

Hall Property Community Park

Encinitas, California



Conflict Assessment

March 25, 2008

La Jolla Center
for Dispute Resolution

1150 Silverado
La Jolla, California 92037
(866) 615-1480
Fax: (858) 454-1021
www.lajollacenter.com

Executive Summary

The Hall Property Community Park presents a multi-faceted community challenge in land use that is becoming increasingly common. Contentious, rights-based battles are waged over precious open space property in our urban areas. As a consequence, proposed park land lays fallow, unavailable to the very citizens who fight over its use.

Absent a change in strategy, the majority of those interviewed for this assessment expect continued community contention and costly political and legal battles. Many Encinitas citizens are frustrated with the delays in making the property a park; others are concerned with the lack of clarity about intended park usage.

There is reason for optimism. This report sets forth perceptions about and challenges related to the Hall Property Park, examines the nature of the dynamics and recommends that the citizens of Encinitas (all of the citizens) invest in the Hall Property Park as a community asset. Such a collaborative approach, described later in more detail, has the potential to address difficult community challenges and to convert a possible liability into an amenity for future generations.

Introduction

The La Jolla Center for Dispute Resolution (La Jolla Center) was hired on May 15, 2007 by three Encinitas citizens who are nearby residents concerned about the intensity of use in the current proposed development. We were asked to review the nature of the controversy that had developed over the use of the Hall Property as a community park. Our charge was to investigate the conflict through the collection of background information, interviews, and other appropriate techniques. This assessment is the report of our findings from that assignment. Here, we discuss the results of our investigation and analyze whether a collaborative process including expanded community involvement might assist the City in building consensus for the Park's use. Consensus would presumably drive development and use of the park without litigation or additional delays.

The La Jolla Center interviewed a number of interested and potentially affected individuals and organizations as part of this assessment. We also posted a survey on our website to solicit additional views. Detail about how the assessment was performed is provided in Appendix A as is the list of those we interviewed. In our interviews, we asked two fundamental questions:

- How did the situation evolve in the way it has?
- What will it take to move ahead?

Our goal has been to candidly and impartially report what we heard about the nature of the challenges and the potential for solutions.

Description and History of the Hall Property Park

The Hall Property is approximately 44 acres, located adjacent to Interstate 5 on the west side of the highway and south of the Von's Shopping Center on Santa Fe Drive. It is surrounded by residential neighborhoods on the south & west sides. The property had been used as a greenhouse facility for approximately 50 years before the City of Encinitas purchased it in 2001.

The City purchased the Hall Property with the intention of developing it into a public park. The City hired RJM Design Group in 2002 to conduct a community workshop to elicit input on the design of the park. The information generated by the meeting was used to prepare a "Community Input Plan" which was presented to the City Council in July 2002. Additional public meetings were held with the City Council to gather input on the design of the park and to refine the park plan. A design was developed and is currently in environmental review.

The following table summarizes the events that have transpired since the purchase of the property by the City. It highlights the fact that more than seven years after acquisition of the Hall property, the park is no closer to being a usable park than it has ever been:

Year	Action on Hall Property
2001	City purchases Hall Property
2002	Park concepts considered by City Council
2002	RJM Design engages community in workshop
2002	Results of the first workshop presented to the City Council
2002	Dokken Engineering presents Mackinnon Bridge Advanced Planning Study. RJM Design Group presents revised plan
2002-2003	Further City hearings held
2003	RJM Design Group presents revised conceptual plan. City proceeds with necessary land use applications and environmental review
2003	Citizens for Quality of Life sues the City for violation of California environmental law
2004	Court orders preparation of Environment Impact Report (EIR)
2004	City begins preparation of EIR
2007	City releases Draft EIR for public comment
2007	City receives over 200 comments on EIR after public hearing. EIR finalization date extended to respond to comments.
2007	EIR process put on hold pending revising Draft to consider global warming implications

Perceptions and Issues

In reviewing the responses to the interviews conducted and the online responses to the survey, it is clear that individuals see the challenges of the Hall Property Park differently. Some see the Park as fulfilling a need for their children. Of those, some believe the dominant use for their kids should be providing competitive sporting facilities; others believe open space for their children is more important. Some focus their comments on the practical limitations of park development due to constraints of geography and funding. Others are concerned about the impact of Park activities on their nearby homes. Almost everyone sees a tremendous opportunity for Encinitas.

There are also differences in peoples' views about the potential for finding solutions. Of those that responded to our interview requests or the survey, there is a minority who see "no solution." On the other hand, there are people of all the represented beliefs who see the glass as half full, cite the potential for moving ahead constructively and want to get beyond parochial and technical challenges. Some of the quotes below highlight this sense of optimism and the desire to seek solutions:

- "There is a rational middle ground position which respects the rights of the neighbors while accommodating both sports and other uses of this public space."

