Lori Saldaña (00:10):
Thank you. Um, how many of you have contributed money to a political campaign? A political action committee? A candidate? How many of you have contributed money over the last few years? Okay. Um, well, thank you for, for paying for the messaging, which, uh, makes it look like we wanna build a lot of affordable housing. Measure C the last time, which is still hasn't been certified, was about homelessness and affordable housing. This measure c I've been looking at the ballot statement. I served on elections and redistricting. I also chaired housing. So I've been looking at the ballot statement or the analysis from the city. There's not one word of affordable housing in the ballot statement, and yet the fundraising is, your committee is called Affordable. What is it called? Affordable Housing for All, I think. Oh, I inspect homes, Affordable Homes for All. And yet there is nothing in this that says anything about affordable housing.

Lori Saldaña (01:06):
So my objection to this is, uh, there are some geologic risks in that area. It is adjacent to a shoreline. Um, I think it's unstable ground. I taught in the Midway District for eight years. We had then infrastructure problems. We had sunken streets, we had leaks. So I object to the building because it will not get us any closer to affordable housing who is putting money into the campaigns to build in that area. Airbnb is one. What has Airbnb? Another short term vacation rentals done for San Diego over the last 10, 15 years, removed almost 20,000 as estimated affordable housing units, or at least housing units from our stock. So if we are going to build more density in this area, it's not a, a lack of height that is stopping us. It's a lack of initiative. It's a lack of will. And it's also, uh, some constraints on, on the decision makers.

Lori Saldaña (02:04):
And the reason I asked if you have contributed is if you look at who's contributed, where the money is coming from to support the Midway Rising Project, which I hope doesn't become the midway sinking project because we are already seeing a 20 million charge on a big infrastructure project just across the San Diego River from this area for pure water because of groundwater intrusion. Uh, if we look at how that was chosen, we follow the money. And that's really what I do. My objections stem from following the money and these decision making processes in City Hall where planning is more often who puts the most money into a plan and they get the biggest bang at the end, and it is not the affordable housing people.

Andy Keatts (02:53):
Okay. So I'm gonna, I'm gonna let Chris jump in here. Uh, I heard a couple different things. Some geologic concerns you have at a height. Uh, I suppose you think those are sufficient at 30 feet, but something above 30 feet would, would raise the geologic concerns. Plus, uh, housing won't be affordable. And, uh, there are developers paying money for the campaign. That roughly the, uh, fair

Chris Cate (03:17):
Summary. What's

Lori Saldaña (03:18):
Stopping Dike from being able to have more people build housing? There is, has nothing to do with the height limit. Okay.

Chris Cate (03:25):
Andy Keatts (03:29):
Uh, counseling. Kate, go ahead for

Chris Cate (03:31):
Thank you. Good morning everybody, and thank you for, for having us as well too. It's good for have my kids south asking for Danny. But a few points. One, I noticed what Lori's looking at is the fiscal impact statement that has nothing to do with us from my side, The as performance of the ballot measure that's produced by our independent budget analyst who looks at revenues and expenses for each of the individual measures. It's not their job to look at development opportunities of this measure. So let's put that aside first. Cause I don't want anybody to have this implication that, uh, there's not gonna be any affordable housing built in in this area. Any development that's built, it's gonna have to have affordable housing on it. You look at the sports screen development proposal from Midway Rising. There's 2000 affordable homes I propose to be built by that project.

Chris Cate (04:18):
That's 2000 additional affordable homes, subsets, affordable homes restricted for individuals to live within this community. Ms. Os talked about fundraising and whatnot, which she must be a fortune teller because we haven't spent any money from a campaign perspective yet. So I don't know how she knows where we've raised money from because we haven't raised any money yet. You haven't, we haven't with money. That's not my account. That's not with this one. No, actually we don't. But nonetheless, nonetheless, I think the overall goal of this measure is really very simple. We have a housing crisis in this city, and we need to look to all solutions to address that. Plain and simple, this is an area that has gone unnoticed, blighted needs that reinvestment, re needs that redevelopment. And I think we should be open to all solutions on that. And the one issue that overarching that I have great issue with is that the folks who are opposed this measure don't live in this community. These are individuals who, for whatever reason, don't wanna see progress in this area and will stop at nothing to stop investment and develop in this community even though they don't live there. And that, for me, that's incredibly frustrating. I don't wanna even speak for decay, but who actually lives there? And I think that should be noticed by everybody about who is actually the ones who are opposing this measure. It's not the folks who live there.

Andy Keatts (06:06):
Linda, I want to let you get in here. Um, so, uh, Lori mentioned a number of reasons that she opposes the measure you're running for, uh, district two, which includes the midway area. Um, why do you oppose the metric, the coastal height limit in Midway specifically, why would you say we should retain that there?

