



NORTH PARK – MID-CITY REGIONAL BIKE CORRIDOR PROJECT
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING 2

March 6, 2013 ♦ 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Sunset Temple
3911 Kansas Street, San Diego, CA 92104

MEETING SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has formed a community advisory group to assist with the planning and design of the North Park – Mid-City Regional Bike Corridors Project. The role of the North Park – Mid-City Regional Bike Corridors Community Advisory Group (Advisory Group) is to provide input on community issues, opportunities, proposed facility designs, and to facilitate broad community involvement from kick-off to completion of the planning and design phase of the project. The Advisory Group will meet four times at key project milestones.

The second Advisory Group meeting was held on March 6, 2013 at Sunset Temple, located at 3911 Kansas Street, San Diego, CA 92104. The purpose of the second Advisory Group meeting was to:

- Review the outcome of the first Advisory Group meeting;
- Describe the route alignment development process;
- Discuss and gather Advisory Group input on preliminary route options; and
- Document other regional and local opportunities.

Approximately 53 community members attended the second Advisory Group meeting. Of those who attended, 19 were Advisory Group members. All community members are welcome and encouraged to attend the Advisory Group meetings.

The materials presented and input obtained at the Advisory Group meetings will also be posted to www.keepsandiegomoving.com/NorthParkMidCityBike for community members to review and comment on after each meeting.

The following sections summarize community members' discussions during the second Advisory Group meeting, organized by meeting topic. Each section briefly describes the agenda item (shown in italics) and then lists community members' comments and questions. Where applicable, the project team's responses are listed below the respective question (shown in italics).



SUMMARY OF TOPICS AND DISCUSSIONS

I. Welcome and Introductions

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG Principal Planner, welcomed attendees to the meeting coming to the meeting and introduced the project team and Advisory Group members. She then provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

II. Review of Community Advisory Group Meeting 1

Bridget Enderle, SANDAG Associate Planner and North Park – Mid-City Regional Bike Corridors Project Manager, thanked participants for their on-going involvement in the project and provided a brief overview of the first Community Advisory Group meeting. She highlighted key issues and opportunities raised by Advisory Group and other community members during the first meeting.

Ms. Enderle also reviewed the project goals, noting revisions made to the goals based upon input obtained during, and since, the first meeting.

III. Route Alignment Development Process

Matt Benjamin of Fehr & Peers described the process for developing preliminary alternative alignments, which includes Advisory Group and community member input as well as findings from site visits. He also outlined the metrics that will be used to evaluate the alternatives and those metrics' relationship to each of the project goals.

Small Group Discussions: Route Options

The majority of the second Community Advisory Group meeting was devoted to small group discussions exploring potential alternative route alignments.

Ms. Enderle explained the objectives for the small group discussions were to collect feedback on the potential alternative alignments to analyze as part of the alignment study. Participants were asked to discuss pros and cons of each potential study corridors based on the project goals, identify any missing corridors, and eliminate unfavorable potential corridors. Participants were also asked to document other opportunities to improve biking, walking and place-making within the study areas.

The Advisory Group and community members then split into five smaller facilitated group discussions. Each facilitated group discussed and marked-up a map displaying one of the three project corridors. The base maps identified initial route alignments identified in the Regional Bike Plan as well as possible additional study corridors identified through community input and site visits.

Advisory Group and community member comments during the small group discussions are summarized below by street and further by route or topic.



Comments on the Meade Avenue Corridor Study Area

Two of the five discussion groups focused on the Meade Avenue corridor study area. These groups' comments are summarized below and their respective annotated maps are attached to this document.

Adams Avenue:

- I'm concerned about the lack of facilities north of Adams Avenue. One of the objectives of this project is to get people around, but none of these options connect to the north.
- One of the concerns is that there are many things already happening on Adams Avenue. I am concerned about connectivity. The people you want to plan for are the people who are not currently riding. It's not that safe of a street right now and how would you get there from these northern communities?
- We should consider Adams Avenue.
- It really connects to the local businesses. I think it'd be a great candidate.
- We should add Adams as a study corridor from Park Blvd to its eastern limit.
- When we add Adams Avenue, there is economic benefit and there is a pre-existing sense of place. It's already established and vibrant. You could enhance the sense of place there.
- Adams Avenue is totally underserved. We should have a study corridor that is further north – on or closer to Adams. The current options are all around El Cajon.