- “Everyone has to be willing to listen to the other members of the Encinitas community.”
- “Can we work this out as a community? Of course we can!”
- “We want to be respectful of everybody’s concerns and needs.”
- “We haven’t come together to work this out only because nobody has tried yet.”
- “Seriously, let’s stop pointing fingers and start coming up with solutions to build a community park.”

The responses we received revealed a number of issues. We have divided them into three categories: (a) procedural issues; (b) communication issues; and (c) perceptual issues.

Procedural Issues

The City solicited community input into the Park’s design process by hiring RJM to conduct the public workshop in 2002. There was dissatisfaction expressed by all parts of the community for various reasons:

- “The workshop wasn’t fair. The residents all sat together. There was no one monitoring the situation.”
- “The tables weren’t mixed to represent different views.”
- “The intention of the workshop was not to get all views but to pacify the residents.”
- “The workshop only gave the appearance of [community] input.”
- “The tools used were biased.”

There were further public hearings about the Park (as detailed in the Chart on page 4). However, the nature of the political process in Encinitas, as in many other suburban cities of its size, does not provide a forum for community members to meet each other and discuss issues or concerns.

- “The City Council meeting format ‘fuels the fire’ because there’s no opportunity for open communication.”
- “We weren’t able to mobilize our parents in time. The meetings were held out of season.”
- “The City staff won’t communicate with the citizens.”

Some community members have looked to the City to provide leadership, guidance and to facilitate a dialogue for the community. City Manager Phil Cotton has described the City as representative of the whole community. He agreed that the City would like to see the community work out its concerns and present real options to the City.

Communication Issues

There are many questions from all parts of the community regarding the specifics of how the Park could and would be used. Some believe there is already a plan while others contend that no details have been created. These differing perspectives indicate a definite lack of communication across political and usage views. Some of the issues that lack clarity of planning and communication center on lights at the park and its possible use as a tournament site for sporting events:

- “We haven’t even thought about the time frame for lighting.”
- “There are not going to be tournaments entirely at that site [Hall].”
- “There are not even going to be tournaments [at Hall].”
- “There will only be one tournament a year.”
- “Hall won’t solve the field deficit for soccer in Encinitas.”
- “Hall [fields] is ok for now but in the future we’ll need more.”
- “How do we know we need more sports fields?”
- “The parking [at Hall Park] is totally adequate.”
- “There’s not enough parking for tournaments [at Hall Park].”

Regardless of whether a full fledged consensus building process is used to define the uses of the Park with the community’s input, these statements indicate that the foundations of decisions that have already been made are not fully known to the Community (if in fact, they are known to the decision makers).

Perceptual Issues

In addition to the specific conflicts inherent in the sports park vs. open space vs. neighboring resident positions that are reflected in the comments outlined above, substantial issues of perception exist. These are important because they affect peoples’ motivations, attitudes and actions.

- “There’s no willingness on the sports side to negotiate.” (Park neighbor)
- “The residents are using the wrong strategy. They should get the sports community to *help* them get mitigations for their neighborhood.” (sports league member)
- We **do** need sports fields [in Encinitas].” (Park neighbor)
- “We feel bullied.” (sports league member)
- “Occasional tournaments are a reasonable thing.” (Park neighbor)
- “None of the residents have children.” (sports league member)

Clearly, there are many challenges to the Hall Park development. This is one reason why the debate is so acrimonious and full of assumptions and misunderstandings. It is also a reason that disappointed participants in the process are so willing to fund litigation to delay implementation of any park usage. People define the problem differently. As with the proverbial elephant described by blind-folded participants touching the elephant in different areas, many see and identify with only portions of the problem. The most appropriate procedural course depends on which problem is under consideration.

The majority of people responding to our inquiries believe that the community could successfully resolve the issues confronting the development of Hall Park. While this belief was based on various foundational assumptions (for example, how is the group convened, what is the charge and scope for the group, and what is the group’s membership), there is, nevertheless, a willingness and desire to become engaged in a collaborative effort.

Recommendation

We think the situation surrounding Hall Park is ripe for community collaboration. Such a process would need to be carefully crafted and limited. Representatives of all the

stakeholder groups would need to be carefully chosen. A series of meetings would be vital to establishing mutual trust and allow time for communication with representatives' constituencies. Early meetings would include steps such as developing a common vision for Hall Park, and establishing what studies and factual matter is acceptable to the group and what is still needed.

Conditions for Success:

- There must be clarity about the purpose of the effort.
- There must be widespread support for the effort.
- There must be balanced representation.
- City staff and elected officials need to be involved and supportive.
- The consensus seeking group must be perceived to be civic-minded and solution-oriented.
- Funding must be available to sustain the effort.
- A collaborative effort may require a series of meetings.

