

Comments from Old Town IPU Public Meeting-10/22/14

Oral

1. Sunset Resident who supports Alternative 3. Favors maintaining the existing footprint of the 1953 Caltrans building. Would like the building to provide a combination of uses for residents. This could include a mix of preservation of archaeology and other resources onsite. Also could include an interpretive center, grocery store, meeting space. The new acquisition should serve tourists and residents of Old Town.
2. In favor of the 1st Alternative (Preferred) but has some concerns including whether the park area will end up similar to the nearby Native Plant Garden which has become full of litter weeds and hasn't been cared for. Doesn't have confidence that with the amount of landscaping proposed in the 1st alternative, that it would be properly cared for. Doesn't like the idea of an orchard and would prefer something that would engage visitors more. Need to have interpretive displays. The interpretation should include the story of Native Americans/Archaeology/Adobes and families that lived there. A water feature to symbolize the river. Elements that are more engaging for people.
3. Interested in incorporated a Museum onto the site. Need to ensure that signage is provided for entering OTSDSHP. The Building could be a source of income. Could interpret the riverbank within the building
4. Alternative 2 needs more time developing a concept. It shouldn't be just open space for future events. Most events are done in the plaza. It can incorporate parking as that would be useful, too.
5. Resident since 1955. Old Town originally had a grocery store downtown within the building that is now the Old Town Mexican Café. At one time, there was a place for veterans to utilize within Old Town, however, it was clarified by another participant that a facility does currently exist.
6. Commenter noted that Alternative 3 being utilized as a museum may be redundant since a Caltrans museum already exists across Taylor St. adjacent to the current Caltrans office complex. Commenter is leaning towards Alternative 1, however, it should include more representation of the 1821-1854 time period. The village of Cosoy should be interpreted. The site should include native plants, not covered wagons. Commenter feels that the earlier period has been neglected. The Park and new acquisition should be better connected to the Presidio.
7. Commenter generally supportive of Alternative 1 (Preferred). It provides the best use of the site, but has some reservations. The IPU should be implemented in a phased manner after completion of a Master Plan amendment. There are photos of what was there historically, therefore, funds shouldn't be spent on something that would need to be removed. Archaeological investigation and historical investigation should be completed. Reservations about placing parking onsite. The concept of the site acquisition was to improve interpretation within the Park. Replication of the historic period, which did not include parking. The future planning should not include parking. Preservation action committee recognizes that the buildings are architecturally significant as an example of mid-century modern architecture, the

committee voted not to recommend its preservation. The reason why the committee did not support its preservation was that it felt there were more significant resources to recognize below ground.

8. **Question:** What are the chances that Alternative 3 will be chosen?

Response: It is being considered as a potential alternative, however, State Parks has chosen Alternative 1 as their preference at this time.

9. **Question:** Are there any more details as to what would go into the building?

Response: Planning has been fairly limited as to what the building would be used for in order to not limit the opportunities that could be considered. Its use would likely be determined within future planning.

Question: If the building were to be remediated, wouldn't it cost far less than demolishing it?

Response: Demolishing the building has a certain cost, however, to bring the building to current code as well as installation of visitor or operation facilities would have a cost as well. Cost of renovation has not been considered at this point.

Question: Wouldn't Alternative 4 be the most environmentally sensitive alternative.

Response: It would likely have the least environmental impact, but would not meet any of the objectives for Immediate Public Use of the site.

10. Commenter has worked on the project extensively. Wants to create a sense of why San Diego is here, how it was founded and the importance of the San Diego River. Presidio was considered the "Plymouth Rock" of the west coast. There is an active Mid-Century Modern group and it was determined that they supported the removal of the building. Concerned about the shape of the riverbank on the site. Would like to make sure that the project meets the mission of State Parks, can operate as a major entrance into the Park and creates a significance increase in park space.

11. **Question:** Has the paving of Juan Street resulted in the discovery of any archaeological resources?

Response: Nothing has been found. There will be monitoring for ground disturbance for the project.