(The group confirmed their general agreement that Adams Avenue should be added as a potential study corridor)

- Cost/benefit does matter. The sense of place is already established, especially on Adams. The analysis needs to factor in not wasting money. We need to link to hospitals, schools, businesses and parks to see the greatest return on the investment.
- Adams Avenue doesn't really provide strong east-west connection. It isn't regional in nature because it doesn't connect communities. Can we take it off of the table and focus on El Cajon Boulevard?
- Adams is important to the local community. Safety is critical, no doubt about it. As far as a long east/west corridor, it's not great, but it does serve a lot of local bike trips and connects to all of the businesses along it.
- Is there going to be any left over money that we could apply to little projects, like on Adams?
- Adams doesn't have "regional" directness, but we can still look at it, right?



- Adams would be good to get to state (San Diego State University), but we would need a bridge at Collwood Boulevard.

Monroe Avenue:

- Monroe is not contiguous. I'd cross it off as an option.
- I would like to keep Monroe on as an option, because it connects to the College Area.
- Monroe is important where Meade ends in the east but not on the western side.
- As a taxpayer, I am looking for a return on my investment. Monroe is useless, especially on the west side.
- *Advantages to Monroe Avenue:*
 - It's more recreational and pleasant than El Cajon.
 - Monroe connects the Talmadge neighborhood to others.
- *Disadvantages to Monroe Avenue:*
 - The intersection of Aldine and Monroe is a critical, but dangerous, intersection for connecting neighborhoods.
 - Monroe and Collwood is also a really tough intersection.
- *Opportunities:*
 - West of Fairmount Avenue, make Monroe bike lane or add sharrows.
 - Add sharrows to Monroe west of Fairmount.
 - Cycle-track Monroe east of Fairmount.

Meade Avenue:

- What does a bike facility on Meade look like?
- What if we made Meade one-way?
- What if we had couplets to avoid steep hills? For example, east on Meade and west on Howard?
- Meade is strong because it doesn't have any freeway interchanges.
- There are opportunities on Meade because of connections between parks and schools.



- The YMCA planned for Meade Avenue is also really important. We want people to go there on bicycles, we don't want 19,000 more people contributing to traffic. It's important to have bike connectivity there.
- *Advantages to Meade Avenue:*
 - The topography is favorable for riders.
 - There is less traffic than some of the other streets.
 - It's much more comfortable to ride on than on El Cajon.
- *Disadvantages to Meade Avenue:*
 - There are lots of stop signs. This disrupts the comfort and flow.
 - Meade and Texas is a bad intersection for cars and bicyclists.
 - Meade Avenue could be a good route to Birney Elementary but the street narrows.
- *Opportunities:*
 - Due to its width, there is an opportunity to create a park-like atmosphere with landscaped traffic circles and improved streetscape.
 - You could add sharrows.
 - Get rid of some of the stop signs.
 - Add better wayfinding.
 - Add parklets and traffic calming on Meade.

El Cajon Boulevard:

- El Cajon Boulevard is very important. El Cajon should be studied all of the way from Park Boulevard to College Avenue, to connect to SDSU.
- Analyze El Cajon to La Mesa; that is logical.
- El Cajon drops down to 4 lanes east of 43rd Street. I don't know what the lane widths are here. Maybe you could squeeze in a bike lane instead of cycle tracks.
- If we cannot do El Cajon, what could we do? What's the relative topography of the various alternatives?
- Close to El Cajon are large amounts of apartment buildings and a very strong park deficiency. The street closest to the commercial street is the best.



- El Cajon struggles with businesses. Does it make sense to work there?
- El Cajon might work if it were improved, with parks and other facilities.
- If you're looking at a young demographic, you're going to want to look at El Cajon because that's where young people will be moving in.
- If we cannot get a separated bike path on El Cajon, I'd rather have a separated bike path elsewhere, even if manifested as a couplet alternating on different streets. A cycle track is the kind of thing I would want my kid riding on.
- I am only willing to forgo Adams Avenue if we can really seriously get a cycle track on El Cajon.
- I think this is our opportunity to attempt to get protected cycle track on El Cajon.
- There will be two bus lanes on El Cajon once the BRT [Mid-City Rapid Bus] is built. These could potentially become shared bus/bike lanes.
- As a small business owner, we want bikes coming to our business. It also brings foot traffic.
- Make El Cajon as an express throughway for bikes, and also improve feeder streets on the sides for non-express riding.
- I would like to have a route on El Cajon to serve local business access and commuter traffic.
- We should have cycle track on El Cajon between Park and Fairmount.
- *Advantages to El Cajon Boulevard:*
 - The topography is favorable.
 - It is much more direct and continuous, especially for riders going to the College Area.
 - It connects to the Grantville Trolley Station.
 - El Cajon is a critical street because it is a commercial district.
- *Disadvantages to El Cajon Boulevard:*
 - There is heavy traffic flow.
 - It's very dark at night in some parts; it needs more street lights.
 - The wayfinding is not very good.
 - Florida and El Cajon is a congested intersection.