Linda Lukacs (06:25):
Perfect. Thank you, Andrew. There we go. Thanks Andrew. Uh, and thanks for hosting, uh, this discussion. I'm very grateful to be here. Um, and thank you all for joining us. Right? This is a critical discussion about our neighborhoods that I live in. And what saddens me is that our current council member didn't take the time to join us today, nor to debate. So we don't get to hear her position on this issue. I, I opposed this issue for a number of reasons. When I first started this campaign and looked into removing the height restriction, I thought, my goodness, you know, they wanna bring so many housing
projects to this area, and we lack the infrastructure to support this development. We don't have the proper infrastructure to support what we have in the community, let alone 4,500 residential units, a 16,000 seat arena, a 200 suite hotel and retail.

Linda Lukacs (07:37):
We have to start planning strategically with, um, and identify what, how this community will move forward, right? We have to preserve some of the essence of our communities. We can't just build randomly removing the height limit does not solve affordable housing. And I think, I know that if we keep the 30 foot height limit, we can add sufficient numbers of affordable housing to that area. That's just a, an excuse for why we wanna lift that height limit. So yes, we can do it. And, and what, what I find disingenuous, when I went to those planning meetings, not one of those recent developers showed us plans on what could be, if they respected our current people's initiative to, to respect that 30 foot height limit, none of those developers.

Andy Keatts (08:38):
So, uh, we've have mentioned it a few times here. There, it's, it's worth clarifying. There are two distinct things. One is the midway height limit, which covers the entire midway area. Uh, the other is a development proposal that the city is selected for the sports arena area. Uh, that is within the co the Midway area and the proponents of that project and City Council have said that it's not possible without lifting the height limit. But this height limit does apply to areas outside of sports arena and that specific redevelopment project. Um, so that, that said, I wanna, uh, throw to you the idea that the Midway area doesn't have sufficient infrastructure, um, either, uh, quality roads, easy in and out, access to freeways, uh, public transit that would support, uh, sign significant density. Um, what do you think about the idea of build, of requiring infrastructure as sort of upfront commitment before you bring the density as opposed to bringing the density first, uh, and then expecting the infrastructure to catch up later?

Dike Anyiwo (09:38):
Yeah, I think in an ideal world, you do both, uh, at both times, right? At the same time, you, you build the infrastructure while you’re building that housing. But at the end of the day, if you look at the current layer of the land, um, like I said, Midway has historically been zoned industrial, historically been zoned commercial, and the uses for those types of, um, I guess activities are very different from what we're talking about from this residential standpoint. So a big part of what we're looking to do when it comes to that infrastructure is ultimately not just identify what needs to be done, but then also pay for it and fund it. And, you know, Chris can talk a lot about how our city derives its revenues and how we ultimately pay for things. You know, as chair of the budget committee knows these things, I don't think any of these other two folks at the table understand how the city functions from a fiscal standpoint.

Dike Anyiwo (10:21):
Uh, but at the end of the day, we don't have the money that we need in order to build the infrastructure that we know that we need. And the only way that you derive those revenues is by that development. And so, unfortunately, we just happen to find ourselves in this position between Iraq and a hard place, right? And so something needs to give, and which is why we're looking to this ballot measure, like I said, as a catalyst to just break up this log jam that we have. We have looked at this community, like I said, for the last four years, we've had updated zoning, not one project. Ultimately, uh, we are stagnant and we're dying. And what we really need is some injection, um, of energy and capital into our community.
And that's what we're seeking to achieve by raising this height limit, is to spark, uh, the catalyst, like I said, for this community that we're really looking for.

Andy Keatts (11:03):
Laurie, the, uh, city of San Diego, um, does have the, the trolley station nearby at the Old Town Station. Uh, there's been some discussions about, uh, increasing connections from that Old Town station to, uh, the Sports Arena project or the rest of Midway. Um, you know, the transit priority area that the city uses to define, uh, target opportunities for <inaudible> development. I believe 75% of the Midway community falls within a transit priority area. Um, if, if one of the climate goals of this city is to build housing where people can viably, take transit, um, instead of driving everywhere they go, uh, why isn't this specifically an appropriate place for, for housing and, and as an environmentalist, um, why not see this, this as the sort of smart development that too often hasn't been how San Diego has grown.

Lori Saldaña (11:52):
Uh, there are are two new bills that were just signed into law SB six and, and 11, am I still not coming through again? Okay. Uh, we can start building housing on commercial zoned land as a result of a change to state laws. We can do mixed use and we see mixed use in the uptown area. For example, those of us who, remember when there was a big Sears store that took up that area and a generation ago, they build a a combination of retail housing mixed use, and that is something that would fit very well into this community. Building high rises in that area is not necessary to take advantage of this new state law. And the reason I'm focusing on following the money is that there's a lot of money out there now for affordable housing. And as I've testified at council, so council member Kate is aware of it, San Diego got one project out of a 2,000,000,001 project for I think $12 million is all the San Diego applied for through Project Home Key in the state of California.

