



California

ITEM NO. 4

# CITY OF OCEANSIDE

## MAYOR AND COUNCIL WORKSHOP

AUGUST 22, 2012

ADJOURNED MEETING                      2:00 PM                      COUNCIL CHAMBERS

2:00 PM - OCEANSIDE CITY COUNCIL  
- WORKSHOP

**Mayor**

Jim Wood

**Deputy Mayor**

Jack Feller

**Councilmembers**

Jerry Kern  
Esther Sanchez  
Gary Felien

**City Clerk**

Barbara Riegel Wayne

**Treasurer**

Gary Ernst

-----  
**City Manager**

Peter Weiss

**City Attorney**

John Mullen

The adjourned meeting of the Oceanside City Council was called to order at 2:00 PM, Wednesday, August 22, 2012.

**20:00 PM - ROLL CALL**

Present were Mayor Wood, Deputy Mayor Feller, Councilmembers Kern and Felien. Councilmember Sanchez arrived at 2:01 PM. Also present were City Manager Weiss, City Attorney Mullen and Assistant City Clerk Trobaugh. Councilmember Kern led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**WORKSHOP ITEMS:**

1. **Presentation by developers regarding responses to the RFP for the Center City Golf Course, and direction to staff**

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** stated we're here as a result of some efforts that started a number of years ago when the City went through a public process to look at alternative uses of the Center City Golf Course property. There's been public input, outreach and participation and that resulted in looking at it for potential office and sports-related uses.

At that time, the push became for a broader vision along the Oceanside Boulevard corridor. More recently, following the El Corazon evaluation process, we received renewed interest in alternate uses of the Center City Golf Course property for sports and athletic-type uses. As a result of that interest, we issued an RFP (Request for Proposals) that we're going to be presenting before Council today.

Two of those proposals look at converting the property to alternate uses, and two of them leave it as a golf course. The purpose today is to have those presentations made to Council and take public input to see if there is community support to look at

**NOT OFFICIAL  
UNTIL APPROVED AT SUBSEQUENT  
MEETING BY CITY COUNCIL**

converting it to an alternate use. Converting it to anything other than recreation would require a vote of the people.

We're looking for Council to provide some general direction. If you're interested in an alternate use, give us direction to go back and evaluate the proposals that provide that and come back with a recommendation. If you're not interested in converting and want to keep it as a golf course, we would then evaluate those 2 proposals. At this time, we have not from a staff level done a comprehensive evaluation of either of those proposals pending the direction we receive from Council.

**CURTIS JACKSON**, Property Agent, stated we're here for this workshop to go over the RFP process and the 4 groups that did propose. Those 4 groups are: Goat Hill Partners, LLC; Golf Links Consulting; Pacific Coast Village; and Stirling Development. The first 2 are golf-related uses, and the last 2 have alternate uses. We are planning on going in alphabetical order for each party's presentation, which will be 20 minutes. Unfortunately the main speaker for the Goat Hill Partners, LLC, groups is delayed. With Council's permission we will push them back and move to the second developer first.

Council concurred.

#### Golf Links Consulting

**LARRY TAYLOR**, Golf Links Consulting, stated we currently are operating the Pico Rivera Golf Course in Los Angeles County. He and his partners are part owners of 6 other golf courses, one of which is the Golf Club of California in Fallbrook. When he got the RFP, he immediately thought it was a problem because the golf course was not making any money. According to his numbers, it's lost about \$130,000 over the last 3 years and the trend is horrific at best. It's dropping 10-20% each year.

At the same time, he realized the City had to do some development, perhaps to other areas outside of a golf course, keeping in mind that the people here want to have a greenbelt. He tried to come up with a proposal that would allow the City to have some options. He used a computer graphic to show his idea, which is very similar to the one they operate in Pico Rivera, where there is a partnership involved between the management company and the City. The relationship they've had with Pico Rivera has worked out quite well. When we took it over, it was losing \$300,000 a year. We took it over on January 1<sup>st</sup> of this year, and after the first 6 months we made \$125,000. Effectively it's going to be a \$500,000 to \$600,000 swing.

He investigated the property and wasn't able to get too much due diligence materials for obvious reasons. He wasn't able to go into the maintenance areas, etc., but with what information he did have and based on the performance of other courses, he was able to come up with the numbers.

He projects that in the first year of operation we'll make \$186,000. In the second year, \$262,000; and the third year would be \$346,000. If we're going to make this money, how should we divide it? The golf course desperately needs capital improvements. It's an embarrassment to the City right now. He proposed a long-term relationship and a short-term relationship. If you decided that you wanted to develop the property, you can't develop it tomorrow. It takes 2 or 3 years with environmental impacts, etc. If we stick together for the 3 to 9 years, Golf Links will take 1/3 of the profit, the City will take 1/3 of the profit and the other 1/3 will go to capital improvements. In the first year, each of the three areas would get \$62,000. That involves more long-term capital improvements.