The La Jolla Center recommends a community presentation to discuss the findings in this report and the possible strategies for moving forward. Should there be a general consensus in the community to adopt a collaborative process, the next step would be to invite stakeholders to a convening session.

Stakeholder groups identified by at least 25% of total respondents to our surveys or interviews include:

- **City of Encinitas**
(including City Council, City Planning, and Parks and Recreation Department)
- **Sports Organizations**
(including Encinitas Soccer League, Cardiff Soccer League, baseball groups, softball groups, and Pop Warner)
- **Citizens for Quality of Life**
- **Nearby residents**
(including Devonshire Road residents, residents East and South of the Park, and Cardiff Glen Homeowners Association)

The first meeting of the representatives of the identified stakeholders would outline the issues, explore the costs of not doing anything, and determine if additional meetings would be productive. The form, scheduling, and context of follow on sessions would be decided on and the scope of the endeavor would be fleshed out.

Dick Bayer
Christina Simokat
March 25, 2007

Appendix A: Background of the Assessment

Why was this Assessment conducted?

The Hall Property was purchased by the City of Encinitas in 2001 with the intention of being developed as a public park. The City hired RJM in 2002 to conduct a community workshop to elicit input on the design of the park. A design was developed and is currently in environmental review.

Parts of the Encinitas community have objected to the proposed design and others favor it. There are many more opinions which fall in between, finding some elements appropriate and questioning others.

This assessment describes the controversy surrounding the current Hall Park design, with particular emphasis on what, if any, expanded community involvement might be helpful. We asked two fundamental questions: How did the situation evolve in the way it has? What will it take to move ahead?

Who conducted the Assessment?

The La Jolla Center for Dispute Resolution (La Jolla Center) was selected to conduct this assessment. The La Jolla Center, based in La Jolla, California, acts as a neutral third party to help address and resolve a range of public policy disputes, often involving natural resources and environmental issues. Dick Bayer, president of the firm, and Christina Simokat conducted this assessment.

How was it performed?

Thirty-two interested and potentially affected individuals and organizations were contacted for in-person interviews. We were unable to secure interviews with some of the people we believed were crucial to the controversy. However, the La Jolla Center conducted interviews with 12 people in Encinitas, either face-to-face or by telephone.

Those interviewed were:

Ken Bobadilla
Cardiff Soccer League, fields coordinator

Audrey & John Bromstad
Park neighbor
Citizens for Quality of Life

Gary Cohn
Park neighbor
Citizens for Quality of Life

Paul Jansen
Park neighbor

Kim Lande
South of Park neighbor
Citizens for Quality of Life

Doug Long
Encinitas Parks & Recreation Commissioner

Chuck Parks
San Dieguito Colt & Pony League (baseball)

Gina Renteria
Devonshire resident

David Saacks
Park neighbor
Citizens for Quality of Life

Jerry Sodomka
Park neighbor
Citizens for Quality of Life

Jay Stoffel
San Dieguito Colt & Pony League (baseball)

Glenn Turner
San Dieguito Youth Softball, fields commissioner

Our goal was to gain a range and balance of perspectives from the broadly-defined community but we tended to receive a larger number of respondents from residents near the Park. Undoubtedly, we missed some people with worthwhile views. We augmented the personal interview process with an online survey, the link for which was distributed by email to individuals, community organizations and sports leagues that we determined may be interested parties. Our interview questions formed the basis for the survey. The survey both provided a further method of input and generated more names and contact information of interested parties. Anonymous and identified comments from the EIR, public meetings, and newspaper and blog articles on the topic of the Hall Park were also reviewed.

All our interviews were conducted in confidence; thus, the results of these interviews are synthesized without attribution. This report is the La Jolla Center's summary of Hall Park issues and challenges as we understand them. This report has not been reviewed by the City of Encinitas or participants for factual correctness although it is based on our reporting what we learned. The report is being sent simultaneously to an email distribution list of individuals we interviewed as well as others who have expressed an interest. We have tried to impartially reflect what we heard about the nature of the challenges and the potential for solutions. To the extent there are errors, they belong solely to us.

Appendix B: Survey questions

Below are the introductory explanation and the questions listed in the online survey designed and distributed by the La Jolla Center. Attached as Appendix C is a listing of comments and responses we received to those questions to which comments could be made.

Introduction

The La Jolla Center for Dispute Resolution provides neutral facilitation and dispute resolution services. We have been asked by members of the Encinitas Community to determine whether the issues involved in the Hall Property Community Park property can be resolved in a public, consensus-building process.

It requires the commitment of important stakeholders including political leaders to participate in collaborative discussions to generate options that address the obstacles to resolution. It is an inclusive process that often results in faster, more satisfactory, durable and implementable options than the typical win/lose political process.