Lori Saldaña (12:53):
They gave away $2 billion total, hundreds of projects, hundreds of homes, San Diego applied for one. So if our city is truly committed and city fiscal constraints aside, there is state money available to build affordable housing. And San Diego's not going after that money. So I understand that we have bicycle fiscal constraints. I always look at past performance to give us a sense of what future performance will look like. And San Diego has been an outlier since the time I chaired the housing committee and traveled around the state and talked to other cities building affordable housing. San Diego did not use redevelopment funds when they had the opportunity to build affordable housing to the extent that other communities did. That's why we are so deficient. That's why hundreds of people are dying because they don't have shelter. And that's why thousands of people don't have homes. We have not, as the city, done a very good job for a very long time.

Andy Keatts (13:47):
We're trying

Lori Saldaña (13:48):
To, Well, I I give San Diego credit for trying, but the reality is, again, hundreds of deaths and thousands of unfiltered people. No,

Andy Keatts (13:56):
This is something I, I'll keep it with you for a second here, Lori. This is something I run into a lot. And in the city of San Diego right now, in terms of local revenue sources for affordable housing, there's exactly one, it's new development of market rate housing or new development of commercial housing. The INU fees, the INU fees that come from market rate development are the only way that we bring in local money for affordable housing. And then we use that local money from affordable housing to go get these state revenues that are available. And so, I, I always wonder when folks are opposed to, uh, market rate development because it doesn't provide enough affordable housing. It's actually the only thing that we have locally that provides affordable housing is new market rate development. That's where we get the money to build affordable housing units.

Lori Saldaña (14:41):
As I said, the state just had a 2 billion fund available for cities and counties to apply for. So it's not for lack of just local development, it's also a lack of the infrastructure and the capacity building within our city government to go and look for that money when it's available, when it's offered. And so here we are, the second largest city in the state, one project, $12 million, and no operational funds. This we are an outlier. San Diego is an outlier statewide. And that's the perspective I take when I look at those dollars. And I, I apologize, Chris, Kate, I, I saw the pack saying Affordable homes for San Diego, led by Chris Kate, yes. On Measure C. Uh, I thought that had something to do with you that

Chris Cate (15:28):
It does, but there's, there's no money from Airbnb in there. So again, let's say this, all of this, I appreciate Ms. Ad's point. It's what about ism? What does any of this have to do with raising the height limit in the midway? Nothing, Nothing. Nothing. She mentions uptown last I check. I don't think there's a height limit restriction in uptown. It's not midway. So all this mixed use projects as you identify and up to, I'm sure Dcap and some folks would love to see that in the midway, but you can't do it because of the height limit. You look at some of the areas that are changing from industrial to residential in my community in Kearny Mesa, which was a very heavily industrial area, and now we're turning into a residential area. There's no height limit in there. And you're seeing projects after projects begin in the Kearney Macy area, where by sometime the next year, year and a half, you're gonna be able to to to live on convoy. That's what we want to transition to. But why are we restricting ourselves to do it? It makes no sense. This is an area that's not next to the coast. It's not next to the beach. There's no issues with coastal views from the midway. I don't think you can see the ocean from the sports arena. But here we go. Like, let's look at opportunities to have growth and address the number one issue that's sided by every single San Diego in San Diego and pull after pull after pull, which is housing.

Andy Keatts (16:54):
Linda, wanna get you back in here. You, you, you mentioned some of the impacts you would be concerned about for the community, uh, insufficient infrastructure, traffic, that sorts of, uh, knock on effects of development, um, without the height limit. If there was to be significant development, uh, would you be concerned about those things if there was, uh, increased development, but but within, you know, within the 30 foot height limit? Is that, is, is that something you think we are, you know, able to, to stomach in the midway area?

Linda Lukacs (17:24):
Yeah. So thank you for that because that was going to be my point. I think that I totally understand the cycle that we're in about how to drive the funding by increasing housing, uh, in order to fund the
infrastructure. That's very clear. And I'm not against building in the Midway District. This is not an attempt to thwart revitalization. What I'm saying is we don't have the infrastructure to handle our current situation. And without a strategic fiscally responsible plan, this is gonna be another bad decision from city Hall. So, wh why do I support then the 30 foot high limit? I believe in mitigating risk, right? So when I look at building housing units, which we desperately need, there's, there's no doubt that we have an affordable, uh, housing crisis. So certainly building in that area makes sense. I say respect the 30 foot height limit that does provide coastal access, that does impact views in our neighboring communities and, um, lessen the density to see what impact that current, that current development would have on our local infrastructure.

