 329 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:07 PM |
| 330 | Depends upon the Park. In the case of a) Alga Norte Park: the pool, the splash park, and the play area. b) Magee Park: the wide expanse of grass, the tall shade trees, and the rose gardens. | 12/31/2021 12:06 PM |
| 331 | Cleanliness and quality of the facilities. | 12/31/2021 11:54 AM |
| 332 | Playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:45 AM |
| 333 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:43 AM |
| 334 | playground | 12/31/2021 11:35 AM |
| 335 | Playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:31 AM |
| 336 | outdoors, fresh air, activity such as pickleball and tennis courts | 12/31/2021 11:31 AM |
| 337 | Cleanliness, variety, themes, activities | 12/31/2021 11:30 AM |
| 338 | The city parks offer a variety of amenities and are clean. | 12/31/2021 11:24 AM |
| 339 | They seem to be kept clean and inviting. | 12/31/2021 11:20 AM |
| 340 | Jazz @ the park concerts. Walking thru them. | 12/31/2021 11:19 AM |
| 341 | Quality of facilities | 12/31/2021 11:15 AM |
| 342 | variety activities available-waling paths, grass areas to lay on, picnic tables | 12/31/2021 11:10 AM |
| 343 | playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:06 AM |
| 344 | Using a variety of facilities. | 12/31/2021 11:05 AM |
| 345 | Versatility | 12/31/2021 11:02 AM |
| 346 | Playing Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:57 AM |
| 347 | pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 10:54 AM |
| 348 | Clean, updated facilities, beautiful trees. | 12/31/2021 10:46 AM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 349 | Space, foliage and native plants, clean | 12/31/2021 10:44 AM |
| 350 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:42 AM |
| 351 | We enjoy the open spaces and view the natural habitat. | 12/31/2021 10:41 AM |
| 352 | Open spaces. | 12/31/2021 10:38 AM |
| 353 | playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:30 AM |
| 354 | walking and hiking | 12/31/2021 10:24 AM |
| 355 | A nice safe space to walk around, see nature, kids playing, and pickleball. | 12/31/2021 10:19 AM |
| 356 | Enjoying our city and the outdoors | 12/31/2021 10:12 AM |
| 357 | Playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:11 AM |
| 358 | The peace and quiet. | 12/31/2021 10:11 AM |
| 359 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:04 AM |
| 360 | aquatic center, Alga Norte | 12/31/2021 10:02 AM |
| 361 | Pickleball and the great facilities | 12/31/2021 9:59 AM |
| 362 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 9:58 AM |
| 363 | Pickleball and tennis courts | 12/31/2021 9:56 AM |
| 364 | Playing Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:47 AM |
| 365 | Playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:43 AM |
| 366 | peaceful green relaxing experience | 12/31/2021 9:41 AM |
| 367 | We enjoy Alga Norte because of the variety of options for families. Also, having dog parks is important as many families don't have a large yard for their dog to run. | 12/31/2021 9:41 AM |
| 368 | Getting fresh air | 12/31/2021 9:35 AM |
| 369 | exercise/ sports | 12/31/2021 9:28 AM |
| 370 | Walking | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 371 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 372 | hiking | 12/31/2021 9:11 AM |
| 373 | kids play | 12/31/2021 9:11 AM |
| 374 | Open spaces, social interaction with others, facilities for activities. | 12/31/2021 9:08 AM |
| 375 | Well Maintained | 12/31/2021 9:06 AM |
| 376 | How well maintained they are! | 12/31/2021 9:05 AM |
| 377 | Walking with my dog | 12/31/2021 9:03 AM |
| 378 | City parks are for friends and family and communities to enjoy, year round because we are so fortunate to live in beautiful San Diego!!! | 12/31/2021 9:03 AM |
| 379 | Parks are clean, the bathrooms almost always have soap, facilities are in good repair. | 12/31/2021 9:02 AM |
| 380 | Softball fields | 12/31/2021 8:54 AM |
| 381 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:52 AM |
| 382 | being out in the sunshine and enjoying our great weather in a safe environment. | 12/31/2021 8:51 AM |
| 383 | Playing pickleball. It saved my life during Covid and I've been playing for a year now and LOVE it! | 12/31/2021 8:45 AM |
| 384 | Being outside | 12/31/2021 8:37 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 385 | Cleanliness. Safe. Bathroom accessibility. | 12/31/2021 8:34 AM |
| 386 | I appreciate the open space, large trees, recreation opportunities and integrated native vegetation at some sites like the riparian area at Poinsettia Park. | 12/31/2021 8:33 AM |
| 387 | Skateboarding | 12/31/2021 8:31 AM |
| 388 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:30 AM |
| 389 | They are nicely maintained. | 12/31/2021 8:29 AM |
| 390 | Outdoors Variety of spaces (playgrounds, sporting, open/nature) | 12/31/2021 8:26 AM |
| 391 | Outdoor space, place for kids sports | 12/31/2021 8:26 AM |
| 392 | Tennis | 12/31/2021 8:24 AM |
| 393 | Clean areas; well maintained; fits with City and surroundings. | 12/31/2021 8:23 AM |
| 394 | Open space. Clean, safe natural environments. | 12/31/2021 8:21 AM |
| 395 | These courts are generally well maintained and high in number (9 courts total). It is a favorite spot for the private teaching coaches. City parks are clean and generally safe. | 12/31/2021 8:20 AM |
| 396 | Meeting new people from the community. Being outdoors | 12/31/2021 8:16 AM |
| 397 | Clean and safe | 12/31/2021 8:14 AM |
| 398 | Playing and meeting people. | 12/31/2021 8:14 AM |
| 399 | I visit alga Norte several days a week. I appreciate the pool v much. Meeting friends at the park during pandemic was a wonderful resource | 12/31/2021 8:12 AM |
| 400 | Feeling refreshed by being outdoors whether alone or with others. | 12/31/2021 8:08 AM |
| 401 | Playgrounds, trails, skate park | 12/31/2021 8:07 AM |
| 402 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:07 AM |
| 403 | cleanliness, spaciousness, well managed/maintained | 12/31/2021 8:05 AM |
| 404 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:04 AM |
| 405 | Preserving the open space and beautiful views | 12/31/2021 8:03 AM |
| 406 | being outdoors is a healthy environment to be in well Maine | 12/31/2021 8:01 AM |
| 407 | For some of the single-purpose activities you can only do at some of the parks. I enjoy some of these single purpose activities. But these single purpose functions are also key Park limitations and prevent fundamental park functions of providing usable grassed multi-use space for all sorts of recreation. | 12/31/2021 7:58 AM |
| 408 | Outdoor activities. Well maintained | 12/31/2021 7:57 AM |
| 409 | Grass areas for games | 12/31/2021 7:55 AM |
| 410 | Walking. | 12/31/2021 7:55 AM |
| 411 | We enjoy the pickleball courts. We like that they have the low fences between the courts to prevent balls from rolling in to nearby courts. | 12/31/2021 7:54 AM |
| 412 | Pool activities. | 12/31/2021 7:52 AM |
| 413 | Pickleball! | 12/31/2021 7:51 AM |
| 414 | being able to play without sitting and watching the same 4 people play nonstop all day. | 12/31/2021 7:50 AM |
| 415 | Big, cleaned and well maintained | 12/31/2021 7:43 AM |
| 416 | Playing Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:40 AM |
| 417 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:37 AM |
| 418 | Taking my grandkids and tennis | 12/31/2021 7:36 AM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 419 | Large spaces to sit,play ,picnic that a clean and we'll maintained. | 12/31/2021 7:36 AM |
| 420 | The safe environment and welcoming community at the pickleball courts. All ages- from school age, teens, college, moms, retirees to octogenarians and beyond, socialize and enjoy | 12/31/2021 7:36 AM |
| 421 | Clean, safe | 12/31/2021 7:33 AM |
| 422 | Open land | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 423 | The open spaces, concerts in the parks, picnic areas and pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:31 AM |
| 424 | Watching my kids play | 12/31/2021 7:31 AM |
| 425 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:30 AM |
| 426 | jazz concerts | 12/31/2021 7:28 AM |
| 427 | Outdoor recreation and meeting new people. | 12/31/2021 7:22 AM |
| 428 | Our aquatic center but it needs to be bigger. The swim team uses it so much that other programs don't have water space. | 12/31/2021 7:19 AM |
| 429 | The park | 12/31/2021 7:17 AM |
| 430 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:57 AM |
| 431 | Pickleball walking | 12/31/2021 6:55 AM |
| 432 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:53 AM |
| 433 | Easy to get to by the bus | 12/31/2021 6:48 AM |
| 434 | Clean and safe | 12/31/2021 6:47 AM |
| 435 | Playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:45 AM |
| 436 | Well kept and clean. | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 437 | Meeting new friends and exercise. | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 438 | Pickleball facility at Poinsettia had changed my life. I would be there all day except it so busy at peak times that it's hard to get playing time. | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 439 | There is a lot to do, they are all close by and they are free. | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 440 | Meeting others while getting exercise playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:39 AM |
| 441 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:33 AM |
| 442 | Walking there at sunset | 12/31/2021 6:26 AM |
| 443 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:21 AM |
| 444 | Open space, enjoy walking around parks | 12/31/2021 6:21 AM |
| 445 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 6:20 AM |
| 446 | Pickleball! | 12/31/2021 6:15 AM |
| 447 | Playing at the Pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 6:09 AM |
| 448 | Used to be safe places to go with family. | 12/31/2021 6:09 AM |
| 449 | The green and spacious environment | 12/31/2021 6:02 AM |
| 450 | The variety of use-spaces, e.g., playgrounds, basketball, softball, etc. | 12/31/2021 5:59 AM |
| 451 | Tennis and pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:51 AM |
| 452 | Recreation and social | 12/31/2021 5:51 AM |
| 453 | Playing pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:50 AM |
| 454 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:45 AM |
| 455 | Location, pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 5:40 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 456 | Space, grass, trees | 12/31/2021 5:25 AM |
| 457 | Open space and playground and athletic facilities | 12/31/2021 5:20 AM |
| 458 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:12 AM |
| 459 | Being active | 12/31/2021 5:06 AM |
| 460 | Exercising outdoors | 12/31/2021 5:06 AM |
| 461 | Well maintained. Diverse and abundant activities. | 12/31/2021 5:06 AM |
| 462 | Play with grandkids, walk dog, walk trails. Availability of restrooms. | 12/31/2021 4:54 AM |
| 463 | How well-maintained they are. The restrooms and facilities at Holiday Park are always clean, the park is always in great condition. | 12/31/2021 4:49 AM |
| 464 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:09 AM |
| 465 | Open space and Pickleball. | 12/31/2021 3:09 AM |
| 466 | Clean well kept facilities | 12/31/2021 2:37 AM |
| 467 | Exercise | 12/31/2021 2:05 AM |
| 468 | They are generally well-maintained. | 12/31/2021 12:46 AM |
| 469 | playing pickleball with everyone | 12/31/2021 12:30 AM |
| 470 | They are clean, well maintained, and my kids love playing there. | 12/31/2021 12:21 AM |
| 471 | I live right by Poinsettia Park. Love the bowl & new playground. Looking forward to the dog park, too. | 12/31/2021 12:09 AM |
| 472 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:44 PM |
| 473 | Greenery. | 12/30/2021 11:41 PM |
| 474 | The beauty and diversity and accessibility for all of Carlsbad | 12/30/2021 11:34 PM |
| 475 | Cleanliness and green areas. | 12/30/2021 11:31 PM |
| 476 | Open space, the people, the trails | 12/30/2021 11:30 PM |
| 477 | Clean, lots of room, many different activities | 12/30/2021 11:29 PM |
| 478 | Crossings golf and beaches and trails. | 12/30/2021 11:20 PM |
| 479 | Space to move without cars nearby, trees and plants, swimming laps | 12/30/2021 11:20 PM |
| 480 | Playing pickleball with all sorts of people from all sorts of places. | 12/30/2021 11:12 PM |
| 481 | Landscape Picnic facilities | 12/30/2021 11:11 PM |
| 482 | Volleyball and pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:07 PM |
| 483 | Meeting people and playing pickle ball and walks. Enjoying the scenery | 12/30/2021 11:05 PM |
| 484 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:04 PM |
| 485 | Open areas with grass. | 12/30/2021 11:01 PM |
| 486 | How beautifully the parks are maintained and the variety of activities available. | 12/30/2021 11:00 PM |
| 487 | I like that Poinsettia park Pickleball courts are nice and well cared for. They are not "let go" like they are in Pacific Beach. | 12/30/2021 10:59 PM |
| 488 | How nice the parks are | 12/30/2021 10:54 PM |
| 489 | Our city parks are really a nice place for the community. They are usually well-maintained. | 12/30/2021 10:54 PM |
| 490 | The friendly community | 12/30/2021 10:45 PM |
| 491 | Seeing neighbors and hearing kids play | 12/30/2021 10:31 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 492 | Pickleball, trails | 12/30/2021 10:28 PM |
| 493 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 10:20 PM |
| 494 | Quietness | 12/30/2021 10:20 PM |
| 495 | The green areas | 12/30/2021 10:19 PM |
| 496 | They're so clean!! The staff that take care of them do an excellent job. The trash is almost never overflowing and the dog park off Carlsbad village is always well taken care of. They bring fresh chips regularly, and I swear a poop fairy must come by every night because I rarely see any poop. Our residents are pretty good about it, but not THAT good. | 12/30/2021 10:16 PM |
| 497 | Nature | 12/30/2021 10:12 PM |
| 498 | Walking, enjoying the views. | 12/30/2021 10:11 PM |
| 499 | Freedom to run and play in a safe, beautiful setting. | 12/30/2021 10:10 PM |
| 500 | Playgrounds children | 12/30/2021 10:09 PM |
| 501 | Open space | 12/30/2021 10:07 PM |
| 502 | Walking dogs, using tennis courts to get exercise to play pickleball. | 12/30/2021 10:04 PM |
| 503 | Walking spaces | 12/30/2021 10:02 PM |
| 504 | Benches, picnic areas | 12/30/2021 10:01 PM |
| 505 | A chance to see other members of my community in an outdoor setting. | 12/30/2021 9:57 PM |
| 506 | Concerts in the park. Hire touring talents not just local var bands! | 12/30/2021 9:53 PM |
| 507 | They're clean, dog waste bags are always available, diverse areas that they're available, there's something for everyone to do (relax, walk, play, playgrounds, etc.). | 12/30/2021 9:53 PM |
| 508 | The city parks are well kept and fun places to go to. Put outdoor pickleball courts at more of them - then the parks would be even better! | 12/30/2021 9:51 PM |
| 509 | Open space and well cared for plants and trees | 12/30/2021 9:51 PM |
| 510 | Trees, clean air, soccer field | 12/30/2021 9:50 PM |
| 511 | The amenities are wonderful. We love alga Norte aquatics and the updated structure at poinsettia park. | 12/30/2021 9:45 PM |
| 512 | Lots of green spaces, trees, and fun places for kids and adults. | 12/30/2021 9:36 PM |
| 513 | Walking, and seeing trees and plants. | 12/30/2021 9:35 PM |
| 514 | I enjoy how many there are and for the most part well kept. | 12/30/2021 9:31 PM |
| 515 | My grandkids enjoy the playgrounds and I enjoy just being able to walk around. I'd love to use the pickleball courts, but they are too crowded. | 12/30/2021 9:23 PM |
| 516 | Skate parks, monkey bars, zip lines | 12/30/2021 9:20 PM |
| 517 | The camaraderie, the variety of people from all walks of life, the availability, the exercise | 12/30/2021 9:19 PM |
| 518 | Open space, grassy areas and kids playgrounds and sports fields. | 12/30/2021 9:17 PM |
| 519 | The fun safe atmosphere. Holiday park needs more homeless enforcment. | 12/30/2021 9:16 PM |
| 520 | High quality facilities. Clean rest rooms. | 12/30/2021 9:09 PM |
| 521 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:55 PM |
| 522 | More trails and all connected | 12/30/2021 8:52 PM |
| 523 | Pickleball along with everything else the basic park items already at most of these parks | 12/30/2021 8:51 PM |
| 524 | Being able to walk around, throw in a few baskets. Just relax. I'd like to take up pickleball - will Calavera park have courts as part of the improvements? | 12/30/2021 8:50 PM |
| 525 | The outdoor space to enjoy fresh air & sunshine without having to wear a mask! (Keeping | 12/30/2021 8:47 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | appropriate social distance, of course) | |
| 526 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:43 PM |
| 527 | Trees | 12/30/2021 8:43 PM |
| 528 | Social aspect and the fitness too! | 12/30/2021 8:39 PM |
| 529 | Taking walks. Walking dogs. Basketball and pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:38 PM |
| 530 | They are clean and safe | 12/30/2021 8:35 PM |
| 531 | Bike parks | 12/30/2021 8:35 PM |
| 532 | Open spaces, well maintained. | 12/30/2021 8:33 PM |
| 533 | Getting outside and playing | 12/30/2021 8:31 PM |
| 534 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:26 PM |
| 535 | Good hours, great commradery, always able to find a other pickleball player. | 12/30/2021 8:25 PM |
| 536 | Playing sports and kids' events | 12/30/2021 8:23 PM |
| 537 | Playing pickleball and softball. | 12/30/2021 8:19 PM |
| 538 | Lots of activities like playgrounds, game courts and fields (various), hiking paths | 12/30/2021 8:19 PM |
| 539 | Outdoors | 12/30/2021 8:18 PM |
| 540 | Being outside in nature | 12/30/2021 8:16 PM |
| 541 | Clean, playground for all ages, open grass area | 12/30/2021 8:16 PM |
| 542 | Variety of parks. Well thought out events and leagues. | 12/30/2021 8:12 PM |
| 543 | The trees and grass and open space | 12/30/2021 8:10 PM |
| 544 | My kids being able to play and get exercise. | 12/30/2021 8:08 PM |
| 545 | poinsettia park is clean and offers something for everyone | 12/30/2021 8:07 PM |
| 546 | Playing with my grandchildren. | 12/30/2021 8:05 PM |
| 547 | Open space, activities, hiking paths | 12/30/2021 7:55 PM |
| 548 | Trails, walkways, greenery, trees, sport fields, playgrounds, and dog parks. | 12/30/2021 7:54 PM |
| 549 | Pickleball and open spaces for dog walking mainly; playgrounds with kids I babysit. | 12/30/2021 7:53 PM |
| 550 | playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:50 PM |
| 551 | Pickleball, hiking and bike riding | 12/30/2021 7:49 PM |
| 552 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:48 PM |
| 553 | Getting together with neighbors and friends to play pickleball. | 12/30/2021 7:48 PM |
| 554 | Pools | 12/30/2021 7:42 PM |
| 555 | Playing with my dog. | 12/30/2021 7:41 PM |
| 556 | Walking | 12/30/2021 7:41 PM |
| 557 | The open space. The manicured lawn. | 12/30/2021 7:41 PM |
| 558 | Long walks and possibly recharging my EV car when available. Cannot wait for Poinsettia to be equipped. | 12/30/2021 7:38 PM |
| 559 | Walking with my dog | 12/30/2021 7:30 PM |
| 560 | Like having multiple activities in one spot so that all family members can participate in a variety of things. | 12/30/2021 7:30 PM |
| 561 | Grass openness | 12/30/2021 7:28 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 562 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:25 PM |
| 563 | The views, the cleanliness, the water fountains and lovely play equipment with large open field for picnics, families and dogs. | 12/30/2021 7:23 PM |
| 564 | Hiking trails, Tennis courts, picnic areas, | 12/30/2021 7:14 PM |
| 565 | Playing pickleball with my family! | 12/30/2021 7:11 PM |
| 566 | Concerts in n the park | 12/30/2021 7:08 PM |
| 567 | Being outdoors! | 12/30/2021 7:07 PM |
| 568 | All the amenities | 12/30/2021 7:03 PM |
| 569 | Nature, kid playgrounds | 12/30/2021 7:02 PM |
| 570 | Walking pathes, BBQ | 12/30/2021 7:01 PM |
| 571 | Alga Norte swim complex | 12/30/2021 6:59 PM |
| 572 | Tennis courts | 12/30/2021 6:58 PM |
| 573 | open space/ multiple activities | 12/30/2021 6:58 PM |
| 574 | the Cleanliness | 12/30/2021 6:55 PM |
| 575 | The greenery | 12/30/2021 6:50 PM |
| 576 | The great outdoor's | 12/30/2021 6:48 PM |
| 577 | Clean, well kept, peaceful | 12/30/2021 6:46 PM |
| 578 | Well planned clean well lighted. | 12/30/2021 6:45 PM |
| 579 | Playgrounds | 12/30/2021 6:43 PM |
| 580 | Kids happiness | 12/30/2021 6:41 PM |
| 581 | Nice equipment and good parking. Also the lack of homeless people hanging out. | 12/30/2021 6:38 PM |
| 582 | The parks are all layer out so nicely and it's fun to take the kids to play. | 12/30/2021 6:34 PM |
| 583 | Being able relax and take in the beauty in many. And a place to walk and not worry about traffic | 12/30/2021 6:34 PM |
| 584 | I play pickle ball frequently. | 12/30/2021 6:33 PM |
| 585 | Cleanliness and upkeep | 12/30/2021 6:29 PM |
| 586 | Location to my home and many activities for kids and families. | 12/30/2021 6:29 PM |
| 587 | Fields, courts picnic areas | 12/30/2021 6:28 PM |
| 588 | Beautiful settings | 12/30/2021 6:27 PM |
| 589 | Playing tennis, walking dog, and strolling | 12/30/2021 6:26 PM |
| 590 | The ability to sit and relax and read, or visit with friends. Watching the children play. Watching wild life. | 12/30/2021 6:21 PM |
| 591 | Walking around them | 12/30/2021 6:17 PM |
| 592 | The summer concerts. | 12/30/2021 6:17 PM |
| 593 | Pools | 12/30/2021 6:14 PM |
| 594 | Playing Pickleball | 12/30/2021 6:14 PM |
| 595 | Community gathering | 12/30/2021 6:12 PM |
| 596 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 6:10 PM |
| 597 | cleanliness | 12/30/2021 6:10 PM |
| 598 | Alga Norte pool | 12/30/2021 6:10 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 599 | Walking in them | 12/30/2021 6:09 PM |
| 600 | The number of locations available, the safety and cleanliness/maintenance is extremely important. | 12/30/2021 6:09 PM |
| 601 | Soccer and pickleball | 12/30/2021 6:07 PM |
| 602 | Playing Pickleball and enjoying a walk around your park | 12/30/2021 6:06 PM |
| 603 | Open space | 12/30/2021 6:06 PM |
| 604 | Decent quality facilities | 12/30/2021 6:03 PM |
| 605 | Natural beauty | 12/30/2021 6:01 PM |
| 606 | Cleanliness | 12/30/2021 5:59 PM |
| 607 | Alga/Monroe pools | 12/30/2021 5:59 PM |
| 608 | Very pretty parks and very clean, esp Alga Norte. I also bike past Laguna ? Park (on Kelly Drive) and that looks very nice to use. | 12/30/2021 5:56 PM |
| 609 | pickling! | 12/30/2021 5:52 PM |
| 610 | When our kids were young they LOVED the playgrounds. And it was a wonderful break for me! | 12/30/2021 5:52 PM |
| 611 | I like to play pickleball at the pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 5:51 PM |
| 612 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:51 PM |
| 613 | Pickling ! | 12/30/2021 5:50 PM |
| 614 | The Pickleball court at poinsettia park | 12/30/2021 5:50 PM |
| 615 | The tennis courts | 12/30/2021 5:48 PM |
| 616 | pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 5:47 PM |
| 617 | Pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 5:44 PM |
| 618 | Nature | 12/30/2021 5:44 PM |
| 619 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:43 PM |
| 620 | How well tended the grounds are kept | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 621 | Meeting new people at the courts | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 622 | Multi-use and tennis. | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 623 | Nice out side space. Well maintained | 12/30/2021 5:40 PM |
| 624 | I enjoy using the spa at Alga Norte | 12/30/2021 5:33 PM |
| 625 | Enjoying the outdoors in a clean and beautiful setting | 12/30/2021 5:33 PM |
| 626 | Grounds well maintained Bathrooms clean with toilet paper Dog parks Sense of community spirit cuz so well used | 12/30/2021 5:33 PM |
| 627 | They are usually clean and well equipped | 12/30/2021 5:31 PM |
| 628 | Being outdoors | 12/30/2021 5:31 PM |
| 629 | Walking | 12/30/2021 5:29 PM |
| 630 | Cleanliness | 12/30/2021 5:29 PM |
| 631 | Open space but with places to exercise. | 12/30/2021 5:26 PM |
| 632 | grandkids games | 12/30/2021 5:25 PM |
| 633 | Playing pickleball with family and friends | 12/30/2021 5:22 PM |
| 634 | They are well maintained | 12/30/2021 5:21 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 635 | Pickleball, safe spaces, and open areas | 12/30/2021 5:16 PM |
| 636 | Being outdoors, the trails & the views | 12/30/2021 5:16 PM |
| 637 | Open space, play areas for children and adults and teens. | 12/30/2021 5:16 PM |
| 638 | Well maintained and clearly used as day use parks and not used as illegal encampments for the unsheltered. | 12/30/2021 5:15 PM |
| 639 | quiet reflection, greenery, walking areas, | 12/30/2021 5:14 PM |
| 640 | Walking, watching | 12/30/2021 5:12 PM |
| 641 | Open fresh air, greenery, community interaction, the presence laughter/life, a place to escape the more crowded recreation venues. | 12/30/2021 5:11 PM |
| 642 | Open space | 12/30/2021 5:10 PM |
| 643 | Talking our granddaughter and playing pickle ball | 12/30/2021 5:10 PM |
| 644 | Open space, a place to picnic | 12/30/2021 5:08 PM |
| 645 | Open space ,grass,trees, some tables, parking | 12/30/2021 5:08 PM |
| 646 | How clean and well maintained our city parks are | 12/30/2021 5:08 PM |
| 647 | Layout | 12/30/2021 5:07 PM |
| 648 | Nice baseball and soccer fields Nice grass and clean play spaces | 12/30/2021 5:07 PM |
| 649 | Beautiful surroundings. | 12/30/2021 5:06 PM |
| 650 | Open space, nature | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 651 | They are really nice | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 652 | Poinsettia is a great park. Everyone knows it which is why it is so crowded. Word of mouth can be a good thing, in this case.....not so good. I see people leave all the time when they see so many paddles on the rack. | 12/30/2021 5:04 PM |
| 653 | Walking trails | 12/30/2021 5:04 PM |
| 654 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:03 PM |
| 655 | Relaxing meditation | 12/30/2021 5:02 PM |
| 656 | Taking my grandchildren | 12/30/2021 5:01 PM |
| 657 | Beautiful place to exercise and relax with ample night lighting and bathroom facilities. | 12/30/2021 4:59 PM |
| 658 | Being outdoors | 12/30/2021 4:54 PM |
| 659 | The open space and greenery. | 12/30/2021 4:53 PM |
| 660 | I swim 4x's per week at Alga Norte. I love that place! | 12/30/2021 4:52 PM |
| 661 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:51 PM |
| 662 | My backyard shares a fence with one of the city parks and has for over 20 years and I love all the healthy happy cheer and family fun the park system brings to a community. The only down side is the landscape blowers. | 12/30/2021 4:49 PM |
| 663 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:47 PM |
| 664 | They're beautiful, clean and well-maintained. Easy parking. Walking paths. | 12/30/2021 4:46 PM |
| 665 | Open space and scenery, playgrounds, outdoor space for gatherings | 12/30/2021 4:46 PM |
| 666 | The upkeep is very good. Environmentally, the parks are peaceful and pleasant. | 12/30/2021 4:46 PM |
| 667 | Very little | 12/30/2021 4:45 PM |
| 668 | Wide open space, lovely views, taking care of my garden | 12/30/2021 4:45 PM |
| 669 | Green space/landscaping and opportunities to exercise and play. | 12/30/2021 4:45 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 670 | Parks with no pets around. | 12/30/2021 4:44 PM |
| 671 | walking my dog on leash until I was told I was breaking the law | 12/30/2021 4:43 PM |
| 672 | Trees, birds, running with dog | 12/30/2021 4:42 PM |
| 673 | A place to walk | 12/30/2021 4:41 PM |
| 674 | Clean and safe | 12/30/2021 4:40 PM |
| 675 | Green grass. | 12/30/2021 4:38 PM |
| 676 | Swimming at Monroe and hiking on trails. | 12/30/2021 4:37 PM |
| 677 | The pools at Alga Norte | 12/30/2021 4:35 PM |
| 678 | Going down to Stage Coach to see if I can actually sit out in the park for once. | 12/30/2021 4:34 PM |
| 679 | Open space to enjoy with family. | 12/30/2021 4:31 PM |
| 680 | Carlsbad parks are always clean and well maintained. | 12/30/2021 4:31 PM |
| 681 | Alga Norte is a good pool | 12/30/2021 4:30 PM |
| 682 | I enjoy seeing my kids run around and play outside. | 12/30/2021 4:29 PM |
| 683 | open space | 12/30/2021 4:28 PM |
| 684 | Feeling connected to the neighborhood and community. | 12/30/2021 4:27 PM |
| 685 | Safe environment for walking and playing sports | 12/30/2021 4:27 PM |
| 686 | The availability. even with a lot of users there is an adequate amount of space to enjoy our parks. | 12/30/2021 4:26 PM |
| 687 | Being outdoors | 12/30/2021 4:25 PM |
| 688 | Open area and lots of options | 12/30/2021 4:24 PM |
| 689 | Chance to get out with nature and observe kids at play | 12/30/2021 4:24 PM |
| 690 | Access to nature, safe/nice place to walk, able to see folks of all ages enjoying themselves. | 12/30/2021 4:24 PM |
| 691 | Playing with my grandson. | 12/30/2021 4:20 PM |
| 692 | Being outdoors, availability of restrooms. | 12/30/2021 4:19 PM |
| 693 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:17 PM |
| 694 | Swimming | 12/30/2021 4:17 PM |
| 695 | Being outside | 12/30/2021 4:16 PM |
| 696 | Everything | 12/30/2021 4:15 PM |
| 697 | Trails walking | 12/30/2021 4:13 PM |
| 698 | There are clean and well maintained. | 12/30/2021 4:13 PM |
| 699 | Playing pickleball and dog parks | 12/30/2021 4:12 PM |
| 700 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:08 PM |
| 701 | Open space, community, and fellow pickleballers. I moved here knowing zero people. One day at Poinsettia Park... 50 new friends! | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 702 | The peaceful environment, seeing people enjoy themselves, Pickleball softball tennis frisbee | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 703 | Walking trails and playing tennis | 12/30/2021 4:05 PM |
| 704 | Nicely groomed open areas. | 12/30/2021 4:05 PM |
| 705 | Very diverse | 12/30/2021 4:04 PM |
| 706 | Friendly people at the PICKLEBALL courts | 12/30/2021 4:04 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 707 | The cleanliness and easy of parking(at most) | 12/30/2021 4:00 PM |
| 708 | Playing with my children. Giving them room to ride their bikes and scooters on curving paths. Having the space to play ball or soccer. It would be great to have better play equipment for the kids to play on. | 12/30/2021 4:00 PM |
| 709 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:59 PM |
| 710 | Playing Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:59 PM |
| 711 | Being able to spend time outdoors with friends and family! | 12/30/2021 3:58 PM |
| 712 | Playing tennis | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |
| 713 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |
| 714 | Walk through and around Parking from walk through the surrounding areas Bathrooms | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |
| 715 | Clean and well laid out | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 716 | Play softball in a league so I go at least twice a week. Also enjoy special events like Oktoberfest, Brewfest, etc. Play tennis as well. Also like to take my grandson to fly kites, practice batting and fielding. | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 717 | Free | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 718 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 719 | Pickleball players. | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 720 | Community and connection with others playing Pickelball | 12/30/2021 3:54 PM |
| 721 | Outdoor activities | 12/30/2021 3:54 PM |
| 722 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 723 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 724 | the beautiful landscapes and facilities | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 725 | Being outdoors | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 726 | Green grass and clean surrounding areas | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 727 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 728 | The space...especially along the coast. | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 729 | The great upkeep and the pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 3:51 PM |
| 730 | Peaceful and relaxing. Sitting areas should be where young kids may not be. | 12/30/2021 3:51 PM |
| 731 | Gathering with friends in beautiful Carlsbad | 12/30/2021 3:51 PM |
| 732 | Being able to bring my family to the park to play while I get to play some pickleball games as well. | 12/30/2021 3:50 PM |
| 733 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:49 PM |
| 734 | Tennis and walking | 12/30/2021 3:49 PM |
| 735 | outdoors, clean fresh air, benches to relax on, meeting people and other dogs | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 736 | Used to be the woody area at Stagecoach Park :-/ | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 737 | Mountain Biking | 12/30/2021 3:47 PM |
| 738 | Meeting up with friends | 12/30/2021 3:47 PM |
| 739 | Pickleball playing competitive games and meeting new people getting out into the open air environment | 12/30/2021 3:44 PM |
| 740 | Clean clean facilities and friendly staff | 12/30/2021 3:43 PM |
| 741 | Pickelball | 12/30/2021 3:43 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 742 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:42 PM |
| 743 | open feeling | 12/30/2021 3:41 PM |
| 744 | Play ground and grassy area | 12/30/2021 3:41 PM |
| 745 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:39 PM |
| 746 | Well maintained | 12/30/2021 3:39 PM |
| 747 | Recreational facilities available | 12/30/2021 3:38 PM |
| 748 | Outdoor concert series, pickleball courts. When kids were young, having birthday parties in reserved spots. | 12/30/2021 3:37 PM |
| 749 | When my kids play sports at the parks like soccer or basketball | 12/30/2021 3:36 PM |
| 750 | Watching grand kids play in grassy bowl at Poinsetia Park | 12/30/2021 3:36 PM |
| 751 | Getting outdoors and being active. | 12/30/2021 3:36 PM |
| 752 | The tennis courts and Pickleball courts are first class...Nice to hang out there too | 12/30/2021 3:34 PM |
| 753 | Open spaces | 12/30/2021 3:33 PM |
| 754 | The open space and horticulture. | 12/30/2021 3:33 PM |
| 755 | The easy of parking. Amenities. Pool. | 12/30/2021 3:32 PM |
| 756 | Landscaping and open areas. | 12/30/2021 3:32 PM |
| 757 | My kids love running around in the large fields and playing on the play structures. We all enjoy meeting up with friends in a fun place that's outside so we can minimize exposure to sickness. We no longer feel comfortable having playdates or meeting with others in our home, so we're very grateful to have the city parks available to allow us to get together with others. | 12/30/2021 3:31 PM |
| 758 | Walking, watching landscape. | 12/30/2021 3:29 PM |
| 759 | Walking trails | 12/30/2021 3:28 PM |
| 760 | The play areas for my grandsons. | 12/30/2021 3:28 PM |
| 761 | Open space,trees, paths. | 12/30/2021 3:28 PM |
| 762 | Recreating in the outdoors | 12/30/2021 3:27 PM |
| 763 | Greenery, nature, hearing the laughter of children and people and children enjoying playing. | 12/30/2021 3:27 PM |
| 764 | Hiking trails | 12/30/2021 3:26 PM |
| 765 | Picnic facilities, playgrounds and a nice area to walk around in. | 12/30/2021 3:25 PM |
| 766 | Getting away from cement and roofs | 12/30/2021 3:25 PM |
| 767 | Playing pickleball. | 12/30/2021 3:23 PM |
| 768 | 1) the open green space 2) tennis courts, b-ball fields, soccer fields | 12/30/2021 3:23 PM |
| 769 | Pickleball and cycling | 12/30/2021 3:22 PM |
| 770 | Used to be a safe place for families or to get together with friends. | 12/30/2021 3:21 PM |
| 771 | The peaceful atmosphere | 12/30/2021 3:18 PM |
| 772 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:18 PM |
| 773 | They are modern, clean, and well kept. Easy access for everyone. | 12/30/2021 3:17 PM |
| 774 | Parking and quality of the facilities | 12/30/2021 3:16 PM |
| 775 | Big open spaces for pets and easy parking | 12/30/2021 3:16 PM |
| 776 | Beautiful views, fresh air, EXERCISE | 12/30/2021 3:15 PM |
| 777 | Natural landscape; cleanliness; distance | 12/30/2021 3:12 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 778 | open trails well kept, well kept courts | 12/30/2021 3:11 PM |
| 779 | The open spaces | 12/30/2021 3:10 PM |
| 780 | They are clean and mostly safe, though there have been a lot of car break-Ins lately. | 12/30/2021 3:10 PM |
| 781 | openness | 12/30/2021 3:08 PM |
| 782 | Outdoor fun. | 12/30/2021 3:07 PM |
| 783 | Meeting up with friends. Getting my kids out of the house. | 12/30/2021 3:05 PM |
| 784 | Space to eat outside and play | 12/30/2021 3:03 PM |
| 785 | Walking my dog, riding my bike and playing Pickleball. | 12/30/2021 3:03 PM |
| 786 | We go to Carlsbad specifically to play pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:01 PM |
| 787 | The carefree environment | 12/30/2021 3:01 PM |
| 788 | I enjoy the open space, trees, trails and tennis courts the most. | 12/30/2021 3:00 PM |
| 789 | Open space | 12/30/2021 3:00 PM |
| 790 | walking the dog on the trails | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 791 | level safe walking areas for limited mobility folks | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 792 | Nature | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 793 | Beauty and sense of community it brings to the neighborhood. | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 794 | playing pickelball | 12/30/2021 2:58 PM |
| 795 | open air kids having alot to do | 12/30/2021 2:57 PM |
| 796 | Very good facility | 12/30/2021 2:56 PM |
| 797 | Watching my kids play sports | 12/30/2021 2:56 PM |
| 798 | Pickleball courts at Pointsettia | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 799 | I love the Alga Norte Park, with the pool and water park. This park has something for everyone. | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 800 | Walking quiet | 12/30/2021 2:54 PM |
| 801 | The playground, pools and tennis facilities | 12/30/2021 2:54 PM |
| 802 | Beautiful, well maintained spaced. Sports fields, esp. tennis & pickleball and dog parks. | 12/30/2021 2:54 PM |
| 803 | The nature, access to good parking and sports facilities | 12/30/2021 2:54 PM |
| 804 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 805 | Location and ambience | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 806 | The variety of things to do at the parks. | 12/30/2021 2:51 PM |