In order to assess whether the issues involved in the Hall Property Community Park controversy are susceptible of such a consensus, we ask your assistance in responding to this survey. The survey responses will be compiled into a report which will identify areas of agreement and disagreement, without attributing comments to any individual or group. Your responses will not have your name on them. This report will be available to all participants.

While this survey is confidential, we encourage you to give us your name and contact information so we can develop a list of important stakeholders. Thanks for taking the time to participate in this process.

1. If you care to, please identify yourself.
2. How close is your residence to the Hall Park property?
3. Are you: Registered voter in Encinitas?
 Elected Official in Encinitas?
 Appointed Official in Encinitas?
 Other
4. Are you identified with any particular interest group in connection with the proposed uses of the Hall Park property?
5. What do you believe are the main obstacles to consensus on the Park's final design?
6. If you have read the draft Environmental Impact Report, you are aware that in addition to the plan detailed in the EIR, there are seven alternatives that have been analyzed (you can access the draft EIR at

http://www.ci.encinitas.ca.us/Government/PublicD/Hall_Draft_Program_EIR/).
Please rate your current view of the current plan and its seven alternatives.

7. If you believe there are other alternatives, please describe below:

8. If we are able to arrange for a consensus building process, please list the organizations that you believe should be represented as stakeholders in that process.

9. If we are able to arrange for a consensus building process, please list the names of important individual participants you believe should represent stakeholders in that process.

10. Please let us know any additional comments you may have. Thanks for your time.

Question 2. How close is your residence to the Hall Park Property?

- 57.1% live within .5 mile of the property
- 11.4% live between .5 to 1 mile from the property
- 2.9% live between 1.1 and 1.5 miles from the property
- 11.4% live between 1.6 and 2 miles from the property
- 17.1% live more than 2 miles from the property

Question 3: Are you?

- A registered voter in Encinitas? 91.2%
- An Elected Official in Encinitas? 0%
- An Appointed Official with the City of Encinitas? 0%
- Other? 8.8% (included field coordinator for sports league, a resident of La Costa close to Encinitas and a local resident involved in town politics)

Question 4. Are you identified with any particular interest group in connection with the proposed uses of the Hall Park property?

- No. 83.9%
- Yes, Soccer: 3.2%
- Yes, Softball: 0%
- Yes, mixed recreational uses: 12.9%

Question 5. What do you believe are the main obstacles to consensus on the Park's final design?

- neighbors vs. those who want sports fields
- Traffic flow
- The City of Encinitas ignored the results of 200+ concerned citizens who input ideas at the design charret.
- TRAFFIC TRAFFIC TRAFFIC TRAFFIC TRAFFIC TRAFFIC TRAFFIC TRAFFIC
- intensity of the park , no space to relax, it is a sports park for a small segment of our population
- intensity of the park , no space to relax, it is a sports park for a small segment of our population
- The sports people have no regard for the residents living near the park. Taxpayers should not be paying for sports facilities.
- Making the 'park' into a regional sports facility.
- Predominant usage
- access or the lack of safe access to the park
- Irrational soccer contingent unwilling to negotiate for the betterment of the whole community
- Night time lighting.
- City Council non-transparency and obvious leanings towards development.

- The city of Encinitas invited it's citizens to design a community park in our local paper. The citizens did this and the concepts that were determined to be the will of the people were ignored and changed, without public comment, to become the "Special Use" park plan that the city is now backing, that yeids to the wishes of special interest groups.
- greed
- Overhead lighting
- Conflicting desires of general use vs. special-interest (soccer, etc.)
- The lights that would disturb the neighborhood. The Encinitas city park on Lake Dr. is horrible to live near.
- How much of the park to designate to various sports activities, if any
- That people seem unwilling to discuss a compromise of both the parks potential use as sports park and community park.
- Desire of non-local people to create a regional sports park
- traffic
- lack of interest by the city council in altering the current park proposal - compromising - given the overwhelming negative public feedback thus far
- The City Council commitment to soccer interest
- Ingress/Egress - access to the park
- Lights
- Traffic impacts to surrounding neighborhoods
- LIGHTED SPORTS FIELDS
- too many active sports fields that lead to tournaments
- Parking inadequate for max use with no good scheme for off site parking
- For us it's the lights at night. If they didn't inlcude lights I'd say it's fine.
- Jim Bond - Encinitas Councilman - uncompromising and not interested in consensus
- different beliefs about impact of traffic, lights and noise
- Tournaments (Soccer, Softball etc)
- The City Council put too many ball fields in the park, over the wishes expressed at the design charet meeting.
- LIGHTS LIGHTS LIGHTS LIGHTS LIGHTS LIGHTS LIGHTS LIGHTS
- traffic/parking problems
- traffic/parking problems
- Traffic is already a nightmare on Santa Fe. Two people have been killed and more traffice will come with the park.
- Lights, lights and more lights. Night games on several fields each night.
- Parking
- traffic and parking or the lack of parking for the number of active use facilities on the property
- Traffic
- Too much space devoted to soccer fields.
- Contentious atmosphere within community.
- The original design the the city presented was to include a main entry off of Hwy 5. This is many years away. To try to build this "Special Use" park without this critical element would be a traffic disaster for the comminity.
- selfishness