Linda Lukacs (18:50):
Right? So when you think about 30 feet versus a hundred feet, right, that's exponentially more people, right? Which then we have to look at our natural resources, our water, our electric grid, our streets, our traffic, our parking, our schools, all of which we have no plan. And as someone who has operated a business, I don't believe in, fingers crossed, we're gonna build it and hopefully we're gonna figure it out. I believe in putting a plan forward first doesn't have to be done, but there's gotta be a stable plan that augments the development and is complimentary to the community it serves.

Andy Keatts (19:30):
Yeah, you wanna get in

Dike Anyiwo (19:31):
Here? Yeah. Just because you've not read the plans doesn't mean they don't exist. Um, we have a plan called the community plans. It actually dictates not only the zoning, but it also speaks to parks and open space. It also speaks to mobility Chapter three. You should check it out. Um, and ultimately, like I said, we have a plan. Is it perfect? I don't think so, but do we have the capacity to start to execute it? Yes. And that's what we're seeking to achieve by raising this limit. So, like I said, I mean, not being aware of something is not an excuse to say that it doesn't exist in my opinion.

Andy Keatts (20:00):
Linda, I wanna let you, uh, respond to that. But I'll add into the mix here. Uh, one of the principles behind the, the sort of dense smart growth development that's an issue here is that all of those things you listed are easier to provide on a per capita basis through density than they are through sprawl. The cost per mile of sidewalks and electrical lines and plumbing is all much smaller if you, uh, build up instead of out. And so I, I think in fairness, there's sort of a baked in idea that this is a good way to address those problems, um, by, by, you know, making our infrastructure costs per unit smaller.

Linda Lukacs (20:37):
So thank you. Um, so thanks for that dk. I, I have read the plan and I've attended the meetings and I asked every three of the finalists, the developer finalist, what is our plan? And their response to me is, we don't have one yet. So that's where I'm coming from. Again, if, if you lay it out and it makes sense, then maybe we could have another discussion. But we can't, we can't, um, deny the, our community input. Right? And I will say that when this was last on the ballot, I believe my research indicated that somewhere between 50 and 56% of this area of district two voted against, uh, raising the high limit. So again, we, we choose to live here. I live in the Sunset Cliffs area. I do business in, in the midway area. I, I, my dentist is in the midway area.
Linda Lukacs (21:38):
I shop in the midway area. So this has a direct impact on all of us that live their quality of life. And I think we're, we're missing that part of the equation. What is the impact? What are the consequences of those who live in that area? It's very easy to look at those plans and say, Oh my gosh, they're beautiful. Right? That makes sense. Wouldn't it be lovely to have that here and from an, if I didn't live here, I probably would vote for it, right? But I live here and I know what the impact is gonna be. And when you think about congestion, traffic congestion, now you're looking at Rosecrans Midway Sports Arena that are already packed. And then we have one single artery that leaves our community from the five eight split one lane to get on the eight freeway. And, you know, with without a strategic plan, I'm a planner. I like to see results. I like to see the data without a, a plan moving forward that I was told there wasn't one. Um, it, it doesn't make sense.

Andy Keatts (22:41):
Councilman Kate, I wanna let you get in here, but I, I, I want to hear your response to, to, you know, the essence of something she just said, which is sure, maybe she doesn't live in Midway, but, um, she runs errands there. She has a dentist there, uh, in the city. We all are home in multiple communities. I live in Golden Hill, but I work downtown. I, my take goes to daycare and City Heights. Um, you know, I think, I think it's reasonable to be a, uh, you know, concerned with quality of life concerns, even if you don't specifically live in an area.

Chris Cate (23:09):
Well, I wanna, I wanna go back to something I said couple minutes ago about the impacts. And it was an interesting choice of words. It said, there's impacts on the neighboring communities, not to the midway community itself who is essentially asking for this unanimously. So we have to understand that it's easy to talk about what the impacts of these things down the street from us are or other neighborhoods are. And boy, I do shopping here, or I take my kids a daycare there, and man, that's gonna impact my life and increase my commute by a minute and a half. So, gosh, that's just such a burden on me to, to do this. I mean, that is the essence of the problem that we are facing and challenges we're facing as a city. We're looking to identify opportunities to increase the housing stock in our city, in our region.