Archaeological testing was completed during the improvements made to Taylor St. Findings from that work shall be reviewed.

12. Chairperson from Descendants of San Diego: Likes Alternative 1, it should embrace descendants. There are 80,000 that have been identified. Would like to see consideration of expanding the Park into the Presidio. There should be consideration of interpretation outside of the site.

13. The project site is near a transit center.

Question: How will the site be secured? Want to be sure that it doesn't become a problem. The area could begin to resemble downtown, with transients and panhandlers.

Response: State Parks has taken steps to add additional security staff.

Question: Will maintenance of the site be considered.

Response: Maintenance is provided from a separate funding source.

14. Good lighting should be used to help with security, since the majority of business is occurring at night.

15. **Question:** Great of job of making a park, but are there markers (interpretive) to tell/explain to people what the riverbank is?

Response: There is a small budget for interpretation as part of the project.

The project should include the Kumeyaay and why San Diego began

16. **Question:** When will a decision be made as to the alternative chosen?

Response: A decision will be made at the time of certification of the EIR, approximately Winter 2015.

17. Consideration should be made of celebrating the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Diego within the project site and or OTSDSHP.

Written

1. #3 Plan – if the 1953 building is retained, what community (non-tourist) resources will be available in the space for residents? We residents are neglected in plans 1 and 2. Our community needs are for a market/grocery and plans 1-3 aren't addressing resident's needs, only tourists/visitors. I live here and want amenities other communities have.
2. I prefer option 3. I'd like to see Old Town have infrastructure that supports the people who live here today. The remaining building could support a grocery store for the residents of Old Town, so that we don't have to get in our cars to drive. We should be able to walk to our grocery store.
3. I and my parents moved to Sunset St. in 1955. At that time one could grocery shop at the Old Town Mexican Café, which even had a butcher. For more than 50 years we've had to get in the car to shop. I would love to see a grocery store in Plan 3
4. Alternative #1. That's what we have all worked so hard for. With some modifications Save Our Heritage Org (SOHO) –Bruce Coons
5. #1 with more refining.
6. As a member of a Band in the Kumeyaay Nation, I would like to see California State Parks prioritize Option 1 with an emphasis on creating a Kumeyaay primary focus. This is critical to balance out the currently heavy focus in Old Town on the Mission Era, Spanish occupation and contemporary San Diego history. Kumeyaay focus on traditional village, native plants and their uses and Kumeyaay prehistory, history and contemporary views. Parking should be restricted on the site except for handicap. I support the vacation of the two City of San Diego streets to connect the project area to the other areas of Old Town. I request California State Parks consider designation of this area as a historic Kumeyaay District and connection of the Kumeyaay Ocean, river, mountain and desert. The only commercial use on the project area should be the creation and marketing of N. Baja and Kumeyaay traditional and contemporary

arts and crafts. A traditional foods care3 could a compatible use such as the Indian Center in ABQ, New Mexico. I also request State Parks establish a Kumeyaay Planning Committee for all phases and use Kumeyaay monitors during construction.

7.
 1. Entrance, brand with walls and logo as other entrances
 2. Keep and develop multiple use building (i.e museum, interpretive center, meeting room/small convention

8.
 - Develop “Master Plan” based on historic and archaeological record
 - Use IPU to implement 1st phase of this plan to meet project goal to recreate 19th century landscape including grading plantings, etc.
 - Consider area as historic “cultural landscape”
 - Minimize modern and intrusive elements as they will be destructive of state goals including parking

9. I would recommend no parking in Alternative #2

10. I would like to see the Native, Spanish adobe, Mexican period represented more but I love the concept for #1. But being a descendent I feel that our time period 1776-1829 is not represented! I feel that the families and business owners had at that time period. Have our adobe homes represented in the Spanish Period. 1820-1850 is not represented enough.

11. Presentation was very informative. Thank you for hearing our comments. Prefer #1 with Cosoy Village and 1821. How it all started in California. Thank you!