- Loud speakers
- Conflicting goals: park primarily for use/enjoyment of residents vs. sports facility to benefit the region by hosting regional events
- Sports tournaments (soccer, baseball, softball, etc.) that would create traffic and parking problems. What will happen to someone trying to get to Scripps Hospital Emergency Room when a game lets out?
- How much of the park to designate to general park use - trails, picnic areas, etc.
- other neighbor complaints
- The City believing that they have no reason to reach any compromise
- Too many sports fields which will allow tournaments and large crowds
- Traffic impact
- Sports Park vs Community Park
- traffic and parking
- Cumulative impact of traffic on Santa Fe from all development
- The lights as proposed will go directly into our yard and house at night.
- Jerome Stocks - Encinitas Councilman - uncompromising and not interested in consensus
- Parking
- The City is catering to the wishes of a special interest group (youth soccer/ball sports) over those of the general public.
- NOISE NOISE NOISE NOISE NOISE NOISE NOISE NOISE NOISE NOISE NOISE NOISE
- light pollution
- light pollution
- The purchase of this land by the City Council was a foolish spending of taxpayers' money. Sports facilities should be away from residential neighborhoods.
- Traffic flowing into the park and surrounding neighborhoods. The area can't accommodate it.
- Traffic Safety
- noise will be a problem if the park is lit and allowed to stay open until 10:00 pm or midnight as the EIR stated
- Jerome Stocks -- championing the soccer interest and not serving the whole community
- Not enough mitigation of traffic in and out.
- No real evidence of any political will towards a sustainable, human-centered community.
- Lighted sports fields.
- nimbys
- no access or parking
- Other wise go forward with the design.
- How much of the park to create natural space for wildlife
- Highly partisan EIR with obvious inconsistencies to soften the impact of adverse consequences
- The mistaken belief that we need more soccer fields
- Santa Fe Drive access. Santa Fe Drive is already too crowded and with the other proposed developments - it spells gridlock!
- Noise

- noise
- Parking impact to the surrounding community
- Dan Dalager - Encinitas Councilman - uncompromising and not interested in consensus
- PEOPLE PEOPLE PEOPLE PEOPLE PEOPLE PEOPLE PEOPLE PEOPLE PEOPLE
- noise pollution
- noise pollution
- Noise, light and traffic pollution in a coastal residential neighborhood.
- Not enough parking for the planned soccer or baseball tournaments.
- Noise
- how will we pay for the park?
- Lighting
- Parking.
- Not meeting the needs of the majority of the community.
- Regional sports fields
- NO LIGHTS, NO TOURNAMENTS, NO PROBLEMS!
- How much of a buffer zone to place between the park and neighborhood to reduce lights and noise
- Failure of city planners to listen to residents
- A "we" "they" attitude
- Insufficient parking
- lights
- Soccer and Baseball Leagues
- CARDIFF, MY HOME AND MY NEIGHBORHOOD RUINED FOREVER, JUST AS BAD AS IRAQ
- Emergency vehicles from the hospital will meet excessive traffic stacked up on Santa Fe Drive.
- Noise.
- Lighting
- Parking
- Access through local neighborhoods
- passive versus active uses
- How big the park should be at all, or to have a park it at all, due to traffic, noise and congestion concerns
- Business interests (ie \$\$) conflicting with resident interests
- Not a true community park. I would like to see varied activities and more plain old useable open space
- no adequate entrance and exit to and from the park
- Rotary Club

Question 6. Ratings of the current proposed plan and the 7 identified alternatives:

	Strongly disfavor	Disfavor	No opinion	Favor	Strongly favor	Rating Average	Response Count
1. The current plan as detailed in the pending Hall Draft Program Environmental Impact Report.	66.7% (14)	14.3% (3)	4.8% (1)	4.8% (1)	9.5% (2)	1.76	21
2. Through access on Mackinnon Avenue Alternative	41.7% (10)	20.8% (5)	12.5% (3)	8.3% (2)	16.7% (4)	2.38	24
3. Reduced Intensity Alternative	3.7% (1)	7.4% (2)	14.8% (4)	25.9% (7)	48.1% (13)	4.07	27
4. Citizens for Quality of Life Alternative	7.7% (2)	3.8% (1)	7.7% (2)	23.1% (6)	57.7% (15)	4.19	26
5. No Athletic Field Lighting Alternative	11.5% (3)	3.8% (1)	11.5% (3)	23.1% (6)	50.0% (13)	3.96	26
6. No Project-Development of Residential per Zoning Alternative	61.1% (11)	22.2% (4)	5.6% (1)	0.0% (0)	11.1% (2)	1.78	18
7. No Project-No Build Alternative	47.1% (8)	17.6% (3)	5.9% (1)	11.8% (2)	17.6% (3)	2.35	17
8. Offsite Location- Strawberry Field Alternative	33.3% (6)	16.7% (3)	33.3% (6)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (3)	2.5	18
	<i>answered question</i>						33