| 807 | Alga norte pool | 12/30/2021 2:51 PM |
| 808 | The parks are city treasures and park staff are friendly and helpful. | 12/30/2021 2:51 PM |
| 809 | sense of community | 12/30/2021 2:50 PM |
| 810 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:47 PM |
| 811 | The weather and surroundings | 12/30/2021 2:45 PM |
| 812 | the feeling of getting away from the city sprawl/suburbanization | 12/30/2021 2:45 PM |
| 813 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 814 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 815 | Good unkept play structure Clean bathrooms | 12/30/2021 2:43 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 816 | Playing poinsettia PickleBall & tennis | 12/30/2021 2:42 PM |
| 817 | Nice way to enjoy being outside. Enjoy the openness and well kept grounds | 12/30/2021 2:42 PM |
| 818 | Getting outside! | 12/30/2021 2:41 PM |
| 819 | Concerts in the park | 12/30/2021 2:40 PM |
| 820 | I like clean safe Outdoor space | 12/30/2021 2:40 PM |
| 821 | Sports access | 12/30/2021 2:40 PM |
| 822 | Healthy and exercise Good quality of life Play areas Grass areas and trails | 12/30/2021 2:39 PM |
| 823 | Swimming | 12/30/2021 2:38 PM |
| 824 | Concerts. Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:37 PM |
| 825 | Grass. Trees. Picnic tables. Limited entrance / exit areas so that little kids aren't running into the parking lots too easily. | 12/30/2021 2:37 PM |
| 826 | Family time | 12/30/2021 2:36 PM |
| 827 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:36 PM |
| 828 | Playing sports | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 829 | Play Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 830 | Pickleball! | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 831 | Well maintained | 12/30/2021 2:32 PM |
| 832 | Hiking | 12/30/2021 2:31 PM |
| 833 | Playing Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:31 PM |
| 834 | Nature, wide open spaces and dog friendly hikes | 12/30/2021 2:31 PM |
| 835 | Great locations. | 12/30/2021 2:29 PM |
| 836 | Safety, well-kept, access to clean restrooms | 12/30/2021 2:29 PM |
| 837 | Cleanliness | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 838 | Outdoor space. Skateparks aren't locked up like they are in San Diego city | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 839 | Scenery, area for kids to run around | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 840 | Their integration with their natural surroundings. | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 841 | Pickle ball coirted | 12/30/2021 2:27 PM |
| 842 | Playground for the kids. | 12/30/2021 2:26 PM |
| 843 | Being outdoors | 12/30/2021 2:26 PM |
| 844 | Taking my dog | 12/30/2021 2:25 PM |
| 845 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:23 PM |
| 846 | They are clean and well maintained. | 12/30/2021 2:23 PM |
| 847 | Being with friends, being outside, playing sports | 12/30/2021 2:22 PM |
| 848 | Pickleball and good parking | 12/30/2021 2:22 PM |
| 849 | Pickleball, walking. | 12/30/2021 2:21 PM |
| 850 | Being outside. | 12/30/2021 2:21 PM |
| 851 | The wide variety of activities available | 12/30/2021 2:20 PM |
| 852 | Hiking and relaxing Picnics | 12/30/2021 2:20 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 853 | Open space, accessible | 12/30/2021 2:18 PM |
| 854 | Access to fitness activities that we enjoy. | 12/30/2021 2:18 PM |
| 855 | exercise and community! | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 856 | Pool at Agua Norte, seeing kids play at parks & act normal again | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 857 | The cleanliness you currently maintain. | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 858 | LOVE the tennis courts at Poinsettia Park. Like having a place for meeting like minded, athletic, peaceful people expressing themselves through friendly competitive spirit. | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 859 | plants, paths, people | 12/30/2021 2:14 PM |
| 860 | City staff test | 12/30/2021 2:14 PM |
| 861 | walking and hiking | 12/30/2021 2:14 PM |
| 862 | Not crowded most of the time...relaxing | 12/30/2021 2:13 PM |
| 863 | Wide Open spaces, dog parks, skate park for kids, and pools | 12/30/2021 2:13 PM |
| 864 | how nice they are | 12/30/2021 2:12 PM |
| 865 | Dog park | 12/30/2021 2:10 PM |
| 866 | Open space | 12/30/2021 2:10 PM |
| 867 | Fresh air and exercise | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 868 | Pickleball and play structures suitable for older kids | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 869 | Walking path | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 870 | Pointsettia is awesome, alga Norte, Aviara and holiday park are also fun. Like having lots of play structures to climb in, unusual swings at pointsettia and alga norte | 12/30/2021 2:08 PM |
| 871 | Availability | 12/30/2021 2:07 PM |
| 872 | Generally very clean and well kept. Also we have a lot of options. Very nice overall. | 12/30/2021 2:07 PM |
| 873 | Clean ope | 12/30/2021 2:06 PM |
| 874 | the open space | 12/30/2021 2:06 PM |
| 875 | Pickleball! | 12/30/2021 2:05 PM |
| 876 | They are beautiful. | 12/30/2021 2:05 PM |
| 877 | Baseball | 12/30/2021 2:04 PM |
| 878 | The quiet time, peacefulness, the wildlife and the opportunity to walk/hike/workout. | 12/30/2021 2:04 PM |
| 879 | Meeting new people at Poinsettia Pickleball Courts. Carlsbad parks are the most beautifully-landscaped and meticulous city parks in San Diego County. | 12/30/2021 2:04 PM |
| 880 | New, clean facility. Many classes and activists to enjoy | 12/30/2021 2:03 PM |
| 881 | Trees, little kids | 12/30/2021 2:02 PM |
| 882 | Walking dogs and myself on a safe natural outdoor trail | 12/30/2021 2:02 PM |
| 883 | Convenient location and plenty of parking. Classes for yoga. Concerts in the park. | 12/30/2021 2:02 PM |
| 884 | Quiet peaceful well maintained. | 12/30/2021 2:01 PM |
| 885 | They're beautiful | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 886 | Convenience | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 887 | Clean, safe, easy parking | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 888 | Organized youth sports - lessons in different sports and aquatics | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 889 | The pickleball courts at Pointsettia | 12/30/2021 1:58 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 890 | Walking paths | 12/30/2021 1:58 PM |
| 891 | The green space. | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 892 | Play equipment for our granddaughters. | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 893 | The Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 894 | Sports dog parks pickle ball court | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 895 | Nature. Extremely important since overgrowth (more/higher buildings) is taking away quality of life. Parks is all we have left. | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 896 | Lots of open space, nature, trees (shade). Walkways, clean picnic tables. | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 897 | Facilities | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 898 | Well maintained and safe. | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 899 | Areas to walk | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 900 | Pickle ball courts and dog parks fenced in | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 901 | Playgrounds, Pickleball and fields. | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 902 | Green space | 12/30/2021 1:55 PM |
| 903 | Community | 12/30/2021 1:54 PM |
| 904 | Sports | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 905 | Visiting | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 906 | Being out in the fresh air. | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 907 | A place to get away from home and crowds | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 908 | Variety of activities and convenience of locations | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 909 | Pickleball Courts | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 910 | My kids love the playgrounds and large grass areas to relax or play | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 911 | open space | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 912 | Playing Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:51 PM |
| 913 | Playgrounds, walking, biking, and some that are dog friendly | 12/30/2021 1:50 PM |
| 914 | Well maintained, safe and clean. | 12/30/2021 1:50 PM |
| 915 | Walking paths, benches, picnic tables | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 916 | The walking paths and trees | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 917 | Seeing families outside enjoying fresh air. Seeing organized classes and sports utilizing the space. | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 918 | Concerts in the park, walking paths, watching sports | 12/30/2021 1:48 PM |
| 919 | Cleanliness and open feeling | 12/30/2021 1:48 PM |
| 920 | Open plan form. Walking. Watching the sports events. Halloween at the water park. | 12/30/2021 1:47 PM |
| 921 | Locations | 12/30/2021 1:46 PM |
| 922 | They are always well kept and clean. | 12/30/2021 1:45 PM |
| 923 | Quiet NATURAL environment | 12/30/2021 1:45 PM |
| 924 | Being with family and our dog | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 925 | Play equipment is well maintained. Bathroom facilities. Close parking. Not too crowded. | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 926 | Ball fields and tennis courts. | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 927 | Cleanliness and well maintained parks. | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |
| 928 | They're well maintained and there's fun things for the kids to do. | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |
| 929 | Nature & open space | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |
| 930 | How well maintained they are | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 931 | Well maintained and some nicely blend the structured and the natural area together | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 932 | Seeing the families enjoying the parks. | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 933 | They have functional things I enjoy (tennis, soccer fields, walking trails, etc), are clean, and accessible. | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 934 | Trees and plants | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 935 | Pool | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 936 | Only place in Carlsbad with green grass! | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 937 | Being outside, the plants, and sometimes playing pickleball with friends | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 938 | Great for an escape | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 939 | Cleanliness , new equipment, landscaping | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 940 | Peaceful and quiet surroundings, seeing people enjoying themselves, clean air, sunshine. | 12/30/2021 1:37 PM |
| 941 | they are well done | 12/30/2021 1:36 PM |
| 942 | The pool at alga | 12/30/2021 1:35 PM |
| 943 | Nice facilities | 12/30/2021 1:35 PM |
| 944 | Swimming | 12/30/2021 1:34 PM |
| 945 | natural beauty | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 946 | Including the walkways in my daily walks | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 947 | green space, I wish there was some near Ponto Ave Encinas | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 948 | I truly appreciate our the variety of our parks - the many options offered for all age groups! Thank you! | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 949 | Enjoy taking grandchildren to parks and watching their sporting events. | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 950 | the beautiful landscape and cleanliness | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 951 | Being outdoors, seeing children play, trees and bushes. | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 952 | Exercise, relaxation, enjoying the beautiful beaches and ocean. Gardening in the community gardens. Picnicking at Maxton Park. | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 953 | Open space | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 954 | The access and cleanliness | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 955 | Open space | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 956 | Pools | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 957 | Bring outside | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 958 | Well maintained | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 959 | Area for my infant to play | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 960 | The pool at Alga Norte | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 961 | Fresh air. Room to roam. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 962 | Alga Norte Aquatic Center, I consider a park. I love the Deep Water Boot Camp taught by Darcy. The new instructor is feeling her way and needs to conform to the generation she is | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | instructing. The open lane swim in the competitive pool is wonderful. | |
| 963 | OPEN SPACE | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 964 | Kids playgrounds and dog off leash areas. Also I like that the jungle gyms and swings are in new condition. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 965 | swimming, running trails | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 966 | Open space and watching children/parents play. | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 967 | Alga pool | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 968 | Places to walk | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 969 | The playground for the tots | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 970 | Walking paths, large open grassy areas, lots of parking. | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 971 | Being outdoors, landscaping to appreciate, swimming. | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 972 | Being outside, walking | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 973 | we have many to choose from and not all are recreational purpose. Lots of green space | 12/30/2021 1:24 PM |
| 974 | Feeling safe and playing pickleball. I also enjoy watching my daughters play soccer and other sports. | 12/30/2021 1:24 PM |
| 975 | the pool | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 976 | Playing pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 977 | They are clean and safe | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 978 | Jazz in the Park (when we can have it again), seeing families together, clean and landscaped spaces. | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 979 | The playgrounds for kids and picnic tables. | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 980 | Peaceful walks | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 981 | Turf fields | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 982 | Going for walks! Hidden Canyon is wonderful! | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 983 | The trails and the landscaping. | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 984 | Lots of options for playgrounds, exploring, sports, etc. | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 985 | Walking trails picnic areas | 12/30/2021 1:21 PM |
| 986 | Parks are clean and well kept with nice green space. | 12/30/2021 1:21 PM |
| 987 | Cleanliness | 12/30/2021 1:20 PM |
| 988 | playgrounds | 12/30/2021 1:20 PM |
| 989 | open space | 12/30/2021 1:20 PM |
| 990 | Being outdoors and relaxing in grassy areas. Not being harassed and intimidated if my dogs are along with me while in Carlsbad. Antiquated and discriminatory rules toward our furry family members must be abolished. Most dogs are in fact better behaved, and more sanitary, than many people's children! Yet children are allowed everywhere. People are animals too. This is a scientific fact. People's animal dog family must be allowed to join them for outings in Carlsbad, while also unperturbed by overzealous enforcement of arcane laws. Most people in Carlsbad have dogs, and realize how unfriendly our city is toward them. This is a shame! | 12/30/2021 1:20 PM |
| 991 | The ability to be part of the community in a beautiful outdoor setting. | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 992 | beautiful maintenance and appeal to children | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 993 | Open space and ocean breeze | 12/30/2021 1:18 PM |
| 994 | Comprehensive and well painted facilities. Variable options for all age ranges including children | 12/30/2021 1:18 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 995 | Fun place, nature, facilities | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 996 | Wide open Space | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 997 | Walking around | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 998 | Being outdoors. Green space within city. I like the trails through Leo Cabrillo Park. | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 999 | Getting out of the house | 12/30/2021 1:16 PM |
| 1000 | Great place for an outdoor venue with family and friends. | 12/30/2021 1:16 PM |
| 1001 | They are very well maintained | 12/30/2021 1:15 PM |
| 1002 | Beautiful open green spaces w/ areas for sports & picnicing | 12/30/2021 1:15 PM |
| 1003 | The parks are active and it's a pleasure seeing them utilized. | 12/30/2021 1:14 PM |
| 1004 | Ample parking | 12/30/2021 1:13 PM |
| 1005 | Green space, trees. | 12/30/2021 1:13 PM |
| 1006 | walking and watching games and people enjoying themselves. | 12/30/2021 1:12 PM |
| 1007 | Playgrounds | 12/30/2021 1:11 PM |
| 1008 | they're clean and feel safe | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 1009 | Spending time in the outdoors with friends | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 1010 | N/A | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 1011 | clean, maintained | 12/30/2021 1:09 PM |
| 1012 | The trees | 12/30/2021 1:09 PM |
| 1013 | The pool | 12/30/2021 1:09 PM |
| 1014 | They have something for everyone. Sports courts, fields, playgrounds, picnic areas to have family gatherings, and bday parties. | 12/30/2021 1:08 PM |
| 1015 | Recreation. Family gatherings | 12/30/2021 1:08 PM |
| 1016 | Walking | 12/30/2021 1:06 PM |
| 1017 | Dog park Playset when our children were younger | 12/30/2021 1:06 PM |
| 1018 | The cleanliness and peaceful times. | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 1019 | Classes and going with my grandchildren, parks are very popular with my grandchildren aged 4 to 10 years | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 1020 | Space for kids to play and quality play equipment | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 1021 | Aquatic center | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 1022 | They are so well kept | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 1023 | I appreciate that the city put in pickleball courts. It is apparent that they are well loved and we could possibly use more. I also enjoy using the city pools for recreational and also for my sons practice. | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 1024 | Tennis | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 1025 | Athletic field and amenities | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 1026 | Clean and well maintained | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 1027 | Letting the grandkids run around and be free! And good class/camp options for kids and adults. | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 1028 | Group activities, concerts, walking, biking, reading, picnics | 12/30/2021 1:02 PM |
| 1029 | They are clean and safe. | 12/30/2021 1:02 PM |
| 1030 | Nice to walk around | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1031 | Tennis | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1032 | Dog parks | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1033 | Usually they're clean and landscaped. The City does a great job with graffiti abatement and trash clean up - great job people! | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1034 | They are green. Ability to access park by walking less than 1 mile from home. Ability to walk dog at the park. Having tennis courts. | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1035 | Mix of playground and grass/open areas, convenient locations, abundant parking, well-maintained bathrooms | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1036 | I enjoy the green open space, trees, being outdoors with friends and family, walking and activities, children play areas, and available sports activities. | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1037 | Kids playing | 12/30/2021 1:00 PM |
| 1038 | The greater density that a city commitment to parks allows. Single-family homes are very isolating, especially for children who need friends. Parks are meeting grounds, and multifamily living creates a natural neighborhood. | 12/30/2021 1:00 PM |
| 1039 | Playinh with my kids | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1040 | Open space | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1041 | Beauty, relaxation, nature, meeting friends for walks and talks, but the roses at magee park are my favorite! | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1042 | Walking/Hiking | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1043 | Green spaces and playgrounds | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1044 | Very clean | 12/30/2021 12:57 PM |
| 1045 | Variety of experiences | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1046 | Our kids are now grown, so for us, its hiking and taking our dogs places where they can be off leash. | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1047 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1048 | being outdoors outside the house | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1049 | Nature/plants | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1050 | Being outside | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1051 | Playing pickleball in Poinsettia Park | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1052 | Large open grass areas, picnic tables, pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 1053 | Swimming Pool | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 1054 | Softball fields | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 1055 | Space | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1056 | hiking and walking | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1057 | They're well maintained, peaceful, offer a multitude of activities, dog parks | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1058 | Different things are enjoyed at different parks. We enjoy walking at the Lagoon trails- we enjoy playground equipment at Alga Norte. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1059 | Getting out of suburban surroundings and into green spaces | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1060 | Pool | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1061 | Community gathering | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1062 | Playground for our grandkids | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1063 | I use the pool on a regular basis. Love it! | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1064 | Close to home, well maintained, like to see people using the parks | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1065 | They are well maintained | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1066 | Well maintained. | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1067 | the people that attend | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1068 | Walking | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1069 | Clean, pretty space | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1070 | Walking or just sitting on the benches on a nice day. | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1071 | beaches, green grass and clean bathrooms close to all | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1072 | The trees and plants | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1073 | The nature, getting outside. Feeling safe, and getting away from the political troubles (so looking at bums and their trash, and the new prevalence of graffiti kinda kills it.) | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1074 | Open space, concerts and walking paths. | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1075 | the lools | 12/30/2021 12:49 PM |
| 1076 | Kids say: swinging on swings and playing with friends Opens spaces | 12/30/2021 12:49 PM |
| 1077 | Pools, skateboarding | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 1078 | Meeting new people | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 1079 | Variety of play structures for different ages. Areas to ride scooters. Not right next to road/parking lot for safety. Grassy areas. | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 1080 | Walking dogs | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1081 | Close | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1082 | Green space, trees and places to gather work friends for picnicking | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1083 | Finding a spot to throw frisbees. | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1084 | Keeping kids active | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1085 | Open space. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1086 | Playing Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1087 | Clean, open space for people to meet and get fresh air. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1088 | Having something to do there. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1089 | Getting away from the congested neighborhoods to a safe place the kids can run and play freely | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1090 | Pickleball, masters swimming and spa at alga Norte | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |
| 1091 | Being outside away from electronic distractions, and having the kids in eyesight in a multi use area, such as small area with playground and also grassy area for sitting in the grass | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |
| 1092 | Artificial (non grass) Ball fields | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |
| 1093 | Clean, safe | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1094 | Balance of green space and play structures | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1095 | basketball courts | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1096 | The playgrounds and variety of parks | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1097 | Open space | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1098 | Pedestrian friendly open spaces, with safety and pleasant surroundings. | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1099 | The number of parks, and the cleanliness and the various opportunities of activities. | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1100 | TGIF Concerts | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1101 | Being outside | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1102 | Open space and sports fields | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1103 | Pickleball and Tennis Dog park Birdwatching | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1104 | Being outdoors. Seeing neighbors. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1105 | I get exercise while surrounded by a beautiful park and wonderful people. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1106 | I used to go to the dog park but it was not well maintained | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1107 | Walking, concerts, seeing people enjoying the park. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1108 | Visiting with friends. It has been a blessing during this pandemic | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1109 | The open space. | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1110 | nature--trees, grass, birds | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1111 | Playgrounds for kids | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1112 | I have a 4yr old grandson. We like BIG playgrounds | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1113 | Jazz in the Park | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1114 | Well maintained | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1115 | Open space with walking paths | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1116 | Walking, looking at the views and the plants, seeing dogs and children playing, and sitting on the benches. | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1117 | trails, picnics, classes, and recreation. | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1118 | With much more time having to be spent inside one's homes, particularly with much business being conducted in virtual formats, it has been enjoyable to use parks as a means of getting out in the fresh air to simply enjoy the spaces. I appreciate the picnic areas as well as the open lawn areas that allow for putting down a blanket and sharing a picnic with family or friends. We have made use of the BBQ areas as well. It has also been a welcome location for small gatherings with youth groups such as Scouts, for example, during times when indoor gatherings have been discouraged. In the past, we enjoyed the Carlsbad summer "Concerts in the Park" and look forward to their return in the future. | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1119 | no dogs allowed | 12/30/2021 12:40 PM |
| 1120 | Outdoor activities | 12/30/2021 12:40 PM |
| 1121 | The playground and walking trails | 12/30/2021 12:40 PM |
| 1122 | walking trails | 12/30/2021 12:40 PM |
| 1123 | open space, greenery, relaxing feeling | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1124 | Safe locations | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1125 | Dog parks & bike trails Quality of facilities | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1126 | Pickleball courts and soccer fields | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1127 | I enjoy it when they are not too crowded. | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1128 | 1. Trails 2. Bringing grandchildren to play equipment | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1129 | location | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1130 | Pleasant place to meet and have a lunch or dinner with family and friends sometimes it is fun sit and reflect. | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1131 | The quiet & solitude when I want to just sit & read under a tree or take a good walk. | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1132 | Open area and available activities/sports | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1133 | Relaxing. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1134 | see #2 | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1135 | I love that they're taking care of well, seemingly patrolled and the community takes part in them. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1136 | So we'll maintained. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1137 | Fun structures and activities at the playground. Good walking trails and paths | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1138 | The aquatics center is amazing. Facilities like this are hard to find. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1139 | Pickleball, trails and pool | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1140 | Turf fields and skateparks. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1141 | Enjoy tennis. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1142 | The well maintained grass and walkways. Quiet areas it provides to rest outside or while on a walk to stop and pause / sit. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1143 | I love the warm pool at Alga Norte! It's clean and well-maintained. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1144 | Early mornings, when you can have a peaceful walk. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1145 | Clean without dog poop and adequate parking and restrooms. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1146 | open space, trees | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1147 | Playgrounds | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1148 | Activities | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1149 | Getting into nature. | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1150 | Playing sports with children, enjoying youth sports leagues- would like other leagues to be able to rent out fields too so current ones don't have a monopoly and overcharge as FNL flag football does. | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1151 | Walking | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1152 | Swimming at Alga del Norte | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1153 | Pickle-ball, tennis, walking. | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1154 | Proximity | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1155 | So many of them | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1156 | riding bikes | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1157 | My kids having a safe place to play | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1158 | Getting to enjoy the outdoors safely | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1159 | Getting Exercise. | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1160 | The people and courts | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1161 | The fresh air, clean scenery and sitting areas | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1162 | Great for kids | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1163 | Close to home and generally well kept aside from some areas. | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1164 | Playgrounds for our grandchildren | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1165 | The open space and the cleanliness | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1166 | Taking my dog to a fenced in dog park | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1167 | Free time | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1168 | Walking . We have beautiful parks. The staff does a great great job and they are are friendly | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| | and courteous. | |
| 1169 | Available parking | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1170 | Walking with dog | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1171 | Being outside and enjoying the many features at different parks | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1172 | open spaces | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1173 | Clean @ well maintained | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1174 | Open space. Skate parks | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1175 | Walking | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1176 | I use Alga Norte Park and Pool 2-3 times per week. It is always clean and I feel very protected during COVID with the precautions that are in place. However now that spread is faster than ever I think splitting swim lanes should be discontinued. | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1177 | Parks are super well maintained. Plants are amazing. | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1178 | Get rid off all the homeless | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1179 | Green open space | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1180 | walking | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1181 | Picnic area, trails | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1182 | Clean, safe and diverse options | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1183 | Clean and spaces. | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1184 | A place to walk near my house. | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1185 | The kids facilities & playgrounds. | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1186 | Swim pools Kid play areas | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1187 | There are several of them and mostly away from high-traffic areas. | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1188 | enjoying my grandchildren's activities | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1189 | Grass, trees, open spaces, no dog poop, play structures for children. | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1190 | community events | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1191 | Basketball | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1192 | My teenage son enjoys the skateboard parks. | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1193 | Open space, fresh air | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1194 | Location then beauty. | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1195 | Being able to be outside, do gymnastics on real grass, playing on playgrounds | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1196 | Enjoying natural and historical features-- i.e. Rancho Carrillo; using the dog park, doing summer programs with arts & crafts. | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1197 | Tennis courts, open space, hiking trails, space for public meetings and gatherings. | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1198 | Cleanliness | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1199 | Watching my kids play safely. | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1200 | Open areas, place for kids, dogs | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1201 | Other than dog feces on the playing fields the parks are pretty clean | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1202 | Playing Pickleball. | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1203 | Pool and playground | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1204 | How well kept and beautiful they are | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |

Q3 What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1205 | being in an open space | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1206 | Basketball hoops, views, good maintenance. | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1207 | How clean they are | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1208 | Playing basketball and frisbee w the kids | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1209 | GREEN! | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1210 | They fields are all kept in great shape. It's great that the pool is open so much. | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1211 | Well maintained, lots of activities, spacious. | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1212 | Greenery | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1213 | Meeting homeless people as that's why I am there | 12/30/2021 12:23 PM |
| 1214 | the quietness and openness. | 12/30/2021 12:23 PM |
| 1215 | the amenities | 12/30/2021 10:24 AM |

Q4 What is the main reason you don't visit city parks?

Answered: 51 Skipped: 1,715

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | No reason to visit. | 1/10/2022 12:32 PM |
| 2 | Currently live in Carmel Valley, considered at one time (6 or so years ago) purchasing a home in the Pacifico development area near Ponto, decided not to buy based on the plans to develop the coastal area. | 1/8/2022 6:32 AM |
| 3 | No park near me. | 1/7/2022 8:21 PM |
| 4 | Not convenient. Dog parks are unwelcoming. There is not one park close to my home. None | 1/7/2022 6:23 PM |
| 5 | Because there are no parks near me that are walkable. | 1/7/2022 4:33 PM |
| 6 | Single woman, no children, work full time | 1/7/2022 10:45 AM |
| 7 | I am so busy i don't have time to go lie down on the lawn. | 1/6/2022 5:44 PM |
| 8 | leave in Riverside County | 1/6/2022 10:05 AM |
| 9 | no reason to - my granddaughter lives in northern CA, and I don't tend to hold get togethers at parks | 1/5/2022 12:51 PM |
| 10 | We are seniors and stay closer to home. | 1/5/2022 12:28 PM |
| 11 | Homeless people hang around there | 1/4/2022 8:31 PM |
| 12 | I have other interests like hiking. | 1/3/2022 4:53 PM |
| 13 | Nothing there for me, we are both in our 80s | 1/3/2022 9:58 AM |
| 14 | Children are grown, and we go to the beach. | 1/2/2022 6:15 PM |
| 15 | i prefer the trails in the open spaces | 1/2/2022 9:06 AM |
| 16 | They don't allow dogs. | 1/1/2022 8:33 AM |
| 17 | Live out of state | 12/31/2021 7:05 PM |
| 18 | no facilities comfortable for seniors age 94 | 12/31/2021 5:00 PM |
| 19 | crime, drug use, people living in the parks | 12/31/2021 3:16 PM |
| 20 | Not a huge fan of parks and don't go unless I have a reason (invited to a sport game or party). | 12/31/2021 8:16 AM |
| 21 | I do not have young children | 12/31/2021 6:59 AM |
| 22 | Don't want to | 12/31/2021 6:14 AM |
| 23 | Our children are adults now, and there is nothing that interests us at the parks currently. Also, we live close to the border of Carlsbad and Encinitas, so Stagecoach is the closest and most convenient location, and there is no pool there for lap swimming and no Pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 3:58 AM |
| 24 | I am older and unable to participate in recreation. | 12/30/2021 10:31 PM |
| 25 | Not of interest to me. Don't walk much and when I do, I prefer the beach. | 12/30/2021 10:15 PM |
| 26 | to lazy | 12/30/2021 8:18 PM |
| 27 | I prefer the beach. | 12/30/2021 5:50 PM |
| 28 | There are no walking trails. I don't know if Bataquitos Lagoon is a city park. I walk there. | 12/30/2021 5:06 PM |
| 29 | Don't live in the area | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 30 | Kids older now | 12/30/2021 3:51 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 31 | can not walk very well | 12/30/2021 3:32 PM |
| 32 | Because you continue to rent out the fields and park space to private organizations and travel teams!!! | 12/30/2021 3:32 PM |
| 33 | Being harassed by homeless | 12/30/2021 3:14 PM |
| 34 | No reason | 12/30/2021 2:57 PM |
| 35 | I feel they are mostly sports oriented as opposed to a nice place to just sit and contemplate nature. | 12/30/2021 2:37 PM |
| 36 | Currently disabled. | 12/30/2021 2:37 PM |
| 37 | I am alone and don't feel safe | 12/30/2021 2:36 PM |
| 38 | My recreational activities revolve primarily around my dogs. Since dogs aren't allowed in Carlsbad parks I don't use the Carlsbad parks. Dog parks are not the same. I want to be able to walk around and through the parks with my dogs. Perhaps stop and sit, throw a ball or run around a bit. I'm not nearly as interested in off leash as I am about being able to have my leashed dog with me. | 12/30/2021 2:23 PM |
| 39 | i do no have small children. | 12/30/2021 2:10 PM |
| 40 | I am a disabled senior and don't drive. | 12/30/2021 2:08 PM |
| 41 | People do NOT keep their dogs on a leash. | 12/30/2021 1:45 PM |
| 42 | i live in a park | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |
| 43 | My family and I Ride bikes (bmx, pump tracks and jump lines) currently there are places for skaters and soccer fields but no place for bikes. There was a few spots people built hills but they were torn down. | 12/30/2021 1:37 PM |
| 44 | Don't care for non well behaved children. Also, I don't really know where they all are and have been living in Carlsbad for 4+ years, San Diego for 14 total. | 12/30/2021 1:21 PM |
| 45 | High risk individual and trying to stay away from unmasked people! | 12/30/2021 1:13 PM |
| 46 | Too much dog poop left by careless dog owners or wandering pets. | 12/30/2021 1:11 PM |
| 47 | Time | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 48 | There's not enough reasons: no special gardens nor art; no flat and paved paths to take; not enough seating; not enough shade. | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 49 | I ride a bike or hike the trails. | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 50 | as a senior adult, it's not a place to generally hang out (no family) | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 51 | I swim at Alga Norte Swim Complex | 12/30/2021 12:23 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

Answered: 1,220 Skipped: 546

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Walking and cycling. Outdoor activities suited to seniors. | 1/11/2022 5:37 AM |
| 2 | I wish the city offered gymnastics for kids 6-14 year old | 1/10/2022 8:55 PM |
| 3 | Kids tennis, kids swim, summer camps | 1/10/2022 3:24 PM |
| 4 | team sports, martial arts | 1/10/2022 12:49 PM |
| 5 | Soccer | 1/10/2022 12:37 PM |
| 6 | Yoga, Pilates, art, photography, volunteer opportunities | 1/10/2022 12:35 PM |
| 7 | None. | 1/10/2022 12:32 PM |
| 8 | Soccer, pickleball, volleyball, etc. | 1/10/2022 12:22 PM |
| 9 | Running clubs | 1/10/2022 12:18 PM |
| 10 | Soccer, karate, swimming, dance! | 1/10/2022 11:20 AM |
| 11 | Soccer, already play with CitySC. | 1/10/2022 11:09 AM |
| 12 | Youth baseball and football, archery as well. | 1/10/2022 11:00 AM |
| 13 | soccer, tennis, holiday events | 1/10/2022 9:47 AM |
| 14 | Open space is all I would require | 1/10/2022 7:54 AM |
| 15 | I teach a fitness class for the city | 1/9/2022 6:11 PM |
| 16 | surfing for kids, summer water activities for kids, dog freedom on the beach to run | 1/9/2022 12:39 PM |
| 17 | Coastal activities such as volleyball and water sports and bark parks. | 1/9/2022 12:09 PM |
| 18 | Just open to the ocean for walking and peace. | 1/8/2022 6:22 PM |
| 19 | Outdoor yoga | 1/8/2022 5:35 PM |
| 20 | N/A | 1/8/2022 4:48 PM |
| 21 | Pottery classes | 1/8/2022 2:37 PM |
| 22 | Senior softball League, ocean water safety for pre teens | 1/8/2022 2:35 PM |
| 23 | outdoor yoga or tai chi | 1/8/2022 2:32 PM |
| 24 | safe space for walking | 1/8/2022 2:00 PM |
| 25 | Yoga and weighted classes | 1/8/2022 1:10 PM |
| 26 | dog park | 1/8/2022 1:09 PM |
| 27 | yoga, tai chi, and dance classes would be nice. NO sports leagues! | 1/8/2022 10:30 AM |
| 28 | open space next to ocean | 1/8/2022 10:24 AM |
| 29 | All of the above | 1/8/2022 9:53 AM |
| 30 | soccer | 1/8/2022 9:42 AM |
| 31 | Anything at or near the beach - especially Ponto | 1/8/2022 9:13 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 32 | Pickle ball | 1/8/2022 8:58 AM |
| 33 | Nature tours of areas near the coast. | 1/8/2022 8:57 AM |
| 34 | Golf, yoga | 1/8/2022 8:28 AM |
| 35 | I don't participate in classes, just enjoying grass areas/picnic areas | 1/8/2022 8:25 AM |
| 36 | Yoga, soccer, playgrounds | 1/8/2022 7:20 AM |
| 37 | Youth sports | 1/8/2022 7:17 AM |
| 38 | Soccer and crafts for youth as well as tennis and picks all leagues for seniors | 1/8/2022 6:58 AM |
| 39 | Volleyball, walking/hiking for seniors | 1/8/2022 6:35 AM |
| 40 | Baseball. Swim. | 1/7/2022 11:47 PM |
| 41 | Walking, biking,hiking | 1/7/2022 9:24 PM |
| 42 | Excercise activities for senior citizens, summer camp for my grandkids. | 1/7/2022 9:23 PM |
| 43 | Nature tours and coastal view points | 1/7/2022 9:20 PM |
| 44 | Hiking trails | 1/7/2022 9:00 PM |
| 45 | Grandkids are getting into karate and fishing and I would love to see an archery range and more obstacle type courses. | 1/7/2022 8:53 PM |
| 46 | Volleyball and soccer | 1/7/2022 8:39 PM |
| 47 | Yoga. Tai chi. | 1/7/2022 8:29 PM |
| 48 | Open space to walk ... | 1/7/2022 8:22 PM |
| 49 | Skateparks, fishing availability, more water sports. | 1/7/2022 7:57 PM |
| 50 | Pickleball | 1/7/2022 7:55 PM |
| 51 | We would appreciate a neighborhood park with covered picnic benches. No athletic fields required | 1/7/2022 7:50 PM |
| 52 | Pickle ball - more courts! Local runs on the trails | 1/7/2022 7:39 PM |
| 53 | Volleyball, hiking | 1/7/2022 7:22 PM |
| 54 | Hiking trails, bike trails, playgrounds for kids, sports fields, and courts. | 1/7/2022 7:22 PM |
| 55 | kid's sports | 1/7/2022 7:16 PM |
| 56 | Softball or Ultimate frisbee leagues; | 1/7/2022 7:15 PM |
| 57 | Safe biking | 1/7/2022 7:08 PM |
| 58 | COASTAL PARK AT PONTO. NO MORE HOUSING THERE! We are a pathetic exception among coastal cities that have public open space near/at the beach | 1/7/2022 7:06 PM |
| 59 | Biking | 1/7/2022 7:04 PM |
| 60 | None | 1/7/2022 7:01 PM |
| 61 | Art, yoga, cooking, soccer, tennis, gardening,. | 1/7/2022 6:58 PM |
| 62 | Mountain Bike trails | 1/7/2022 6:57 PM |
| 63 | During, paddle boarding, pickle ball, basketball, beach parks and open space | 1/7/2022 6:50 PM |
| 64 | Our grandkids would enjoy sports there, such as pickle ball or basketball. | 1/7/2022 6:49 PM |
| 65 | -0- | 1/7/2022 6:48 PM |
| 66 | Yoga in the park, soccer, tennis | 1/7/2022 6:35 PM |
| 67 | None | 1/7/2022 6:29 PM |
| 68 | more pickleball courts please! | 1/7/2022 6:28 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 69 | Dog play and training and I'm a proponent of all sports and classes and camps outdoors. So important at every age. | 1/7/2022 6:26 PM |
| 70 | Walking areas in a safe environment and a place where the kids can play | 1/7/2022 6:24 PM |
| 71 | None--Just beautiful open space that draws local native flora and fauna | 1/7/2022 6:10 PM |
| 72 | None. I'm just looking for space, and places to get away from other people. Not taking more classes. | 1/7/2022 6:04 PM |
| 73 | Soccer and sports camps and more hiking trails. | 1/7/2022 6:01 PM |
| 74 | N/A | 1/7/2022 5:55 PM |
| 75 | none | 1/7/2022 5:49 PM |
| 76 | Surfing and sandy beaches. | 1/7/2022 5:44 PM |
| 77 | Biking. Soccer. Lacrosse. Skateboarding | 1/7/2022 5:43 PM |
| 78 | Outdoor Yoga and other fitness classes. | 1/7/2022 5:41 PM |
| 79 | Water aerobics, basketball, baseball, soccer. | 1/7/2022 5:32 PM |
| 80 | None, kids are in high school and coloege | 1/7/2022 5:13 PM |
| 81 | all of the above | 1/7/2022 5:02 PM |
| 82 | Adult baseball/softball, Pickleball, soccer, outdoor Zumba, a rec center with covered space, picnic spaces | 1/7/2022 4:47 PM |
| 83 | Outdoor yoga, cross training group classes, swimming, basketball | 1/7/2022 4:40 PM |
| 84 | whiffle ball | 1/7/2022 4:37 PM |
| 85 | Lacrosse for all three of my kids, basketball for my son. | 1/7/2022 4:36 PM |
| 86 | running. | 1/7/2022 4:34 PM |
| 87 | I go to the Y for fitness and special interest classes. Possibly yoga on the grass. | 1/7/2022 4:33 PM |
| 88 | Yoga, mediation , bacci ball, any children sports . We also need more recreational pools for the children of north county | 1/7/2022 4:32 PM |
| 89 | Swimming, soccer | 1/7/2022 4:27 PM |
| 90 | Soccer, flag football, lacrosse, parkour, skateboarding (by the way, we love Alga Norte - it's just a bit of a drive away ... thank you so much for that park!!!) | 1/7/2022 4:21 PM |
| 91 | yoga in the parks. and in covered areas. tai chi or chi gong in the park | 1/7/2022 4:19 PM |
| 92 | None. Just enjoy being by myself | 1/7/2022 4:18 PM |
| 93 | Concerts at the Park | 1/7/2022 4:15 PM |
| 94 | Yoga, adult dance & racket sports | 1/7/2022 4:07 PM |
| 95 | Would like more PickleBall courts | 1/7/2022 4:03 PM |
| 96 | We need more pools in Carlsbad! Simply upgrading Monroe Street pool will not meet demand. A new pool should be built at Alga! | 1/7/2022 4:02 PM |
| 97 | Water safety classes at the new South Ponto Coastal Park. | 1/7/2022 4:02 PM |
| 98 | Kids sports of all kind, yoga, nature painting, pet friendly areas. | 1/7/2022 4:01 PM |
| 99 | Walking trails | 1/7/2022 3:57 PM |
| 100 | Yard games, yoga, baseball. | 1/7/2022 3:55 PM |
| 101 | Anything and everything! We love fitness and outdoor sports | 1/7/2022 3:55 PM |
| 102 | Fitness, walking trails | 1/7/2022 3:54 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 103 | Youth Lacrosse | 1/7/2022 3:53 PM |
| 104 | Yoga in the park. | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 105 | Pickleball | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 106 | Soccer, Yoga, playgrounds, barbeques | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 107 | Not sure | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 108 | My wife and I are seniors. We enjoy walking through a quiet park environment. | 1/7/2022 3:50 PM |
| 109 | Bocce ball court. | 1/7/2022 3:09 PM |
| 110 | Middle-aged, non-married, no children focus--cooking classes, beginners programs like mountain biking, first time volunteer opportunities, etc --but for single professionals that are age group 35-45ish. | 1/7/2022 10:48 AM |
| 111 | - Swim team (not lessons) or camp for younger kids aged 5-10 year olds. - Swim options with actual 'coaches' not high school students who don't seem to care about the advancement of kids progress. - Master Sports type camps | 1/7/2022 8:37 AM |
| 112 | Mountain bike basics. Summer surf camps. | 1/7/2022 8:27 AM |
| 113 | Yoga Pilates boot camp | 1/7/2022 7:20 AM |
| 114 | Dog parks, pickleball courts | 1/7/2022 5:25 AM |
| 115 | pickleball tennis | 1/6/2022 6:34 PM |
| 116 | Spanish lessons | 1/6/2022 5:45 PM |
| 117 | Pickleball, FNL flag football, yoga with mat Pilates. | 1/6/2022 1:52 PM |
| 118 | ? | 1/6/2022 12:12 PM |
| 119 | swimming | 1/6/2022 10:05 AM |
| 120 | Pickleball clinics or tournaments would be fun! | 1/6/2022 9:54 AM |
| 121 | Soccer, rugby, baseball, mountain biking, rock climbing/bouldering, races/challenges. | 1/6/2022 8:44 AM |
| 122 | Yoga | 1/6/2022 8:17 AM |
| 123 | More pickleball courts! | 1/5/2022 11:57 PM |
| 124 | Pickleball. We need more courts across carlsbad! | 1/5/2022 11:35 PM |
| 125 | open space for play, walking trails, yoga | 1/5/2022 6:50 PM |
| 126 | pickleball, bocce ball, outdoor yoga, outdoor circuit training class | 1/5/2022 12:52 PM |
| 127 | Martial Arts and Yoga | 1/5/2022 9:16 AM |
| 128 | Over 35 softball | 1/5/2022 7:08 AM |
| 129 | spin classes, low-impact fitness | 1/5/2022 12:14 AM |
| 130 | Soccer, pickleball, baseball | 1/4/2022 9:27 PM |
| 131 | Yoga, trail hikes | 1/4/2022 7:13 PM |
| 132 | Pickle ball | 1/4/2022 6:51 PM |
| 133 | Pickle ball | 1/4/2022 5:36 PM |
| 134 | Ping pong, yoga/pilates, Community Days - events with coffee and maybe activities to get to know your neighbors. | 1/4/2022 5:28 PM |
| 135 | Pickle ball leagues and beach volleyball leagues | 1/4/2022 4:53 PM |
| 136 | Kids summer camps, archery, and kids pickleball | 1/4/2022 4:50 PM |
| 137 | Pickleball | 1/4/2022 4:48 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 138 | Ocean natural orientations - large flat outdoor walking track around green lawn area - yoga, dog park, elderly, disabled, tri city wellness center had right idea for catering to aging population with warm water and medical related fitness but needed indoor AND outdoor pool and walking and class areas. Could use large lawn area for music and movie amphitheater functions near ocean as community and entertainment draw to hotel area | 1/4/2022 4:31 PM |
| 139 | Tennis courts, adding better lights to the basketball courts at Laguna Rivera | 1/4/2022 3:36 PM |
| 140 | Yoga classes | 1/4/2022 3:13 PM |
| 141 | Environmental classes, paint and sip classes, camps and classes for kids that focus on art and handy skills, intergenerational activities for grandparents-kids, outdoor acoustic music | 1/4/2022 2:30 PM |
| 142 | Children's yoga, children's rollerblading | 1/4/2022 2:18 PM |
| 143 | High school-aged flag football | 1/4/2022 1:07 PM |
| 144 | Swimming / water activities | 1/4/2022 12:34 PM |
| 145 | Tai chi, pickle ball | 1/4/2022 12:32 PM |
| 146 | Tennis | 1/4/2022 12:32 PM |
| 147 | Mainly walking for me — I live alone. Also area where one could do a fitness circuit. | 1/4/2022 12:22 PM |
| 148 | Improvements to Monroe Street pool. Paved biking course. Increase and improve rail trail access and length. | 1/4/2022 12:22 PM |
| 149 | pickleball | 1/4/2022 8:39 AM |
| 150 | pickleball | 1/4/2022 8:28 AM |
| 151 | Pickleball, running, barre method, soccer, hiking, | 1/4/2022 8:28 AM |
| 152 | Yoga. | 1/4/2022 7:41 AM |
| 153 | Baseball, swimming, yoga, senior (60+) classes | 1/3/2022 11:59 PM |
| 154 | Zumba gold, cooking, gentle yoga, arts and crafts, musical concerts (indoor/outdoor) , dance lessons, senior citizen local bus trips or transportation to botanical gardens, Oceanside pier, balboa park, Coronado hotel, old town, ... | 1/3/2022 11:02 PM |
| 155 | Pickleball | 1/3/2022 8:00 PM |
| 156 | dog park, open space for all kinds of play, yoga | 1/3/2022 7:03 PM |
| 157 | My daughter loves ballet and soccer. My son loves tennis, golf, soccer and volleyball. I'm interested in aquatics, tennis and pickleball. | 1/3/2022 6:44 PM |
| 158 | camping, hiking | 1/3/2022 4:55 PM |
| 159 | Running. Advanced or competitive Swim with instructit | 1/3/2022 4:03 PM |
| 160 | Pickelball | 1/3/2022 4:01 PM |
| 161 | Basketball. Skateboarding. Martial arts. | 1/3/2022 2:14 PM |
| 162 | tai chi | 1/3/2022 1:55 PM |
| 163 | Children's sports (soccer, kickball) Swimming Yoga | 1/3/2022 1:38 PM |
| 164 | Yoga outdoors would be nice. | 1/3/2022 1:13 PM |
| 165 | Pickleball for all ages and youth programs | 1/3/2022 12:23 PM |
| 166 | Sports classes | 1/3/2022 12:06 PM |
| 167 | "boot camp" work outs for all levels of fitness (on the weekends) | 1/3/2022 11:36 AM |
| 168 | soccer | 1/3/2022 11:35 AM |
| 169 | yoga, preschool, pilates, | 1/3/2022 10:53 AM |
| 170 | Masters swim, skateboarding. | 1/3/2022 10:50 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 171 | We really need reservable and free (or very cheap - like \$5) places for Girl Scouts to meet where there's shelter. Schools are no longer available. I would love some more arts and crafts offerings, vinyasa yoga for seniors (not chair yoga or yin), game clubs or classes for older nerds and techies. | 1/3/2022 10:03 AM |
| 172 | if you had bocce ball courts. We go to play bocce ball in Encinitas twice a week. | 1/3/2022 10:00 AM |
| 173 | Pickle Ball and Tennis | 1/3/2022 9:39 AM |
| 174 | Youth sports camps for older (Middle and high school aged) children. Outdoor yoga classes in City parks and beaches. | 1/3/2022 9:34 AM |
| 175 | Pickleball. | 1/3/2022 9:04 AM |
| 176 | natural education, gardening/cooking, yoga, dance, art, local history | 1/3/2022 8:15 AM |
| 177 | Soccer and movie nights | 1/3/2022 8:05 AM |
| 178 | Soccer, more basketball | 1/3/2022 7:20 AM |
| 179 | Swimming | 1/3/2022 6:50 AM |
| 180 | adult basketball, hiking, youth sports | 1/3/2022 5:09 AM |
| 181 | Pickleball courts and basketball | 1/2/2022 10:38 PM |
| 182 | Summer sport camps, STEAM activities. Open rec basketball. | 1/2/2022 8:15 PM |
| 183 | quilting, yoga, stretching, other sewing classes | 1/2/2022 7:58 PM |
| 184 | None, at this time | 1/2/2022 6:15 PM |
| 185 | None - just more pool space | 1/2/2022 5:47 PM |
| 186 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 5:25 PM |
| 187 | Soft ball for old people and adult dance classes | 1/2/2022 4:10 PM |
| 188 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 3:58 PM |
| 189 | Pickleball, volleyball, gymnastics, roller skating | 1/2/2022 3:55 PM |
| 190 | I think it would be great to have camp counselors at the parks during the summer months. I was one at a city park when I was in high school years ago. It was a great summer job. We led checker tournaments, arts and crafts projects and all kinds of fun races and athletic activities. I loved it as much as the kids and their parents! | 1/2/2022 3:34 PM |
| 191 | hiking, picnicing and just hanging out | 1/2/2022 3:33 PM |
| 192 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 2:51 PM |
| 193 | Sports, | 1/2/2022 1:50 PM |
| 194 | Pickle Ball | 1/2/2022 1:28 PM |
| 195 | Croquet, lawn bowling or bocce ball; exercise and fitness; street dance; den building; and swimming are just a few of the physical activities. Classes/presentations/lectures that allow participants to experience nature. | 1/2/2022 1:12 PM |
| 196 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 12:58 PM |
| 197 | Surf camps and lifeguard camp similar to encinitas | 1/2/2022 12:24 PM |
| 198 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 12:15 PM |
| 199 | Pickle ball | 1/2/2022 11:42 AM |
| 200 | pickleball (kids and adults) | 1/2/2022 11:23 AM |
| 201 | NCEA - swim team | 1/2/2022 10:22 AM |
| 202 | My 7yo would really like something along the lines of stretching, tumbling, core building (with a Ninja theme, but it doesn't have to be - it's just him). He HATES team sports, so fitness classes that have kids doing stuff individually in a class would benefit him the most (i.e. | 1/2/2022 10:10 AM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

obstacle courses, light gymnastics, core/balance moves to music, etc.). I always wished there were more of that kind of thing for kids and adults in the Park & Recs in North County (and tai-chi not just for 50+). Otherwise some weekend camps would be lovely! He did a week long summer one (science) that he adored, but some weekend long ones (particularly on long weekend with holiday/school closures?) here and there we'd definitely do. Any classes focused on science, engineering, Legos and such are a huge interest and would have him wanting to sign up. Oh, does Carlsbad have any performance arts programs? More gender neutral and not just dance classes? He loves to perform but I have a hard time finding classes locally.