The other option would be to see if we could hang on for the few years and develop the property. We won't spend as much money on capital improvements. It would be more short-term improvements like cart path repair, more water on the golf course, fixing the clubhouse, fixing the driving range, fixing all of the signs, new tee markers and new flags. We would split the money a little differently. The City would

make more money up front because the need for capital improvement would be less. Instead of the \$62,000 for each of the parties in the first year, we would each take 42% and the balance of 16% would be used for capital improvements. For example, in the first year the City would make \$77,000, the second year \$107,000; and the third year \$141,000. During those 3 years contemplated, the amount of capital improvements would be \$130,000.

His background has been in reviving bad golf courses and taking over golf courses. He's been a receiver 3 different times for golf courses in this area that have gone bankrupt. We know exactly what to do and how to make things happen without spending a lot of money. We know how to get the people there.

Some of the other things he's planned for a jump-start. For example, at Pico Rivera kids get to play golf for free, not at peak times, but they do play for free at other times. The idea is to get kids involved in golf, but also to get the kids to bring their parents to play golf. It's done a remarkable turnaround for Pico Rivera. We would also make the golf course known. He would propose changing the name. Center City doesn't mean anything and Goat Hill is even worse. This is a wonderful piece of property overlooking the ocean. Let's take advantage of that. We could call it Ocean Breezes or something like that.

Part of his relationship with the City would be allowing you to develop as you need. If we have a developer who wants to put in some condos along the golf course or maybe a hotel or restaurant, we'll work with the developer. We can turn the golf course from an 18-hole to a 9-hole if it requires that. We can do things with the driving range. We have the ability to adjust to fit the needs of the City and the community.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** asked if Mr. Taylor played golf there.

**MR. TAYLOR** responded yes.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** asked what his experience was and how he would make it different.

**MR. TAYLOR** thinks it's a cute little course. It's a lot of fun and the ocean view is amazing. The problem is that it's in such bad shape it's hard to appreciate how beautiful it is there. They haven't spent any money on water, and you can see the deferred maintenance all over the place. With a little loving care it could be a wonderful facility. This is a great opportunity for the City to do something special. This can truly be a landmark and flagship for Oceanside.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** asked if he would be able to incorporate a venue for the kids besides golf, for instance if the adults are playing golf the kids could have another recreational opportunity there.

**MR. TAYLOR** thinks the problem with this golf course is that it's trying to be a lot of things to a lot of people and instead it's nothing to anybody. We want to get kids to play golf. We'll have special tees for the kids so they don't get frustrated. We'll create special junior teams, too. That way it becomes a family opportunity. Goat Hill will always be a family golf course. It appeals to all ages. The answer is to get people playing golf. We need to get the kids out of the house and off the video games;; that's why we let kids play free.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** asked how long he's been involved in managing golf courses.

**MR. TAYLOR** responded since about 1986.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** asked how many golf courses he's managed since then.

**MR. TAYLOR** has managed, worked and consulted at over 20 golf courses. He is currently part owner of 3 golf courses. He wants something he can get his hands on and contribute to the community.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** asked in his experience, does he truly believe he can turn this golf course around.

**MR. TAYLOR** responded yes. It looks exactly like the 3 golf courses he took over that were bankrupt. This has all the typical signs. This all reflects on the City. He wants to get tourism involved in the golf course. No hotel right now would want anybody to play at this golf course. They wouldn't want to be associated with it. He will make it so the hotels want to be associated with it. Your other golf course is wonderful, but it's a little hard to find and isn't on the beach.

Pacific Coast Village

**MEL KUNAL**, 3604 Carlton, San Diego, stated regarding our development on Highway 76, after 7 years and a lot of money we're getting renewed interest from some of the tenants, so we're anticipating getting under construction in the next 8-10 months.

We found out about this RFP when there was only 2 weeks left to respond. We've been using Byron Ware as a consultant on some of our projects so he asked him to prepare the response. In looking at this property, it dawned on him that this is a location where something really grand could be done in the way of development.

When looking up tourist attractions in the County, there are 196 attractions listed. Many are downtown, Point Loma, La Jolla, Pacific Beach and Carlsbad. There is only one in Oceanside, which is the mission. He had an architectural firm in Austin, Texas, for quite some time and while there he became very familiar with the Riverwalk in San Antonio, which he is using as an example of what can be done as a major attraction to any community. It attracts people from all over Texas, the country and abroad. There are 70+ acres here that warrant development such as Riverwalk.

We want to do this in a village format where we have all of the uses you'd see in a village, including residential, retail, hotels, office buildings and entertainment. Computer graphics were used to show examples of the Riverwalk in San Antonio. The magnitude of each of these uses would need to be researched and developed by expert opinions, market analysis, etc. to set the goals of how many units of residential, hotel and retail. We see a lot of infrastructure being put in place here, some of which could be water. A good example would be the Stone Brewery in Escondido.

The recreation is there already. We see enhancing, improving and increasing that. The habitat is there and, if it's allowed, we'd like to improve that with public waterways and picnic spots. We're indicating 2 hotels, 2 office buildings, a theater, some residential and retail laid out similar to the Riverwalk.

We can't do a proforma until we know the scope of the project, but the magnitude of a project like this would create thousands of jobs in construction and permanently. That's important for the community. The hotel would be determined in the proforma by the magnitude and quality of the hotel by market analysis and in-depth studies by the experts. With the right kind of development, it will definitely work.

We're going to need support from the community before spending a lot of time and money. If we're selected to proceed, we would hold many outreach meetings with the public and with Council.

