

# ReWild Mission Bay

## Summary of Public Workshop #3

Workshop was held:  
Tuesday, September 27, 2016, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.  
Mission Bay High School – Cafeteria  
2475 Grand Ave, San Diego, CA 92109

**Next Workshop Anticipated in Early 2017**  
**Stay Tuned! Go to:** <http://rewildmissionbay.org/>

### MEETING OVERVIEW

Public Workshop #3 was the third of four planned workshops for ReWild Mission Bay. ReWild Mission Bay is a project of San Diego Audubon (SDAS) and its partners, funded by the California State Coastal Conservancy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Coastal Program, to protect and restore wetlands in the northeast corner of Mission Bay.

Approximately 135 people attended the meeting. The purpose of Public Workshop #3 was to provide information about the project and to solicit public feedback on the initial draft restoration alternatives. In addition, the public was encouraged to provide input via comment card, email, and online through the ReWild website. Comments received between September 27, 2016 and October 12, 2016 are included in this report. This feedback will be one of many factors that the project team considers as the alternatives are refined over the next few months. Other factors used to refine the alternatives could include considerations such as technical feasibility, potential environmental impacts, and the ability of an alternative to satisfy ReWild goals and objectives, among others.

Public Workshop #3 consisted of an open-house style format with six stations:

- Station #1: What is ReWild Mission Bay?
- Station #2: How are the Restoration Alternatives Being Developed?
- Station #3: Historical Conditions / Existing Conditions / Key Considerations
- Station #4: Introduction to the Alternatives
- Station #5a: Alternatives 1 + 2
- Station #5b: Alternatives 3 + 4
- Station #5c: Alternatives 5 + 6
- Station #5d: Alternatives 7 + 8
- Station #6: De Anza Special Study Area



Appendix A contains the station boards displayed at the workshop. Appendix B contains the sign in sheets documenting workshop attendees. Appendix C includes comment cards and alternatives handouts. Appendix D contains additional comments and comment cards received online or via email. Note that the online commenting opportunity was intended to provide an additional mechanism for the community to provide open-ended input on the alternatives and was not intended as a voting exercise. Accordingly, this workshop summary does not summarize the most frequent comments and instead identifies a cross-section of key issues relevant to the ReWild process.

The sign-in sheets included a box for attendees to note how they heard about the workshop. The table below provides a rough approximation of how participants responded. This information is useful in focusing notification and publicity efforts for future ReWild Mission Bay workshops. Importantly, nearly half of participants became aware of the workshop through email (either from SDAS or a community group), and more than 40% heard about the workshop from a friend or through word of mouth.

### How did you hear about Public Workshop 3?

Flier seen in community	Email from SDAS	Email from community group	Friend/word of mouth	Presentation by SDAS staff	Newspaper	Postcard
2%	29%	18%	43%	5%	1%	3%

Note: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

## KEY DISCUSSION THEMES

Participants were encouraged to note what elements they liked and disliked about the alternatives, and why. This input will help the project team determine which elements of various alternatives to carry forward for inclusion in the final draft restoration alternatives. This section presents an overview of input that was provided during the workshop. The following key discussion themes emerged during the workshop:

<b>Theme 1: Allocation of Wetland Restoration and Recreation Uses</b>
<b>Theme 2: Wetland Restoration</b>
<b>Theme 3: Hydrology/Water Quality</b>
<b>Theme 4: Recreation</b>
<b>Theme 5: Access and Circulation</b>
<b>Theme 6: Process Suggestions/Ideas</b>

Points raised in association with each of these discussion themes are provided below. For each discussion theme, majority and minority opinions are summarized. However, for a comprehensive understanding of the richness of input, the discussion presented here should be reviewed in concert with detailed input from the workshop provided in Appendices C and D. Furthermore, the themes are not listed in any order of priority or importance.

### Theme 1: Allocation of Wetland Restoration and Recreation Uses

There were mixed opinions on how to allocate wetland restoration and recreation uses. Many commenters noted they would like to see as much wetland restoration as possible. Some commenters expressed the importance of finding a balance between wetland restoration and the provision of adequate recreational opportunities within Mission Bay. Many commenters also expressed support for recreation that would be compatible with potential restored habitats, and that would connect visitors to nature. Many other commenters prioritized recreation opportunities over restoration.

There were also mixed opinions regarding uses that should be located along the shoreline. Some advocated for continued camping and recreation uses, citing a desire for low-cost, overnight waterfront accommodations. Others noted that a natural shoreline would provide habitat and educational opportunities.