Chris Cate (24:00):
This is the issue. This is the core argument. This is what it all comes down to, is, boy, this is gonna really disrupt my life. The things that I have already about the other folks who are looking for houses, my kids who I want to grow up in the city, let them be damned they can go somewhere else. This is my issue. And that's, I mean, as someone who born and raised in San Diego who loves this city raising three kids here, family has left because they can't afford to buy a home in San Diego. This is a fundamental problem that we face. And I don't know why there are always challenges to figure out where we're gonna address this crisis and find solutions. This is the, this is the easiest one to do. And we've already had 50, 57% of voters say yes. But again, we're back here again because of select few who live in neighboring communities don't want to be impacted.

Lori Saldaña (25:00):
I, I have to

Andy Keatts (25:01):
Yeah, I'd, I'd like ahead, I'd like you to respond. The, the, the, the, the allegation here is essentially that opponents are pulling off the ladder after them. Uh, do you, how do you respond that?

Lori Saldaña (25:10):
Right. Well, course, it's, it's always a little dangerous to personalize these objections because I think that all of us are here because we do want, uh, a good experience not only for our, our current community, but, but looking forward. And, um, the best way I, one way I try to characterize this, I also am a lifelong San Diego, and I've also been an advocate on various infrastructure projects for decades as a Sierra Club member, as a presidential appointee. I, uh, 25 years ago went to the city of Coronado and said, Unless you invest in infrastructure in Mexico, you are going to have your beaches closed by sewage. And the city council members looked at me 25 years ago and said, No way, San Diego Coronado, we are fine. It's just Imperial Beach. They're the ones that at ground zero, they're at risk. How many days this year has Coronado beaches been closed from sewage?

Chris Cate (26:01):
What does it have to do? Yeah. Can we stay on topic here?

Lori Saldaña (26:03):
I think, I think I am on topic. Okay. The world changes, population density changes, impacts change. And those of us who take a long view and look at climate change and look at the impacts in coastal areas, this is not going to be the same area that the city has done geologic risk assessments of this area. It is those of, you've heard of Liquifaction, that is a prime area for liquifaction with high rises. It has a very high water table. Trying to build a high rise in that area is going to require ongoing pumping of groundwater that increases cost, that increases on greenhouse gas emissions. It doesn't meet our climate action plan. These are all things that may be seen as obscure, may be seen as picky, but I don't want, in my lifetime to see another project that I said, this is going to have impacts down the road.

Lori Saldaña (26:51):
You're not considering have those impacts on the generation. I may not be around in another 25 years, but I, I don't wanna see another problem that I could have done something to help avoid. And that's why I continue to be active and discuss these things that other people don't wanna discuss. This is not about, if, if you wanted to build more affordable housing, why would you put it in an area that is going to be ultimately driven higher cost because of its proximity to the codes? I live in Claremont Kearney. Mesa didn't exist when I was growing up there. It is a better place to put affordable housing because there will be less pressure by, frankly, the short term vacation rentals, the speculators, the house flippers in those communities that are more inland away from the coast.

Andy Keatts (27:33):
Okay. So, uh, I that's interesting. I actually wanna ask you about this. So this isn't the case, but if it were the case that the measure predicated the height limit increase on some sort of elevated inclusionary requirement for affordable housing, if, uh, development in the area was going to have, you know, be required that some percentage of developments were going to be affordable, you've focused a lot of your comments on affordable housing. If that were a condition of this, would that change your perspective? What you just said makes me think no, that you think that this is a bad idea, period.

Lori Saldaña (28:05):
I think this is a bad idea for high rise development, even if it is affordable housing. Okay. And I think affordable housing can be accomplished, especially with changes in ST Law on commercial use of commercial retail space. We could do mixed use in existing areas. There are massive parking lots down there that could be turned into, uh, it could be turned into mixed use mm-hmm. <affirmative>. So, uh, I think we have a lot of land that could be repurposed, and I don't think it requires, uh, and not only that, they don't define what the height limit is, so that is a concern. It's not just we wanna go up to 50 feet, it's, we just wanna rescind the height limit. We're not putting any constraints on what the maximum height could be for that area.

Andy Keatts (28:46):
D jump. Yeah.

Dike Anyiwo (28:47):
I've got How, how do you define highrise, Laurie? What is your definition of a highrise

Lori Saldaña (28:53):
Building for the case of, of this particular discussion? It's, it's, we're talking about the height limit over 30 feet.

Dike Anyiwo (28:59):
I'm asking you for your definition of a highrise building. I, I, I you don't have an

Andy Keatts (29:03):
I, you know, having that, that, Well, let ask it this way then. Uh, you know, you mentioned that the, there would be sort of liquidation current concerns that would jump in above 30 feet and they would be fine and mixed use at 30 feet. What, what is the height at which you would have start to have geologic concerns

Lori Saldaña (29:19):
From a design? Every foot of height that you have, If you're going to be, you have to have a foundation mm-hmm. <affirmative> that is a ratio of that. So if you're going to go up over 30 feet, you're going to have to have some type of stable footings and underground structure to support that, that is getting close to not exactly 30 feet, but, um, there could be bathtub structures to deal with groundwater. But I'm, I'm certain that discussion, Did you have an answer? Did you have a I'm listening

Dike Anyiwo (29:47):
A number. I'm listening.