**BYRON WARE** served on the San Diego City Council and led the effort to redevelop downtown with Echo Park, our expanded convention center and oversaw the reuse of the Naval Training Center, which was very controversial, but people are

comfortable with what's happened with that project where we kept many of the old features.

The policy decision is up to the Council and the people of Oceanside to determine which way you want to go. If you want to pursue alternative uses to a golf course, we think this project should be grand and world-class, and something you can be proud of. That is up to the people of this community.

If you head down the path of an alternative use, we think it should be sustainable with the village concept of live/work/play all in one location. From a human and environmental healthy standpoint, fewer traffic trips, energy efficiency, etc. would be very important to the project.

We want to meet the community needs and enhance the existing recreation that is there, in terms of providing the City with additional tax revenue so those recreational amenities can be enhanced for the people in the community. There are other recreational entertainment things that could be incorporated into the project, so it's not just parks but how people entertain and what they do in other kinds of facilities. We're looking at a theater complex with joint use on parking between the theater and office, which lends to the village concept.

The Sprinter station is just a few blocks away, and we want to take full advantage of making this a transit-oriented development and providing greater linkages to the transit center that's already there. We want it to be comfortable for people to either walk or use a shuttle service to get people from the development to the Sprinter station. That's exciting to have in terms of the transportation infrastructure not too far away.

Cross-utilization of recreational facilities, like restrooms, etc., lend itself to a village concept. There is a real opportunity here, should Council decide to head off in a village concept or alternative uses, to end up with something that benefits the people with greater recreational opportunities, provides greater revenue for the City and will be a world-class project.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** asked if the community were to say they would like to see more recreational opportunities here, what would they envision there.

**MR. WARE** is also a Board Member of his YMCA, and believes those kinds of facilities are a great way for the City to partner. The facility itself would need to have recreational amenities incorporated within the development, and then the habitat area where people can have access with some trails, etc. We're open to whatever recreational needs need to be met and incorporated into this project.

#### Stirling Development

**DOUGALL AGAN**, President and CEO of Stirling Development, loves golf and has played for years, so this opportunity was very exciting. The City has inspired all of us to think of different ways to enhance Oceanside. Today's presentation will focus on alternatives that we've identified that are clearly trending as enormous demands within the U.S. and around the globe. This is a tremendous opportunity for Oceanside to capture this activity. We've explored new ideas and possibilities for alternative uses for Center City Golf Course and adjacent civic use properties

Stirling is more than a developer. We take a lot of pride in being innovators. We feel that we're visionaries and focus a tremendous amount of our effort on collaboration. We have a shared and vested interest in Oceanside because we believe in Oceanside. We understand all that is possible.

Twelve years ago we envisioned a new world corporate headquarter center in Oceanside. Through strategic linking of innovative approaches and true collaboration,

we created Ocean Ranch, attracting the finest businesses to our community. We invigorated the local economy. Today Ocean Ranch is Oceanside's largest employer. Ocean Ranch is our promise to the Oceanside community. It's a beautiful and thriving center for businesses in Southern California. For example, Genentech has 500 employees and was named the Fortune 500 Best Company to Work For; Hydronautics' headquarters is here with 300 employees; One Source Distributors headquarters has 100 employees.

Strategically, Oceanside is located in an area that is between major population areas: Los Angeles County, with roughly 10,000,000 people; Orange County, with roughly 3,000,000; and San Diego with another 3,000,000 people. This visibility of Center City off Interstate 5 can become a gateway to more of the best to be attracted to Oceanside. Interstate 5's annual and daily traffic to Mission Avenue represents 184,000 cars per day. Oceanside is the third largest city in San Diego, has easy access from neighboring counties and is located on the coastal front.

Just north of Oceanside is Camp Pendleton Marine Base with 42,000 currently employed there. According to the U.S. Census, Oceanside's continued growth will put the City population estimates above 200,000.

Our vision for Center City is to create an innovative vibrant and unique environment for multi generations to live, work, play, heal, learn and enjoy; something for everyone for today and tomorrow. We need to address the needs for healthcare in an aging population and create new jobs and opportunities for personal growth. According to the government's data, the average salary of jobs in Oceanside is \$35,524 per year, and the median income of households in Oceanside is \$55,000. Through exploring new industries and trends through education, we can do more for the community.

The future in medicine is in the prevention care for better health and wellness. The World Health Organization study has projected that the chronic conditions will become the leading cause of disability across the world for 2020. If not successfully prevented and managed, chronic disease will become the most expensive problem faced by our healthcare system. Oceanside has a wonderful opportunity to spearhead that leadership by positioning those innovative technologies here.

Oceanside is an ideal setting for new technologies and advancements in treatment. Communities will need satellite centers for innovative therapies and rehabilitation. The Department of Health and Human Services reported older Americans are disproportionately affected by chronic diseases and conditions. The need for programs that enable older adults to learn and practice healthier behaviors is critical.

Our aging population and young families will want living options that are affordable and integrated into a thriving environment, with access to amenities and public transportation.