- The intersection of Park and El Cajon is confusing.
- Fairmount Avenue is the route to Grantville Trolley Station but its high traffic.
- *Opportunities:*
 - Traffic calming features are needed.
 - West of Fairmount, make El Cajon a Class 1 bike path.
 - East of Fairmount, perhaps divert the bike path to Monroe?
 - Around the Little Saigon Area and Hoover High School, create a pedestrian-friendly streetscape and sidewalk. It's a busy commercial district.
 - Improve the wayfinding.
 - East of Fairmount is a challenge because of high traffic volumes and fewer lanes but maybe bike lanes or sharrows would work.
 - Solve the parking problem on El Cajon by creating diagonal parking on side streets.

Other Opportunities and General Comments:

- Fairmount Avenue is proposed to be a green belt. It currently has a failing LOS [level of service] grade.
- Collwood Boulevard should have a separated bikeway.
- I am not convinced that Collwood Boulevard could give us what we want, but maybe there is another connection that could get us over there. It's really hilly through that eastern area.
- One of the opportunities for Utah Street is that there is space to put a bike facility between the parking and the curb on Utah. We also probably need some more 4-way stops there.
- I am a big advocate of putting cars between bikes and moving traffic and adding nice, native, good-smelling plants.
- We should analyze where it feels safe and comfortable; not necessarily where it's safe now, but where it could be.
- There aren't too many connections to Mission Valley.
- We need to look for connections through Kensington.
- The Texas Street bike lane is a big improvement.



- We submitted a proposal to Caltrans many years ago for a bike path along the I-15 that connects these communities to mission valley. This is a really high priority for the community.
- As a cyclist, if you're on one of these side streets, you will feel like a second class citizen.
-
- If we can get separated facility. We don't want a half project. For instance, BRT [Mid-City Rapid Bus project] has not become BRT. There is no dedicated bus lane.
- We want to provide a safe environment for cyclists.
- The densification of Mid-City is coming, whether we like it or not. We should have as many people riding bikes as possible. We are going to have nodes of density. We should look at projects in places that will become increasingly dense.
- I am okay with sharing a road with traffic if there is very little of it and it is very slow.
- I am concerned because we aren't taking demographic shifts into account. Are we evaluating these based on current conditions or for projected conditions? I want to see demographic projections.
- 32nd Street is a great connection to downtown.
- Euclid Avenue is very narrow and has high traffic but it is a good connection.
- 30th Street should have traffic calming and trees.
- Streetscape improvements on 30th Street are desirable.

Comments on the Howard/Orange Corridor Study Area

Two of the five discussion groups focused on the Howard/Orange Avenue corridor study area. These groups' comments are summarized below and their respective annotated maps are attached to this document.

Howard Avenue and Polk Avenue from Park Boulevard to Euclid Avenue:

- There is a nice four-way stop at Texas Street and Polk, and bikes don't trigger the stoplight at Howard.
- Howard is preferred over Polk.
- Polk is preferred until Utah Street, then from Utah east, Howard/Orange is better than Polk.
- To make the north-south connection between the two, Utah already has a nice bike



lane, and the University/Utah streetlight detects and triggers the light for bikes.

- Orange Avenue is preferred over Polk Avenue due to crime and narrower width of Polk.
- Polk also has many intersections with uncontrolled north-south traffic.
- The last block west on Howard is steep (approaching Georgia Street) however it shouldn't be eliminated from the study because Polk is even steeper.
- A new streetlight on Polk at Texas may be needed.
- Orange is preferred over Polk. Orange goes through; Polk doesn't. Then once you hit Winona, Trojan becomes the preferred route.
- The group generally favors Orange/Howard over Polk.