Lori Saldaña (29:49):
Ok. And so the liquifaction issue has to do we see the same thing in other places that are built on old what are, what used to be water. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, uh, wetlands areas. Mexico City is a keen example of

Dike Anyiwo (30:02):
That. It's not Midland.
Lori Saldaña (30:04):
Yeah. Okay. But it is, again, if, if, I'm sure you've looked at the seismic safety study, I'm sure you've looked at the geologic hazard study. This is a high life risk area. So if we're going to talk about putting high rises on laugh at define,

Dike Anyiwo (30:20):
We define, I mean, we should,

Lori Saldaña (30:25):
Okay.

Andy Keatts (30:25):
Should we, we, I mean, I don't wanna get too, too much into the technical studies within the, the community plan here, but, uh, I mean, it's, it's a fair point, but I think maybe broad, what's logical conclusion should, should there be no development in Midwest? Should we, should we be retreating from that area and, and returning it to its natural habitat?

Lori Saldaña (30:43):
Potentially. I think we that, I mean, we're looking at coastal retreat in a lot of other communities. I don't know if that will be necessary right away mm-hmm. <affirmative>, but we are seeing Coastal Retreat as an option in many other parts of, of, uh, San Diego County.

Dike Anyiwo (30:58):
Yeah. A few months ago, Lori, uh, you called into a city council meeting, and a few months ago, Laura, you called into a city council meeting that was, uh, being held to potentially extend the lease of the existing Orchard facility, which is a senior living home in the Midway District by 50 years. And so my curiosity is, if you don't think that this is the place to live, why is it that you think that it's affordable? That, that, excuse me, that it's allowable? Can I, for our seniors currently live there now, we're one of our most vulnerable populations if we can't build new housing there Now, why is it okay for them to stay for another 50 years?

Lori Saldaña (31:35):
Um, they may not stay 50 years. Certainly the current residents that are in their seventies and eighties are probably not gonna be there. I agree.

Dike Anyiwo (31:41):
There's, I agree. Um, but you want that facility to be there for under 50 years.

Lori Saldaña (31:44):
Down to your question. I specifically called in to propose, and it was accepted and amended that they add solar panels on city property. It is managed for older adults. The costs are managed for them. It's affordable housing. But the operational costs and the shared costs for lighting and energy, uh, are increasing because we pay the highest utility rates in the country here in San Diego. So my proposal was not specifically about the 50 year that was already negotiated. My proposal had to do with incorporating solar and it was accepted. And Jola kava amended the 50 year lease agreement to include solar panels
as part of the rehab that's taking place. Will they need to do some type of defensive measures because of salt water intrusion or other coastal issues? Potentially. My proposal was to mitigate the climate impacts of having and the cost for the residents. So there are a lot of ways to approach this, and I think having clean locally produced solar energy on any new housing should be part of any future development in the state of California. Uh, going back to AB 32, we are ahead of the curve on that, but in this project, it didn't have solar. That's why I called in. And that's why Joe Lava amended that, that's

Andy Keatts (33:00):

Why called in support of an extension of a 50 year lease. Okay. We're, we're all, we're off track a little bit. Um, Linda, you wanna jump back in here? I, we have, we have, uh, glancingly, uh, approached one of the topics that I think comes up often when people, uh, discussed this topic, which is, um, allowing new and increased development, whether through zoning or height limit restrictions, um, opening up a community to people who have not had an opportunity to live there yet. Uh, you know, to, to remove exclusionary regulations to allow more people to come in. And there's a very interesting and relevant history at this site. Um, if anybody hasn't read, Scott Lewis, um, wrote a story at the beginning of this year about the history of, you know, before this was a sports arena project. It was a neighborhood called Frontier. It was a predominantly black community. Uh, there was a, a number of the Latino people as well. Um, but that was torn down and built for, it built into a sports arena and a parking lot, um, after it provided affordable housing to people during, uh, a housing crisis in San Diego. It's very relevant. Um, it is keeping this height limit exclusionary.