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 203 | Pickle ball | 1/2/2022 9:19 AM |
| 204 | n/a | 1/2/2022 9:06 AM |
| 205 | Pickleball. | 1/2/2022 9:03 AM |
| 206 | Pickleball & yoga | 1/2/2022 8:57 AM |
| 207 | none | 1/2/2022 8:51 AM |
| 208 | Adult sports leagues, such as pickleball and waterpolo, and more adult cooking and art classes. | 1/2/2022 8:39 AM |
| 209 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 8:22 AM |
| 210 | Yoga for seniors in a pleasant setting | 1/2/2022 8:20 AM |
| 211 | Pickleball, bocci ball | 1/2/2022 8:13 AM |
| 212 | Need more tennis courts. Too many turning into pickle ball courts. | 1/2/2022 7:53 AM |
| 213 | Skateboarding, swimming, diving | 1/2/2022 6:37 AM |
| 214 | Recreational water polo. Non contact. A fun way to get in shape for people that get bored swimming laps. | 1/2/2022 5:24 AM |
| 215 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 11:35 PM |
| 216 | BEING ABLE TO USE THE SPA! | 1/1/2022 10:45 PM |
| 217 | pickleball | 1/1/2022 9:10 PM |
| 218 | Beach volleyball, adult tap dance,pickleball, flag football | 1/1/2022 8:52 PM |
| 219 | Tennis in north Carlsbad - not as far south as poinsettia, swimming, golf | 1/1/2022 8:49 PM |
| 220 | pickleball | 1/1/2022 8:42 PM |
| 221 | Pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 8:38 PM |
| 222 | pickleball | 1/1/2022 8:33 PM |
| 223 | Soccer/sports camps, martial arts/tai chi and dance | 1/1/2022 8:27 PM |
| 224 | Picklball and tennis | 1/1/2022 8:20 PM |
| 225 | More Tennis And Pickleball courts. | 1/1/2022 6:59 PM |
| 226 | Dog park, trails & pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 6:40 PM |
| 227 | Pickleball, basketball, painting classes, volleyball | 1/1/2022 6:10 PM |
| 228 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 6:05 PM |
| 229 | Pickle ball | 1/1/2022 5:53 PM |
| 230 | tye che | 1/1/2022 5:52 PM |
| 231 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 5:44 PM |
| 232 | Zumba | 1/1/2022 5:43 PM |
| 233 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 5:42 PM |
| 234 | softball, basketball, | 1/1/2022 5:14 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 235 | Baseball and Soccer mainly. | 1/1/2022 5:06 PM |
| 236 | Older rec leagues | 1/1/2022 5:02 PM |
| 237 | Pickle ball, outdoor exercises, educational classes | 1/1/2022 5:01 PM |
| 238 | Outdoor socially distanced yoga, meditation & fitness classes, worm composting and organic gardening, | 1/1/2022 4:44 PM |
| 239 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 4:41 PM |
| 240 | Soccer, gymnastics, dance, summer camp | 1/1/2022 3:52 PM |
| 241 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 3:11 PM |
| 242 | Fitness classes for seniors. My children are grown and they live out of state. When my children were young the tee ball, soccer, softball we're much appreciated. | 1/1/2022 2:18 PM |
| 243 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 2:14 PM |
| 244 | pickleball | 1/1/2022 1:25 PM |
| 245 | art, cooking, dance, gymnastics classes | 1/1/2022 1:24 PM |
| 246 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 1:14 PM |
| 247 | water aerobics and swim classes for the grandkids as well as summer camps for the kids | 1/1/2022 1:04 PM |
| 248 | dancing classes for adults | 1/1/2022 12:13 PM |
| 249 | Investing, technology, cooking, biking, swimming, yoga, pickle ball, ping pong, movies, lectures, day field trips, music, . I love all the services. Wish I had more time to enjoy everything! | 1/1/2022 11:47 AM |
| 250 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 11:42 AM |
| 251 | Swimming and soccer, but we can already find those at our local parks. | 1/1/2022 11:38 AM |
| 252 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 10:49 AM |
| 253 | - - | 1/1/2022 10:39 AM |
| 254 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 10:36 AM |
| 255 | Pickleball and tai chi classes for beginners. | 1/1/2022 10:35 AM |
| 256 | tennis | 1/1/2022 9:50 AM |
| 257 | Tennis, swim | 1/1/2022 9:47 AM |
| 258 | outdoor volleyball leagues on the grass or sand, more pickle ball courts, more kickball leagues at Calaveras location | 1/1/2022 9:35 AM |
| 259 | Outdoor yoga, pickleballl | 1/1/2022 9:29 AM |
| 260 | LCYO youth softball. | 1/1/2022 9:25 AM |
| 261 | None | 1/1/2022 9:16 AM |
| 262 | women's pickleball league | 1/1/2022 8:57 AM |
| 263 | Softball, tennis, outdoor fitness | 1/1/2022 8:43 AM |
| 264 | Pickleball and lots of courts! | 1/1/2022 8:42 AM |
| 265 | Step classes. Heated community pool in the Village area, not just Bressie Ranch. | 1/1/2022 8:35 AM |
| 266 | walking, qigong | 1/1/2022 8:33 AM |
| 267 | We need a safe place where families can ride bikes. | 1/1/2022 7:58 AM |
| 268 | pickleball | 1/1/2022 7:56 AM |
| 269 | Pickleball; tai chi; yoga | 1/1/2022 7:54 AM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 270 | Yoga, kickboxing, ceramics camp, acting/theatre camp | 1/1/2022 7:44 AM |
| 271 | Pickleball and outdoor fitness classes | 1/1/2022 7:39 AM |
| 272 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 7:38 AM |
| 273 | Outdoor yoga, pickle ball, perhaps a spot for small RV's to park during the day. | 1/1/2022 7:28 AM |
| 274 | Yoga, Tai Chi | 1/1/2022 7:02 AM |
| 275 | Kids pickleball classes. | 1/1/2022 6:59 AM |
| 276 | Basketball, soccer, baseball | 1/1/2022 6:42 AM |
| 277 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 5:34 AM |
| 278 | Outdoor fitness class | 1/1/2022 3:16 AM |
| 279 | Pickleball league. | 1/1/2022 1:27 AM |
| 280 | More Pickleball courts, clinics, classes, tournaments. | 12/31/2021 11:43 PM |
| 281 | Pickle ball and tennis | 12/31/2021 10:29 PM |
| 282 | We all play pickleball and tennis! | 12/31/2021 9:46 PM |
| 283 | Kids: gymnastics, Rock climbing, more swimming options (often sold out), soccer teams, lacrosse Adults: cross fit, yoga | 12/31/2021 9:35 PM |
| 284 | PICKLEBALL, SWIMMING POOL FACILITIES!!! | 12/31/2021 9:13 PM |
| 285 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:47 PM |
| 286 | None. We have enough parks. Please spend our tax dollars to eliminate homeless and drug issues on the street before thinking about adding more parks. | 12/31/2021 8:44 PM |
| 287 | swimming, pilates, yoga, pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:39 PM |
| 288 | N/a | 12/31/2021 8:12 PM |
| 289 | none | 12/31/2021 6:40 PM |
| 290 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:38 PM |
| 291 | Any & all. | 12/31/2021 6:12 PM |
| 292 | Masters swim classes | 12/31/2021 5:42 PM |
| 293 | Gentle yoga for seniors. | 12/31/2021 5:40 PM |
| 294 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:34 PM |
| 295 | very warm water and limited to seniors. Need not be available every day, There once was such a service available in North County. | 12/31/2021 5:02 PM |
| 296 | tai chi/yoga at the park, beginners lessons in pickle ball, continued music/concerts at the park | 12/31/2021 4:57 PM |
| 297 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:35 PM |
| 298 | Yoga for seniors | 12/31/2021 4:25 PM |
| 299 | Archery classes. Yoga for elders. Flower arranging. craft classes | 12/31/2021 4:24 PM |
| 300 | lap swim and adult eater aerobic classes | 12/31/2021 4:22 PM |
| 301 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:18 PM |
| 302 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:16 PM |
| 303 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:13 PM |
| 304 | Soccer, track and field, tennis and pickle ball lessons. | 12/31/2021 3:57 PM |
| 305 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 3:55 PM |
| 306 | Senior exercise classes and activities | 12/31/2021 3:53 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 307 | we all play pickleball | 12/31/2021 3:50 PM |
| 308 | Tennis, kickball, pottery, knitting, sewing, board game groups, cooking | 12/31/2021 3:48 PM |
| 309 | Gentle Yoga, stretching, gentle walking groups in afternoon not early am | 12/31/2021 3:45 PM |
| 310 | Yoga, lap swim, water fitness, trails | 12/31/2021 3:37 PM |
| 311 | Early childhood program, yoga, general exercise program | 12/31/2021 3:26 PM |
| 312 | gardening classes, ballroom dance classes, yoga classes, spanish and french classes, over 55 swim, softball, and bowling leagues, crochet and knitting groups | 12/31/2021 3:19 PM |
| 313 | Bocca ball or lawn bowling | 12/31/2021 3:07 PM |
| 314 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 3:05 PM |
| 315 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:59 PM |
| 316 | Dance , Tai Chi | 12/31/2021 2:59 PM |
| 317 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:55 PM |
| 318 | Sorry...and have to go with Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:55 PM |
| 319 | pickle ball stadium court | 12/31/2021 2:54 PM |
| 320 | Fitness: Pilates Reformer Classes. Beach volleyball, Photography. | 12/31/2021 2:45 PM |
| 321 | More Pickleball and golf | 12/31/2021 2:39 PM |
| 322 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:26 PM |
| 323 | Swimming... senior center classes when safe to resume...balance class..history of area.. | 12/31/2021 2:25 PM |
| 324 | Pickleball! | 12/31/2021 2:20 PM |
| 325 | golf, baseball, soccer | 12/31/2021 2:16 PM |
| 326 | Yoga, pickle ball, water sports like windsurfing, e-foiling, paddle boards, soccer. Might also consider model boat pond and/or model airplane/drone field. | 12/31/2021 2:13 PM |
| 327 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 1:43 PM |
| 328 | None come to mind | 12/31/2021 1:41 PM |
| 329 | pickle ball | 12/31/2021 1:40 PM |
| 330 | Adult fitness programs near me. Clear notice of activities. | 12/31/2021 1:35 PM |
| 331 | Tennis, swimming, hiking. | 12/31/2021 1:33 PM |
| 332 | playground gymnastics (basic skills like cartwheels, monkey bars, jump roping, etc), ninja gymnastics for young boys, the art of storytelling for kids (helps them with pretend play), intro to skateboarding | 12/31/2021 1:18 PM |
| 333 | Beach volleyball, indoor volleyball | 12/31/2021 1:14 PM |
| 334 | Archery, yoga, BMX, mountain biking, rollerskating, pickleball | 12/31/2021 1:04 PM |
| 335 | swimming, yoga | 12/31/2021 1:00 PM |
| 336 | Pickleball Courts Pickleball clinics | 12/31/2021 1:00 PM |
| 337 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:52 PM |
| 338 | Pickel ball and dog park | 12/31/2021 12:41 PM |
| 339 | Pickleball and yoga | 12/31/2021 12:24 PM |
| 340 | Yoga, dog training, skateboarding | 12/31/2021 12:17 PM |
| 341 | only pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:13 PM |
| 342 | Dog park and Pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:08 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 343 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:08 PM |
| 344 | Tai Chi in one or more of the parks | 12/31/2021 12:07 PM |
| 345 | Tennis camps, adult soccer indoor league, bigger dog parks. | 12/31/2021 11:56 AM |
| 346 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:45 AM |
| 347 | Pickleball tournaments | 12/31/2021 11:44 AM |
| 348 | ?? not sure right now. | 12/31/2021 11:36 AM |
| 349 | pickleball, tennis , painting (art) classes, | 12/31/2021 11:32 AM |
| 350 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:31 AM |
| 351 | All of my family members play pickleball. The sport has outgrown the facilities in Carlsbad by a long shot. It would be nice if the city offered pickleball lessons and tournaments. | 12/31/2021 11:27 AM |
| 352 | Yoga, Tai Chi. | 12/31/2021 11:21 AM |
| 353 | I am missing the Boys/Girls club indoor heated pool and the Artheritis class they had. Best thing for Seniors that Carlsbad offered. Wish city could participate and have this class included in the Sr. Agenda. | 12/31/2021 11:21 AM |
| 354 | Fitness classes | 12/31/2021 11:20 AM |
| 355 | Soccer and Swimming | 12/31/2021 11:16 AM |
| 356 | tai chi like classes or groups to join | 12/31/2021 11:11 AM |
| 357 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:06 AM |
| 358 | Pickleball. The fastest growing sport in the USA. | 12/31/2021 11:06 AM |
| 359 | Love the kids sports offered for grandchildren | 12/31/2021 11:03 AM |
| 360 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:57 AM |
| 361 | pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 10:55 AM |
| 362 | Baseball LCYO. We never seem to have enough space to practice during the weekdays. | 12/31/2021 10:46 AM |
| 363 | Pickleball outdoor courts, indoor basketball, | 12/31/2021 10:44 AM |
| 364 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:43 AM |
| 365 | We enjoy playing Bocce Ball, Biking, walking & Pickle Ball. | 12/31/2021 10:42 AM |
| 366 | Yoga | 12/31/2021 10:38 AM |
| 367 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:30 AM |
| 368 | ok as is. Although it would be nice to have a "Hollywood Bowl" type facility at the Strawberry fields | 12/31/2021 10:25 AM |
| 369 | N/A | 12/31/2021 10:23 AM |
| 370 | Outdoor tai chi | 12/31/2021 10:22 AM |
| 371 | Pickleball, swimming and tennis. | 12/31/2021 10:20 AM |
| 372 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:12 AM |
| 373 | Puckleball | 12/31/2021 10:12 AM |
| 374 | Soccer camps. Skateboard classes. Mountain biking basics. | 12/31/2021 10:12 AM |
| 375 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:04 AM |
| 376 | senior fitness | 12/31/2021 10:02 AM |
| 377 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:59 AM |
| 378 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:58 AM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 379 | Basketball, pickleball and tennis | 12/31/2021 9:56 AM |
| 380 | Yoga. Workout classes | 12/31/2021 9:50 AM |
| 381 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:47 AM |
| 382 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:44 AM |
| 383 | Yoga, dogs, exercise | 12/31/2021 9:43 AM |
| 384 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 9:35 AM |
| 385 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:29 AM |
| 386 | My wife and I are both 77 and would like more pickleball courts, both indoor and outdoor, yoga and tai chi courses. | 12/31/2021 9:17 AM |
| 387 | Walking | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 388 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 389 | Something geared to senior citizens | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 390 | swimming | 12/31/2021 9:11 AM |
| 391 | Swimming at AguaNorte and Pickleball at Poinsettia Park. More of the same. | 12/31/2021 9:09 AM |
| 392 | Affordable cooking classes Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:07 AM |
| 393 | Pickleball, platform tennis, paddle tennis, and need large walls (back in the 80's, that is how we all learned to play tennis, hitting against a wall w a line drawn for the net!!) so individuals could do drills and practice their forehand and backhand shots!! | 12/31/2021 9:06 AM |
| 394 | Soccer | 12/31/2021 9:05 AM |
| 395 | Cross-generational activities for elementary & younger, plus retired people. | 12/31/2021 9:04 AM |
| 396 | Yoga | 12/31/2021 9:03 AM |
| 397 | tennis and softball | 12/31/2021 8:55 AM |
| 398 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:52 AM |
| 399 | Adult softball, swimming, yoga, kids activities | 12/31/2021 8:45 AM |
| 400 | Pickleball :) | 12/31/2021 8:45 AM |
| 401 | Pickle ball | 12/31/2021 8:37 AM |
| 402 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:35 AM |
| 403 | 1. Pickleball 2. Tai Chi | 12/31/2021 8:34 AM |
| 404 | Skateboarding | 12/31/2021 8:32 AM |
| 405 | Pickleball tournament | 12/31/2021 8:31 AM |
| 406 | Pickleball and dog parks. | 12/31/2021 8:30 AM |
| 407 | Soccer:City SC FNL Summer camps: sports, arts Rec sports for kids and adults Alga Norte Pool | 12/31/2021 8:28 AM |
| 408 | Softball, water polo, yoga/Pilates, tennis, basketball, pickle ball, bike paths | 12/31/2021 8:27 AM |
| 409 | Tennis and picklenall | 12/31/2021 8:25 AM |
| 410 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:23 AM |
| 411 | Bocce Ball. Outdoor, no cost group Tai Chi practice. Ukulele club. | 12/31/2021 8:23 AM |
| 412 | Tennis, soccer, dog exercise, dance, pickle ball. | 12/31/2021 8:20 AM |
| 413 | adult swim workout adult dance lessons | 12/31/2021 8:17 AM |
| 414 | Pickleball courts, pickleball clinics, more yoga and senior classes. Maybe a Spanish/English | 12/31/2021 8:17 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | language exchange group | |
| 415 | Pickleball Surfing Softball | 12/31/2021 8:15 AM |
| 416 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:15 AM |
| 417 | Pickleball for all ages, classes for parent/toddlers, yoga, tai chi, hiking/walking group | 12/31/2021 8:15 AM |
| 418 | Our household is v interested in aquatic programs | 12/31/2021 8:14 AM |
| 419 | Skate, surf, kids school break camps, junior lifeguards, MTB clinics | 12/31/2021 8:08 AM |
| 420 | swimming, pickle ball, yoga | 12/31/2021 8:08 AM |
| 421 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:07 AM |
| 422 | Tennis, softball, pools | 12/31/2021 8:03 AM |
| 423 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:03 AM |
| 424 | swimming | 12/31/2021 8:01 AM |
| 425 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:01 AM |
| 426 | very few. The City's pricing of these is not competitive. We have used other Cities recreation programs due to Carlsbad's higher costs, excessive need to drive/park, and general lower value. | 12/31/2021 8:01 AM |
| 427 | Understanding elements of investing. Muscle conditioning for the frail. | 12/31/2021 7:59 AM |
| 428 | A Pickleball league | 12/31/2021 7:57 AM |
| 429 | Pickleball, yoga, HIIT | 12/31/2021 7:57 AM |
| 430 | Love all the Aquafit classes, Deep Water Running, as well. | 12/31/2021 7:54 AM |
| 431 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:53 AM |
| 432 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:52 AM |
| 433 | pickleball 3 members. | 12/31/2021 7:51 AM |
| 434 | Pickleball, softball and soccer | 12/31/2021 7:44 AM |
| 435 | Pickleball, yoga | 12/31/2021 7:41 AM |
| 436 | Pickleball, swimming | 12/31/2021 7:37 AM |
| 437 | Zumba, Pickleball, art | 12/31/2021 7:37 AM |
| 438 | Pickleball, soccer, tennis, tgif | 12/31/2021 7:37 AM |
| 439 | Yoga, tennis, pickle ball | 12/31/2021 7:33 AM |
| 440 | Walking club? | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 441 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 442 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 443 | All sports, mountain biking, skateboarding. | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 444 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:31 AM |
| 445 | pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:28 AM |
| 446 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:23 AM |
| 447 | Masters swim, masters water polo, club water polo, rec swim, | 12/31/2021 7:20 AM |
| 448 | Pickleball and basketball | 12/31/2021 7:18 AM |
| 449 | My family goes to poinsettia to play pickleball. It is so crowded and you end up playing people and kids that arent at your level after waiting 45 minutes you end up playing a game for only 7 minutes | 12/31/2021 7:00 AM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 450 | Pickleball Swimming Hiking | 12/31/2021 6:55 AM |
| 451 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:53 AM |
| 452 | swim instruction for adults--on weekends, because there's no time on weekdays | 12/31/2021 6:49 AM |
| 453 | Pickel ball courts | 12/31/2021 6:47 AM |
| 454 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:46 AM |
| 455 | We have done sports camps, science camps, computer classes at the library, ceramics. Outdoor adult fitness would be nice. | 12/31/2021 6:45 AM |
| 456 | Pickleball and beach volleyball camps. | 12/31/2021 6:44 AM |
| 457 | Already use the aquatic center so I am happy. | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 458 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 459 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:39 AM |
| 460 | The Carlsbad Triathlon was one of my favorite events | 12/31/2021 6:27 AM |
| 461 | Soccer, cross country, biking | 12/31/2021 6:22 AM |
| 462 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:21 AM |
| 463 | Pickleball Walking | 12/31/2021 6:20 AM |
| 464 | Youth sports and pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:16 AM |
| 465 | None | 12/31/2021 6:14 AM |
| 466 | Senior day trips | 12/31/2021 6:10 AM |
| 467 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:09 AM |
| 468 | Dance for tweens, pilates and meditation | 12/31/2021 6:03 AM |
| 469 | I believe the city already offers a great variety. | 12/31/2021 5:59 AM |
| 470 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:52 AM |
| 471 | More pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:51 AM |
| 472 | Pickleball leagues | 12/31/2021 5:50 AM |
| 473 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:45 AM |
| 474 | Pickleball, walking. | 12/31/2021 5:40 AM |
| 475 | Picklball | 12/31/2021 5:21 AM |
| 476 | All levels of yoga classes | 12/31/2021 5:08 AM |
| 477 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:07 AM |
| 478 | Pickleball, softball | 12/31/2021 5:07 AM |
| 479 | Programs for kids younger than kindergarten. Yoga, senior activites | 12/31/2021 4:55 AM |
| 480 | Pickleball, tennis, Soccer | 12/31/2021 4:52 AM |
| 481 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:09 AM |
| 482 | Pickleball, adult tap dancing, lap swimming. | 12/31/2021 4:00 AM |
| 483 | Pickleball. | 12/31/2021 3:09 AM |
| 484 | Pickleball open play and round robin tourney | 12/31/2021 2:38 AM |
| 485 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:06 AM |
| 486 | More Pickleball courts! | 12/31/2021 12:46 AM |
| 487 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:30 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 488 | Yoga Swim Cooking | 12/31/2021 12:22 AM |
| 489 | Pickleball :) | 12/31/2021 12:10 AM |
| 490 | youth camps in all sports | 12/30/2021 11:45 PM |
| 491 | Pickleball, football, soccer. | 12/30/2021 11:41 PM |
| 492 | We are retired and belong to a local gym. We probably would not partake in classes. We especially love the summer concert series! | 12/30/2021 11:35 PM |
| 493 | Senior softball in the evenings to accommodate seniors that are not retired. | 12/30/2021 11:32 PM |
| 494 | Prefer independent activities | 12/30/2021 11:31 PM |
| 495 | Soccer, football, pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:30 PM |
| 496 | Get Junior Lifeguards going at full capacity soonest. | 12/30/2021 11:21 PM |
| 497 | Swimming, volleyball | 12/30/2021 11:20 PM |
| 498 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:13 PM |
| 499 | More pickleball courts are needed | 12/30/2021 11:12 PM |
| 500 | Adult Volleyball Open pickleball at pointsetia park | 12/30/2021 11:08 PM |
| 501 | Pickle Ball and Line Dance, Improver. Classes of interest such as people talking about their trips, religion, geology etc. | 12/30/2021 11:08 PM |
| 502 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:04 PM |
| 503 | more pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 11:00 PM |
| 504 | More out door Pickkeball. | 12/30/2021 11:00 PM |
| 505 | Friday Night Lights, Soccer, Dance, or Cheer It would be good to have camps that are longer than 3 hours with a lunch break in between, so working parents can have an option. Swim at Alga Norte has been great. | 12/30/2021 10:56 PM |
| 506 | Pickle ball , Zumba | 12/30/2021 10:55 PM |
| 507 | Pickleball clinics | 12/30/2021 10:45 PM |
| 508 | Senior fitness, yoga | 12/30/2021 10:32 PM |
| 509 | Pickleball, tennis, yoga | 12/30/2021 10:31 PM |
| 510 | Pickleball, soccer | 12/30/2021 10:28 PM |
| 511 | Yoga, habitat identification | 12/30/2021 10:22 PM |
| 512 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 10:20 PM |
| 513 | Tenis | 12/30/2021 10:20 PM |
| 514 | None | 12/30/2021 10:16 PM |
| 515 | Archery, archery, archery. | 12/30/2021 10:16 PM |
| 516 | General adult & teen fitness - aerobics, yoga, stretching. More tennis & pickleball coaching options. | 12/30/2021 10:13 PM |
| 517 | As a Senior citizens I would like to see more fitness classes for seniors. | 12/30/2021 10:12 PM |
| 518 | Walking | 12/30/2021 10:10 PM |
| 519 | Soccer, basketball, Judo, Yoga | 12/30/2021 10:10 PM |
| 520 | More areas to play pickleball Using parks for concerts and special events Running and biking trails for exercise | 12/30/2021 10:05 PM |
| 521 | Soccer, baseball, outdoor yoga | 12/30/2021 10:03 PM |
| 522 | Pickleball classes | 12/30/2021 10:01 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 523 | Bocce ball, tai chi | 12/30/2021 9:58 PM |
| 524 | Aquatic camp Lego camp | 12/30/2021 9:58 PM |
| 525 | Krav maga, Parkour, yoga, foreign language (Spanish) | 12/30/2021 9:55 PM |
| 526 | Outdoor Thai Chi | 12/30/2021 9:54 PM |
| 527 | Mostly outdoor pickleball - there aren't nearly enough courts in carlsbad | 12/30/2021 9:52 PM |
| 528 | Soccer and foreign language classes | 12/30/2021 9:52 PM |
| 529 | Fitness for old folks | 12/30/2021 9:52 PM |
| 530 | Tween sports and science programs/camps. In addition to the many fine current offerings, we would love to see archery and rock climbing since we must travel to other cities for those sports classes. | 12/30/2021 9:38 PM |
| 531 | Any sport would be great. | 12/30/2021 9:36 PM |
| 532 | adult and adult with kids work out boot camp. | 12/30/2021 9:35 PM |
| 533 | Senior fitness, all sports for kids, dance classes, pickleball. | 12/30/2021 9:23 PM |
| 534 | Junior life guards at pools | 12/30/2021 9:21 PM |
| 535 | PICKLEBALL | 12/30/2021 9:19 PM |
| 536 | Soccer, Flag Football, Yoga, Musical Theater, Horseback Riding. | 12/30/2021 9:19 PM |
| 537 | swimming | 12/30/2021 9:16 PM |
| 538 | Another pool would be great. | 12/30/2021 9:10 PM |
| 539 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:55 PM |
| 540 | Senior activities | 12/30/2021 8:52 PM |
| 541 | Pickleball open play! | 12/30/2021 8:51 PM |
| 542 | Our children are both grown up now, but both utilized sports fields and camps at local parks. These should continue for all kids, and for older folks: tai chi, yoga, stretching, mindfulness, fitness walking, etc would be most welcome. A dog park where people could socialize and attend training classes would also be wonderful! | 12/30/2021 8:51 PM |
| 543 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:51 PM |
| 544 | None | 12/30/2021 8:43 PM |
| 545 | Pickle ball, Zumba classes, etc. | 12/30/2021 8:43 PM |
| 546 | Pickleball for kids ! | 12/30/2021 8:40 PM |
| 547 | Rolley Skating and I'll all area Ana basketball | 12/30/2021 8:39 PM |
| 548 | More for little kids on the weekends | 12/30/2021 8:36 PM |
| 549 | Bike parks | 12/30/2021 8:35 PM |
| 550 | Pickleball, Tai chi, | 12/30/2021 8:34 PM |
| 551 | Soccer | 12/30/2021 8:32 PM |
| 552 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:26 PM |
| 553 | Pickleball, tennis | 12/30/2021 8:26 PM |
| 554 | FNL, soccer, baseball, softball | 12/30/2021 8:24 PM |
| 555 | More pickleball courts and tap, ballroom dance classes, yoga. | 12/30/2021 8:23 PM |
| 556 | N/A | 12/30/2021 8:21 PM |
| 557 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:19 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 558 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:18 PM |
| 559 | Dance, soccer, gymnastics, science camp, swim , animal, art | 12/30/2021 8:18 PM |
| 560 | Zumba and dance | 12/30/2021 8:17 PM |
| 561 | Pickleball, the zip line park is amazing. | 12/30/2021 8:12 PM |
| 562 | Yoga softball pickleball flag football ultimate frisbee | 12/30/2021 8:11 PM |
| 563 | Track and field classes for elementary aged kids. Sports or dance classes that are available at 4:30-5:30 start time. Working parents can't get young children to classes that start too early. | 12/30/2021 8:10 PM |
| 564 | yoga for seniors | 12/30/2021 8:08 PM |
| 565 | Pickleball, water aerobics | 12/30/2021 8:05 PM |
| 566 | More Pickleball courts, pickleball leagues and clinics; gentle yoga classes; golf clinics; women's beginner golf league; spinning classes. Games such as Mexican train dominoes would be fun. Bridge lessons. Computer classes. Book clubs. | 12/30/2021 7:58 PM |
| 567 | yoga, adult dance classes | 12/30/2021 7:58 PM |
| 568 | Yoga classes | 12/30/2021 7:55 PM |
| 569 | Pickleball, and better use of recreation centers. Rec centers cater to basketball leagues, run by the same people, all over the city, and the participants are the SAME GUYS, traveling to various rec centers, all over this city. I am a referee. I know this to be true. We should have volleyball and badminton nights, for LOCAL residents!!!! | 12/30/2021 7:52 PM |
| 570 | pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:50 PM |
| 571 | Pickleball league | 12/30/2021 7:49 PM |
| 572 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:48 PM |
| 573 | Football, waterpolo, lacrosse | 12/30/2021 7:42 PM |
| 574 | tai chi | 12/30/2021 7:42 PM |
| 575 | N/A | 12/30/2021 7:41 PM |
| 576 | I like the unstructured feel of a park actually. | 12/30/2021 7:41 PM |
| 577 | Everything is pretty good the way it is. | 12/30/2021 7:39 PM |
| 578 | Pottery, tennis, woodworking, visual arts, ballroom dancing, salsa dancing | 12/30/2021 7:32 PM |
| 579 | As mentioned, pickleball. Great sport for a family if there is a non competitive environment available for them to just play & have fun. | 12/30/2021 7:32 PM |
| 580 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:29 PM |
| 581 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:25 PM |
| 582 | Soccer, yoga, kickboxing | 12/30/2021 7:24 PM |
| 583 | Tennis, pickelball | 12/30/2021 7:14 PM |
| 584 | Pickleball please | 12/30/2021 7:12 PM |
| 585 | Softball yoga | 12/30/2021 7:09 PM |
| 586 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:07 PM |
| 587 | Special-Needs geared camps, spots. With teachers/counselors/coaches who are highly experienced with working with Special-needs kids. | 12/30/2021 7:04 PM |
| 588 | Youth Baseball | 12/30/2021 7:01 PM |
| 589 | Swim | 12/30/2021 6:59 PM |
| 590 | Tennis | 12/30/2021 6:58 PM |
| 591 | yoga, craft classes, tennis lessons | 12/30/2021 6:58 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 592 | pickle ball, softball, senoir sports | 12/30/2021 6:56 PM |
| 593 | Stretching class | 12/30/2021 6:51 PM |
| 594 | Outdoor yoga | 12/30/2021 6:48 PM |
| 595 | Bicycle trails, dog runs | 12/30/2021 6:46 PM |
| 596 | Gardening classes and composting classes | 12/30/2021 6:46 PM |
| 597 | Tai chi | 12/30/2021 6:43 PM |
| 598 | Soccer, tennis, volleyball, for children and adults. You guys do a good job. | 12/30/2021 6:42 PM |
| 599 | Deep Water Boot Camp | 12/30/2021 6:41 PM |
| 600 | Swimming, surfing, lifeguard skills. Water safety. | 12/30/2021 6:39 PM |
| 601 | I don't need any now but my grandsons loved the summer camps | 12/30/2021 6:36 PM |
| 602 | Pickle ball Classes/ camps for 16-22 year olds with disabilities. | 12/30/2021 6:35 PM |
| 603 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 6:33 PM |
| 604 | Golf. Carlsbad is the epicenter of the golf universe but it's golf course is too expensive for us retired folk. Why can't Carlsbad provide affordable opportunities to play and practice??? | 12/30/2021 6:32 PM |
| 605 | Pickleball, yoga, | 12/30/2021 6:29 PM |
| 606 | Pickleball clinics, leagues, and tournaments | 12/30/2021 6:28 PM |
| 607 | Softball, basketball | 12/30/2021 6:28 PM |
| 608 | Senior walking trails | 12/30/2021 6:27 PM |
| 609 | Tennis lessons | 12/30/2021 6:27 PM |
| 610 | More pickleball courts please. | 12/30/2021 6:26 PM |
| 611 | Tai Chi classes early in the AM. | 12/30/2021 6:22 PM |
| 612 | I don't really do that. | 12/30/2021 6:17 PM |
| 613 | Aquatics | 12/30/2021 6:14 PM |
| 614 | Pickleball clinics, leagues and open play | 12/30/2021 6:14 PM |
| 615 | Pickleball, stroller strides | 12/30/2021 6:13 PM |
| 616 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 6:11 PM |
| 617 | more open swimming time at city pools | 12/30/2021 6:11 PM |
| 618 | N/A | 12/30/2021 6:10 PM |
| 619 | Nothing until covid has passed | 12/30/2021 6:09 PM |
| 620 | Women's soccer league (11v11 or 8v8) | 12/30/2021 6:08 PM |
| 621 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 6:07 PM |
| 622 | Yoga, Pilates, pickle ball, tennis. Swimming g | 12/30/2021 6:07 PM |
| 623 | Mountain bike instruction and trails | 12/30/2021 6:04 PM |
| 624 | Another swimming pool in south Carlsbad! | 12/30/2021 6:02 PM |
| 625 | More dog parks | 12/30/2021 6:00 PM |
| 626 | Nine | 12/30/2021 6:00 PM |
| 627 | Ultimate (frisbee/disk throwing game), water aerobics. Co-ed softball or kickball teams | 12/30/2021 5:57 PM |
| 628 | Outdoor yoga and fitness boot camp. | 12/30/2021 5:53 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 629 | pickleball competitions! | 12/30/2021 5:52 PM |
| 630 | Senior Yoga and Tai Chi | 12/30/2021 5:52 PM |
| 631 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:51 PM |
| 632 | Physical education and/or therapies about healing trauma by working with the body. | 12/30/2021 5:51 PM |
| 633 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:50 PM |
| 634 | Volleyball, pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:50 PM |
| 635 | More pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:48 PM |
| 636 | Tennis camp | 12/30/2021 5:48 PM |
| 637 | pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 5:47 PM |
| 638 | Pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 5:44 PM |
| 639 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:43 PM |
| 640 | Outdoor aerobics for seniors. | 12/30/2021 5:42 PM |
| 641 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 642 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 643 | soccer and tennis | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 644 | Yoga Out door stationery bike classes | 12/30/2021 5:34 PM |
| 645 | I am a masters endurance runner, anything along that line would interest me | 12/30/2021 5:33 PM |
| 646 | Pickleball league | 12/30/2021 5:33 PM |
| 647 | Craft classes | 12/30/2021 5:31 PM |
| 648 | Gardening | 12/30/2021 5:31 PM |
| 649 | Yoga, | 12/30/2021 5:29 PM |
| 650 | Toddler classes | 12/30/2021 5:29 PM |
| 651 | Walking trails and Pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 5:26 PM |
| 652 | kids leagues | 12/30/2021 5:26 PM |
| 653 | Yoga, swimming, exercise for seniors | 12/30/2021 5:24 PM |
| 654 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:23 PM |
| 655 | Pickleball facilities including with lights and s Ed's to water fountains | 12/30/2021 5:22 PM |
| 656 | Basic computer & phone operation classes. I believe you already offer these connected to the senior center. Will be nice when Covid is gone. Also field trips for seniors would be nice. | 12/30/2021 5:17 PM |
| 657 | skateboarding, dance for HS age kids, and rock band | 12/30/2021 5:17 PM |
| 658 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:16 PM |
| 659 | You already offer a ton of classes. I'd like to see one day classes. Photography for a half day, flower arranging for a half day, etc. | 12/30/2021 5:16 PM |
| 660 | Girls softball, | 12/30/2021 5:13 PM |
| 661 | Crafts, gardening, diy, self sufficiency type activities. | 12/30/2021 5:12 PM |
| 662 | I live in La Costa Greens. You built Agua Norte - a large Park without a walking path. You built a dog park. Apparently you think dogs need to walk more than people. | 12/30/2021 5:11 PM |
| 663 | Yoga, Pilates, art, photography, music | 12/30/2021 5:10 PM |
| 664 | Pickle ball! Lol | 12/30/2021 5:10 PM |
| 665 | Pickleball, walking/hiking/jogging trails that are well established, and lit. | 12/30/2021 5:09 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 666 | Baseball, soccer, volleyball and tennis camps Music/instrumental classes for kids | 12/30/2021 5:09 PM |
| 667 | Yoga, some type of free fitness too | 12/30/2021 5:08 PM |
| 668 | Water aerobics, water boot camp in the afternoon (I work until 1:30) and miss my am class I took in the summer! | 12/30/2021 5:08 PM |
| 669 | Teen yoga, multi-sport camps | 12/30/2021 5:07 PM |
| 670 | Soccer | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 671 | Pickleball and youth baseball | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 672 | yoga, youth sports | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 673 | We like pickleball and tennis. But prefer pickleball. that's the trend my friend | 12/30/2021 5:04 PM |
| 674 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:03 PM |
| 675 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:03 PM |
| 676 | Science/art/nature camps for grandchildren. Low cost art classes for adults. | 12/30/2021 5:03 PM |
| 677 | Swimming pool and community garden | 12/30/2021 5:02 PM |
| 678 | Softball, inner tube water polo | 12/30/2021 5:00 PM |
| 679 | Tennis, swimming, dog training, yoga | 12/30/2021 4:55 PM |
| 680 | Skateboarding classes, mountain biking classes, sailing camps. | 12/30/2021 4:53 PM |
| 681 | Swimming at Alga Norte. I swim there 4x's per week and my wife swims there 3x's per week. | 12/30/2021 4:53 PM |
| 682 | I'm happy with how you are operating the parks system. | 12/30/2021 4:51 PM |
| 683 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:48 PM |
| 684 | Non-competitive volleyball and paddleball, dancing, arts and crafts. I find it annoying that regular people can't play games on the fields because they are so often in use by sports leagues that only some people can belong to and that cost money. If regular citizens can't use the parks they pay for because a Vista football team is using the field, that doesn't seem quite fair. | 12/30/2021 4:48 PM |
| 685 | Adult aerobics and yoga classes; art and sports camps/classes for kids | 12/30/2021 4:47 PM |
| 686 | Morning yoga classes in the park would be wonderful! | 12/30/2021 4:47 PM |
| 687 | Senior fitness and aquatic opportunities. Yoga. | 12/30/2021 4:47 PM |
| 688 | Enjoyed baseball, basketball and soccer youth sports leagues in the past. No interest currently. | 12/30/2021 4:47 PM |
| 689 | None | 12/30/2021 4:45 PM |
| 690 | An indoor running track would be nice, but a professional surfaced outdoor track would be very nice. | 12/30/2021 4:45 PM |
| 691 | special interest classes | 12/30/2021 4:43 PM |
| 692 | Seniors activities, exercise, place to cook and picnic. | 12/30/2021 4:42 PM |
| 693 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 4:41 PM |
| 694 | Rock climbing classes and sessions. Yoga classes. | 12/30/2021 4:40 PM |
| 695 | Soccer | 12/30/2021 4:38 PM |
| 696 | Just the pool at Alga Norte | 12/30/2021 4:35 PM |
| 697 | The kind that stay where they belong, and not all over the open park area. | 12/30/2021 4:35 PM |
| 698 | Swimming is important to me. My grandchildren love the swings and park area at Alga. | 12/30/2021 4:35 PM |
| 699 | Barre classes | 12/30/2021 4:32 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 700 | None | 12/30/2021 4:31 PM |
| 701 | basketball, soccer, tennis, archery, rock climbing, gymnastics | 12/30/2021 4:30 PM |
| 702 | senior citizen | 12/30/2021 4:29 PM |
| 703 | Yoga, archery, decathlon events, steeplechase | 12/30/2021 4:29 PM |
| 704 | Yoga, pickle ball | 12/30/2021 4:28 PM |
| 705 | Horticulture and gardening classes, Yoga, Pilates, arts & Crafts, painting, photography, historical tours. | 12/30/2021 4:28 PM |
| 706 | jazzercise classes or some outdoors Tai Chi classes | 12/30/2021 4:27 PM |
| 707 | A class on flexibility that is not tied exclusively to yoga poses/practice (e.g. Paul Ecke YMCA) | 12/30/2021 4:26 PM |
| 708 | None | 12/30/2021 4:25 PM |
| 709 | Basketball, pickleball, football | 12/30/2021 4:24 PM |
| 710 | yoga | 12/30/2021 4:20 PM |
| 711 | Not able to participate | 12/30/2021 4:20 PM |
| 712 | Pilates, fitness classes not just for senior citizens | 12/30/2021 4:18 PM |
| 713 | Pickleball clinics | 12/30/2021 4:17 PM |
| 714 | Yoga Tai Chi, stretching. Belly dancing. | 12/30/2021 4:17 PM |
| 715 | Yoga, dog training groups, walking groups | 12/30/2021 4:17 PM |
| 716 | Yoga, senior sports | 12/30/2021 4:14 PM |
| 717 | Pickleball classes and play. | 12/30/2021 4:13 PM |
| 718 | Pickle ball lessons | 12/30/2021 4:13 PM |
| 719 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:08 PM |
| 720 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 721 | Pickleball and softball | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 722 | Tennis | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 723 | More community garden spaces. | 12/30/2021 4:05 PM |
| 724 | Hiking | 12/30/2021 4:05 PM |
| 725 | PICKLEBALL | 12/30/2021 4:04 PM |
| 726 | jazzercise type classes. Art classes, Cooking classes | 12/30/2021 4:01 PM |
| 727 | Pickleball and walking | 12/30/2021 4:00 PM |
| 728 | Soccer, field hockey, womens only exercise classes | 12/30/2021 4:00 PM |
| 729 | N/A | 12/30/2021 3:59 PM |
| 730 | Pickleball! | 12/30/2021 3:59 PM |
| 731 | Senior fitness classes,, beginner pickle ball for seniors | 12/30/2021 3:58 PM |
| 732 | Softball pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |
| 733 | Softball. Basketball. | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |
| 734 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 735 | 1) Hiking: The seniors in the area are walkers but, the available trails are so short they aren't worth walking. 2) There are a large number of nationally competitive athletes in Carlsbad but we all have to go somewhere else to work out. | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 736 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 737 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 738 | Pickleball. | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 739 | Pickelball please! The demand is high yet than thy he number of courts. Please | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 740 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:54 PM |
| 741 | We have no sports from the City at Poinsettia Park. That would be a nice change. | 12/30/2021 3:54 PM |
| 742 | Boot camp style workouts, more Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:54 PM |
| 743 | You have a good mix now | 12/30/2021 3:54 PM |
| 744 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 745 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 746 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 747 | Just using pool | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 748 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 749 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:51 PM |
| 750 | Pickleball leagues and tournaments. | 12/30/2021 3:50 PM |
| 751 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:49 PM |
| 752 | Masters swimming | 12/30/2021 3:49 PM |
| 753 | Mountain biking. Off lease dog trails | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 754 | zumba gold, yoga | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 755 | Over 50 soccer (men and women) | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 756 | My 10 year old daughter loves going to camps & classes offered by the city... especially the STEM ones (game design, animation, etc). | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 757 | Warm water aquatics, deep water running | 12/30/2021 3:47 PM |
| 758 | Outdoor yoga classes What's Covid being a constant problem outdoor classes would be a great benefit an alternative | 12/30/2021 3:45 PM |
| 759 | After school and non school day activities especially sports | 12/30/2021 3:43 PM |
| 760 | Pickelball | 12/30/2021 3:43 PM |
| 761 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:42 PM |
| 762 | Soccoer | 12/30/2021 3:42 PM |
| 763 | n/a | 12/30/2021 3:41 PM |
| 764 | Kids soccer and nature camps for age 4+ Adult womens soccer | 12/30/2021 3:40 PM |
| 765 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:39 PM |
| 766 | Not applicable | 12/30/2021 3:38 PM |
| 767 | We're seniors, so pickleball opportunities or outdoor yoga classes. More concerts (could be on a smaller scale than Jazz series.) | 12/30/2021 3:38 PM |
| 768 | Options for different level of Yoga, swim for kids- lessons, basketball pick up games indoors | 12/30/2021 3:37 PM |
| 769 | Aqua fit. I love it. Please fix the spa at Alga Norte pool. | 12/30/2021 3:37 PM |
| 770 | Surfing, swimming, yoga, mountain biking, hiking, tennis | 12/30/2021 3:37 PM |
| 771 | N/A | 12/30/2021 3:34 PM |
| 772 | Yoga over 65. Pottery. Knitting | 12/30/2021 3:34 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 773 | art classes and aerobic fitness classes. | 12/30/2021 3:34 PM |
| 774 | probably non | 12/30/2021 3:34 PM |
| 775 | The grandchildren enjoy your youth baseball leagues & the fitness classes for seniors I enjoy. | 12/30/2021 3:33 PM |
| 776 | Basketball, football and acting classes. | 12/30/2021 3:33 PM |
| 777 | I would love for my kids to be able to do gymnastics! There used to be gymnastics for elementary and middle school kids held during a weekday afternoon, but it stopped being offered when my kids were old enough for it. | 12/30/2021 3:33 PM |
| 778 | Archeology camp where kids could dig for fossils, arrow heads, etc. Similar to what is at the nature center on Cannon. | 12/30/2021 3:32 PM |
| 779 | Outdoor yoga | 12/30/2021 3:29 PM |
| 780 | Taiji, qigong, yoga, line dance, Taiji fan. | 12/30/2021 3:29 PM |
| 781 | Walking | 12/30/2021 3:28 PM |
| 782 | Mountain Biking, Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:27 PM |
| 783 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 3:27 PM |
| 784 | I am 77. I would like free tai chi | 12/30/2021 3:27 PM |
| 785 | Yoga & aerobic classes. | 12/30/2021 3:25 PM |
| 786 | Hiking | 12/30/2021 3:25 PM |
| 787 | Pickleball. Yoga in the park. | 12/30/2021 3:24 PM |
| 788 | Exercise room (that we could pay monthly to use), tennis lessons, first aid training or CPR training. | 12/30/2021 3:24 PM |
| 789 | Nothing comes to mind. | 12/30/2021 3:23 PM |
| 790 | Walking club | 12/30/2021 3:19 PM |
| 791 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:18 PM |
| 792 | Pickleball leagues | 12/30/2021 3:17 PM |
| 793 | Softball, Racquetball, fitness classes | 12/30/2021 3:17 PM |
| 794 | Yoga, softball league, run groups | 12/30/2021 3:17 PM |
| 795 | Aquatic based fitness in afternoon | 12/30/2021 3:16 PM |
| 796 | Pickle ball, kick ball, cycling | 12/30/2021 3:15 PM |
| 797 | Indoor fitness centers would be nice | 12/30/2021 3:14 PM |
| 798 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 3:13 PM |
| 799 | swimming & pickle ball | 12/30/2021 3:12 PM |
| 800 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 3:10 PM |
| 801 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:10 PM |
| 802 | n/a | 12/30/2021 3:09 PM |
| 803 | My two oldest are 4 years apart so I gravitate towards camps that have a wide age group so they can go together. We also like camps with activities we don't normally do at home. Science experiments, larger scale arts and crafts, robotic legos. | 12/30/2021 3:08 PM |
| 804 | Anything golf related. | 12/30/2021 3:07 PM |
| 805 | Pickle ball, soccer | 12/30/2021 3:04 PM |
| 806 | Only walking and pickleball here. | 12/30/2021 3:04 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 807 | Pickleball leagues possibly | 12/30/2021 3:03 PM |
| 808 | Actual sports for kids. Not a team nor a league but teaching them basic rules followed by actual play of the actual game like kids used to do in the 50's through 90's | 12/30/2021 3:02 PM |
| 809 | Pickleball! | 12/30/2021 3:01 PM |
| 810 | yoga, running, tennis | 12/30/2021 3:01 PM |
| 811 | None | 12/30/2021 3:00 PM |
| 812 | none specifically- current approach is excellent | 12/30/2021 3:00 PM |
| 813 | City camps for grandchildren. | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 814 | balance classes | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 815 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 816 | Fitness class | 12/30/2021 2:58 PM |
| 817 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:58 PM |
| 818 | soccer, basketball, baseball, outdoor sports | 12/30/2021 2:57 PM |
| 819 | Baseball, Basketball, Soccer, Running, Pilates or Yoga, Hiking | 12/30/2021 2:57 PM |
| 820 | Senior fitness classes and senior computer classes. | 12/30/2021 2:56 PM |
| 821 | Pickleball leagues by level | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 822 | Surfing classes | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 823 | Water aerobics, tennis and pickle ball | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 824 | Classes: Yoga & Tai Chi | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 825 | Better/more frequent swim camps. We swim, play soccer, softball, football and basketball and always look to participate in the associated camps. | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 826 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 827 | Tennis | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 828 | Senior Softball, Jacki Sorenson's Aerobic Dance, all kids' sports camps. | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 829 | Aquatics Lectures on early California life from docents at Carrillo Ranch | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 830 | swimming | 12/30/2021 2:51 PM |
| 831 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:50 PM |
| 832 | dance, gymnastics | 12/30/2021 2:50 PM |
| 833 | pilates/calisthenics fun group sports such as kickball, reindeer tag, four corners, capture the flag, ultimate frisbee, and open court volleyball summer camps on gardening and about native wildlife | 12/30/2021 2:48 PM |
| 834 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:47 PM |
| 835 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 2:45 PM |
| 836 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 837 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 838 | None Opening Monroe street pool with the old hours opening at 6 am | 12/30/2021 2:43 PM |
| 839 | Tennis & PickleBall lessons | 12/30/2021 2:43 PM |
| 840 | Pickle ball classes | 12/30/2021 2:42 PM |
| 841 | Pickleball, yoga. | 12/30/2021 2:42 PM |
| 842 | Outdoor concerts | 12/30/2021 2:41 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 843 | Basketball leagues, yoga, outdoor activities, volleyball, and swimming | 12/30/2021 2:41 PM |
| 844 | Pickleball please | 12/30/2021 2:40 PM |
| 845 | Art classes | 12/30/2021 2:39 PM |
| 846 | Yoga, meditation, art, crafts for adults. Walking and hiking for seniors. | 12/30/2021 2:38 PM |
| 847 | Yoga. CrossFit. Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:38 PM |
| 848 | I would like to take my dogs with me to a park. Easy paved walking trails. | 12/30/2021 2:38 PM |
| 849 | youth sports at local fields. Softball, baseball, basketball, volleyball, tennis, football, pools, parkour, gymnastics. Nearby to each neighborhood. | 12/30/2021 2:38 PM |
| 850 | Yoga. Balance. The Japanese slow movement process. | 12/30/2021 2:37 PM |
| 851 | Rugby, tennis, lacrosse for youth and outdoor fitness for adults. | 12/30/2021 2:37 PM |
| 852 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:37 PM |
| 853 | fitness classes for over 55, outside or inside | 12/30/2021 2:36 PM |
| 854 | Softball, pickle ball | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 855 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 856 | Pickleball lessons | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 857 | Tennis and aquatics | 12/30/2021 2:33 PM |
| 858 | More swimming pools so we can get better time slots for club Water Polo. Water polo is a great team sport that builds great adults. When I was in the military, a lot of my officer friends who played intercollegiate Water Polo went on to be special ops officers who were SEALs, Combat Controller, and Pararescuers. Water Polo teaches leadership and teamwork, and your local club team (Carlsbad Water Polo) has really made a positive impact in a lot of young lives in our community. More areas for skateboarding. More bike and pedestrian trails independent of automobiles leading between neighborhoods, schools, and major public gathering spaces--cars drive too fast and aggressively here. Dirt tracks and trails for mountainbikers. Look at the city of Folsom, CA, and how they integrated cycling into their city design. Kids had somewhere safe to walk and bike to schools, parks, and athletic centers. | 12/30/2021 2:33 PM |
| 859 | Carlsbad Tri | 12/30/2021 2:32 PM |
| 860 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:32 PM |
| 861 | Ocean front campsites on the sand instead of the highway | 12/30/2021 2:32 PM |
| 862 | pickleball, tennis, art | 12/30/2021 2:31 PM |
| 863 | Lacrosse, yoga outside and concerts in the parks. | 12/30/2021 2:30 PM |
| 864 | Tae Kwon Do, outdoor yoga, outdoor fitness training. | 12/30/2021 2:30 PM |
| 865 | Badminton, softball, yoga | 12/30/2021 2:30 PM |
| 866 | Swimming, surfing classes, Zumba | 12/30/2021 2:29 PM |
| 867 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 868 | Pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 2:27 PM |
| 869 | Softball league | 12/30/2021 2:27 PM |
| 870 | Community Gardening | 12/30/2021 2:25 PM |
| 871 | A running club, game nights | 12/30/2021 2:25 PM |
| 872 | It might be very beneficial to have a program or function where volunteer mentors can spend time with underserved kids that need more access to sports recreation and/or more engagement and structure with adults. | 12/30/2021 2:24 PM |
| 873 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:23 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 874 | Pickleball leagues and tournaments. | 12/30/2021 2:23 PM |
| 875 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:22 PM |
| 876 | Yoga and pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:22 PM |
| 877 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:21 PM |
| 878 | More outside senior walking groups. | 12/30/2021 2:21 PM |
| 879 | Bicycling | 12/30/2021 2:21 PM |
| 880 | Our family participates in swim lessons, lap swimming and recreational swimming during the summer. | 12/30/2021 2:19 PM |
| 881 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:18 PM |
| 882 | Fewer special interests & more free lanes to swim at Agua - sometimes there are so many "special interests" that if you are merely a taxpaying adult , good luck swimming. | 12/30/2021 2:17 PM |
| 883 | swim, frisbee, pickle ball, ping pong, | 12/30/2021 2:16 PM |
| 884 | youth volleyball, baseball, soccer, basketball and art co-ed softball, volleyball and more | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 885 | fitness, senior sports | 12/30/2021 2:15 PM |
| 886 | City staff test | 12/30/2021 2:14 PM |
| 887 | Water polo, skateboarding, and dog exercise | 12/30/2021 2:14 PM |
| 888 | Picked ball | 12/30/2021 2:13 PM |
| 889 | pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:13 PM |
| 890 | Tai-chi instruction | 12/30/2021 2:11 PM |
| 891 | Na | 12/30/2021 2:10 PM |
| 892 | Pickleball for adults and non-competitive swim teams for kids | 12/30/2021 2:10 PM |
| 893 | Pickle balls | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 894 | set up walking group | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 895 | Soccer, ballet, dance and arts for kids I do stroller strides | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 896 | Cooking | 12/30/2021 2:08 PM |
| 897 | Yoga, water aerobics | 12/30/2021 2:07 PM |
| 898 | yoga or boot camps | 12/30/2021 2:07 PM |
| 899 | Tennis | 12/30/2021 2:07 PM |
| 900 | Pickleball!! | 12/30/2021 2:06 PM |
| 901 | Team sports for younger kids, creative art class/ music class(instrument, vocal) / dance class/ drama , science camps, field trip camp | 12/30/2021 2:06 PM |
| 902 | Little league | 12/30/2021 2:05 PM |
| 903 | Bird watching and plant tours | 12/30/2021 2:05 PM |
| 904 | Pickleball tournaments and league play. | 12/30/2021 2:04 PM |
| 905 | Very large area (fenced in) so dogs can run!! Dogs need to run! | 12/30/2021 2:03 PM |
| 906 | Swimming volleyball all types of yoga and physical exercise, | 12/30/2021 2:03 PM |
| 907 | Yoga. Dance. | 12/30/2021 2:03 PM |
| 908 | None | 12/30/2021 2:01 PM |
| 909 | Fitness | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 910 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 911 | Kids gymnastics, adult volleyball, adult softball, pickle ball, kids summer camps | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 912 | Tennis, water polo, outdoor crossfit | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 913 | Pickleball and volleyball | 12/30/2021 1:59 PM |
| 914 | group exercises | 12/30/2021 1:59 PM |
| 915 | For adults: visual arts, wine and cheese making. For children: visual arts, dance, children's sports. | 12/30/2021 1:59 PM |
| 916 | Affordable classes. Dance for older adults in the evenings, not day time like senior center. | 12/30/2021 1:58 PM |
| 917 | yoga, Pilates-type, meditation for adults and for children communication classes such as NVC. | 12/30/2021 1:58 PM |
| 918 | None for us | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 919 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 920 | Softball addition of scoreboards would be nice | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 921 | Pickle ball, yoga | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 922 | Pickle ball !!!!! | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 923 | Youth Soccer, basketball | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 924 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 925 | N/A | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 926 | Over 65 tennis league for doubles play. | 12/30/2021 1:55 PM |
| 927 | Outdoor classes of interest to old people | 12/30/2021 1:55 PM |
| 928 | Adult soccer, outdoor Pilates, surf camps | 12/30/2021 1:54 PM |
| 929 | MTB, | 12/30/2021 1:54 PM |
| 930 | Pickle,yoga fitness | 12/30/2021 1:54 PM |
| 931 | Soccer | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 932 | zumba | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 933 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 934 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 935 | Pickleball pop | 12/30/2021 1:51 PM |
| 936 | See #1 question | 12/30/2021 1:51 PM |
| 937 | Karate; soccer; dance | 12/30/2021 1:50 PM |
| 938 | Volleyball for beg/int players, more tennis, rec leagues for teenagers | 12/30/2021 1:50 PM |
| 939 | Na | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 940 | Racquetball, pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 941 | Maybe a senior walking group, maybe | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 942 | Yoga Day camps for preschoolers Dog training Volleyball Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 943 | Dog training. Camping over night event | 12/30/2021 1:48 PM |
| 944 | What is provided so far from our real estate and other taxes are enjoyed by other communities that do not have the amenities provided here in Carlsbad. We see overcrowded situations with people coming from other communities. | 12/30/2021 1:48 PM |
| 945 | An asphalt pump track built by velosolutions like the one we always go to in Temecula. The asphalt is cheap to maintain, cheap to repair, has good drainage and attracts an amazing community of people. Also velosolutions is the top pump track builder in the world. There was | 12/30/2021 1:46 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