We need to address today's increasing demands for healthier lifestyle options. Childhood obesity has hit epidemic levels. Families do not eat at home because they do not know how to cook. Our generation is the first to live less than the generation before. We have solutions; we just need to bring them to our communities. He would like to see teaching kitchens in the places that need them most: medical schools, hospitals, public schools and military bases.

The face of retail and hospitality is changing dramatically. Consumers are now a part of creating the shopping experience. We all remember going to the mall, but we now have an internet that gives us global access to products that we never dreamed we could access. The most recent trend is the retailers are now allowing the consumers to customize their products on their own.

A new and dynamic industry is action sports, which has influenced everything from the way we speak and dress to the local music and art scene. Action sports industry leaders like skateboard legend, Tony Hawk, or the Flying Tomato, Shaun White, have both established their homes and headquarters here. Action sports aficionados from around the world gather at San Diego's beaches and bay, skate parks, boardwalks and BMX tracks for carefree holidays and high performance competitions. U.S. Surf & Skate reported retail sales of \$6,240,000,000 in 2010. Footwear generated the greatest sales of \$1,500,000,000, which is up 8.2% over 2008. Wetsuit sales also increased to \$110,400,000 in 2010. Over \$296,000,000 was spent on snowboarding equipment. The U.S. bike industry reported 1,000,000 jobs and generated \$1,800,000,000 in taxes. It's an industry that's growing dramatically and Oceanside's proximity to where these athletes now live and are recreating presents an incredible opportunity for us to capture that activity and demand.

The trend is for youth to learn how to get involved in the action sports arena, and one of those areas happens to be the digital media area. Camp Woodward has a program in Pennsylvania. They used to be the Olympic training facility for gymnastics and have now evolved into an acrobatic training facility for all action sports. Coupled with that, they have now paralleled the digital media program where the best videographers and visual media representatives around the world come and teach the youth how to activate and get involved with this emerging industry. Technology and digital media are changing at a speed that is unprecedented. The opportunities are endless to integrate this medium into our community. According to the *Global Entertainment Media Outlook*, during the next 5 years they project that the entertainment and media industry's spending will grow at 5.7%, compounded annually at a rate of \$2,100,000,000,000. Global digital and non-digital spending and major trends in growth across the industry are a consistent driver in the digital media. Digital spending continues to drive growth. 67% of total entertainment and media spending growth to 2016 will be generated by digital media.

A computer graphic was used to show their Master Plan for Center City. In an effort to preserve the current organizations that are based in Center City, they will actively seek partnerships with potential users to maintain the positive impact these local organizations have on the community. A good example is the Boys & Girls Club and the YMCA. A lot of those programs can be easily integrated into an environment that Camp Woodward is accustomed to providing at their facility in Pennsylvania. They're looking for a strategic location on the west coast, and we've recommended they locate in Oceanside. They seem excited about the opportunity.

Our vision for Center City is to help Oceanside become a leader in new industries that are waiting to be embraced. It's the right time and the right place. His son has worked closely with Camp Woodward and various companies like Oakley and Nike to bring this concept to Oceanside. A video was shown demonstrating the possibilities.

Our proposal is not intended to disrespect golf. It has nothing to do with that. Our job and responsibility is to look for alternatives that we feel can generate revenue and exponentially extend success throughout the community, not just in Center City. It's a momentum driver. It is one location along Interstate 5 that's near the pier. There is a lot of investment already going into the pier area that can easily be linked. That diversification is something that is real and can be captured here. We need to come together and believe. We know it's going to take more work because it would require a General Plan Amendment, but it would be worth the effort.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** stated it looks like Mr. Agin's proposal really talks about residential, urban living and vibrant living is residential. You've got 18 acres of residential and 13 acres of commercial. The other acres are called different things, but it's probably going to be concrete. It looks like the open space is less than half of the total acreage. Is that correct?

**MR. AGIN** responded the Camp Woodward site isn't concrete. There is a lot of

open space and different venues. The one area we've identified as commercial, we all know that there are some viability issues.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** stated those are our baseball diamonds for Little League.

**MR. AGIN** stated we had hoped to put commercial there. If it were possible to develop commercial there, that would be the appropriate location given it's orientation to Interstate 5. We think there are opportunities to reposition those baseball fields elsewhere, but you can't reposition Interstate 5. It has the unique opportunity for exposure from a land-planning standpoint.

As far as the residential, we looked at the economics to grade the property to allow us to create this diversification, and it's a \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000 to grade it. That infrastructure expense would need to be offset with some revenue. That's why we're looking at the mixed-use residential.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** asked if the will of the community is more recreational, and that is the critical piece for this whole thing, what would you do? How would you get rid of more of the concrete that's in here?

**MR. AGIN** responded the reality check is the economics. If we need to add more recreation, we need to see what kind of revenue it can generate compared to the cost to deliver the land for that new recreation. That's where we were challenged. We were trying to look at the uses and who could afford to be in an environment of more recreation.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** asked how Mr. Agin would change the plan he presented right now to accommodate more recreation and green.