Question 7. If you believe there are other alternatives, please describe below:

MAKE IT A NATURAL PARK NO SPORTS AT ALL WHAT'S THE "STRAWBERRY FIELD ALTERNATIVE" THERE IS NO TRAFFIC ACCESS ALTERNATIVE THAT WILL WORK UNLESS YOU WANT TO TRAP ALL OF THE RESIDENTS OF CARDIFF IN THERE HOMES FOREVER

Total open space and green belt. Something that is beautiful and takes advantage of the coastal views. A place for EVERYone to enjoy peacefully. No skateboard park with all the noise. Take the skateboard parks to the desert where no one can see them or hear what goes on.

How about tearing down the Von's center and rebuilding it with a proper entrance to the park? The owners don't seem to care for the property.

Community Gardens and natural habitat building.

I dislike the fact that your survey form allows only one choice for each of the Favor/Disfavor categories. Suppose I strongly disfavor several of the alternatives, how do I indicate that? FYI, I strongly disfavor 1, 2, 6, 7.

question 6 is not allowing me to rate the alternatives - here are my ratings: strongly favor: alternatives 1, 2 and 4 favor: alternative 3 but with mackinnon avenue being left open to through traffic as in alt 1 strongly disfavor: alternatives 5, 6, 7

A more balanced approach without light and with convertible fields.

This survey would not allow me to click on multiple selections in the above section. I would definitely like to see reduced intensity, NO athletic field lighting, and a realistic ingress/egress from the property - without this, I do not think it is even an option to develop this property into such a large park.

In questions #6 - I was not able to rate more the one alternative the same way. Here are the responses I would have checked: 2. Strongly disfavor, 5. Strongly disfavor, 6. Strongly disfavor

My check marks are not holding. Therefore, # 2 strongly favor # 4 strongly favor # 7 disfavor

The park needs to have more passive uses with less organized sports uses. The parking available should be equal to the max usage figures. A current City traffic count must be done prior to any decision as well as a final decision by Cal Trans on the offramp configuration at I5 and Santa Fe. All the development planned for should have their principals meet with the Planning Commission to "divy up" their respective traffic impacts on Santa Fe and surrounding areas - everyone can not get what is currently proposed and leave Santa Fe as a viable street [even with mitigation].

8. If we are able to arrange for a consensus building process, please list the organizations that you believe should be represented as stakeholders in that process.

- City
- Cardiff Soccer League
- Residents in close proximity to park
- Citizens for Quality of Life
- Citizens for Quality of Life
- Sierra Club
- Citizens for Quality of Life
- friends of the hall property park

- Neighbors of Scripps Encinitas - Gina Renteria
- The citizens
- San Diego County Sheriff's Department
- The local citizens first and special interest groups last. I don't believe the citizens of Encinitas want to spend
- Local neighborhood organizations
- Encinitas Soccer League
- Cardiff and Encinitas soccer
- Immediate neighbors of the project
- Citizens for Quality of Life
- CARDIFF TOWN COUNCIL
- city council
- City of Encinitas [Hall Property]
- Cardiff Glen Home owners association - closest housing development to the park.
- Neighbors
- Encinitas Little League
- Cardiff Town Council
- Cardiff Preservation Association
- Cardiff Preservation Association
- San Diego Horticulture Society
- City Council
- cardiff soccer
- Citizens for Quality of Life
- Cardiff Chamber/Mainstreet Association
- Encinitas Fire Department
- Local sports groups - whoever would be interested in space there
- Cardiff and Encinitas baseball
- Other residents in the general vicinity of the property
- LEUCADIA TOWN COUNCIL
- city staff
- Scripps [hospital expansion]
- Representatives of all sports leagues
- YMCA
- Citizens for Quality of Life
- Scripps Neighbors
- Scripps Neighbors
- National Audubon Society
- Encinitas Soccer League
- encinitas softball
- Local residents
- Citizens for Quality of Life
- our community.
- Local nature groups - like Audubon
- City Council
- City Council members