Linda Lukacs (34:09):

So thank you for that. So a couple things. I I just wanna go back just a a minute and just touch on the liquid action because it is a real possibility in this area. There's also the fault line. And what I do know, I'm not a structural engineer, but I've looked into this because it, I do think it comes into the discussion, The higher you go, the more it costs to build whatever it is you're building, right? The cost increase in exponentially. So now, if a developer's coming in thinking they're paying one, you know, one cost and that gives them a margin of profit at X dollars, right? And now they're going up, it's gonna cost them more to build that structure to make it safe for those who live there. Also, um, I, I was reading an article just the other day that talked about the utilities that are underground, um, in zones of, of liquifaction. And that presents problems because there is, is that chronic, um, ground shaking and earthquake potential. So I think yes, it can be built, however, I think it's gonna cost a lot more money. And then you, then you have to look at the cost benefit analysis, right? Linda, I'm

Andy Keatts (35:25):

Gonna,

Linda Lukacs (35:25):

Developers going to be able

Andy Keatts (35:26):

To sustain. I wanna jump in. We're growing a long time, and I wanna spend some time on this topic, is, uh, a coastal height limit that is a height limit in a coastal area, a high rank coastal height limit exclusionary to people who would have not traditionally had an opportunity to live in near us.

Linda Lukacs (35:41):
I don't think it is. I, my whole point is that we don't have the infrastructure to support this project. So keeping it 30, uh, feet and building, um, to whatever the maximum we can is in that area that doesn't further stress the infrastructure in place, I think is the prudent way to go here.

Andy Keatts (36:06):
Councilman.

Chris Cate (36:06):
I think it's important to note that if nothing happens, there will be no, no money for infrastructure improvements anyways. This is how you fund infrastructure projects. I'm gonna apologies, go back, revert back to Kearny Mesa. Kearny Mesa is not a residential neighborhood, but those developments are gonna be occurring in Kearny Mesa. The fees that are gonna be paid to the city will go to pay for the infrastructure improvements, the fire stations, the roads, the sidewalks, the parks, all those things are paid for buy these fees. So whether it's the Sports Serena project and the proposal that was, uh, we're moving forward at the council or other projects that will be be born from removing this exclusion will allow for those fees to be paid for, to pay for all the infrastructure movement that the Midway community planning group identified as needs. When there is development, absent a development, there are no, there are no infrastructure improvements. The council, I don't wanna speak for them. I doubt are going to say, Here's a bunch of money for you guys to make improvements, although nothing's happening in Midway. Well, that's not fun. The things that are happening in these other areas where development is actually occurring and residents are being built and homes are being built. So I think it's important to note that, that without development, there are no dollars for infrastructure.

Andy Keatts (37:25):
All right, I'm gonna try this one more time. Is it exclusionary to people who have not had opportunity to live in in? Yes. I wanna go through everybody you talk

Chris Cate (37:33):
About. I wanna say one thing. Yeah. There is a 30 foot height limit in the Claremont community planning area as well too, which is east of Interstate five. So I would hope that the folks on this panel who are worried about coastal access issues and whatnot, will come down sometime next year and speak and support of removing the 30 foot height limit in the Claremont community plan as well too.

Andy Keatts (37:55):
You guys, uh, is the coastal height limit restriction, uh, excuse your name. Yes. It's ex Yes, it is exclusionary. Lauren is the coastal height limit exclusionary?

Lori Saldaña (38:06):
Uh, I think our short term vacation rental policies are more exclusionary. Yeah.

Andy Keatts (38:10):
Well, so is the coastal height limit exclusionary?

Lori Saldaña (38:16):
It, it's impossible to assess that because with so many of our coastal homes are being turned into short term vacation business.

Andy Keatts (38:24):
Um, I wanna ask a little bit about, uh, the reason we are voting on this at all in the first place. Uh, Councilman Kate, We, uh, should be experiencing some dejavu. Uh, few years ago, the city of San Diego, uh, put this identical ballot measure up. Uh, it was approved by 56.56% of voters. Um, a it was sued. It was sued on the grounds that the city did not adequately explore the environmental impacts specifically of, uh, view corridors and, uh, what the height would do to neighboring communities and their, their views. Uh, the city has put it back on the ballot and updated their environmental report to address those views. There's another lawsuit suggesting that they still didn't do enough that there will be continued traffic and air quality concerns based on development that should have been looked at again. But you brought the previous measure forward. You were on the city council that approved the Midway community plan in the first place. Uh, did the city this?

Chris Cate (39:24):
No. I mean, look, I, I think you, you go back to the word that you, you use and abuses, which is neighboring communities. So we went back, unfortunately, the judge, I think wrong wrongly made, made a wrong decision. And we went back, went through the whole process again, and lo and behold, were sued by the same exact people again and again. These are, these are individuals who don't want anything to happen in this community. I, I don't have else to say it. They don't want anything else to happen here. They don't want to have their impacts to their daily lives, again, at the behas and at the detriment of, of this community. And so we're gonna go through this rigmarole again. My hope is that we've done enough. We can move forward. Voters pass this. The judge will rightly deny the, the lawsuits and, and move forward and we can now move forward in progress with this community. That's my hope. But anybody can sue. We're in San Diego. Why not next San Diego special. Let you let you and Scott make that decision.