Orange Avenue and Polk Avenue east of Euclid Avenue:

- Orange Avenue is preferred over Polk.
- Howard from Park to Utah is preferred over Orange if there are improvements made to the stoplight at Texas.
- Swap the stoplight/stop sign at Howard and Polk – make Howard a stop sign, make Polk a stoplight; or make the Howard stoplight able to detect bikes.

University Avenue:

- The southern corridor is on University to Colina Park, then winding up to Orange. University is a safe route, especially at night, and will be used by commuters.
- We want facilities on University Avenue from 44th to Winona.
- Of what's there, University is best.
- I think there is general agreement that University is preferred over the other options. The circuitous routes are not viable.

Various Alignment Options East of Winona Avenue:

- There is a treacherous section on Tarragona Drive. It has a terrible uphill. Eliminate this portion of the route.
- The Tower Street/Solita/Seminole/ Vale Way alignment for a northern route option is preferred.
- Go through Colina Park as depicted on the route option shown on the map to avoid the steep hills on Orange Avenue and Trojan Avenue.



- Eliminate the Polk and Trojan alignment near Colina Park.
- Altadena is where it starts to get difficult.
- The more complicated, twists and turns, the less people will use it; you want simple and straight. And turns affect cars' ability to see you.
- Vale is better than Trojan.
- There is a hill at the intersection of Orange and 52nd Street, and then it's almost flat once you get to the park.
- Put a bridge on Trojan across Collwood; then you're set.
- Orange at Collwood is chaotic but a lot of cars are anticipating that already. It's almost like crossing freeway entrances.
- Going through Colina Park is not really viable.
- Orange is best until you hit the hill; then take Trojan from Winona east to avoid the hill. Then we need a tunnel or bike elevator.
- From Winona it depends on where you're going but both options are flat. You could improve University to get to La Mesa and Trojan to get to connect to State (San Diego State University).
- At 58th Street, Vale is preferred over Trojan.
- The College Avenue crossing is tricky.
- Adelaide and Estelle Street just to the north could make a nice couplet or possibly Vale Way.
- Consider Acorn to College then Vale past College going westward.
- Vale to College, then Estelle past College going eastward is also an option.
- Malcolm Drive is nice.

General Comments and Other Opportunities:

- To connect Orange to University, use Winona rather than the Altadena circuitous route.
- For north-south connections, more destinations are on College than on 54th. There is already a bike lane on 54th Street. It has rolling hills.
- College has more ability to be improved than 54th.
- But 54th should still be a major regional facility.



- Fairmount Avenue and 44th Street is a major north/south route. There are lots of businesses along the corridor.
- A lot of us would be perfectly happy on Wightman and Landis. Why fight the traffic, why fight the lights? Why fight all the traffic on University? I used to turn on Euclid, cross El Cajon and take Adams, to Collwood, into the neighborhoods.
- Lincoln is an option but not preferred as much because it dead ends, and cars use it as an alternative to the boulevards.
- It is important to balance the needs of the 8-years old to 80-years old age group with commuter cyclists.
- Eliminate travel on steep hills, as much as possible.
- It is better to put facilities on busier streets at night because there is more lighting and more eyes on the street for crime prevention.
- Southern and northern corridors are needed.
- There is concern over parking loss in North Park. Try to make the plan parking neutral to avoid implementation issues with residents. Would a bike couplet work? For example, westbound on Howard and eastbound on Polk, in order to keep more parking.
- Don't forget that access to businesses for local trips, especially on University and El Cajon Boulevard, is important.
- Bike parking near schools and parks, with bike repair stations along the route, is important to consider.
- There are two schools on Euclid and 49th Street.
- Put a bike station at El Cajon Boulevard Central and El Cajon (vacant lot) and on the I-15/University bridge deck.
- Place a bike fix-it station in the area where University and Lincoln diverge, east of I-805.
- Add Lincoln Street as a study corridor between University and Texas.
- Orange could be an urban greenway connecting the freeway deck to Colina Park.
- Clay Park is a linear Park near Aragon with bike parking.
- Consider the 54th/University intersection for a fix-it station park, using the now unused right-of-way, and add pedestrian amenities.
- Central Avenue as a bike boulevard is ideal. The Orange to El Cajon Boulevard segment needs to be finished.