**MR. AGIN** would have to look at whether those recreational uses are sustainable from a revenue standpoint. We would need to position them in a place they will thrive and determine what kind of rents they can achieve to see if it's even viable. We'd be willing to go down that path with the City to look at recreation. If it's the will of the people, then it may end up requiring the Master Plan to be reduced because economically you couldn't deliver.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** stated this is a piece of land that's been designated parkland for decades and was the result of several initiatives and mitigation. It is something the community has wanted to see developed as recreational for decades. Understanding that history and that at least a couple of other RFP's have suggested recreation and keeping most of it green, what would your vision be to create that critical piece of recreation for the community, or is it something you would not be able to do because it would not pencil out for you?

**MR. AGIN** feels very capable of delivering, the issue becomes what the primary goal is of the City. We wanted to look at what the demand generators were that could give public benefit. Jobs and revenue are a public benefit because then you'd have more resources going back to help enhance other assets or amenities within the City. That was our attempt to look at it as a public benefit opportunity to generate jobs and revenue. If it's just recreation, he's nervous that a lot of those require a public subsidy or support in order to get activated. You need to compliment them with private enterprise that can pay the revenue necessary to subsidize that recreation.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** stated at least 2 of the RFP's recommend keeping golf as a primary, which would keep it green and recreational. That pencils out for them, but you're saying that's not something you are interested in.

**MR. AGIN** responded that's not proven. We would not be interested in developing a golf course. When you look at our plan, the concept is a health and

wellness environment and has a lot of green and open space. That is the future. Green recreation could be hiking or biking trails or a whole host of amenities that are outdoors and green space to help the vibrancy of that type of health-oriented environment. That's what we envisioned trying to create.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** is not interested in landscape, she's interested in a project that's going to maintain most of the property as recreational and open space. It has to be open space because of our multiple habitat conservation plan, but she's not hearing how you plan to offer recreational opportunities to our kids.

**MR. AGIN** thinks one of the biggest areas to our plan is the action sport area. We've talked about education and training, a controlled safe environment for them to learn all of these new sports. We've seen them in the Olympic games, and this could now be a world-class training facility for some of those sports. This would be a perfect opportunity to breed that type of recreation within this Master Plan.

#### Goat Hill Partners, LLC

**JOHN ASHWORTH**, Goat Hill Partners, LLC, has been in the golf business locally for the past 25 years. He founded a company called Ashworth, which is a sportswear company. He grew up in Escondido and played Center City Golf Course in high school golf matches. It's a phenomenal place, and we feel the greatest cities in the world are those that don't turn over all of their green spaces to concrete and paved development. Keeping that connection with the natural landscape enhances the entire City.

From New York to San Francisco, the great cities keep their green spaces; even in this case, where it's close to the freeway. We believe Goat Hill has a great foundation of all the elements that most cities lack and would love to have. Once they're gone, it's very difficult to reinstate them.

We play Goat Hill all the time and when we found out there was an RFP issued, we collectively figured out the best way to offer a chance to beautify the City and bring some world-class talent to our project. Our plan calls for bringing in one of the world's best-known golf architects, Tom Doak. That is one of the key elements to our plan because he's regarded on the golf scene as one of the best, and his projects are a destination for many people. Beyond that, our mission is to restore, maintain and beautify the Goat Hill property.

We also plan to put in a clubhouse with a bar & grill that's a destination unto itself. It would work with the golf course, but also takes advantage of the ocean view for people to meet and recreate.

We are hoping to have Goat Hill be the home of the North County Junior Golf Association, which is a local non-profit organization where the kids could have a place to learn golf. We plan on also putting in a 6-hole kid's course.

We intend to turn the whole area into a botanical gardens kind of setting, with walking paths, sculpture gardens, etc. We want a golf retreat, as well as a place where people can come and enjoy the view.

The clubhouse is a key architectural feature. We want it to be in keeping with the community, but we also want to create a vibe and atmosphere that brings in non-golfers so it is a destination. We also envision a community garden that not only grows food for the restaurant, but incorporates the community and the kids in the gardening.

Ours is a minimalistic plan, but it goes back to trying to beautify that piece of ground and make it the most we can. These little golf courses are feeder courses to the golf community where people can be beginners, learn and get hooked on the game. A lot of these courses like Goat Hill are going away and that's what's wrong with golf right

now. We're not embracing the beginner. He's played all over the world at all different golf courses, but has so much fun at Goat Hill. If we did this course right, it would be a beacon for the rest of the world. It would demonstrate how you can take a rag-tag situation and turn it into a gem for the local community.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** stated this presentation made a lot of sense in terms of the community. It sounds like major community access. We are short on meeting and conference rooms, so would your plan incorporate those for people who want to meet there?

**MR. ASHWORTH** responded yes. Architecturally speaking, the clubhouse is to be able to handle events and groups of 100+ and be able to spill out into the surrounding area. We could do weddings and have plans to combine the surf culture and golf culture and have tournaments and events at the site. We'd love to have the short-course championship of the world held there. We have promotional ideas to make it an amazing place to have events. We could terrace the driving range and have a stage at the bottom for concerts. We also plan to close it one day a month for people to come and enjoy the grounds and have picnics. We want to embrace the community and make a place for people to go, even if they aren't golfers.

#### Public input

**JIMMY KNOTT**, 127 Sherri Lane, suggested in the future having the presenters prepare an electronic presentation. There were items that Council saw that the audience did not. Also, there were a number of presentations that appeared to impact the senior center. What would be the impacts or trade-offs for the senior center, community and parking? He hopes the developers have taken some of the geological problems into account in their presentations.