Andy Keatts (40:30):
Yeah. Uh, so Laura, the city has a track record of not necessarily being able to pull off things that it takes on, uh, with this, uh, lawsuit through coming for the, the second time we're trying, uh, that's ballot measured. Um, did the city do enough the second time around to win a lawsuit?

Lori Saldaña (40:49):
I, I actually haven't, uh, looked at the district text to that, but I will say that we are often driven. There's a tailgate park, uh, project that's under litigation now because they're not providing the, uh, current state limit of affordable housing. Um, a lot of our major redevelopment plans have led not only to litigation, but investigations, Petco Park bonds were put out without fully stating the city's obligations to the pension fund. And that led to our getting a nickname of VE Run by the Sea and the mayor resigning, so the city of San Diego. And, and that is really my concern. We have a history of pay to play, what I call slot machine development deals. You put in a certain amount of money into a political campaign and you get back a certain development agreement and it, it, we end up with Ash Street. We end up with a former skydiving center downtown that's supposed to be supporting homelessness navigation, but there's no place to navigate people too. So I think the city of San Diego has a pattern. If we wanna look at past performance informed future performance, um, I think we have a rather troubling past performance history.
Andy Keatts (41:54):
Okay. Uh, DK you were on the community planning group when the city put this up the first time around. You were on the planning group when you guys did the, the community plan update towards the end, right?

Dike Anyiwo (42:05):
I joined right after it got done.

Andy Keatts (42:06):
Okay. And, uh, and now you, you're here as well. Uh, has the city done its size cross its team enough, or are we gonna have to do this another time two years from now?

Dike Anyiwo (42:15):
Yeah. One, one thing I really wanna bring to this conversation before we wrap is that when this conversation about a high limited midway first really, um, I think became tangible, it was during that community plan update process, right? During that process, we go before planning commission, folks are saying, Okay, why is it that we even have this 30 foot limit? This is not an area. When you look at what we're translating from commercial, from, uh, industrial to this mixed use residential, there's no reason for this 30 foot, uh, constraint to be here. The reasoning that was given back the planning commission was because of this 70, 1972, 50 year old law that constrained, Right? So immediately upon completion of our community plan in 2018, we set about addressing this, 20 72, 50 year old limit. The only way we can do that is by voted the citizen of the citizenry of the city of San Diego.

Dike Anyiwo (43:01):
So 2018, we complete our community plan. In 2020, we, we embark on this effort, right, to basically complete what we couldn't complete in the community plan update process itself. Funny enough, when we started talking the city, our community planning group, the city's ambition was actually limited to the sports arena side itself. They only wanted to re uh, to remove this limit on the city owned land. And ultimately it was our planning group that worked closely in conjunction with our council member. That expanded the horizon to the extent of our community planning era. That's the end of our jurisdiction. We were unanimous in our effort to, like I said, expand this footprint from not just the city own land on the sports arena site, but to the entire community. We did that. We ran that campaign, we ran that during a presidential campaign when you have the highest amount of turnout, right?

Dike Anyiwo (43:44):
Measure k I think it was a few years ago, said that we have to make big decisions during big election cycles and not a midterms or specials. So as far as I'm concerned, we as a community have done everything in our power to put our best foot forward. Uh, we rely on partnerships, right? We are solutions oriented, but, um, uh, partnership oriented comp, we, we, we are a land use advisory group, right? It's a community group. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, This city is ultimately the one that has to execute these different functions. And while I do think that now we've done enough at this point, the only reason we're having this conversation, like Chris said, is because two years ago after we did run the Citywide campaign, after we did, uh, declare victory by about 57.6 whatever percent that was, we got more votes than Todd. I'm pretty sure. Um, there are some folks from outside our community that are relentless in their attempts to author. So I wanna make sure that we're all clear about why we are here today, because two years ago we did this. And unfortunately, my neighbors in Point Loman in Mission
Hills took it upon themselves to get in our way. And so that's the only reason we're here today. Um, but I do think that we've done enough at this point to to, to clear victory in a few more weeks. All

Andy Keatts (44:48):
Right. We're all done. We, I I wanted to ask one more question, but we have to wrap up so everybody can get to the next session. Um,

Speaker 6 (44:56):
Everybody, um,

Andy Keatts (45:03):
I'll be hanging around all day. You guys want to jump me in? Uh, just jump on in, spend my ear a little bit

Speaker 6 (45:08):
About, uh, whatever I didn't ask. Okay. Blue shirt along the way. It's all part building. I don't think so. Yeah, it's not.