- OLIVENHEIN TOWN COUNCIL
- Quality of Life members
- The Browns [proposed development]
- Other community members
- Pop Warner
- All voters and residents of Encinitas
- Quail Gardens
- pls. don't include LCCPW=they primarily live in Carlsbad
- Encinitas Union School District
- CQL
- Encinitas and Cardiff soccer leagues - NOT Carlsbad
- QUALITY OF LIFE
- Cardiff Town Council members
- All other proposed development [collection of smaller property upgrades]
- Members of other communities who have solved a similar dilemma
- Youth and other sports groups
- UCSD
- San Dieguito Union High School District
- Cardiff Town Council
- Encinitas and Cardiff baseball/softball leagues - NOT Carlsbad
- CARDIFF PTO , PRINCIPALS AND SCHOOL BOARD
- Encinitas Taxpayers members
- Schools on or around Santa Fe [Sanderling, etc.]
- Local nature/environmental groups
- Self-Realization Fellowship
- DEMA
- Maybe schools in Cardiff
- ENCINITAS UNION PTO, PRINCIPALS AND SCHOOL BOARD
- San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy
- Business owners in the area [the Von's center owner will be most impacted]
- Leucadia 101 Mainstreet
- Cardiff Glen
- ENCINITAS TAX PAYERS ASSOC.
- Cardiff Botanical Society
- A representative of local sports interests [soccor]
- City of Encinitas Parks & Recreation
- soccer people/groups
- A wildlife representative
- San Dieguito Boys & Girls Club
- softball people/groups
- A representative of CQL
- YMCA
- dog people/groups
- One or multiple Encinitas Planning Commissioners

Question 9 concerned individuals that should be contacted. We have omitted their names from this summary of responses.

Question 10. Please let us know any additional comments you have:

- It really sucks that this has to drag on and on while the property sits idle.
- I did not have time to look at the EIR, although I have been involved with our neighborhood group (Citizens for Quality of Life) in the park design process.
- DO NOT RUIN CARDIFF DO NOT DO SOMETHING THAT YOU CAN NOT UNDO A SPORTS PARK FOR THE COUNTY ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE 5 WILL NEVER WORK AND IT'S AN IDIOTIC IDEA KEEP SAN DIEGO SAN DIEGO WE DO NOT WANT TO BE ORANGE OR LA COUNTY IF YOU WANT A SPORTS PARK BUILD IT IN CARLSBAD OR SOMEWHERE ELSE, NOT IN CARDIFF SAVE NATURE SAVE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CARDIFF IS A SPECIAL PART OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY JUST LIKE LA JOLLA AND DEL MAR SAVE CARDIFF
- We need a park for the entire community. That means all families, seniors, children, teens. We need a park to picnic in, to play in, to relax in. We do not want or need a park dedicated mainly sporting events for tournaments. We want a park for our community.
- We want a simple community park not a park for rent. We need the city to really listen to what the majority community wants.
- We need a park for the entire community. That means all families, seniors, children, teens. We need a park to picnic in, to play in, to relax in. We do not want or need a park dedicated mainly sporting events for tournaments. We want a park for our community. We want a simple community park not a park for rent. We need the city to really listen to what the majority community wants.
- Just sell the damned spot to the Self-Realization Fellowship!
- Scale back the park. The area and surrounding neighborhoods with winding streets and no place to park will be congested and the quality and local flavor will be lost. A local park for local kids to practice and play soccer or baseball is fine, preferably without 90 ft. lights. In fact, no one I've spoken to about the park has ever seen 90 ft. lights in a regional park. Scale it back, way back. Thanks.
- Wouldn't it be nice if we could come up with a plan for a park that all the residents of Encinitas would be proud of and be able to enjoy.
- what about tennis courts? hand ball basketball running trails w/mile markers & exercise stations 4f community garden.
- The park as proposed is overbuilt for the area given the fact Scripps Hospital is going to expand -- at least doubling its size. The park is located next to a freeway. This is not a good location for young people to be exercising in as studies have shown the detrimental effects of air quality on children who live next to freeways. The park as proposed is geared toward servicing only one recreational interest in the community, soccer. I like tennis and want tennis courts. The City does not have enough. I also want a swimming pool. Look at Stanley Park in UC. I was living there when that was built and enjoyed the use of the swimming pool and tennis courts -- both of which are lower cost to maintain than fields of manicured grass. Soccer is a fad in the US -- once the fickle public turn to another sport then we are left with huge fields of grass for the dogs to poop on. The park needs to

serve all the community interests, not just one group. I vote for putting the money into school grounds -- then the school children could enjoy the grassy playing fields, the soccerheads could use the fields after school and on the weekends, there is already parking available, and the soccerheads could pay a fee to the City for the use of the school grounds so that the maintenance of the grounds would have some offset.