- North-south routes that should be recommended for other studies and implementation:
 - Central Avenue
 - 30th Street
 - 54th Street
 - 70th Street
 - Cutting through Colina Park to avoid hills

Comments on the Landis Street/Wightman Street Corridor Study Area

One of the five discussion groups focused on the Landis Street/Wightman Street corridor study area. This group's comments are summarized below and their annotated map is attached to this document.

Landis/Wightman Street from 35th Street to Euclid Avenue:

- Wightman and Landis are “ground zero” for elementary schools all through the neighborhood. Bike facilities should be designed to accommodate families and kids.
- These streets are dark. There are not enough street lights in the area, especially east of I-805. Lighting definitely needs to be put in.
- Wightman and 38th Streets have assets that can be served by a bike facility: Cherokee Elementary School, YMCA and the park. A nice wide sidewalk and pedestrian bridge – it’s good for biking – this should be a destination that has plenty of signage and other amenities. Enhancing this area would provide benefits for the community.
- A key debate from the last meeting is should a major bike corridor be built on a main street or secondary street? On this map, University would be the ideal alignment – it has commercial destinations, eyes on the streets, shopping and grocery stores, bike parking and corrals, transit stops, etc. A secondary street has less traffic, but no destinations. Should SANDAG invest in the main thoroughfare or secondary? Each alignment would serve a different population with a different mindset towards biking.
- Fix the pedestrian bridge and general circulation around Landis and I-15 to prevent sidewalk riding.

(The group generally agrees that the two eastern alignments are viable, but would like to add the entire length of University Ave. from Park Boulevard to I-15 for consideration in the alignment study.)



Landis/Dwight/Upas Street from I-805 to Park Boulevard:

- On Landis at Ray Street, it's a one-way street; you don't want to go against the one-way street.
- The northern alignment on Landis is preferred over the southern alignment on Dwight/Upas due to its proximity to University Avenue.
- Disadvantages of the Upas/Dwight alignment include:
 - Extremely steep hills on Dwight near I-805 and Upas near 28th Street.
 - Dwight is also not a through-way (there is no bridge over I-805). It's also completely residential with stop signs on every corner.
 - Balboa Park, Morley Field, and South Park are major destinations that would be better served with a north-south connection that could be utilized as a "destination route" rather than bike thoroughfare.
- The western end of Landis does have some disadvantages too:
 - The road is jagged, rather than a straight, direct path.
 - There are stop signs at every single intersection, which are a hindrance. Traffic signals are preferred for a faster ride.
 - There is no commercial activity on Landis.
 - There is a dead end at Georgia with a steep hill and canyon. The connection to Robinson must be improved.
- West of I-805 in North Park, Lincoln is a good alternative to Landis. There are fewer stop signs and it follows a straight path. The road is flat with no odd turns, better paving, and some commercial activity.

Robinson Avenue and Landis/Wightman Street:

(There is general agreement among the group that Wightman/Landis is a favorable route.)

- Extend the Wightman route east to Euclid.
- Euclid Ave is really narrow and busy.

Robinson Avenue:

- Bike lifts on Robinson at Florida Canyon would be helpful.
- Robinson east to Landis is a possibility if the gap could be closed at Florida Street.



- A bridge on Robinson near Florida Street is supported.
- Eliminate Robinson because you can't go through at Florida/Georgia.

Landis Street and Wightman Street:

- Take Landis all the way over once you get past Ray Street to get to Cherokee Point. There's a hill at the I-805 but it's nice past that because it's continuous; and the YMCA is on Landis.
- Wightman from 35th Street east would be good if improvements were made. The street is in disrepair and has lots of stop signs.

University Avenue from Park Boulevard to I-15:

- *Advantages to University Avenue:*
 - Slowing down University would make it a more attractive destination for families and have positive economic benefit. Bike infrastructure on this main thoroughfare will slow the traffic down, help the economy, and support local businesses.
 - If University would have a separated cycle track, then it would get more ridership and be a better investment than Landis.
 - University has the road width, provided that parking spots are removed, to support bike infrastructure such as a cycle track.
 - University is the superior alignment and has many bike amenities that can support everyday trips.
- *Disadvantages to University Avenue:*
 - As it is, University is not a safe street because it is too fast. There are other corridors that are currently more secure.
 - A lot of money needs to be invested into University to make it better, and investment into a secondary street might be more efficient.
 - A lot of residential areas don't have street lights, bike infrastructure, etc. A bike facility on a secondary street could enhance the community, create more destinations, and strengthen the sense of place. Bike facilities on a secondary path would be better for attracting families and the "interested but concerned" bikers.
 - The City Heights portion of University Avenue needs better sidewalks. The traffic around Euclid becomes too fast for bike riding, as well. There is terrible visibility on the western end of University.
 - Cyclists are afraid of buses and parked car doors opening.