### **Theme 2: Wetland Restoration**

Many commenters supported maximizing wetland habitat. Some of these commenters noted that contiguous blocks of habitat are important to protect ecologically vulnerable areas and these blocks would also be important in planning for adaptation to sea-level rise (for example, to allow for habitat migration).

Several commenters supported restoration that would increase upland, transitional, mudflat, and intertidal areas, noting that they are crucial habitats for shorebirds, and other wildlife. In particular, some commenters noted that intertidal habitat should be maximized to support Light-Footed Ridgway's Rail, a federally-listed endangered bird.

### **Theme 3: Hydrology/Water Quality**

Many commenters noted the importance of improving water quality, and the associated need for water filtration in the area. There was specific input from several commenters regarding the location, alignment, and size of channels for purposes of increasing filtration of urban runoff and improving water quality in the bay. Many of these commenters supported multiple channels and/or meandering channels to maximize habitat variability, flood attenuation, and water circulation and flushing. Some also expressed concern about introducing urban runoff into sensitive habitats.

#### Rose Creek

Many commenters expressed support for the alternatives that route Rose Creek into Kendall Frost. Many participants also supported a meandering alignment of Rose Creek and a "delta" at the mouth of Rose Creek.

#### De Anza Cove:

Some commenters supported filling De Anza Cove, citing poor water quality in the cove. However, some commenters expressed concern for the potential loss of swimming areas if De Anza Cove were to be filled. Many commenters supported rerouting Rose Creek through the wetland and into the cove to provide additional flushing and filtration. Several commenters supported the island south of De Anza Cove.

### **Theme 4: Recreation<sup>1</sup>**

Many commenters would like to see recreation opportunities that are compatible with wetland restoration. Other commenters were concerned that recreation could disturb wildlife. The following sections provide additional detail regarding these mixed opinions on recreation.

#### Low to medium intensity recreation:

Many commenters supported a higher ratio of low to medium intensity recreational uses over medium to high intensity recreational uses, citing a desire to minimize potential disturbance to wildlife and habitat. Examples included promoting ecotourism with activities such as kayaking and birdwatching on the perimeter of the wetlands. Some commenters expressed support for the alternatives in which low to medium intensity uses were adjacent to wetland restoration areas.

---

<sup>1</sup> Workshop boards provided images of the types of recreation that could be considered low to medium intensity recreation, such as birdwatching, picnicking, boardwalks, and tent camping, and medium to high intensity recreation, such as RV camping, ball fields, and interpretive centers.

### Medium to high intensity recreation

Several commenters would like to see more area allocated for medium to high intensity recreation. Many commenters would like to see a multi-use interpretive, educational center to promote eco-tourism, including a link with Mission Bay High School.

Several commenters also supported the alternatives in which any potential pollution sources (baseball fields, RVs, commercial uses) were located inland, away from the bay, while others would like to keep medium to high recreation adjacent to wetlands.

### Campland on the Bay

Many commenters noted that they would prefer to see the Campland property restored entirely to wetlands in efforts to maximize wetland restoration. Some participants noted they would prefer RV camping be located in other areas of Mission Bay. Yet many other commenters emphasized the importance of preserving the existing Campland property as it is, or creating another waterfront camping area of similar size located in De Anza Cove if relocation is required. Many commenters opposed relocating camping away from the water, where it must be shared with other types of recreation and near undesirable high traffic areas, such as freeways.

### **Theme 5: Access and Circulation**

Many commenters suggested non-motorized access, such as pedestrian boardwalks, additional bike facilities, a series of trails and rest areas in and/or adjacent to the restored wetlands, with considerations for seasonal restrictions on access to protect wildlife.

**Theme 6: Process Suggestions/Ideas** Suggestions were made to keep the public apprised of progress, ensure collaboration with De Anza Revitalization Plan, and that sea-level rise impacts and adaptation be considered. Some commenters also expressed concern about the costs of certain actions, such as filling large areas.

### **NEXT STEPS**

The timeline below depicts the steps involved in creation of the ReWild MB Final Restoration Alternatives. Public input provided at Public Workshop #3 will be considered as the project team refines the initial draft alternatives to develop the final draft restoration alternatives. As depicted in the timeline, Public Workshop #4 is tentatively scheduled for early 2017. Details regarding the time and location of Public Workshop #4 will be posted at [www.rewildmissionbay.org](http://www.rewildmissionbay.org).

# TIMELINE