**BRUCE POORE**, 2167 El Monte Drive, lives in the area that would be affected by this and is also a golfer who has played Goat Hill many times. He is in favor of maintaining the property as a golf course. It's a great golf course and a great piece of property as an open space. You can go here and enjoy being outside with the beautiful trees and great location. What's really nice about it is that it's affordable. The patrons are of all different ages and income types. There are a lot of things that can be done to maintain it as a recreational area and golf course.

**RICK KRATCOSKI**, 2110 Foster, stated listening to both of the golf course projects, they would be good to do a collaboration. Golf Links is guaranteed money of somewhere between \$60,000 and \$100,000 a year and \$100,000 in improvements. The golf course needs water. There isn't any water there, and that's the big cost.

Pacific Coast Village said in their proposal that today's market development cannot be financed on leased property. They already can't meet the demand. It's leased property, and it's going to stay leased property. They should be out of the picture.

Regarding Stirling's proposal, how are they going to get their money? Looking at their proposal, it looks like Oceanside taxpayer money. Their proposal says they're going to get permanent lending grants. Who are they lending it from? They also say a community facility district, which sounds like a lighting district where citizens have to pay for them to build these houses. General obligation bonds means raiding water and sewer enterprise funds and parks & recreation funds to help build their project that takes our park space away. What good are we getting out of it? They're taking all of our money, and they're making all the money. Stirling wants to obtain development entitlement. Does that mean that they own all of the land once they build everything? It's our land. Stirling needs \$12,500,000, not to mention the added cost of moving the Boys & Girls Club and the Little League Fields. Are they going to pay for it? The Stirling project is way out of bounds.

If Council goes with Stirling or the Pacific project, it's going to end up like Manchester. They won't be able to do it, and then they'll come back and sue the City for \$1,000,000. Let's stay with golf and the 2 guys who proposed golf. They know what they're doing.

**LOUISE MANGANELLI**, 1615 South Tremont, has talked to young people, and none of them are interested in golf; However, this can be a very nice facility. She's been a concessionaire for the State. The State keeps their lands, and they develop concessions that are productive, bring in tax and concession money, and enhance the facilities. There isn't a great need for a golf course. There might be a need for open space, but not a golf course. She would like to see the City consider this 70+ acre property as a theme park, a destination for residents and tourists. It would provide jobs and income and could be a nice facility. In her experience, concessions bring in a nice income from things like boat rentals, snack bars, etc. This is a large enough piece of property if all of the parking were underground. That would enable you to put all of the buildings on the ground. She could see an ice skating or roller skating rink, a dance hall, open air theater, bowling alley or miniature golf. There is nothing for younger people to do and nowhere to go. There is a need for something like this. The data shows less and less people play golf nowadays.

This could be a huge improvement to the community. If it's well-done and the funding came through concessions on leased land, which is yours, you can usually go to people who are already running things, like a bowling alley or skating rink, and they'll fund the construction and accept a 20-year lease from the City. The money will generate itself from what you have offered. She would like to see the City consider this.

**NADINE SCOTT**, 550 Hoover Street, stated this is one of the greatest legacies we have in this town. It's an 80-90 acre parcel that includes vital services that will be displaced by Stirling and the Riverwalk people. Those are beautiful ideas in the wrong place. We had 2 concrete proposals that would retain our parkland status and make it available to the public. These guys gave me faith in humanity. Their visions are brilliant. The greatest places in the world keep their green spaces and do not turn them into concrete. West of Crouch Street we have no more green space. That's our biggest parcel of land that belongs to the public. They aren't talking about displacing the Boys & Girls Club or getting rid of our senior center and ballparks. These are public facilities that are bought and paid for and exist and provide essential services to our community. Goat Hill Partners has her vote, and she'll do what she can to keep this land public forever.

**NORALEE SHERWOOD**, Oceanside resident, stated considering the options for Goat Hill, it seems like most of the emphasis has been placed on raising revenue and how to do it to best afford that for the community. The developers made a lot of promises. She was troubled to see a comment from Mayor Wood recently about it not paying for itself. Oceanside officials are so preoccupied with the bottom line that they fail to see the ways that traditional parks add value to our community. Goat Hill was purposely set aside by Oceanside citizens as parkland. Park and green spaces have a particular value to communities. You have a wonderful example of the value of a traditional park when you look at Buddy Todd Park. It's a true park that is extensively used by the public for family gatherings and recreation.

There has been an abundance of studies done related to parks and green spaces and their non-revenue increasing value. One study showed that when green spaces are adjacent to residential areas, they create neighborhoods with fewer violent crimes and crimes against property. Natural areas relieve mental fatigue, which in turn relieves irritability and impulsivity, which are both precursors to violence. The studies are evidence that green spaces and parks increase surrounding property values and make communities more livable and desirable to businesses and homeowners. The word recreate comes from the Celtic and means to recreate, restore and refresh ones spirit.

She hopes Council will consider the value of Goat Hill to this community as more than another potential revenue source and that you improve and maintain it the way you do Buddy Todd Park. It is a much needed resource for the citizens of Oceanside to enjoy peace and quiet and restoration of the spirit, which is so necessary to a healthy community.