- There is room for a bridge at the Georgia Street hill.
- If University is not a feasible alignment in the near term, ensure smaller north-south corridors are improved that connect Landis/Wightman to University.

Other Opportunities and General Comments:

- Expand the bike share program into the North Park community. North Park has many destinations for tourists and locals and will bring in many non-regular and different riders.
- Consider one-way couplets, such as University and El Cajon. To keep traffic slow, reduce the speed limit to 20mph.
- Orange Avenue is a great street for a potential bike facility. It's flat, connected, and has a lot of schools like Wightman does. Community members would like to see investments here.
- 30th Street is an important north-south connection. No one uses the bike facility on Utah because there is nowhere to go. People ride on 30th Street despite buses, cars, etc. because it has destinations. 30th Street verses Utah is a corollary to University verses Landis. People would like to be on University because it has destinations.
- Consider Adams Ave. as a good example of a bike facility. It can also be enhanced.
- Get rid of angled parking in Hillcrest. Build a buffered bike lane that's protected with parallel parking to the left of the bike facility.
- It's important to have a good connection to Robinson.
- Georgia Street can serve as an alternative north-south connection to Park Blvd.

IV. Large Group Discussion: Route Options

Representatives from each small group presented their findings to the entire group.

V. Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Ms. Enderle described the next steps to the planning process, noting that the next Advisory Group meeting will be held in May. She closed the meeting and thanked Advisory Group and all community members for attending.



MEETING ATTENDEES

The following 64 people attended the second North Park – Mid-City Regional Bike Corridors Community Advisory Group meeting.

Community Advisory Group Members (and alternates):

Denise Armijo, Eastern Area Communities Planning Committee
Dionné Carlson, North Park Planning Committee
Bill Ellig, University Heights Community Development Corporation
Joan FitzSimons, Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group
Beryl Forman, El Cajon Boulevard Business Improvement Association (The Boulevard)
Esperanza Gonzales, City Heights Built Environment Team
Andy Hamilton, WalkSanDiego
Everett Hauser, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
Andrew Holets, Copley Family YMCA
Mario Ingrassi, Eastern Area Communities Planning Committee
Michelle Luellen, Proyecto de Casas Saludables
Jeff Motch, Adams Avenue Business Association
Marzhel Pinto, SDSU Bicycle Advisory Committee
Jeff Kucharski, North Park Community Association
Lee Rittner, Rolando Park Community Council
Mark Rowland, Normal Heights Community Planning Group
Christopher Taylor, North Park Main Street
Randy Van Vleck, City Heights Community Development Corporation
René Vidales, North Park Planning Committee

Community Members:

Allan Acevedo
Jinna Albright, Thomas Bike Shop
Yoav Altman
John Anderson
Ron Anderson
Matti Asgarian
Laura Ball
Leylla Badeanlon
Tyler Bergin
Khalisa Bolling
Rosemary Bystrak
Kevin Clark
Olivier Clerc
Jose France Garcia, Environmental Health Coalition
Lucken Gibord
Jennifer Guerra, City Heights Community Development Corporation
Paul Jamason
Roddy Jerome
Angela Landsberg, North Park Main Street
Melinda Lee, Rancho Urbano



Alexander Lukes
Sidney Michael
Fernando Morados
David Moty, Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group
Aaron Nuñez
Veronica Rivera
Chip Sanders
Elvia Sandoval, Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group
Bruce Shank
Jim Springsteen
Seth Torma
Hans Wangbichler
Darren Whittaker

Presenters and Discussion Facilitators:

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG (presenter)
Matt Benjamin, Fehr & Peers (presenter)
Bridget Enderle, SANDAG (presenter and facilitator)
Chris Carterette, SANDAG (facilitator)
Chris Kluth, SANDAG (facilitator)
Marlon Pangilinan, City of San Diego (facilitator)
Michael Prinz, City of San Diego (facilitator)
Dave Sorenson, Kimley-Horn (note-taker)
Carline Au, SANDAG (note-taker)
Christine Eary, SANDAG (note-taker)
Alison Moss, SANDAG (note-taker)
Suchi Mukherjee, SANDAG (note-taker)