one built in rainier by a contractor that was not a track builder and they made a huge track no one uses cause it is designed so terribly.....not Elsinore wants to know why no one comes to it. The truth is because it is a botched job.....also the one in Carmel valley was supposed to be for bikes.....it was contracted out to spohn ranch...a skate park builder(don't get me wrong, they are an amazing skate park builder) but they designed it for skate boards....so once again the bikers get run off into the hills they we are getting kicked out of because another skate oriented park was built. Sorry if it seems like I'm ranting, I'm just raising 2 kids that race bmx and I grew up racing motocross here as well as bmx. The best motocross riders in the world as well as the top factories for the sport are right here in San Diego. Bikes are the best way for Mx riders to cross train and have fun.....the entire community is missed by our cities cause skaters get a park every 2 blocks and no bikes are ever allowed. You should go to the Temecula pump track and ask everyone how far from the track they live....on most days 8 out of 10 are and hour plus away. We all go there and spend our money and time in Temecula cause we have nothing here.

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 946 | Bike trails and bike parks | 12/30/2021 1:45 PM |
| 947 | Swim, Karate, Soccer, Softball for children. | 12/30/2021 1:45 PM |
| 948 | We used to enjoy all the sports, skate park, and pool but our children have grown out of that stage. | 12/30/2021 1:44 PM |
| 949 | Preschool sports of any kind: martial arts, t-ball, etc. | 12/30/2021 1:44 PM |
| 950 | yoga | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 951 | Tennis, pickle ball, softball, archery | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 952 | Kids volleyball, a climbing wall and more adult art and gardening classes. Thanks | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 953 | Running, Soccer, & swimming. | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 954 | Aquatic classes | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |
| 955 | Pilates or yoga classes but only in the shade. Self defense for females (shade also required, possibly a pergola situation). I don't go in the sun anymore. Outdoor cooking classes, especially grilling. Wine tastings, small intimate groups. Stationery cycling outdoors. Citizens pay for these classes at a modest fee. Succulent identification. Creating a drought tolerant garden area. | 12/30/2021 1:42 PM |
| 956 | In our house thinks like yoga, zumba, pilates, etc | 12/30/2021 1:41 PM |
| 957 | More fields available for pick-up games. | 12/30/2021 1:41 PM |
| 958 | Tai chi | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 959 | Frisbee/disc golf! | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 960 | A snorkeling/freediving expedition to explore the local reef! And other ways to learn about the nature around us :) | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 961 | Volleyball, pickle ball, core-hiit fitness training. Fitness obstacle course. Long hiking trails-connect current trail system. | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 962 | Gardening, exotic fruits and vegetable growers club | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 963 | All | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 964 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 965 | None | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 966 | fitness/nutrition classes | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 967 | Zumba, Tai-chi, yoga | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 968 | A master swim for younger people like teens | 12/30/2021 1:36 PM |
| 969 | walking trails | 12/30/2021 1:36 PM |
| 970 | More Aqua Aerobics. More over 55 age activities | 12/30/2021 1:35 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 971 | Adult swimming | 12/30/2021 1:35 PM |
| 972 | No particular preferences | 12/30/2021 1:34 PM |
| 973 | A general fitness class designed for 4-5 year olds. This age is still a bit young for organized sports but really responds to physical activities like running and climbing | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 974 | outdoor yoga Stretching aerobics in place | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 975 | Fitness classes for seniors | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 976 | Swim, yoga, dance, youth leadership | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 977 | Reinstate morning hours at Monroe Street Pool! | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 978 | Softball, pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 979 | Pickleball outdoors and more classes for learning and maybe some organized league play Also more outdoor activities eg. Walking for seniors. | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 980 | Swimming pool in poinsettia Park. Not dog parks | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 981 | Swimming | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 982 | Bike, basketball, soccer, FNL | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 983 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 984 | Swimming, Gymnastics and kids self defense classes. Not Karate but actual self defense and safety. | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 985 | Toddler and kid courses | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 986 | Yoga and pilates in an outdoor setting. | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 987 | My children are grown. We are predominantly aquatic people. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 988 | masters swimming at Alga Norte running groups | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 989 | Allow dogs to be on leashes and walk on sidewalks inside the parks, especially at the new Buena Vista park. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 990 | None of the above. We currently participate in all activities that interest us. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 991 | ANY | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 992 | Pickleball open play for different levels of play might be helpful. Maybe have challenge/advanced courts, intermediate courts and beginner courts during busy times of the day. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 993 | Longer trails and trails that connect as a means of getting places. | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 994 | Yoga, meditation, stretching, kick boxing for exercise | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 995 | Spanish classes | 12/30/2021 1:26 PM |
| 996 | In the barrio many cannot easily access the Monroe St. pool. I wish we had a pool in walking distance in the 92008 area. | 12/30/2021 1:26 PM |
| 997 | Spin classes | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 998 | none | 12/30/2021 1:24 PM |
| 999 | I go to the SeniorCenter for art classes. We are two seniors, but my daughter really enjoyed to spaces for play and sport | 12/30/2021 1:24 PM |
| 1000 | Martial Arts, Soccer and swimming. | 12/30/2021 1:24 PM |
| 1001 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 1002 | No classes needed- our gym is the great outdoors! | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 1003 | Tennis, pickle ball, bird watching. | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 1004 | Tennis | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1005 | Soccer | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 1006 | Running/track and field for little kids 6 years old | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 1007 | Better hours and more availability for lap swimming at Monroe Street Pool. | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 1008 | Many more varieties of aquatic aerobics programs, aside from organizations like NCA dominating our city pools! These pools are supposed to be for the use of residents to recreate in and enjoy. | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 1009 | Preschool / kids classes outside | 12/30/2021 1:21 PM |
| 1010 | gardening for kids | 12/30/2021 1:21 PM |
| 1011 | N/A | 12/30/2021 1:21 PM |
| 1012 | none of the above | 12/30/2021 1:20 PM |
| 1013 | swimming and martial arts | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 1014 | youth sports of all kinds, rec basketball, outdoor yoga | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 1015 | Waterpolo and tennis | 12/30/2021 1:18 PM |
| 1016 | Taichi, Zumba, yoga | 12/30/2021 1:18 PM |
| 1017 | Masters Swimming at Monroe Pool | 12/30/2021 1:18 PM |
| 1018 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 1019 | Arts and crafts for beginners | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 1020 | N/A | 12/30/2021 1:17 PM |
| 1021 | Ti chi | 12/30/2021 1:16 PM |
| 1022 | Biking, hiking, dog walking | 12/30/2021 1:15 PM |
| 1023 | Don't know | 12/30/2021 1:14 PM |
| 1024 | Tennis, pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:13 PM |
| 1025 | walking groups, swimming exercise | 12/30/2021 1:13 PM |
| 1026 | Senior activities | 12/30/2021 1:12 PM |
| 1027 | Soccer, football, basketball sports | 12/30/2021 1:11 PM |
| 1028 | 'Pickle ball'. Again we utilize full tennis court but use pickle ball equipment because we are seniors and pickle ball equipment does not require the same strength but we like running around the larger court to get more exercise | 12/30/2021 1:11 PM |
| 1029 | I don't know | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 1030 | n/a we use professional clubs for sports | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 1031 | Pickleball, yoga, Pilates, different skill levels for walking groups and hiking groups, cooking classes | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 1032 | None of these. | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 1033 | More yoga offerings | 12/30/2021 1:09 PM |
| 1034 | Fitness classes | 12/30/2021 1:09 PM |
| 1035 | Dog park only at this point | 12/30/2021 1:06 PM |
| 1036 | We are over 55 and would love to play softball. I'm sure she has some special classes for us to attend. | 12/30/2021 1:06 PM |
| 1037 | Tai Chi | 12/30/2021 1:06 PM |
| 1038 | Swimming, Silver Sneaker Free Swimming, or would that be Silver Flipper? | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1039 | Kids cooking classes, little kids soccer and baseball, swim classes, drama camp | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 1040 | We are swimmers and are very invested in Alga Norte and Monroe Street. Carlsbad still needs an additional pool and/or an opportunity to join a swim team besides NCA in Carlsbad. It is unfair to so many kids that have to commute to other cities every day to have something different than the monopoly NCA has. It's impossible for the public to even swim at Alga Norte after 3p every day because NCA occupies 19 out of 20 lanes. Many people have complained about this! | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 1041 | Community sports, Adult leagues | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 1042 | Swimming, aquatics, martial arts. | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 1043 | Nothing in particular | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 1044 | Tennis | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 1045 | Adult softball, baseball, soccer, water polo, beach volleyball | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 1046 | None | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 1047 | Yoga, active aging, open air watercolor (plein aire) painting | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 1048 | I would like to see a larger emphasis on family "activities" involving all generations. The inclusion of sports such as Pickleball and leagues for all ages. | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 1049 | Senior fitness class | 12/30/2021 1:02 PM |
| 1050 | Tennis. Latin dance classes. Language clases/clubs. Cycling classes. | 12/30/2021 1:02 PM |
| 1051 | Kids swimming/aquatics classes and camps | 12/30/2021 1:02 PM |
| 1052 | Tennis and pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1053 | Swiming | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1054 | Baseball, dance, dodgeball, gymnastics | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 1055 | None... spontaneous recreation is better. How about a beer and wine garden along a trail? | 12/30/2021 1:00 PM |
| 1056 | Swimming | 12/30/2021 12:59 PM |
| 1057 | Swim and dance | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1058 | Swimming | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1059 | Swimming and the park | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1060 | FNL Master Sports basketball Summer camps | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1061 | Outdoor yoga and Tai Chi classes, outdoor Ukel | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 1062 | Swimming | 12/30/2021 12:57 PM |
| 1063 | Sailing or open-water activities & instructors for kids. Archery | 12/30/2021 12:57 PM |
| 1064 | None at this time | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1065 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1066 | asian cooking classes....Thai food and chinese food cooking classes. | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1067 | Softball, dance, weight training, golf | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 1068 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1069 | Lap swimming and pickle ball and gentle yoga | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1070 | weight training, yoga, meditation, stretching. Emphasis on over-50 group. | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 1071 | Masters Swim | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 1072 | Softball | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 1073 | Sports FNL, Baseball, swimming Pilates Aqua aerobics | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1074 | Aqua aerobics, square dancing, knitting, book exchange, | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 1075 | Having a variety of options | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 1076 | None | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1077 | Any kids adventure camps | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1078 | Zumba classes would be awesome. I currently go to Oceanside & Vista for classes. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1079 | AYSO and Sr Walks and Hikes. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1080 | Swimming, baseball | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 1081 | Painting, sculpture, crafts | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1082 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1083 | water fitness, men's 55+ softball league | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1084 | pickleball league | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1085 | n/a | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 1086 | Water polo, soccer, football and basketball | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1087 | senior and kids classes | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1088 | You have very little for early teens. Just because they are 12 or 14 doesn't mean they don't like art, and some of the fun summer camps you have for younger kids. | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1089 | Outdoor yoga and more community events. | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1090 | Youth soccer for young ages. Possibly ballet/dance. Love the swim programs, just would like it to be easier to get lessons in summer. | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 1091 | My daughter has used the pool for years. When I was a kid (in Carlsbad), I took classes from the city including tennis lessons, etc. My son took drum lessons | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1092 | Golf, football (flag) , pickle ball | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1093 | Plein aire art classes or just gatherings for artists. Bocce ball grounds and croquet would be good. Everything you have is geared for the very active citizens. | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 1094 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:49 PM |
| 1095 | Swim team opportunities - more pools | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 1096 | All our three kids play soccer. | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1097 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1098 | Pickleball and Disc Golf | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1099 | Track and field for elementary age kids. Cooking classes, farming classes | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1100 | tennis courts | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1101 | Our family enjoys more open areas to play catch, frisbee, and picnicking. | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1102 | Craft classes for multi age groups- sewing, cooking, leather crafts, things that both parent or grandparent and child can participate in together. | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 1103 | Bike camp | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1104 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1105 | Pickleball for everyone in my household | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1106 | City should have a real baseball field with grass infield for senior baseball use. Plenty of softball fields. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1107 | Senior classes stretching, building muscle and soft ball games. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 1108 | Masters swimming, Pickleball tournaments, | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1109 | Softball | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |
| 1110 | Swimming Soccer | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1111 | None | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1112 | Golf | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1113 | basketball, football, lacrosse | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1114 | Native plant walks, fitness walks. | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1115 | Football, lacrosse, basketball, pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1116 | Pickleball, yoga, tai chi | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 1117 | Bicycle | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1118 | Walking trails, swimming | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1119 | Senior fitness outdoors during Covid. | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1120 | I can't wait to use the new exercise area recently put in at Calaveras Park. More waking activities | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1121 | Yoga and Pilates | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1122 | At the moment, I would be interested in opportunities to participate in gentle yoga classes or meditation. We have also enjoyed a variety of other activities over the years, but I would like to encourage park planning that is less focussed on "programmed" activities, and more on open play and multi-use access opportunities. | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 1123 | Baseball, soccer and football | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1124 | 0 | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1125 | exercise classes. From "low impact" (read: "EASY") to Intermediate. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1126 | Adult kickball. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1127 | Tennis, NCA, summer camps | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1128 | Masters swimming. Adult lap swim | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1129 | My sons would appreciate adult soccer leagues, or just more adult pickup soccer games. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1130 | Not sure. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1131 | art, yoga | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1132 | Sports, camps and classes for 4-7 years old, specifically in La Costa. | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1133 | None that I can think of | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1134 | Yoga classes along with any meditation activities | 12/30/2021 12:40 PM |
| 1135 | genealogy special interest classes | 12/30/2021 12:40 PM |
| 1136 | Yoga and watercolor painting | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1137 | Summer camps, FNL, City SC soccer and pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1138 | Bike park, bike camps, mtn bike skill instruction | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1139 | Yoga and perhaps fundraising events. | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1140 | I like the variety of classes at the Senior Center | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1141 | Softball, pickle ball, scavenger hunts, classes with academic value, | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1142 | Use to take be involved with soccer, but kids are older now and no longer on Teams. | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1143 | Pickleball Volleyball Roller skate | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1144 | Pickleball, hiking, art classes | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1145 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1146 | yoga | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1147 | Yoga fitness circuit Pilates | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1148 | Family friendly options. Young child sports. There is a lot for 4+ but virtually nothing for kids 2-3 years old. Dog friendly activities. | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1149 | Fitness classes | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1150 | Any programs for maintaining and improving the health of our aging population such as walking, posture and balance, qigong, low impact exercises, par courses with exercises that accommodate varying degrees of ability. | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1151 | I'd be more interested in some meditation. I love watching sports. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1152 | Masters Swim | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1153 | Tennis and soccer. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1154 | improved lap lane access for lap swimmers at Alga del Norte. NCA has far too many lanes reserved making it very hard to get a lap lane from 3-6 PM currently and it is worse in the summer. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1155 | When the covid-19 virus is less prevalent, I would like to take a life-saving course that was geared to ordinary surfers/ocean-goers. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1156 | None | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1157 | pickleball, hiking and pool | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1158 | fitness classes, soft ball league | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1159 | soccer, yoga, women's fitness classes | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1160 | Youth basketball, flag football, soccer leagues, school/holiday break sports camps, classes, after school sports classes | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1161 | Yoga, gentle Pilates, bridge | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1162 | Yoga | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1163 | Yoga in the wild. | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1164 | Pickle ball league, soccer leagues. | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1165 | We have no community center at our park (Aviara) so it is limited to what my park can provide. Would love a center that offered fitness and special interest classes (arts, crafts, etc.) that is walkable from my home as I continue to age in place. | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1166 | Mountain bike parks | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1167 | Sports for kids 2-5 that are actually affordable | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1168 | Pickleball, yoga | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1169 | N/a | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1170 | Pickleball, disc golf, mountain biking | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1171 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1172 | Pickleball if possible | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1173 | After school camps and holiday camps | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1174 | Outdoor exercise programs for the seniors. | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1175 | Pickleball, more softball availability | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1176 | Yoga, tennis, art, music | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1177 | Adult craft classes | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1178 | Senior Softball | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1179 | Skate park. There are at least as many skaters as bicycle riders. Skate parks are really good for families. | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1180 | Learning pickle ball. | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1181 | Archery | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1182 | Yoga, sewing | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1183 | None. | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1184 | evening walking group - I'm not into the 7 am thing. | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1185 | Mindfulness | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1186 | Volleyball | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1187 | Running track, tennis, yoga | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1188 | Jackie Sorenson's class. | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1189 | Senor exercise class. | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1190 | Tennis, basketball fields, outdoor yoga & pilates | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1191 | Biking, nature hikes, kite flying, treasure hunts, geo-caching, bounce house, birding, wild life hike/class. | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1192 | volleyball, lacrosse, dog agility, skateboarding intro, plein air painting, gardening education, running training.. | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1193 | dog parks fitness classes | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1194 | Aqua boot camp, aqua fit, | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1195 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1196 | None, the city has enough of these. It would be great if parks were more available for open-community use. | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1197 | flag football, cross country competition, pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1198 | None | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1199 | Friday night lights flag football, alga Norte skate park | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1200 | Senior | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1201 | Bike park, then adult rugby league. | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1202 | Youth volleyball, golf, tennis. | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1203 | Football, yoga, running | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1204 | Senior Tennis play connections. | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1205 | Water polo. It would be great to have adult ultimate Frisbee league, and soccer league | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1206 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1207 | Baseball / Lacrosse / Skating | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1208 | Soccer and volleyball | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1209 | tai chi, senior aerobics outdoors | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1210 | yoga areas | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1211 | Basketball, yoga, football, frisbee golf | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1212 | Running club | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1213 | Walking | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |

Q5 What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1214 | none | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1215 | Kendo if it starts up again | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1216 | fitness, crafts, computer classes, knitting, investment clubs | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1217 | Soccer (City Soccer) | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1218 | Tennis Barre Ballet | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1219 | Swimming for fun | 12/30/2021 12:23 PM |
| 1220 | basketball, gymnastics | 12/30/2021 10:24 AM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

Answered: 1,084 Skipped: 682

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Activities suited to seniors. Improved hiking trails in green spaces- city parks for example | 1/11/2022 5:38 AM |
| 2 | Dance classes for kids | 1/10/2022 8:55 PM |
| 3 | Archery, volleyball | 1/10/2022 3:24 PM |
| 4 | Soccer | 1/10/2022 12:37 PM |
| 5 | Outdoor music and events | 1/10/2022 12:35 PM |
| 6 | We would like to see the elimination of e-bikes. They are dangerous on our streets and riders do not obey traffic signals. | 1/10/2022 12:33 PM |
| 7 | Pickleball. | 1/10/2022 12:22 PM |
| 8 | Safe running spaces | 1/10/2022 12:18 PM |
| 9 | Not sure! | 1/10/2022 11:20 AM |
| 10 | Pump track, skate parks, bigger play structure parks for older kids. | 1/10/2022 11:10 AM |
| 11 | Archery | 1/10/2022 11:00 AM |
| 12 | holiday events | 1/10/2022 9:49 AM |
| 13 | A park by the ocean for those that can't afford to live there but want to enjoy an outdoor setting with an ocean view. | 1/9/2022 6:12 PM |
| 14 | Biking, SAFE dog areas to run | 1/9/2022 12:40 PM |
| 15 | Coastal location is what promotes this community, so coastal activities | 1/9/2022 12:11 PM |
| 16 | pickleball | 1/9/2022 10:10 AM |
| 17 | Pickle Ball | 1/8/2022 6:22 PM |
| 18 | Recreational activities for all ages. | 1/8/2022 5:41 PM |
| 19 | N/A | 1/8/2022 4:48 PM |
| 20 | No housing developement in the Ponto region | 1/8/2022 2:38 PM |
| 21 | Places for my family to be together | 1/8/2022 2:36 PM |
| 22 | Pickle ball, Yoga, dance classes | 1/8/2022 2:32 PM |
| 23 | Outdoor yoga | 1/8/2022 1:10 PM |
| 24 | dog park | 1/8/2022 1:09 PM |
| 25 | dedicated walking areas with NO bikes, e-bikes, or skateboards. This means no bikes or skateboards on the sidewalks, and giving pedestrians the right of way. | 1/8/2022 10:33 AM |
| 26 | access to ocean | 1/8/2022 10:25 AM |
| 27 | Walking | 1/8/2022 9:53 AM |
| 28 | soccer | 1/8/2022 9:42 AM |
| 29 | Bocce, pickle ball, pickup softball | 1/8/2022 9:14 AM |
| 30 | Pickle ball Most cities have 3 times the pickle ball courts that we have | 1/8/2022 8:59 AM |
| 31 | Would like more non-paved jogging trails, especially in the coastal area. | 1/8/2022 8:59 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 32 | More coastal parks and less developments from large developers looking for a quick buck | 1/8/2022 8:31 AM |
| 33 | Does not matter to me as long as there is open space | 1/8/2022 8:25 AM |
| 34 | Intergenerational | 1/8/2022 7:48 AM |
| 35 | elder activities | 1/8/2022 7:38 AM |
| 36 | Coastal parks with kids playground and picnic tables | 1/8/2022 7:20 AM |
| 37 | Some place you could walk your dog. | 1/8/2022 7:18 AM |
| 38 | Place a park in the Ponto area. Those of us living in southwest Carlsbad are underserved by park facilities | 1/8/2022 6:59 AM |
| 39 | Live music | 1/7/2022 11:47 PM |
| 40 | Runs | 1/7/2022 9:29 PM |
| 41 | Outdoor yoga classes, boot camp classes | 1/7/2022 9:26 PM |
| 42 | Open spaces for walking and recreating. | 1/7/2022 9:23 PM |
| 43 | Make Ponto Park a reality. I have spent most of my 70 years enjoying the undeveloped open spaces overlooking Ponto and surfing, diving, fishing and boating at Ponto Beach. Losing this gem to development would be heart breaking. | 1/7/2022 9:23 PM |
| 44 | Hiking trails | 1/7/2022 9:00 PM |
| 45 | Hiking trails, archery range, disc golf course! | 1/7/2022 8:54 PM |
| 46 | Martial arts | 1/7/2022 8:39 PM |
| 47 | Better and safer biking opportunities. | 1/7/2022 8:29 PM |
| 48 | Dog park with grass. | 1/7/2022 8:22 PM |
| 49 | Skateparks and water facilities. | 1/7/2022 7:58 PM |
| 50 | Pickleball | 1/7/2022 7:55 PM |
| 51 | We need neighborhood parks in SW Carlsbad | 1/7/2022 7:52 PM |
| 52 | Hiking trails with ways to connect them Biking paths with separation from the car traffic | 1/7/2022 7:40 PM |
| 53 | We need to combine our resources and add more hiking, biking, and nature trails. Recently I spent time in Boulder Colorado. Trails everywhere, parks on every block, sports facilities for all to use and open space. Carlsbad has the opportunity to preserve what little coastal open space that is left. Ponto Park in South Carlsbad would be a welcome addition to the already beautiful trails around Batiquitos Lagoon. More Parks please! | 1/7/2022 7:36 PM |
| 54 | Hiking trails | 1/7/2022 7:22 PM |
| 55 | kid's outdoor classes, art outdoors | 1/7/2022 7:16 PM |
| 56 | Biking around Batiquitos lagoon. Please let bikes share the path | 1/7/2022 7:10 PM |
| 57 | More options for summer and after school kids | 1/7/2022 7:07 PM |
| 58 | Safe bike trails. | 1/7/2022 7:04 PM |
| 59 | Bike trails. Dedicated bike paths that are safe with barriers between cyclists and cars. | 1/7/2022 7:02 PM |
| 60 | Bocce ball | 1/7/2022 6:59 PM |
| 61 | Mountain biking trails on hilly areas. | 1/7/2022 6:58 PM |
| 62 | More open space and parks by South Ponto | 1/7/2022 6:50 PM |
| 63 | I do not know. | 1/7/2022 6:49 PM |
| 64 | N/A | 1/7/2022 6:35 PM |
| 65 | Mountain bike trails | 1/7/2022 6:29 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 66 | PICKLEBALL!! | 1/7/2022 6:28 PM |
| 67 | Trails by Ponto Beach! | 1/7/2022 6:27 PM |
| 68 | Dog areas | 1/7/2022 6:25 PM |
| 69 | Opportunities for high quality long walks--trails that connect to parks that connect to restaurants/shops/beach... | 1/7/2022 6:12 PM |
| 70 | None. | 1/7/2022 6:04 PM |
| 71 | Preservation of open space and less development in the remaining open spaces we do have. We should not strive to be overly developed like National City. The City needs to just say NO to development of more homes and retail space on remaining open spaces. | 1/7/2022 6:03 PM |
| 72 | More beach accessible park space particularly in So Carlsbad area. | 1/7/2022 6:00 PM |
| 73 | safe walking paths free of wheeled vehicles | 1/7/2022 5:56 PM |
| 74 | shuffleboard; tennis court for pickle ball; chess areas | 1/7/2022 5:50 PM |
| 75 | Bike parks | 1/7/2022 5:44 PM |
| 76 | Hiking and nature trails. | 1/7/2022 5:44 PM |
| 77 | More activities towards preservation. | 1/7/2022 5:42 PM |
| 78 | N/a | 1/7/2022 5:32 PM |
| 79 | Surfing supporting services at the beach | 1/7/2022 5:14 PM |
| 80 | swimming pool | 1/7/2022 5:03 PM |
| 81 | We need an outdoor park that would serve coastal south carlsbad! | 1/7/2022 4:49 PM |
| 82 | Any rec sport for the K-8th grade level that is reasonable in cost so my kids can try new things. Right now it seems to be all soccer and crazy expensive. | 1/7/2022 4:45 PM |
| 83 | Outdoor yoga and outdoor fitness classes. Oh, and more pickle ball courts! | 1/7/2022 4:41 PM |
| 84 | Walking paths and jogging trails. | 1/7/2022 4:35 PM |
| 85 | More pools . | 1/7/2022 4:32 PM |
| 86 | Swimming | 1/7/2022 4:27 PM |
| 87 | We would just really love a place where our kids can go play sports - we live in a high-density area and a place where they could go play some "sand-lot" baseball, soccer, etc. would be great! Oh, and pickleball! | 1/7/2022 4:22 PM |
| 88 | yoga, tai chi, nature walks, beach walks. like walking meditations. Communita Yoga does these in Oceanside. | 1/7/2022 4:21 PM |
| 89 | Opportunities for beach volleyball for example at Ponto where there should be a park for everyone to enjoy | 1/7/2022 4:19 PM |
| 90 | Health and wellness outdoor classes | 1/7/2022 4:15 PM |
| 91 | See #4 | 1/7/2022 4:07 PM |
| 92 | Pickleball | 1/7/2022 4:03 PM |
| 93 | Pools! Pools! Pools! | 1/7/2022 4:02 PM |
| 94 | More activities for kids. | 1/7/2022 4:02 PM |
| 95 | Kids soccer | 1/7/2022 3:57 PM |
| 96 | Walking trails, tennis, picnic areas, play areas and BBQ areas for families. | 1/7/2022 3:56 PM |
| 97 | A coastal southern park to fly kites, jog, play badminton, volleyball, basketball, whatever! | 1/7/2022 3:56 PM |
| 98 | A park close to my home to enjoy outdoor activities...walking paths, bicycle path | 1/7/2022 3:55 PM |
| 99 | Youth Lacrosse | 1/7/2022 3:53 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 100 | A paved ocean walk in south coast. | 1/7/2022 3:52 PM |
| 101 | dog park, pickleball | 1/7/2022 3:52 PM |
| 102 | Beach Kids | 1/7/2022 3:52 PM |
| 103 | Music festivals or casual band days in the park; food truck days, small beer festivals | 1/7/2022 3:52 PM |
| 104 | Access to the southwest Carlsbad beaches. | 1/7/2022 3:51 PM |
| 105 | Nature hikes. | 1/7/2022 3:10 PM |
| 106 | The fitness parks and/or addition of fitness components to existing parks | 1/7/2022 10:49 AM |
| 107 | Swimming for kids, Basketball for kids, more accessibility to flat (not steep) trails for running and biking. | 1/7/2022 8:38 AM |
| 108 | More summer surf camps. The Lego camps were also great but could do more. | 1/7/2022 8:28 AM |
| 109 | Large dog park | 1/7/2022 7:21 AM |
| 110 | Pickleball courts | 1/7/2022 5:25 AM |
| 111 | pickleball | 1/6/2022 6:34 PM |
| 112 | Parking for surfing and beach walking. | 1/6/2022 5:45 PM |
| 113 | Pickleball! 🤪 | 1/6/2022 1:53 PM |
| 114 | Beach activities | 1/6/2022 12:13 PM |
| 115 | Pickleball | 1/6/2022 9:54 AM |
| 116 | Motorcross/4-wheeling, mountain biking, jogging trails, hiking. Please look at S CBad coastal to build a park;) | 1/6/2022 8:46 AM |
| 117 | Yoga | 1/6/2022 8:17 AM |
| 118 | Fewer dog parks and more pickleball courts! | 1/5/2022 11:57 PM |
| 119 | Pickleball. There is always a crazy lineup of people waiting to play & the few courts we have are jam packed. The demand is extremely high for residents like me. | 1/5/2022 11:36 PM |
| 120 | we need more parks and open land - we dont need more high density housing - we need a coastal park in SW Carlsbad | 1/5/2022 6:50 PM |
| 121 | segregating a portion of our beach to dogs! | 1/5/2022 12:52 PM |
| 122 | It would be great to see more exercise equipment. | 1/5/2022 9:17 AM |
| 123 | Concerts in the park. | 1/5/2022 7:09 AM |
| 124 | Sand volleyball pits, Bocce ball courts, small & large dog runs | 1/5/2022 12:18 AM |
| 125 | Pickleball courts | 1/4/2022 9:27 PM |
| 126 | Trails and open green spaces | 1/4/2022 7:13 PM |
| 127 | Pickle ball | 1/4/2022 6:51 PM |
| 128 | Pickle ball | 1/4/2022 5:36 PM |
| 129 | Hiking trails. Offleash areas (as opposed to cookie cutter dog parks). | 1/4/2022 5:29 PM |
| 130 | Pickle ball! | 1/4/2022 4:53 PM |
| 131 | More pickleball courts for families | 1/4/2022 4:50 PM |
| 132 | Pickleball | 1/4/2022 4:48 PM |
| 133 | All levels of retired and disabled groups | 1/4/2022 4:33 PM |
| 134 | Fitness | 1/4/2022 3:44 PM |
| 135 | More pickleball courts (but not converting existing tennis courts) | 1/4/2022 3:36 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 136 | Happy with what is available. | 1/4/2022 3:13 PM |
| 137 | hiking, intergenerational activities | 1/4/2022 2:31 PM |
| 138 | Roller rink | 1/4/2022 2:19 PM |
| 139 | More bike lanes, safer biking conditions on all roadways. | 1/4/2022 1:07 PM |
| 140 | More toddler / family interactive activities | 1/4/2022 12:34 PM |
| 141 | Even more walking trails! | 1/4/2022 12:32 PM |
| 142 | I'm pretty content ... not sure. Lots Of walking trails. | 1/4/2022 12:23 PM |
| 143 | Protected biking and walking lanes/paths. More availability at Monroe Street pool. Hiking and walking along lagoons, etc | 1/4/2022 12:23 PM |
| 144 | pickleball | 1/4/2022 8:39 AM |
| 145 | pickleball | 1/4/2022 8:28 AM |
| 146 | See previous answers as well as add guided group hikes. | 1/3/2022 11:04 PM |
| 147 | Pickleball | 1/3/2022 8:00 PM |
| 148 | open space for doing whatever we want in nature | 1/3/2022 7:04 PM |
| 149 | We've done the camps every summer and they've been wonderful so definitely keep those on the schedule. Soccer and ballet. | 1/3/2022 6:45 PM |
| 150 | camping, hiking, cycling | 1/3/2022 4:55 PM |
| 151 | Swim | 1/3/2022 4:03 PM |
| 152 | Pickleball | 1/3/2022 4:01 PM |
| 153 | more pickleball courts | 1/3/2022 3:36 PM |
| 154 | Skate and surf | 1/3/2022 2:14 PM |
| 155 | Hiking | 1/3/2022 1:38 PM |
| 156 | Pickleball, continued growth of bike trails and Gaga ball and other outdoor activities for kids | 1/3/2022 12:26 PM |
| 157 | You are already doing a great job! | 1/3/2022 12:07 PM |
| 158 | more recreational classes for seniors at Stagecoach Park | 1/3/2022 10:53 AM |
| 159 | More pool time availability. | 1/3/2022 10:51 AM |
| 160 | movies in the park. Can't wait for covid restrictions to ease on large gatherings. Outdoor music festivals, wine and beer fests, smaller arts and crafts fairs, museums & galleries, etc. Cultural and lifestyle events. There should be something happening, like a gallery walk or pop-up sports or arts classes, at least twice a month in the summer. | 1/3/2022 10:12 AM |
| 161 | Bocce ball courts | 1/3/2022 10:00 AM |
| 162 | More Pickle Ball Courts | 1/3/2022 9:39 AM |
| 163 | Hiking, bootcamp-style workouts, yoga, stretch classes and adult sports camps. | 1/3/2022 9:35 AM |
| 164 | Pickleball courts (dedicated for public use). With the huge popularity players are quickly improving. Therefore at least 50% of all courts to be challenge courts and 50% to be social courts. | 1/3/2022 9:08 AM |
| 165 | trails/natural areas, natural play spaces, bike trails for safe transportation through the city, community gardens, pickleball (shared courts with tennis for sustainability) | 1/3/2022 8:17 AM |
| 166 | Educational | 1/3/2022 8:05 AM |
| 167 | Running | 1/3/2022 6:50 AM |
| 168 | Pickleball courts | 1/2/2022 10:39 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 169 | bike routes | 1/2/2022 7:59 PM |
| 170 | Unsure | 1/2/2022 6:17 PM |
| 171 | Pickleball, outdoor concerts, dog beach and dog friendly off-leash open space areas | 1/2/2022 5:27 PM |
| 172 | Senior dance classes game nights for seniors Off leash dog parks more boardwalks at the beach ... NO HOMELESS AT THE PARKS | 1/2/2022 4:13 PM |
| 173 | More multipurpose courts | 1/2/2022 3:59 PM |
| 174 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 3:55 PM |
| 175 | I'm fine with what is here. Maybe more bike lanes. | 1/2/2022 3:33 PM |
| 176 | Allowing pickleball to be played on empty city tennis courts | 1/2/2022 2:51 PM |
| 177 | More pickleball courts. | 1/2/2022 2:14 PM |
| 178 | Swimming | 1/2/2022 1:28 PM |
| 179 | Croquet, lawn bowling or bocce ball; exercise and fitness; street dance; den building; and swimming are just a few of the physical activities. Classes/presentations/lectures that allow participants to experience nature. | 1/2/2022 1:13 PM |
| 180 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 12:58 PM |
| 181 | more surf camps and junior lifeguarding. more martial arts | 1/2/2022 12:25 PM |
| 182 | Pickleball Could you use the existing tennis courts and draw lines for Pickleball and use portable nets at the ends of the tennis court? | 1/2/2022 12:16 PM |
| 183 | Pickle ball | 1/2/2022 11:43 AM |
| 184 | Maybe some places for stretching on walking areas. | 1/2/2022 10:23 AM |
| 185 | Science classes and performing arts camps/programs for kids. Individual (in a class) exercise programs for kids. More things at a 4pm time slot or utilized on weekends. | 1/2/2022 10:12 AM |
| 186 | Pickle ball | 1/2/2022 9:19 AM |
| 187 | hiking, mountain biking, trail running | 1/2/2022 9:07 AM |
| 188 | Swimming access. Pickleball. Dog friendly areas. | 1/2/2022 9:04 AM |
| 189 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 8:57 AM |
| 190 | A skateboard park in the Northern part of the City. Access to public school fields and running tracks for public use. | 1/2/2022 8:41 AM |
| 191 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 8:22 AM |
| 192 | Walking trails with beach access | 1/2/2022 8:21 AM |
| 193 | Pickleball | 1/2/2022 8:13 AM |
| 194 | Tennis courts | 1/2/2022 7:53 AM |
| 195 | Skateboarding and diving | 1/2/2022 6:37 AM |
| 196 | Mountain biking trail and recreational water polo | 1/2/2022 5:25 AM |
| 197 | Maintaining what you have would be good! | 1/1/2022 10:46 PM |
| 198 | can't think of any | 1/1/2022 9:11 PM |
| 199 | See previous | 1/1/2022 8:53 PM |
| 200 | pickleball | 1/1/2022 8:42 PM |
| 201 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 8:38 PM |
| 202 | pickleball | 1/1/2022 8:34 PM |
| 203 | More martial arts and dance classes | 1/1/2022 8:28 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 204 | Pickle ball, tennis, hiking trails | 1/1/2022 8:21 PM |
| 205 | Tennis and Pickleball courts. | 1/1/2022 7:00 PM |
| 206 | Pickleball, volleyball | 1/1/2022 6:10 PM |
| 207 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 6:05 PM |
| 208 | More open trails. One that would circle Agua Herionda Lagoon would be fun. The current trail is very short. | 1/1/2022 5:55 PM |
| 209 | pickball | 1/1/2022 5:52 PM |
| 210 | More Pickleball courts More tennis courts | 1/1/2022 5:44 PM |
| 211 | Pickle ball and more fishing events for the community | 1/1/2022 5:44 PM |
| 212 | Pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 5:42 PM |
| 213 | unk | 1/1/2022 5:14 PM |
| 214 | Skate and bike parks at every park, there is no reason they are not added for the enjoyment of kids and adults. | 1/1/2022 5:06 PM |
| 215 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 5:02 PM |
| 216 | pickle ball courts | 1/1/2022 5:01 PM |
| 217 | Turn some of that land at Ponto into a park that could be used for concerts, art and food events, etc. | 1/1/2022 4:46 PM |
| 218 | Pickleball Dog Parks | 1/1/2022 4:41 PM |
| 219 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 3:11 PM |
| 220 | Pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 2:14 PM |
| 221 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 1:14 PM |
| 222 | heated pools - playgrounds | 1/1/2022 1:04 PM |
| 223 | dancing | 1/1/2022 12:13 PM |
| 224 | Biking trips around the Carlsbad areas. More evening and afternoon activities. Not everyone can go to the am activities. More library events. Carlsbad is doing a nice job and I enjoy what is offered. Thank you! | 1/1/2022 11:51 AM |
| 225 | More pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 11:43 AM |
| 226 | Nothing more at this time. | 1/1/2022 11:39 AM |
| 227 | Pickleball, want stadium court | 1/1/2022 10:49 AM |
| 228 | Swimming pools | 1/1/2022 10:39 AM |
| 229 | Pickleball courts thank you | 1/1/2022 10:36 AM |
| 230 | Pickleball. | 1/1/2022 10:36 AM |
| 231 | Any activity that doesn't require masks. | 1/1/2022 9:47 AM |
| 232 | Frisbee golf, pickle ball courts, skateboard parks | 1/1/2022 9:35 AM |
| 233 | I would like to have more activities within walking distance and have all of our planned trails completed | 1/1/2022 9:31 AM |
| 234 | Softball batting cages. | 1/1/2022 9:25 AM |
| 235 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 9:16 AM |
| 236 | pickleball courts | 1/1/2022 8:57 AM |
| 237 | Picklball! | 1/1/2022 8:42 AM |
| 238 | Degsinated dog beach. | 1/1/2022 8:36 AM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 239 | Active senior | 1/1/2022 8:33 AM |
| 240 | A bike park soon. Thank you. | 1/1/2022 7:58 AM |
| 241 | pickleball | 1/1/2022 7:56 AM |
| 242 | Pickleball leagues. Let's make Carlsbad a top Pickleball vacation destination! | 1/1/2022 7:55 AM |
| 243 | lacrosse | 1/1/2022 7:44 AM |
| 244 | Outdoor fitness classes | 1/1/2022 7:39 AM |
| 245 | Pickleball | 1/1/2022 7:38 AM |
| 246 | Outdoor performance area would be really nice. | 1/1/2022 7:29 AM |
| 247 | Group exercise events for all ages. | 1/1/2022 7:02 AM |
| 248 | Pretty well covered | 1/1/2022 6:43 AM |
| 249 | pickleball | 1/1/2022 5:35 AM |
| 250 | Hiking groups | 1/1/2022 3:17 AM |
| 251 | Pickleball. It's the fastest growing sport, played by all ages, and as a 21 year resident and tax payer a easy burden on the city. | 1/1/2022 1:29 AM |
| 252 | See 4. | 12/31/2021 11:43 PM |
| 253 | Same | 12/31/2021 10:30 PM |
| 254 | More pickleball for sure! | 12/31/2021 9:46 PM |
| 255 | Connect bike and jogging trails, for example around the lagoons, to calavera preserve, and to the beach | 12/31/2021 9:35 PM |
| 256 | PICKLEBALL!! | 12/31/2021 9:13 PM |
| 257 | None. Please don't spend our tax dollars on any more recreational issues until drug dealing and homeless issues are gone. Carlsbad Village streets are not safe anymore. | 12/31/2021 8:48 PM |
| 258 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:47 PM |
| 259 | same answers as question 4 | 12/31/2021 8:39 PM |
| 260 | N/a | 12/31/2021 8:12 PM |
| 261 | long running and/or biking trails | 12/31/2021 6:41 PM |
| 262 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:39 PM |
| 263 | Any & all. | 12/31/2021 6:13 PM |
| 264 | Safe bike paths that are interconnected to the community that are not on the car road. | 12/31/2021 6:04 PM |
| 265 | Yoga, swimming. | 12/31/2021 5:40 PM |
| 266 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:34 PM |
| 267 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:35 PM |
| 268 | chair yoga for disabled at a time that is not at dawn.....better in the afternoon | 12/31/2021 4:26 PM |
| 269 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:18 PM |
| 270 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:16 PM |
| 271 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:13 PM |
| 272 | Hopefully we can see more of the free library children's programs (legos, crafts and music for school age children). | 12/31/2021 3:59 PM |
| 273 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 3:55 PM |
| 274 | Pools | 12/31/2021 3:54 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 275 | need more pickleball cts | 12/31/2021 3:50 PM |
| 276 | Hiking and biking trails connected to those from other cities to form safe, continuous routes | 12/31/2021 3:50 PM |
| 277 | Lawn concerts once Covid is calmed down | 12/31/2021 3:45 PM |
| 278 | Pools, paths | 12/31/2021 3:38 PM |
| 279 | More fitness classes, for all ages | 12/31/2021 3:27 PM |
| 280 | leagues for over 55 | 12/31/2021 3:20 PM |
| 281 | Senior activities | 12/31/2021 3:08 PM |
| 282 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 3:05 PM |
| 283 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:59 PM |
| 284 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:59 PM |
| 285 | PICKELBALL | 12/31/2021 2:58 PM |
| 286 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:56 PM |
| 287 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:56 PM |
| 288 | pickle ball bick lanes | 12/31/2021 2:55 PM |
| 289 | More pickleball courts and more golf events, classes, etc | 12/31/2021 2:40 PM |
| 290 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:27 PM |
| 291 | Another pool... sometime! | 12/31/2021 2:26 PM |
| 292 | More pickleball courts at poinsettia park | 12/31/2021 2:20 PM |
| 293 | golf | 12/31/2021 2:16 PM |
| 294 | See previous answer. Also biking and e-bikes. | 12/31/2021 2:13 PM |
| 295 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 1:43 PM |
| 296 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 1:41 PM |
| 297 | pickle ball | 12/31/2021 1:40 PM |
| 298 | Tennis, trails for walking/running/hiking. | 12/31/2021 1:34 PM |
| 299 | scavenger hunts, digging areas like at the Botanic Gardens where they also have lightweight wood planks the kids use to build and pretend. Also want to express huge disappointment with the structures at buena vista playground. They are either too small for more than one kid or don't make sense with the type of play that kids do... must not have been designed by a parent... | 12/31/2021 1:23 PM |
| 300 | Questions are getting repetitive here. | 12/31/2021 1:15 PM |
| 301 | Bike trails, skate parks, pickleball, tennis courts, yoga classes, tai chi, | 12/31/2021 1:05 PM |
| 302 | swimming pools | 12/31/2021 1:00 PM |
| 303 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 1:00 PM |
| 304 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:53 PM |
| 305 | More pickel ball court space! | 12/31/2021 12:41 PM |
| 306 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:24 PM |
| 307 | My kids want better monkey bars and more advanced equipment. Think the park off of Santa Fe in Encinitas. The love the new park on Buena Vista but think the play area is geared for little kids and want more of a challenge. (Don't get me wrong, that park is amazing and long over due!) | 12/31/2021 12:24 PM |
| 308 | pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 12:14 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 309 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 12:08 PM |
| 310 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:08 PM |
| 311 | Open trails for mountain biking. | 12/31/2021 11:57 AM |
| 312 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:45 AM |
| 313 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 11:44 AM |
| 314 | Indoor pools and fitness classes for seniors and others who have physical limitations.- similar to what was offered at Tri-City Wellness. | 12/31/2021 11:38 AM |
| 315 | Pickleball as it's wonderfully fun for everyone regardless of age. | 12/31/2021 11:32 AM |
| 316 | pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 11:32 AM |
| 317 | Pickleball courts, hiking and biking trails. | 12/31/2021 11:27 AM |
| 318 | Senior Softball | 12/31/2021 11:21 AM |
| 319 | Indoor swimming | 12/31/2021 11:21 AM |
| 320 | Bring back concerts | 12/31/2021 11:20 AM |
| 321 | Swimming | 12/31/2021 11:16 AM |
| 322 | none | 12/31/2021 11:11 AM |
| 323 | more pickleball courts - maybe share some tennis courts | 12/31/2021 11:07 AM |
| 324 | Pickleball courts. Carlsbad has only one public outdoor Pickleball court. | 12/31/2021 11:06 AM |
| 325 | More parks in de carlsbaf | 12/31/2021 11:03 AM |
| 326 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 10:57 AM |
| 327 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:55 AM |
| 328 | Baseball. In south Carlsbad we do not seem to have a central location for baseball for our youth to have a community feeling. In North Carlsbad they have Chase field and families can picnic and use snack bar and it generates a true community feeling and a safe activity for the kids. We don't have that in South Carlsbad. | 12/31/2021 10:47 AM |
| 329 | Bocce Ball Courts, It is a very nice and easy game for seniors to play. Costs and maintenance is minimal compared to many other sports activities. | 12/31/2021 10:45 AM |
| 330 | Outdoor Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 10:44 AM |
| 331 | Bocce ball | 12/31/2021 10:39 AM |
| 332 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:30 AM |
| 333 | anything that is bike friendly | 12/31/2021 10:26 AM |
| 334 | Pickleball and swimming. | 12/31/2021 10:21 AM |
| 335 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:12 AM |
| 336 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:12 AM |
| 337 | Cycling, mountain biking, and skateboarding. | 12/31/2021 10:12 AM |
| 338 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 10:04 AM |
| 339 | More pickleball courts. They offer so much health wise to the community. | 12/31/2021 10:00 AM |
| 340 | Pickleball please | 12/31/2021 9:58 AM |
| 341 | Pickleball and tennis | 12/31/2021 9:56 AM |
| 342 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:47 AM |
| 343 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:44 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 344 | dog parks, SAFE walking areas | 12/31/2021 9:43 AM |
| 345 | pickleball. the 6 courts are great but need more there are long waiting lines. I was surprised that the new DOG part is bigger than the current pickleball courts. Yu can walk your dog ANYwhere in the beautiful parks all over SD but very limited locations for pickelball. Even the tennis courts are not unutilized are much as the pickleball courts, i have never seen people waiting to play tennis and thet are 10 courts and tak up LOTS of space. Please note that the new bathroom has a tin/metal roof on it. It reflects on \the pickleball courts and is blinding and make the courts somewhat unusable (sunglasses do not even help) :(Brent 858.692.1844 bhaws@san.rr.com | 12/31/2021 9:36 AM |
| 346 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:35 AM |
| 347 | indoor and outdoor pickle ball courts, some with lights for evening play. | 12/31/2021 9:18 AM |
| 348 | Outdoor classes, like yoga and Pilates | 12/31/2021 9:13 AM |
| 349 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 350 | I think most activities are provided. Carlsbad does a great job! | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 351 | swimming | 12/31/2021 9:12 AM |
| 352 | Outdoor Pickleball courts. Only 6 in Poinsettia, always crowded, long waiting times to play. | 12/31/2021 9:10 AM |
| 353 | More pickleball courts Off road bike course Disc golf Foot volleyball | 12/31/2021 9:08 AM |
| 354 | Pickleball tournmnts!! | 12/31/2021 9:07 AM |
| 355 | bird-watching and naturalist pursuits to help people here learn more about what should be living here. | 12/31/2021 9:06 AM |
| 356 | running and fitness events | 12/31/2021 9:03 AM |
| 357 | more tennis courts please. Only 4 at stagecoach | 12/31/2021 8:55 AM |
| 358 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:53 AM |
| 359 | Some concerts or some kind of festival each year? | 12/31/2021 8:46 AM |
| 360 | Morning swim at Monroe | 12/31/2021 8:45 AM |
| 361 | Pickle ball league | 12/31/2021 8:37 AM |
| 362 | Walking groups | 12/31/2021 8:36 AM |
| 363 | More outdoor pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 8:35 AM |
| 364 | Skateboarding | 12/31/2021 8:32 AM |
| 365 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:31 AM |
| 366 | Pickleball and dog parks. | 12/31/2021 8:30 AM |
| 367 | Bike park like in Truckee, pump track like in Carmel Valley, a skatepark in the northern part of Carlsbad. | 12/31/2021 8:28 AM |
| 368 | Tennis and pickleball. Us baby boomers don't want anymore soccer or baseball fields | 12/31/2021 8:25 AM |
| 369 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:23 AM |
| 370 | More Community Gardens. | 12/31/2021 8:23 AM |
| 371 | Multi acre, back country, Open area, off leash dog park. | 12/31/2021 8:21 AM |
| 372 | More pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:17 AM |
| 373 | Pickleball for all ages, play equipment, hiking trails, and a dog beach. | 12/31/2021 8:17 AM |
| 374 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:15 AM |
| 375 | Additional pickleball courts at Poinsettia Park. | 12/31/2021 8:15 AM |
| 376 | More swimming pool, please | 12/31/2021 8:14 AM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 377 | Pump tracks, gravel route signage | 12/31/2021 8:09 AM |
| 378 | swimming, pickle ball | 12/31/2021 8:08 AM |
| 379 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:07 AM |
| 380 | Organized fitness & conditioning classes near me (NE quadrant). | 12/31/2021 8:07 AM |
| 381 | I think we have a nice variety of activities | 12/31/2021 8:04 AM |
| 382 | just usable grassy multi-use parks within walking distance so all sorts of informal and formal recreation activities can be conducted. an outdoor neighborhood fitness classes would be nice, but you need neighborhood parks you can walk to for that. | 12/31/2021 8:03 AM |
| 383 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:03 AM |
| 384 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 8:01 AM |
| 385 | More pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 7:57 AM |
| 386 | Yoga for seniors. | 12/31/2021 7:55 AM |
| 387 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:53 AM |
| 388 | Pickleball! | 12/31/2021 7:52 AM |
| 389 | pickleball since the current courts are impossible to play since they are monopolized by the same people everyday. | 12/31/2021 7:51 AM |
| 390 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:44 AM |
| 391 | Bocce ball, Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:41 AM |
| 392 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:40 AM |
| 393 | Intramurals | 12/31/2021 7:38 AM |
| 394 | More Pickleball and cheaper prices for your classes. \$70 for one class is too much. | 12/31/2021 7:38 AM |
| 395 | TGIF,MORE POOLS, SENIOR LEAGUES AND ACTIVITIES | 12/31/2021 7:38 AM |
| 396 | Dog friendly | 12/31/2021 7:34 AM |
| 397 | Pickle ball | 12/31/2021 7:33 AM |
| 398 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 399 | pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 400 | Mountain biking | 12/31/2021 7:32 AM |
| 401 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:31 AM |
| 402 | pickleball, pilates, yoga | 12/31/2021 7:29 AM |
| 403 | More pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 7:23 AM |
| 404 | Water sports and safety | 12/31/2021 7:20 AM |
| 405 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:18 AM |
| 406 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 7:01 AM |
| 407 | Pickleball Swimming | 12/31/2021 6:56 AM |
| 408 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:53 AM |
| 409 | there used to be a meetup group hosted by a Carlsbad employee, who led the group on walks and easy hikes through various parts of the city--would like to see this brought back, because it introduced us to parts of the city we hadn't seen | 12/31/2021 6:50 AM |
| 410 | Pickel ball | 12/31/2021 6:48 AM |
| 411 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:47 AM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 412 | No need to bring in more activities-just keep the homeless wasted and mentally unstable out of the parks - use the money to get them somewhere safe and get the resources they need. | 12/31/2021 6:47 AM |
| 413 | More pickleball and beach volleyball courts. | 12/31/2021 6:45 AM |
| 414 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:44 AM |
| 415 | I would like to see more pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 6:43 AM |
| 416 | Additional pickleball opportunities | 12/31/2021 6:40 AM |
| 417 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:33 AM |
| 418 | The Carlsbad Triathlon | 12/31/2021 6:27 AM |
| 419 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 6:21 AM |
| 420 | Pickleball court | 12/31/2021 6:20 AM |
| 421 | More Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 6:16 AM |
| 422 | ? | 12/31/2021 6:14 AM |
| 423 | Excursions/day trips | 12/31/2021 6:11 AM |
| 424 | More Pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 6:10 AM |
| 425 | Dog training opportunities, hiking groups, art/clay classes for teens | 12/31/2021 6:05 AM |
| 426 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:52 AM |
| 427 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:51 AM |
| 428 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:50 AM |
| 429 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:46 AM |
| 430 | Pickleball. | 12/31/2021 5:40 AM |
| 431 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:21 AM |
| 432 | More outdoor pickleball courts! | 12/31/2021 5:09 AM |
| 433 | Pickleball courts, softball diamonds | 12/31/2021 5:08 AM |
| 434 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 5:07 AM |
| 435 | Keep some locations "wild" to enjoy nature. Don't need to "harden" all surfaces. Keep some remote hiking sites remote. Enjoy the multitude of all activities that are available even if I can't participate in all. Makes Carlsbad a wonderful place to live! Convert power plant site to open space park not housing or commercial!!! | 12/31/2021 5:03 AM |
| 436 | Pickleball courts | 12/31/2021 4:52 AM |
| 437 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 4:09 AM |
| 438 | Pickleball, adult tap dancing. | 12/31/2021 4:03 AM |
| 439 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 3:10 AM |
| 440 | More Pickleball courts. Very crowded with long wait time now. | 12/31/2021 2:40 AM |
| 441 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 2:06 AM |
| 442 | More Pickleball courts. | 12/31/2021 12:46 AM |
| 443 | Pickleball | 12/31/2021 12:30 AM |
| 444 | Outdoor concerts | 12/31/2021 12:22 AM |
| 445 | Poinsettia pickleball courts have gotten really busy. Would love to be able to play more & to not have to wait as much. | 12/31/2021 12:12 AM |
| 446 | more outdoor pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 11:45 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 447 | Pickleball, football, soccer. | 12/30/2021 11:41 PM |
| 448 | No | 12/30/2021 11:36 PM |
| 449 | Hosting youth baseball tournaments. Additional pickle ball courts. | 12/30/2021 11:34 PM |
| 450 | Walking trails, Tai Chi | 12/30/2021 11:31 PM |
| 451 | Soccer, football, pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:30 PM |
| 452 | Men's softball. | 12/30/2021 11:22 PM |
| 453 | Swimming lanes available for lap swim | 12/30/2021 11:22 PM |
| 454 | Pickleballl | 12/30/2021 11:13 PM |
| 455 | More pickleball courts needed | 12/30/2021 11:12 PM |
| 456 | See previous | 12/30/2021 11:09 PM |
| 457 | Pickleball at more locations | 12/30/2021 11:08 PM |
| 458 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:04 PM |
| 459 | Public pickleball courst | 12/30/2021 11:00 PM |
| 460 | Out door Pickleball | 12/30/2021 11:00 PM |
| 461 | The concerts in the parks used to be fun. Egg hunt, obstacle course, etc. are also great. | 12/30/2021 10:57 PM |
| 462 | Painting or ceramic classes also offered at all parks not just down at the senior center | 12/30/2021 10:56 PM |
| 463 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 10:46 PM |
| 464 | Pickleball and tennis courts. Why are Carlsbad highest tennis courts open to the public and la costa Canyon's are not | 12/30/2021 10:33 PM |
| 465 | Senior fitness, yoga especially on weekends. | 12/30/2021 10:32 PM |
| 466 | Pickleball, soccer, football field goal posts | 12/30/2021 10:29 PM |
| 467 | Off road cycling, | 12/30/2021 10:23 PM |
| 468 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 10:21 PM |
| 469 | N/a | 12/30/2021 10:21 PM |
| 470 | Well, archery obviously. I'd really love a pride parade once the world calms down a little. I'd also love to have the History of Calrsbad highlighted by making some sort of 3D film or the use of augmented reality. | 12/30/2021 10:19 PM |
| 471 | Party Bridge | 12/30/2021 10:16 PM |
| 472 | Groomed nature trails | 12/30/2021 10:14 PM |
| 473 | Walking trails. | 12/30/2021 10:12 PM |
| 474 | More activities for small children k-5 | 12/30/2021 10:12 PM |
| 475 | AquaFit at AlgaNorte pool. More classes!! | 12/30/2021 10:11 PM |
| 476 | I'd like to just have this park. We were told there would be a park when we first moved to our community when my son started kindergarten. He's now 22. I feel this is stuck in planning. Maybe allow for time and money to tweak the plans but prob time to get started. | 12/30/2021 10:10 PM |
| 477 | Pickleball for all ages. Make tennis courts pickleball friendly. | 12/30/2021 10:06 PM |
| 478 | swimming | 12/30/2021 10:01 PM |
| 479 | More gardening, and a way maybe to get more of the community, and maybe those experiencing homelessness, involved in gardening in Carlsbad. | 12/30/2021 9:59 PM |
| 480 | Motorcycles to be able to use the trail system a couple times a year. Some people are unable to walk but can ride. | 12/30/2021 9:57 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 481 | Obstacle course integrated into the park, stewardship, drone racing | 12/30/2021 9:56 PM |
| 482 | Local music in the park. Classical, Pop, rock, tribute, jazz, everything! Opera! Just more of that! Its all ages- and it brings us together - outdoors! | 12/30/2021 9:55 PM |
| 483 | Since there are more and more pickleball players every day, I'd love to see more outdoor pickleball courts available at city parks | 12/30/2021 9:53 PM |
| 484 | Ballroom dancing | 12/30/2021 9:52 PM |
| 485 | Work out sites. | 12/30/2021 9:36 PM |
| 486 | Disc golf | 12/30/2021 9:35 PM |
| 487 | Pickleball courts and open plays. | 12/30/2021 9:23 PM |
| 488 | Bike trails, bike parks, bmx and mountain bike please! Skate parks. Cool climbing features for older kids. Swings for older kids. Outdoor gym machines at parks for teens and adults. Plus pull up bars. Keep teens active and exercising they like parks too! Thank you | 12/30/2021 9:23 PM |
| 489 | Allow dogs on public beaches one hour prior to sunset until 10 am the following day. | 12/30/2021 9:21 PM |
| 490 | skate parks | 12/30/2021 9:16 PM |
| 491 | Playgrounds and a pool. | 12/30/2021 9:10 PM |
| 492 | Live music & movement—for parents with toddlers & preschoolers, for families who might want to come learn to do yoga or line dancing, or mindfulness, and relaxation exercises, for teens who might want to begin a fitness regimen or learn some new workouts. In other words, introductory styles of activities, where people could try or sample something & possibly continue with whichever fitness or other class, regularly on their own after that. | 12/30/2021 9:00 PM |
| 493 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:56 PM |
| 494 | More trails and all connected | 12/30/2021 8:52 PM |
| 495 | I don't see anything that needs improvement. | 12/30/2021 8:52 PM |
| 496 | Pickle ball. | 12/30/2021 8:44 PM |
| 497 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:43 PM |
| 498 | Kids activities | 12/30/2021 8:40 PM |
| 499 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:39 PM |
| 500 | More movies in the park during summer | 12/30/2021 8:36 PM |
| 501 | Bike parks | 12/30/2021 8:35 PM |
| 502 | More pickleball courts in the Stagecoach Park area. | 12/30/2021 8:35 PM |
| 503 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:26 PM |
| 504 | Pickleball. | 12/30/2021 8:26 PM |
| 505 | Kids' sports | 12/30/2021 8:24 PM |
| 506 | Pickleball leagues. | 12/30/2021 8:24 PM |
| 507 | swimming horseback riding | 12/30/2021 8:22 PM |
| 508 | Pickleball, trails and playgrounds | 12/30/2021 8:20 PM |
| 509 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:18 PM |
| 510 | Nothing I can think of. You do a great job. | 12/30/2021 8:18 PM |
| 511 | You guessed it. Pickleball. | 12/30/2021 8:12 PM |
| 512 | Classes for elementary aged kids at expanded times. | 12/30/2021 8:12 PM |
| 513 | Frisbee golf ultimate frisbee pickleball flag football | 12/30/2021 8:11 PM |
| 514 | Yoga classes | 12/30/2021 8:08 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 515 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 8:06 PM |
| 516 | live music events | 12/30/2021 7:59 PM |
| 517 | Pickleball!! | 12/30/2021 7:58 PM |
| 518 | Racquetball | 12/30/2021 7:55 PM |
| 519 | Pickleball. It's fast growing, and too crowded. | 12/30/2021 7:53 PM |
| 520 | more pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:50 PM |
| 521 | Rollerblading | 12/30/2021 7:50 PM |
| 522 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 7:48 PM |
| 523 | N/A | 12/30/2021 7:42 PM |
| 524 | 8 entertain myself at the beach lol | 12/30/2021 7:42 PM |
| 525 | Nature discovery treks, more beach related activities. | 12/30/2021 7:41 PM |
| 526 | Adult classes | 12/30/2021 7:33 PM |
| 527 | Pickleball courts or multipurpose courts Activities for seniors | 12/30/2021 7:33 PM |
| 528 | Dogparks. | 12/30/2021 7:29 PM |
| 529 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 7:26 PM |
| 530 | Community yoga | 12/30/2021 7:24 PM |
| 531 | Bike paths, Hiking trails, Pickelball, | 12/30/2021 7:15 PM |
| 532 | More pickleball courts!!! | 12/30/2021 7:12 PM |
| 533 | Why are you allowing people to fill this survey out that don't live in the City? It's hard enough to use our parks or find parking when more than 50% come from another city. | 12/30/2021 7:10 PM |
| 534 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 7:09 PM |
| 535 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 7:08 PM |
| 536 | Special-needs friendly activities | 12/30/2021 7:05 PM |
| 537 | unsure | 12/30/2021 6:59 PM |
| 538 | Tennis and Pickleball | 12/30/2021 6:58 PM |
| 539 | I should become more educated before ansswering this. i will go to www.carlsbadparksplan.com | 12/30/2021 6:57 PM |
| 540 | Walks | 12/30/2021 6:51 PM |
| 541 | Trails of mountain bikes | 12/30/2021 6:49 PM |
| 542 | can't think of anything | 12/30/2021 6:46 PM |
| 543 | Tennis and hiking trails | 12/30/2021 6:46 PM |
| 544 | Volleyball, pickle ball and soccer for adults | 12/30/2021 6:44 PM |
| 545 | N/a | 12/30/2021 6:43 PM |
| 546 | Running and hiking groups | 12/30/2021 6:40 PM |
| 547 | More pickle all courts | 12/30/2021 6:37 PM |
| 548 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 6:35 PM |
| 549 | More pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 6:34 PM |
| 550 | Golf!!! Also, art classes/lessons along with adult dance lessons (most of the dance stuff is for kids now). | 12/30/2021 6:34 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 551 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 6:30 PM |
| 552 | Tennis at Alga Norte Community Park | 12/30/2021 6:30 PM |
| 553 | More pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 6:29 PM |
| 554 | Pickleball. Would love to see at least 2 of the tennis courts at Poinsettia converted to full time pickleball courts. Those tennis courts sit vacant most of the time while there are 12+ picklers waiting to play on the 6 congested pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 6:29 PM |
| 555 | Mid day, mid week senior activities | 12/30/2021 6:28 PM |
| 556 | Hiking trails that are much longer than 1 mile round trip. And that are in a wilderness setting. | 12/30/2021 6:23 PM |
| 557 | More Sr. activities at parks | 12/30/2021 6:18 PM |
| 558 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 6:15 PM |
| 559 | Aquatics | 12/30/2021 6:14 PM |
| 560 | Pickleball, concerts in the park | 12/30/2021 6:13 PM |
| 561 | More pickle ball courts and some outdoor racquetball courts | 12/30/2021 6:11 PM |