- I am relatively new to the community, but I feel there are far more parks and recreational areas along this coast community than there are wild places for the native critters, insects and birds. Our children, our families would benefit from discovery and exploration of un-manicured, unorganized, unlandscaped spaces. Besides this area being allowed to rest and be naturally replenished, Leucadia could use tax dollars for the ravaged and deforested roadways
- We purchased our home at _____ about five years ago. We have lived in the Cardiff area of Encinitas since before it was Encinitas. We love our community. At the time the Hall greenhouses were a pleasant end to our street. When the city purchased the property, we applauded the concept of a community park. We were impressed by the city, in a public advertisement, inviting it's citizens to design their community park. It was a noble gesture. The process proceeded and a consensus was reached for a park concept in a well organized and fair manner. It appeared to address a very fair share of park elements the community wanted. Although we would miss the greenhouses we thought it would be a good thing. I am not clear what happened next. A very different concept was then presented. Now it is defined as a "Special Use Park". Features from the workshop maps showing gardens, grassy wooded trails, ponds and water features and daylight creeks are sacrificed. Areas for arts/cultural/education, skateboard areas and ball courts have been limited. When we moved to Encinitas, it was "The Flower Capital of The World". Now we have no room for a garden in our 'special use park'. Are we sacrificing all this to accommodate regional soccer tournaments? There should be playing fields. Maybe fifteen percent of our community plays soccer. The majority of the park should appeal to 100% of the stakeholders. I am not sure that this is the park concept that the majority of stakeholders want. A survey of the citizens at Encinitas Days did not want this. A Sandag report was not supportive. Council meetings comments seemed to show that this was not a popular proposal. The press did not seem to support it. Is this the best for the most? If it is, we support it. Perhaps there is time for compromise. A vote? This is a radical departure from any public workshop.
- No lights, No tournaments, No problems.....good luck.
- Although I recognize the many concerns of the citizens of Encinitas and surrounding communities, and their wish that their taxes be used to represent their needs and desires when creating new park space, I believe greater weight should be given to those who will be living next to this space on a daily basis. Not only will their lives be impacted by whatever the space is designated for, good or bad in their opinions, but by the pheriferal impacts such as light, noise, traffic, property value, crime, environmental, etc. No one is more effected than those who will have to live with the park 24/7.
- the survey will not let me make selections for question 6 [ed. Note: this was subsequently corrected]
- I have always felt that the CQL group and other nearby residents have been willing to work together with the community to come up with a park that will truly work for all of Encinitas. It is not a matter of "Not in my back yard" I would love to see a park built there,

just not this park! It is too much for this area. We contend with traffic coming to the ocean, Scripps, etc.. The access to this park will not work. I think we should be able to work something out that addresses everyone's concerns/desires. Not everyone in the City plays soccer. My daughter does and I still don't want this large of a soccer influenced park in Encinitas.

- I DON'T WANT THE OUT OF AREA TRAFFIC ASSOCIATED WITH A SPORTS PARK. I DON'T WANT LIGHTED FIELDS AT THIS LOCATION. I WANT AN OPEN SPACE PASSIVE PARK WHERE YOU CAN FLY A KITE, PICNIC, BIKE, SKATE AND BIRD WATCH. I WAS LED TO BELIEVE THAT THIS WOULD BE A PASSIVE, VIEW ORIENTED PARK. IF I HAD KNOWN THERE WAS ANOTHER AGENDA I WOULD HAVE CAMPAIGNED AGAINST THIS. I DONT WANT MY TAX PAYER DOLLERS GOING FOR A SPORTS FACILITY AT THIS LOCATION.
- While I applaud your efforts in attempting something like this, I think it is way too early in the process for a consensus conference. What we have today to discuss, in a year or two, the discussion might be entirely different. I just think this is premature.
- The cumulative traffic impacts of the proposed development around Santa Fe can not be successfully mitigated to LOS C, even according to the Hall EIR traffic study which is at best, based on old traffic figures. The old technique of letting the Planning Commissioners decide on a per project basis will not work here with out severely penalizing the "last in the door" development. All participants MUST scale down their expectations for this area to remain livable. This means no business building in the Hospital expansion, less intense use of the Hall property, a smaller Brown project, etc. The proposed school expansion should also be curtailed with any expansion being premised on providing off site Hall parking when school is not in session. Once a basic agreement in principal is reached, then we have to wait for Encinitas/Cal Trans to reach an understanding on the on and off ramps on Santa Fe, take another traffic count and review the traffic impacts. NO FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF ANY SORT SHOULD TAKE PLACE UNTIL THAT IS DONE. Better you than me to work this out.
- Why is the no athletic field lighting "strongly favor" choice mutually exclusive. When I tried to also stronly favor the direct access on MacKinon it took my stronly favor vote away from no athletic field lighting? [ed. Note: this was subsequently corrected]
- Jim Bond, Jerome Stocks, and Dan Dalager hold a death grip on the process and nothing can be done while they have a 3:2 majority and while they don't care what anyone else thinks about this.