**DIANE NYGAARD**, 5020 Nighthawk Way, represents Friends of El Corazon. We are a community organization that is committed to seeing this community's vision for a wonderful park at El Corazon become a reality. The financial plan for El Corazon depends on revenue from a limited amount of commercial on El Corazon to pay for operation of that park. An extensive economic analysis was done for El Corazon, and it concluded that it will be many years before there would be enough demand for a second hotel on that site and for the full commercial that was planned. The economic analysis assumed no commercial development would occur at Goat Hill. Our concern is that any commercial development at Goat Hill could make it more difficult for this community to realize the vision for El Corazon. Cannibalizing one City project, one planned park for this community, in order to put commercial on another park where it wasn't planned, invalidates years of effort that went into El Corazon, not to mention the money that's been spent on it. We think it makes no sense to move forward on this unless you've done a thorough economic analysis that shows we're not going to cannibalize not just one park, but two.

**CAROLYN KRAMMER**, 904 Leonard Avenue, representing Citizens for Preservation of Parks and Beaches, is adamantly opposed to any project that would sell, lease or change the designation of parkland on this project property. This is 96 acres of precious land. It includes a golf course, but it also includes Brooks Street Pool, which is used by our community and our high school programs. It consists of Ron Ortega Park and the Little League fields that our kids use, the Boys & Girls Club, and our senior center. Two of these projects want us to put residential there. We don't need more residential that requires more City services. Two of these projects keep the golf course and the parkland designation. She prefers Goat Hill Partners, who have a list of community sponsors, are community oriented and are linked to our community. Let's keep this parkland as parkland and make Goat Hill a world-class course.

**JANET BLEDSOE LACY**, 2165 Grandview Street, stated it was her mother and father's petition that was circulated in 1970 that requires this vote of the people. Anything other than recreational use for this land will require a vote from the people. There are lots of Bledsoe/Lacy's still around. There will be organized opposition regarding any use of this land that is non-recreational in its purpose. What we support is any plan that leases this property, keeps it green and provides recreational use for the citizens of Oceanside. There are very few people who recognize that in 1970 there were 12.5 acres of land located off Mission Avenue, which is now Mission Bazaar, that was a park. In 1970 there was a Council that felt that they needed revenue and a tax base. They needed to take what they called "surplus land" in a commercial area, also known as the park, and sell it to get money. They made promises to the people that it was going to be sold for the purpose of developing Goat Hill and that Goat Hill was going to be used by way of a special fund that was going to create an archery course, water trails and all kinds of recreational use for the people. They emphasized that they were putting the money in a special fund. That land was sold and is now a blight. It is something we should be ashamed of having sold when it had trees and areas for kids to play. No money ever ended up in any special fund to do what was supposed to be done with that land.

You need to be mindful that when you're looking for revenue for the City, you don't sell something as special as this irreplaceable land. Her family knows something about land, property and acquiring property in Oceanside. Once you sell and pave it, it is gone for future generations. They don't make land anymore. This Council has the opportunity to have a vision and a goal. Think of Central Park, Balboa Park, Quail Botanical Gardens. There is no money to do this now, but if you develop this in a way that keeps it green and recreational, you have done something for all of the

Bledsoe/Lacy's that are out there and that are going to stay right here in Oceanside.

**GEORGIO KERPANI**, P.O. Box 123, met with Councilmembers and spelled out block by block what downtown Oceanside could look like. He talked about his vision and how it's been done incorrectly. We have the opportunity to capture \$18,000,000 in additional revenue per year by placing the high school on the Center City Golf Course. It's the only place to put the school. He spoke of what he'd like to see where the existing high school is.

**ANTHONY AVILA**, 2011 Winchester Street, is opposed to any kind of development on the Center City Golf Course. As a life-long resident here and part of the citizenship that voted to keep that golf course and parkland back in the 1970's, he said they voted to keep it that way in perpetuity, not for 30 years. He liked hearing that Mr. Ashworth said the golf course is perfect for the layout of that property. The topography doesn't lend itself well to development, and it's laid out beautifully as a golf course. It does need a face-lift, but he wouldn't call it an embarrassment. The last thing Oceanside needs is more high-density living, commercial space or congestion in that area. There are too many vacancies in the City already.

He doesn't like the negative impact on the Boys & Girls Club and the senior center. He hopes Council doesn't allow themselves to be lead down the primrose path by short-sighted, money-hungry developers. That golf course is a gem in this City. Next to our airport, our harbor and our pier, that piece of greenbelt is what makes this City special to him. It needs to be kept that way. Development in that area isn't going to help anything whatsoever. It's an irreplaceable piece of property and once it gets developed we'll never get it back.

Public input concluded

**MAYOR WOOD** agrees nothing should ever be done with this piece of property without the approval of the citizens. This RFP was about what to do with this piece of land. It's been losing money and hasn't been kept up. It's a bit of a blight at that location. He has no preconceived opinions of what it will or should be. We just wanted input. We had someone else run this. It didn't do well, so the City took it over. Now we're not doing well. We also have people call us saying they'd like to see something else there that would appeal to more people in the City. On the other hand, the terrain there is challenging, and it would take a lot of money to make it something usable.