| 562 | none | 12/30/2021 6:11 PM |
| 563 | There is currently a good variety. | 12/30/2021 6:11 PM |
| 564 | Ramps down to the ocean so a wheelchair can have access | 12/30/2021 6:10 PM |
| 565 | Outdoor pickleball courts and pickup soccer for adults | 12/30/2021 6:09 PM |
| 566 | More Pickleball courts. The courts are too full everytime we visit. More courts will be nice | 12/30/2021 6:07 PM |
| 567 | More swim and bike | 12/30/2021 6:04 PM |
| 568 | More swimming pools and water features | 12/30/2021 6:03 PM |
| 569 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 6:00 PM |
| 570 | Good now | 12/30/2021 6:00 PM |
| 571 | More co-ed teams and Ultimate. | 12/30/2021 5:58 PM |
| 572 | More culturally diverse celebrations - maybe a Dia de Los Muertos event. | 12/30/2021 5:57 PM |
| 573 | Pickleball and work out equipment stations | 12/30/2021 5:53 PM |
| 574 | PICLLEBALL | 12/30/2021 5:52 PM |
| 575 | Musical concerts. | 12/30/2021 5:52 PM |
| 576 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:50 PM |
| 577 | Tennis | 12/30/2021 5:48 PM |
| 578 | pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 5:47 PM |
| 579 | More pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 5:44 PM |
| 580 | Senior walking groups | 12/30/2021 5:44 PM |
| 581 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:43 PM |
| 582 | Cadensia park should be dog friendly also an area of beach should be dog friendly. | 12/30/2021 5:43 PM |
| 583 | Outdoor aerobics for seniors. | 12/30/2021 5:42 PM |
| 584 | Pickleball tournaments and classes | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 585 | dog friendly trails | 12/30/2021 5:41 PM |
| 586 | Nothing really, pretty good assortment of activities for the community | 12/30/2021 5:34 PM |
| 587 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:34 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 588 | Preschool outdoor play dates | 12/30/2021 5:32 PM |
| 589 | Gardening | 12/30/2021 5:31 PM |
| 590 | Outdoor senior exercise classes | 12/30/2021 5:30 PM |
| 591 | None. We have enough | 12/30/2021 5:29 PM |
| 592 | Pickleball tourney. | 12/30/2021 5:27 PM |
| 593 | SAFE parks, trails, etc. | 12/30/2021 5:26 PM |
| 594 | Again, pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:23 PM |
| 595 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:22 PM |
| 596 | I think you do a really good job. Once Covid is over, field trips for seniors would be nice. | 12/30/2021 5:18 PM |
| 597 | Better security at skate parks. | 12/30/2021 5:18 PM |
| 598 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:17 PM |
| 599 | More community gardens, free concerts in parks, a swap/sale venue for residents to sell and buy used items free of commercial sales vendors and without exorbitant seller fees. | 12/30/2021 5:16 PM |
| 600 | Love TGIF and look forward to it coming back. Thank you for putting it all together! It's one of the many things we love about Carlsbad! | 12/30/2021 5:15 PM |
| 601 | I live in South Carlsbad. The Senior Center is about 10 miles away - too far to drive very often. You need a recreation center for seniors in South Carlsbad. | 12/30/2021 5:13 PM |
| 602 | Pickleball, and trails | 12/30/2021 5:10 PM |
| 603 | Music Youth Volleyball Kids Cooking classes | 12/30/2021 5:10 PM |
| 604 | I attended the "Pop up" event in the sculpture garden. Bike club? | 12/30/2021 5:09 PM |
| 605 | Movie nights, sports camps and water play events | 12/30/2021 5:08 PM |
| 606 | Not sure | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 607 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 608 | a pedal court would be nice. | 12/30/2021 5:05 PM |
| 609 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 5:03 PM |
| 610 | More community gardens, please. | 12/30/2021 5:03 PM |
| 611 | Well-lit nighttime walking paths. | 12/30/2021 5:01 PM |
| 612 | Basketball, pools, bike trails, pickle ball | 12/30/2021 5:00 PM |
| 613 | Skateboarding. Mountain biking. | 12/30/2021 4:54 PM |
| 614 | I'm already satisfied with what you offer. | 12/30/2021 4:53 PM |
| 615 | Pickleball and pool time. | 12/30/2021 4:51 PM |
| 616 | More facilities for Carlsbad's rapidly aging demographics due to continually rising high housing costs.. | 12/30/2021 4:50 PM |
| 617 | Outdoor Tai Chi, yoga, and aerobic classes. | 12/30/2021 4:49 PM |
| 618 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:48 PM |
| 619 | Beach-oriented and ocean-oriented, senior-oriented | 12/30/2021 4:48 PM |
| 620 | More open lap and recreation swim, organized trail hikes, pickle ball. | 12/30/2021 4:48 PM |
| 621 | Dog parks | 12/30/2021 4:46 PM |
| 622 | Exercise circuits | 12/30/2021 4:46 PM |
| 623 | Hiking trails | 12/30/2021 4:45 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 624 | pickle ball | 12/30/2021 4:44 PM |
| 625 | Larger play areas, green fields, courts... tennis or pickle ball | 12/30/2021 4:43 PM |
| 626 | Yoga, fitness type classes | 12/30/2021 4:41 PM |
| 627 | Wall rock climbing sessions. | 12/30/2021 4:41 PM |
| 628 | Water structures | 12/30/2021 4:38 PM |
| 629 | Not sure? | 12/30/2021 4:38 PM |
| 630 | Hand and racket ball | 12/30/2021 4:36 PM |
| 631 | Nothing— perhaps more grass dog parks | 12/30/2021 4:35 PM |
| 632 | Simply open space to sit, walk, converse, just "be". | 12/30/2021 4:33 PM |
| 633 | Putt putt golf, tennis, gardening, first aid certifications, free activities | 12/30/2021 4:32 PM |
| 634 | Triathlon or running races | 12/30/2021 4:31 PM |
| 635 | Bocce ball, lawn darts, axe throwing | 12/30/2021 4:29 PM |
| 636 | Walking and running trails | 12/30/2021 4:28 PM |
| 637 | I think we are in good shape in this area. | 12/30/2021 4:28 PM |
| 638 | more protection for bicycle paths (e.g. asphalt curbs, green paint in the bike lane) | 12/30/2021 4:27 PM |
| 639 | Pickleball, outdoor yoga | 12/30/2021 4:25 PM |
| 640 | Upgrade and open Monroe pool | 12/30/2021 4:25 PM |
| 641 | yoga | 12/30/2021 4:21 PM |
| 642 | Outdoor exercise groups; Outdoor social groups that ate NOT political. | 12/30/2021 4:19 PM |
| 643 | More poo hours | 12/30/2021 4:18 PM |
| 644 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:17 PM |
| 645 | Adult Rec. Water aerobics at Monroe st pool. | 12/30/2021 4:17 PM |
| 646 | Senior sports | 12/30/2021 4:15 PM |
| 647 | Additional outside pickleball courts where feasible. | 12/30/2021 4:14 PM |
| 648 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 4:13 PM |
| 649 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:08 PM |
| 650 | Pickleball courts, good seating with overhead sun shades | 12/30/2021 4:07 PM |
| 651 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 652 | I'd like to be able to get a tennis court. | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 653 | More activity geared towards adults. | 12/30/2021 4:06 PM |
| 654 | PICKLEBALL | 12/30/2021 4:04 PM |
| 655 | More interesting play structures in the parks. Other cities have interactive water pads for the kids to play in and get wet. Balance toys, climbing structures etc. | 12/30/2021 4:03 PM |
| 656 | More pickleball | 12/30/2021 4:00 PM |
| 657 | Bocce courts Musical equipment | 12/30/2021 4:00 PM |
| 658 | Pickleball! | 12/30/2021 3:59 PM |
| 659 | Things like adult basketball leagues would be great. | 12/30/2021 3:58 PM |
| 660 | Senior pickle ball | 12/30/2021 3:58 PM |
| 661 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 662 | Pump Track & Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:57 PM |
| 663 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 664 | Pickleball. | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 665 | tennis clinics for kids | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 666 | Hiking and Track and Field | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 667 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:56 PM |
| 668 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 669 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 670 | More Pickelball courts please | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 671 | Extension of Rail Trail south | 12/30/2021 3:55 PM |
| 672 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:54 PM |
| 673 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 674 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:53 PM |
| 675 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 676 | Pool availability | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 677 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:52 PM |
| 678 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:51 PM |
| 679 | Expanded pickleball courts and maybe some youth programs. | 12/30/2021 3:50 PM |
| 680 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:49 PM |
| 681 | arts and craftes | 12/30/2021 3:49 PM |
| 682 | It's a pretty good balance of activities. Our family personally like nature & STEM activities the most (not big into sports). | 12/30/2021 3:49 PM |
| 683 | Mountain Biking, Off leash dog trails | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 684 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 3:48 PM |
| 685 | warm water aquatics, deep water running | 12/30/2021 3:47 PM |
| 686 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:46 PM |
| 687 | Youth sports And other active youth activities | 12/30/2021 3:44 PM |
| 688 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:44 PM |
| 689 | Pickleball courts and ideally hosting camps and tournaments | 12/30/2021 3:43 PM |
| 690 | hiking, particularly good walkable natural trails like the ones near the lagoons | 12/30/2021 3:42 PM |
| 691 | NA | 12/30/2021 3:42 PM |
| 692 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:39 PM |
| 693 | More pickle ball | 12/30/2021 3:39 PM |
| 694 | Surfing, swimming, hiking, fishing, tennis, yoga | 12/30/2021 3:38 PM |
| 695 | Basketball and surf lessons perhaps | 12/30/2021 3:37 PM |
| 696 | Outdoor exercise class at Poinsettia. | 12/30/2021 3:37 PM |
| 697 | I believe there are adequate recreational activities in Carlsbad. | 12/30/2021 3:36 PM |
| 698 | Music events. | 12/30/2021 3:35 PM |
| 699 | ???? | 12/30/2021 3:35 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 700 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:34 PM |
| 701 | Organized hikes and bike rides for kids. Something that doesn't cost a fortune like most of the camps. | 12/30/2021 3:34 PM |
| 702 | Our family is pretty happy with the activities we have now. | 12/30/2021 3:34 PM |
| 703 | I think you have a very diverse, well-rounded program. | 12/30/2021 3:33 PM |
| 704 | All | 12/30/2021 3:33 PM |
| 705 | Light aerobics, Taiji, qigong, yoga outdoors in shaded area. | 12/30/2021 3:31 PM |
| 706 | Dancing, yoga | 12/30/2021 3:30 PM |
| 707 | Longer and more varied walking trails | 12/30/2021 3:29 PM |
| 708 | The fees are too high | 12/30/2021 3:28 PM |
| 709 | n/a | 12/30/2021 3:27 PM |
| 710 | n/a | 12/30/2021 3:26 PM |
| 711 | Maybe some more hiking areas. | 12/30/2021 3:25 PM |
| 712 | More leagues or groups to join, particularly for more entry level people who are hoping to learn and meet others. | 12/30/2021 3:25 PM |
| 713 | Pickleball. | 12/30/2021 3:24 PM |
| 714 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:22 PM |
| 715 | city of Carlsbad organized hiking trail exploration (like they used to have many years ago when I moved here in 2005) | 12/30/2021 3:21 PM |
| 716 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 3:18 PM |
| 717 | Trail running | 12/30/2021 3:18 PM |
| 718 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 3:17 PM |
| 719 | Yoga Pilates Not at a senior center please | 12/30/2021 3:17 PM |
| 720 | Charge less for access to the Alga Norte Swimming facility; Ted type talk show from a Carlsbad resident at the Dove Library How can we all implement "green" activities to lower climate change impact. | 12/30/2021 3:16 PM |
| 721 | Indoor fitness centers | 12/30/2021 3:14 PM |
| 722 | trails, pickle ball courts, bathrooms | 12/30/2021 3:13 PM |
| 723 | Activities for younger kids, preschool and kindergarten age. | 12/30/2021 3:12 PM |
| 724 | This is a recurring theme... more pickleball! | 12/30/2021 3:11 PM |
| 725 | open to dogs | 12/30/2021 3:09 PM |
| 726 | Off-leash time with our dogs. Live music. | 12/30/2021 3:09 PM |
| 727 | We are Pickleball enthusiasts and a dog walker for our 4 legged friend Lucky. | 12/30/2021 3:06 PM |
| 728 | Pickleball courts. Playgrounds for families. | 12/30/2021 3:05 PM |
| 729 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 3:04 PM |
| 730 | Team sports for kids but not in a league or team and not mere training related to skills involved in playing a sport that they will not even know how to play by the end of the class. | 12/30/2021 3:04 PM |
| 731 | Is the North Bluff Batiquitos trail ever going to connect with the trail on the other side of the freeway? I understand the homeowners don't want to give up their easement, even though it was a condition when they bought the property? | 12/30/2021 3:03 PM |
| 732 | Pickleball open play and leagues | 12/30/2021 3:01 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 733 | more public tennis courts | 12/30/2021 3:01 PM |
| 734 | Dance classes | 12/30/2021 3:01 PM |
| 735 | pickelball | 12/30/2021 3:00 PM |
| 736 | Pickleball and yoga | 12/30/2021 3:00 PM |
| 737 | Hiking trails. | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 738 | pickelball courts | 12/30/2021 2:59 PM |
| 739 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:58 PM |
| 740 | More senior outdoor recreational activities. Group walking on the trails | 12/30/2021 2:58 PM |
| 741 | parkour Dog closed areas | 12/30/2021 2:57 PM |
| 742 | Mountain biking and hiking | 12/30/2021 2:57 PM |
| 743 | More outdoor Pickleball courts like Pointsettia | 12/30/2021 2:56 PM |
| 744 | Basketball courts | 12/30/2021 2:56 PM |
| 745 | More swimming and open play fields for soccer/football/lacrosse | 12/30/2021 2:56 PM |
| 746 | More aquatic classes Pickle ball and tennis courts | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 747 | More pball & tennis courts :) | 12/30/2021 2:55 PM |
| 748 | Making sure the walking trails are maintained. | 12/30/2021 2:54 PM |
| 749 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 750 | Tennis field hockey | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 751 | None to offer | 12/30/2021 2:53 PM |
| 752 | walking trails | 12/30/2021 2:52 PM |
| 753 | Pickelball | 12/30/2021 2:50 PM |
| 754 | art | 12/30/2021 2:50 PM |
| 755 | I'm not from Carlsbad 🙄 but I guess more rock-climbing? | 12/30/2021 2:49 PM |
| 756 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:48 PM |
| 757 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 2:45 PM |
| 758 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 759 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 760 | Open lap swim that has lanes available for recreational swimming | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 761 | Keep both pools open for full day | 12/30/2021 2:44 PM |
| 762 | PickleBall!!!! | 12/30/2021 2:43 PM |
| 763 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:42 PM |
| 764 | water activities, and all other outdoor groups and classes that help encourage a healthy lifestyle | 12/30/2021 2:42 PM |
| 765 | Outdoor concerts. | 12/30/2021 2:41 PM |
| 766 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:40 PM |
| 767 | In-line hockey rink | 12/30/2021 2:39 PM |
| 768 | I think there is a very nice variety. It would be nice to have a little bit more for older persons that would encourage them to get outside more. | 12/30/2021 2:39 PM |
| 769 | Biking. skateboarding. walking trails. volleyball courts. (see Sunset Park) frisbee golf. archery. | 12/30/2021 2:39 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 770 | Pickleball. CrossFit | 12/30/2021 2:38 PM |
| 771 | Things for retirees | 12/30/2021 2:38 PM |
| 772 | Art classes, swimming classes, hiking and walking w classes. | 12/30/2021 2:38 PM |
| 773 | more outdoor music | 12/30/2021 2:36 PM |
| 774 | Softball fields, Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:35 PM |
| 775 | Pickleball, pickleball, pickleball! | 12/30/2021 2:35 PM |
| 776 | Water polo. Surfing. Skateboarding. Youth triathlon or aquathlon activities Develop the rail trail Youth opportunities to learn about the local wildlife. Invest in the youth because they are the future of our city | 12/30/2021 2:35 PM |
| 777 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 778 | Outdoor spinning classes | 12/30/2021 2:34 PM |
| 779 | Dance for seniors | 12/30/2021 2:33 PM |
| 780 | Off leash dog trails and sandy beach front campsites | 12/30/2021 2:32 PM |
| 781 | Outdoor Swimming, beach volleyball league | 12/30/2021 2:32 PM |
| 782 | walking trails. | 12/30/2021 2:31 PM |
| 783 | Swimming classes | 12/30/2021 2:29 PM |
| 784 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 785 | Pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 2:28 PM |
| 786 | Community Gardening | 12/30/2021 2:26 PM |
| 787 | Please keep all our tennis courts, and DO NOT under any condition replace any existing tennis courts with pickle ball courts!!! Thank you!!! | 12/30/2021 2:26 PM |
| 788 | Pickleball tournaments and leagues. | 12/30/2021 2:24 PM |
| 789 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:23 PM |
| 790 | More pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:23 PM |
| 791 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:22 PM |
| 792 | More pickleball courts. Please look into converting 2 tennis courts at Poinsettia Park to pickleball. | 12/30/2021 2:22 PM |
| 793 | I'm really happy with the parks. Even though our child is grown, that demographic should continue to come first. Please don't give in to the responses you will no doubt receive from people who think the best use of city parks is a toilet for their dog, Poopsie. | 12/30/2021 2:21 PM |
| 794 | Hiking trails | 12/30/2021 2:21 PM |
| 795 | Perhaps a low key walking or cycling group for older people | 12/30/2021 2:19 PM |
| 796 | We need the Monroe Street Pool open!!! | 12/30/2021 2:19 PM |
| 797 | Open space parks- where the city wants to allow unnecessary development in the park starved region of south west carlsbad of Ponto | 12/30/2021 2:17 PM |
| 798 | more trails and parks along the beach and lagoons - better parking for them also | 12/30/2021 2:16 PM |
| 799 | tai chi, pickleball, exercise | 12/30/2021 2:16 PM |
| 800 | City staff test | 12/30/2021 2:14 PM |
| 801 | Pickel ball | 12/30/2021 2:14 PM |
| 802 | pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:13 PM |
| 803 | More open lanes for swim at Alga. There are basically no lanes available for those of us who can only swim after work. | 12/30/2021 2:11 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 804 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 2:10 PM |
| 805 | More Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 806 | Looking forward to trying movie nights and pool nights now that my kids are bigger | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 807 | Hiking group, cycling group, or adult exercises group, Asian culture/ activists group, foreign language study, dance/ drama/music/ cooking/art class | 12/30/2021 2:09 PM |
| 808 | Walking group | 12/30/2021 2:08 PM |
| 809 | more beginning rec leagues | 12/30/2021 2:08 PM |
| 810 | All good at this time | 12/30/2021 2:08 PM |
| 811 | More water aerobics | 12/30/2021 2:07 PM |
| 812 | Pickleball!! | 12/30/2021 2:06 PM |
| 813 | See A.4 | 12/30/2021 2:05 PM |
| 814 | Bicycle racks, more parking for downtown activities | 12/30/2021 2:05 PM |
| 815 | Outdoor pickleball tournaments and senior pickleball leagues. | 12/30/2021 2:05 PM |
| 816 | Swimming, horseshoes | 12/30/2021 2:04 PM |
| 817 | Following the rules of the garden plots! | 12/30/2021 2:01 PM |
| 818 | None | 12/30/2021 2:01 PM |
| 819 | Holiday races. Would love a 4th of July 5k! | 12/30/2021 2:01 PM |
| 820 | Swimming and water polo | 12/30/2021 2:01 PM |
| 821 | None | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 822 | N/A | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 823 | Activities bringing children and seniors together. | 12/30/2021 2:00 PM |
| 824 | Pickleball and volleyball | 12/30/2021 1:59 PM |
| 825 | More pickleball courts. There are only 2 challenge/advance courts and draws a bit of tension between players, while the social courts have 4 dedicated. | 12/30/2021 1:58 PM |
| 826 | Additional level, smooth surfaced and fairly straight paths for fitness rollerblading/inline skating. | 12/30/2021 1:58 PM |
| 827 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 828 | Pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 829 | Places at the parks to do weights and stretched | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 830 | Pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 1:57 PM |
| 831 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 832 | Dog Parks | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 833 | Beginner pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:56 PM |
| 834 | Anything outdoors | 12/30/2021 1:55 PM |
| 835 | Bike parks with tracks to ride on | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 836 | take back the triathlon | 12/30/2021 1:53 PM |
| 837 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 838 | Pickleball for sure. If you go to pointsettia during the week it is always packed all day! | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |
| 839 | Dedicated bike trails (not mountain bike) | 12/30/2021 1:52 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 840 | Community events, concerts, chalk art days, 4th of July party etc | 12/30/2021 1:51 PM |
| 841 | As I said, our parks are pitifully lacking in interesting and updated play structures. They are minimal and lacking in diverse strength and fun activities. I can share examples of what is offered in Missouri and Minnesota to name a few. | 12/30/2021 1:51 PM |
| 842 | Places to ride off-road motorcycles | 12/30/2021 1:50 PM |
| 843 | Not sure. 🤔 | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 844 | Park benches, streams, QUIET SURROUNDING WHERE NATURE IS PREVAILING. | 12/30/2021 1:49 PM |
| 845 | More holiday events. | 12/30/2021 1:48 PM |
| 846 | Finding or creating a nice long, uninterrupted beach walk. Seems all our beaches accommodate short walks and then beach runs out or some lagoon pops up and you can no longer walk the beach, have to turn around. I'd like to see a five mile stretch of walkable beach like on the east coast, possibly with boardwalk running alongside like up in Cambria on the coast where the elephant seals lay. More opportunities to view our natural wildlife, perhaps a preserve where you can walk on top of the lagoon or lake water and see the wildlife, take pictures, but jetting into the water rather than just walking a trail like batiquitos. How about more language classes? | 12/30/2021 1:48 PM |
| 847 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:47 PM |
| 848 | Slopestyle race course, bmx track, bmx pump track, electric motocross track, bmx dirt jump park | 12/30/2021 1:46 PM |
| 849 | Obviously, the Monroe street pool opened back up during the day. | 12/30/2021 1:44 PM |
| 850 | Group fitness classes for adults. | 12/30/2021 1:44 PM |
| 851 | Track and Field, specifically a running or jogging track. | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 852 | More pools and upgrades to older ones | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 853 | Park clean-up, trail maintenance events that are fun and would give the residents more of a sense of ownership in the parks... | 12/30/2021 1:43 PM |
| 854 | Tai chi | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 855 | Frisbee/disc golf! | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 856 | Volleyball, pickle ball, | 12/30/2021 1:40 PM |
| 857 | Gardening | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 858 | Youth golf! | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 859 | running and walking groups every quarter | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 860 | Zumba classes, Tai-chi, Tennis | 12/30/2021 1:39 PM |
| 861 | beach events | 12/30/2021 1:38 PM |
| 862 | More walking paths. Ebikes must be prohibited with actual enforcement. | 12/30/2021 1:37 PM |
| 863 | Walking groups | 12/30/2021 1:36 PM |
| 864 | Walking groups by interests | 12/30/2021 1:35 PM |
| 865 | Swimming | 12/30/2021 1:35 PM |
| 866 | Entertainment venues | 12/30/2021 1:35 PM |
| 867 | fitness for seniors | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 868 | cycling trails, safe ones | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 869 | Roller rink and aquatic center in south Carlsbad. | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 870 | See previous answer | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 871 | Support of live CSUSM Osher classes within Carlsbad. Longer pool hours at Monroe Street | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | Pool. | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 872 | More pickleball courts around the city | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 873 | Additional outdoor pickleball courts at existing facilities and new pickleball courts at places like La Costa Canyon and other parks in the south eastern part of the city. | 12/30/2021 1:33 PM |
| 874 | Pickle ball courts | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 875 | Organized play for seniors | 12/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 876 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 877 | Swimming pool in Poinsettia Park. Not dog parks | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 878 | Senior Citizens taking part in utilizing the parks and recreations | 12/30/2021 1:31 PM |
| 879 | Swimming and pool access | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 880 | Legal bike trails for both mountain biking and bmx style biking | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 881 | Flag Football | 12/30/2021 1:30 PM |
| 882 | Beach competitions. | 12/30/2021 1:29 PM |
| 883 | running groups | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 884 | I can't think of any. Thanks. | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 885 | Hiking | 12/30/2021 1:28 PM |
| 886 | Gardening | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 887 | I always like as many hiking trails as possible | 12/30/2021 1:27 PM |
| 888 | Swimming, pickle ball, yoga. | 12/30/2021 1:26 PM |
| 889 | yoga, triathlon, running, festivals | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 890 | Martial Arts and Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:25 PM |
| 891 | La Cross and Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:24 PM |
| 892 | Not sure. | 12/30/2021 1:24 PM |
| 893 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 894 | Designated bike trails | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 895 | Previously mentioned. | 12/30/2021 1:23 PM |
| 896 | None | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 897 | N/A | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 898 | Volleyball area | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 899 | More lap swimming availability at Monroe Street Pool. | 12/30/2021 1:22 PM |
| 900 | PONTO PARK! Veterans park plan sucks | 12/30/2021 1:21 PM |
| 901 | n/a | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 902 | Tennis and swimming | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 903 | Movies, music, group exercises | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 904 | Morning Lap swimming back at Monroe Pool! | 12/30/2021 1:19 PM |
| 905 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:18 PM |
| 906 | N/A | 12/30/2021 1:18 PM |
| 907 | interconnected off road bike trails and routes | 12/30/2021 1:16 PM |
| 908 | I think the city has ample rec activities for all ages | 12/30/2021 1:15 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 909 | None. I feel there are plenty already. A city of Carlsbads' size cannot please everyone .Focus on the quality of life and improve streets and roads with much better access. | 12/30/2021 1:14 PM |
| 910 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 1:13 PM |
| 911 | Dancing and other activities with people over 50 in mind | 12/30/2021 1:13 PM |
| 912 | Pickle ball on versatile courts that can accommodate tennis or pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:12 PM |
| 913 | Another pool at Alga Norte park | 12/30/2021 1:11 PM |
| 914 | Pickleball (more courts, groups to meet players of same skill level), walking and hiking groups in order to meet more people of your own skill level | 12/30/2021 1:11 PM |
| 915 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:11 PM |
| 916 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 917 | Not sure at the moment | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 918 | Fitness classes | 12/30/2021 1:10 PM |
| 919 | Not sure | 12/30/2021 1:09 PM |
| 920 | More pickleball courts and don't charge seniors to pay | 12/30/2021 1:07 PM |
| 921 | Keep thinking of ways to link all the trails and make them known and easy to use. More opportunities for fishing | 12/30/2021 1:07 PM |
| 922 | More swimming opportunities for the general public in the afternoons and early evenings. NCA occupies 19 out of 20 lanes at Alga Norte every single weekday after 3pm? What about all the other citizens of this city? Are we all to share one lane? It's ridiculous. | 12/30/2021 1:07 PM |
| 923 | Dancing - Bring culture to the community. | 12/30/2021 1:06 PM |
| 924 | I think most things are well covered | 12/30/2021 1:06 PM |
| 925 | Free concerts in the park. | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 926 | Whatever young folks want most, we just like to walk our dogs | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 927 | Tennis, Swimming | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 928 | I've heard pickleball is really fun! Don't know if Carlsbad has facilities. | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 929 | More bike trails made of dirt. Being able to walk/bike around agua hedionda (AH), need ti make a trail from AH to beach - it's time. Connect all trails to/from agua hedionda from the north side. | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 930 | Beach volleyball, pickleball, water polo, disc golf. | 12/30/2021 1:05 PM |
| 931 | Carlsbad has very good offerings | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 932 | Ability to take my dog to ANY park not just specific off leash parks. Being leashed is not a problem, but we should be allowed to enjoy ANY park. | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 933 | Improved access to swimming to non school and club fitness | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 934 | I think Carlsbad has wonderful opportunities for recreational activities with the exception of family and multi-generational activities. | 12/30/2021 1:04 PM |
| 935 | Skateboarding | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 936 | Keep Monroe street pool open every day | 12/30/2021 1:03 PM |
| 937 | Tennis and pickle ball | 12/30/2021 1:02 PM |
| 938 | Swimming and water polo | 12/30/2021 1:02 PM |
| 939 | Dance | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |
| 940 | The current and proposed plans are so predictable they are simply boring. You can learn much from European designs and park-dependent cities like NYC. | 12/30/2021 1:01 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 941 | Inclusive teams and 1st time players of all ages | 12/30/2021 12:59 PM |
| 942 | Running events | 12/30/2021 12:59 PM |
| 943 | adult flag football leagues | 12/30/2021 12:59 PM |
| 944 | More swimming hours | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 945 | Lap swim pools and more parks for kids | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 946 | Skateboarding options (like Leucadia/Encinitas includes in all park designs...see new park on Olympus & across from Leucadia donuts) Mountain Bike trails!! | 12/30/2021 12:58 PM |
| 947 | I love to hike and also places to take my dogs on and off leash. | 12/30/2021 12:57 PM |
| 948 | Open pool hours. | 12/30/2021 12:57 PM |
| 949 | walking paths in the park on Faraday and Cannon -park coming soon? | 12/30/2021 12:57 PM |
| 950 | We enjoy tennis, pickle ball, dance, yoga, meditation, and outdoor entertainment with musicians from a variety of genres. Movies in the park would also be welcome. Also, it would be great to encourage more community-focussed festivals, art or craft shows, car shows, and other similar opportunities. We participated and really enjoyed the Taste of Carlsbad that took place earlier this year. While that didn't occur in a park, those kinds of activities would be welcome in public spaces. Again, I would also encourage thinking about "unprogrammed" spaces, such as piazzas and other areas where people can enjoy being outside and sharing coffee or food, without having to participate in a "recreational activity." Please review the park planning ideas from Gil Penalosa called "8 to 80" which refers to planning park spaces that can be enjoyed by multiple generations. I would add to that the concept of designing spaces with access to promote equity and inclusion. What better way for community members from all walks of life to come together than by enjoying outdoor venues with food, entertainment, and quiet people-watching opportunities! Since this appears to be my last box in which to type, I would also add that it would also be welcome for those thinking about park design to consider spaces for sculpture, trees and flowers that promote an enjoyable experience, perhaps botanical gardens, and other items that have been overlooked as park design in more recent times has been focuseed on "recreational activities" such as single-use sports fields. The City of San Diego has many joint-use parks for athletic teams to access. Why not design our parks for use by the broader community and create pleasant, outdoor spaces that can be more equitably used by all of us? | 12/30/2021 12:57 PM |
| 951 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 952 | Long course lap swim and more gentle yoga for 55+ that still work and pay taxes! | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 953 | hiking | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 954 | More widely available fitness trails, with equipment to exercise/etc all muscle groups. | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 955 | It is a shame that Carlsbad does not have a championship level Disc Golf course. A round is started every 1.6 seconds in the US. The city of Charlotte NC has 17 courses in its city limits. It would cost 0.5% of the cost of The Crossings and benefits the entire demographic of Carlsbad, not just those that can afford greens fees. In 2020, 3.5 courses per day were installed worldwide. Please Carlsbad, wake up to Disc Golf! Contact the San Diego Aces Disc Golf club to discuss. | 12/30/2021 12:56 PM |
| 956 | Pickleball of course | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 957 | More places to bike, and roller blade that are off the public streets. | 12/30/2021 12:55 PM |
| 958 | Masters Swim - Long Course set up | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 959 | Concerts in the park | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 960 | Water sports | 12/30/2021 12:54 PM |
| 961 | Swimming laps | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 962 | Movie night | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 963 | Carlsbad offers a lot. I can't think of anything else! | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 964 | See previous. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 965 | More swimming hours and options, more mid-day choices for yoga, etc. not a fan of evening classes. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 966 | Hiking. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 967 | Activities geared for older or disabled people that are not held in the one senior center building downtown. It can easily take me 30 minutes to get there. | 12/30/2021 12:53 PM |
| 968 | Music | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 969 | pickleball :) | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 970 | Plant more trees. Rubber and concrete are not parks. Deal with the homeless, and the signs of crime. | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 971 | Summer concerts in the park! Any family events. | 12/30/2021 12:52 PM |
| 972 | More pool space | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 973 | fitness classes | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 974 | Natural areas that are accessible for everyone | 12/30/2021 12:51 PM |
| 975 | Tennis, pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:50 PM |
| 976 | water safety/ awareness- classes in small boating, sailing or kayaks in the Agua Hedionda Lagoon for kids and adults. Perhaps a multigenerational class with parents and child | 12/30/2021 12:49 PM |
| 977 | More pools | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 978 | Bike tracks for kids. A skate park in the northern section of Carlsbad. More bike-centric streets with clear and frequent East-west paths of travel. | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 979 | level walking paths | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 980 | If you study participation at community centers, hiking trails, nature centers, parks, etc. it is very low. We have too many recreational opportunities already. | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 981 | Out door bowling for Seniors or volley ball | 12/30/2021 12:48 PM |
| 982 | DOGS ALLOWED | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 983 | Pump track | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 984 | Bike park | 12/30/2021 12:47 PM |
| 985 | Pickleball-PLEASE | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 986 | Pickleball and swimming. | 12/30/2021 12:46 PM |
| 987 | More walking trails in the open spaces (not in the parks, or next to major streets.) | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |
| 988 | Softball | 12/30/2021 12:45 PM |
| 989 | Waking groups, tennis groups | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 990 | I am not qualified to answer because of my age | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 991 | Things that include dogs. All parks should allow dogs on a leash. Dog beach needed as well. We allow dogs in restaurants but not in parks or the beach. | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 992 | Pickleball courts | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 993 | Art classes, more seminars at the Senior Center | 12/30/2021 12:44 PM |
| 994 | Aquatic activities, walking trails | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 995 | Need more field space | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 996 | Birdwatching if possible | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 997 | I do enjoy the concerts. | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |
| 998 | Adult swim times | 12/30/2021 12:43 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 999 | None that I can think of. | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1000 | More martial arts for kids (4-7 years) Parents night or day out | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1001 | Splash pads and water activities for children | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1002 | More dog and skateboard parks | 12/30/2021 12:42 PM |
| 1003 | Movies and plays | 12/30/2021 12:41 PM |
| 1004 | MOOUNTAIN BIKING!!! | 12/30/2021 12:39 PM |
| 1005 | Keeping Carlsbad green and educating all on recycling/upcycling opportunities so we can all be aware and do our part. | 12/30/2021 12:39 PM |
| 1006 | I'm fine with what is available | 12/30/2021 12:39 PM |
| 1007 | Theater presentations in the park; family movies | 12/30/2021 12:39 PM |
| 1008 | Pickleball courts outside at more parks | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1009 | Hiking trails, natural areas for walking | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1010 | Safer streets for bicycle use. Encourage biking | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1011 | biking (more bike lanes) | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1012 | Fitness and passive walking /running areas. Many trails but not suitable for disabled or seniors. | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1013 | Kids (age 2-3) baseball, mom groups, parents of young kids groups | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1014 | Fitness areas and more clubs or facilities that off group exercise | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1015 | Perhaps fitness challenge events that are more than just running. Could be combination of running, climbing, jumping, etc. | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1016 | better lap swimming lane availability compatible with the working person's schedule | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1017 | Since I live pretty far away, I wouldn't be likely to participate in more rec activities. But maybe bridge games? | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1018 | Outdoor exercising | 12/30/2021 12:38 PM |
| 1019 | Frisbee | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1020 | Trails. Open space Butterflies and nature | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1021 | I think we're very diverse community and the community itself pulls in everything that's needed. | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1022 | Pickle ball and beach volleyball courts | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1023 | Hiking | 12/30/2021 12:37 PM |
| 1024 | PICKLEBALL!!!! | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1025 | aerobic classes! | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1026 | Affordable Youth sports programs at schools Additional sports youth programs after school & During school holiday breaks | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1027 | Swimming lessons | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1028 | I think the City has done a good job in activities. Parking at Poinsettia on Friday night Football games is a problem. Speeding cars on Turnstone and unsupervised children walking into the streets between cars in the dark. | 12/30/2021 12:36 PM |
| 1029 | kids soccer | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1030 | Safe road biking. | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1031 | Pickle ball | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1032 | N/A | 12/30/2021 12:35 PM |
| 1033 | Love this city | 12/30/2021 12:34 PM |
| 1034 | MTB parks | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1035 | Bike parks. Pickleball courts. | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1036 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1037 | N/a | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1038 | Picked ball | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1039 | Mountain Biking | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1040 | Dedicated multi-use paths without cars. Open all public school outdoor recreation areas for public use during non-school hours and on weekends. | 12/30/2021 12:33 PM |
| 1041 | Outdoor yoga classes | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1042 | More bike trails, multi use trails, bike parks, bicycle infrastructure and safe bike lanes throughout the city. | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1043 | More easy bike locking in congested areas | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1044 | Kid programs and multi age sport courts | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1045 | Open trails for walks/hikes | 12/30/2021 12:32 PM |
| 1046 | Alcohol available | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1047 | Music, art | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1048 | More dog parks | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1049 | Same as #4 | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1050 | Skate park. Dog park | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1051 | Anything will be good. | 12/30/2021 12:31 PM |
| 1052 | More bike lanes | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1053 | evening activities | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1054 | Re the South side of Park Drive, from the Tennis Courts at Kelly to the 4700 block of Park Drive a pedestrian path on that undeveloped side of the street would be wonderful. Couldn't it just be leveled and coated with crushed granite? | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1055 | Running track | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1056 | Group hikes | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1057 | Outdoor yoga, outdoor Pilates with equipment included. | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1058 | volleyball, lacrosse, drawing and painting classes, trail running | 12/30/2021 12:30 PM |
| 1059 | bocce ball | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1060 | Non-team sports such as running and cycling groups, but also frisbee golf. | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1061 | pickle ball | 12/30/2021 12:29 PM |
| 1062 | Pickleball | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1063 | Guided nature walks. | 12/30/2021 12:28 PM |
| 1064 | Biking, mountain biking trails and bike park access | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1065 | Bike park | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1066 | Skate park in 92008 | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |
| 1067 | Senior Tennis Clubs for all levels. | 12/30/2021 12:27 PM |

Q6 What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad?

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1068 | Soap box derby!!! | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1069 | outdoor concerts, community pot lucks, block parties | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1070 | Football, running, swimming | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1071 | Water polo, soccer, ultimate frisbee | 12/30/2021 12:26 PM |
| 1072 | Pickleball. | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1073 | Track and field | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1074 | More hiking areas | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1075 | Cycling | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1076 | Safer, off road bike paths, connected walking trails | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1077 | I can't think of any at this time. | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1078 | Frisbee golf | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1079 | areas where children can use their imagination > create play vs. organized teams | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1080 | Yoga class or exercise classes besides water aerobics for seniors at the Alga Norte Swim Complex | 12/30/2021 12:25 PM |
| 1081 | Kendo | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1082 | fitness classes - 55+ good workout center | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1083 | skateboarding park at Poinsettia park | 12/30/2021 12:24 PM |
| 1084 | pickleball | 12/30/2021 10:26 AM |



City of Carlsbad California 2023 - 2030

APPENDIX O -
FEEDBACK GATHERED
FROM PEOPLE WITH
PHYSICAL DISABILITIES



Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update

Feedback gathered from people with physical disabilities

February 2022

The project team gathered feedback from community members with physical disabilities to learn more about their needs and priorities.

Information was gathered through several channels including:

- Sending a survey to a list of attendees who participated in a previous study about how to improve Carlsbad beach accessibility. Staff contacted individuals by email first and requested their participation in the survey.
- Sending the same survey to teachers in Carlsbad Unified School District who serve individuals with physical disabilities and asking them to share the survey with the students' parents. Staff was available to assist with the survey by phone, provide the survey in an alternative format, and in Spanish.
- In person by visiting clinics that serve people with physical disabilities to request their participation.

Survey responses

Number of survey participants: 5

Do you visit City of Carlsbad's parks?

Yes, all the time – 60% (3 respondents)

Yes, occasionally – 20% (1 respondent)

No – 20% (1 respondent)

What would make going to city parks even better?

- Fewer homeless people sleeping around play structures
- More items for older Elementary kids

What do you enjoy most about going to city parks?

- The seesaw provides opportunities for collaborative play.
- Accommodates up to four kids at once.
- Fitness Course for older Elementary.
- Trees, open spaces, sense of community

In your experience, what amenities would make city parks more accessible?

- If there were more areas of shade.
- More equipment for 3-5th grade
- Communication boards posted near the play structures for non-verbal/low verbal kids.

What is the main reason you don't visit city parks?

- Newly arrived

What specific sports leagues, fitness classes, special interest classes and camps would interest you and members of your household?

- If a disability makes it harder for a child to join in on the playground
- If space is only equipped with slides and swings that aren't geared toward children with disabilities, it's unlikely they or their parents will spend much time there.
- Swimming, kayaking, surfing, boogieboarding
- Swim lessons, lap swim

What recreational activities would you like to see more of in Carlsbad? What recreational activity helps kids with disabilities?

- Creative hobbies with defined goals (such as sports or art projects) can provide individuals with disabilities with the opportunity to self-actualize and feel accomplished at the completion of a task. They also foster creative expression, self-esteem, and, in group settings, encourage inclusive environments where children can feel that they belong. This is especially true in settings where art therapy is practiced, as these programs are led by trained professionals, helping participants express themselves, resolve potential conflict, and increase communication.
- Increase lap swim hours at Monroe Street Pool

Informal information gathering

These comments were gathered from informal conversations with parents, teachers and teacher aids:

- For many people who work with individuals with disabilities, the daily walk involves going to a local park and exposing them to a variety of stimuli, exercising with them, use the playground to improve coordination skills, etc.
- Playgrounds have limited choices for kids with physical disabilities. Older kids can't use the swings because they don't have safety features.
- It would be fantastic if the city rented or offered beach wheelchairs to access the ocean, like they do in Oceanside. Those wheelchairs have wide, large wheels that make it easy to push someone with mobility issues to the water and enjoy the ocean.
- Offer more programs for the neurodiverse/differently abled population.