Everyone here agrees that we can't do anything other than parkland or something recreation-minded without a vote of the City. Our citizens want more than an old golf course that has minimum use, and that's why the RFP went out. It's a great location and anybody who wants to put stuff there would agree. In the past, we looked at it as a possible convention center site and hotel, but people wanted to be closer to the ocean. He had called Magic Mountain at one time to see if they would be interested in building some kind of park at this location, but they said in this economy they wouldn't build anything.

The City can't keep taking losses on something when we have real economic issues. We've put 150 employees out of work. Two of tonight's proposals were for golf courses. He also likes hearing about somebody's vision, like with these other 2 projects. He liked what he heard from Stirling tonight. They had a good project. No matter what anybody says, this has to go to a vote of the public. He's happy we sent out the RFP to find out what's out there and to get some ideas. He thanked all of the developers for bringing their projects forward.

He would like to see something that is more than just golf and parkland. Most of our youth don't golf. He's like to see a park that can be used as a park and not just a golf course. If it turns out to be a golf course improvement that makes the City some money, that would be fine. This is a great location.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** stated the world belongs to those who show up, and he appreciates those who came here to offer their opinions. This proposal was put forward to the public. We want to have the support of an overwhelming majority of the people in the City. He's always open to ideas to improve the tax base and bring in revenue to the City. He's not sure that developing this particular parcel is the way to go, but regardless it's not going to happen without the overwhelming consensus that this is the best way to improve the City.

Regarding the 2 golf proposals, how do the rates you're expecting to charge compare to the current rates that are being charged and to other nearby courses?

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded we have not done a detail review of any of the 4 proposals. Part of it was to get direction from the Council on which way you would like to go in. Should Council's direction be toward the golf, that's something we would be discussing through the evaluation process as we bring back an agreement for your consideration in open session.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** stated golf seems to be going through a rough patch and the financials that were provided are suggesting a turnaround. Other than changing the appearance, is the problem with our golf course specifically related to our golf course or is it part of the larger challenges in the industry?

**MR. TAYLOR** responded there is no one answer, it's a series of things. The first thing you have to do is redo the project and make it look better. That will jump up the play from 10-20%. Currently there isn't any marketing done. You would need to do outreach to the communities, such as hotels and parks and recreation. It's about just running and caring about the business, putting in a restaurant and making it a destination. The marketing has to be geared to all kinds of golfers. There could be great walking paths and wildlife observation.

**MR. ASHWORTH** stated if you build it right they will come. We would embrace closing it on Sundays to golf and opening it to families for picnics and a place to enjoy.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** asked, with the alternate use proposals, what would be happening while we wait for an election. Is everything dead in the water or does planning go ahead?

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded if you chose to go in that direction it would take some time to go through the proposals and come back to Council with a recommendation to enter into an exclusive negotiating agreement with one of them. We would also then need to look at what the appropriate environmental review is from a programmatic level to convert those land uses. That would also be part of that vote. You would need about a year to a year and half and that would give you time to have it prepared for the 2014 ballot.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** asked if that would involve the City spending money between now and the election. The outcome of an election would be less than guaranteed and he would be leery of spending money when it could be turned down.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded that, depending on the level of environmental review, yes the City would be spending money.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** asked if the alternate use proposals are going to require the City to sell land. The issue of financing was brought up regarding leased land versus owned land.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded we have not had those detailed discussions. Given our past experience with other projects of a similar nature, at some point in time it's highly likely that we would be asked, due to financing reasons, to sell

part of the property.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** asked the 2 presenters for the alternate use projects if the project is only going to be feasible if the City sells some land at some point in the future.

**MR. KUNAL** responded no. It's not necessary to be purchased. The land we have on Highway 76 is leased, but it's difficult to get it financed.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** stated then it can be leased. While it's more challenging, it doesn't make it dead in the water.

**MR. AGIN** doesn't have the same level of confidence. There are certain areas that could be leased and still financed, depending on the length of the term. Given the proposal we put forth, it has an infrastructure expense that we need to look for ways to offset. Some of those revenue generating uses, like medical, could afford to pay a premium, and, therefore, those proceeds could be applied to that infrastructure. That's why we were nervous that on a ground lease basis there wouldn't be enough revenue in order for us to justify some of the improvements to enhance the area. In today's market for finance, it's even more difficult to finance leased land. It's not possible, but it depends on the use and the credit behind the lease.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** stated from the standpoint of the public and considering options for an alternate use, selling the land is something that they should realistically consider as a possibility.

**MR. AGIN** stated there were comments earlier about a number of the different financing vehicles that we had proposed. We've utilized these even in Ocean Ranch, and it didn't cost the taxpayers any money. It's all leveraged against the companies that then locate there and pay 100% of the tax. It's a supplement to their base property tax. You leverage that over a 20-year period and use those bond proceeds to fund the infrastructure. It isn't a burden on the taxpayer at all, it's just a way for you to accelerate development on the shoulders of that private company that is now located to that development.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** stated in terms of our never-ending search for water and our use of recycled water, will the new proposals require or involve enhanced use of recycled water?

**MR. ASHWORTH** responded that would be the best case scenario.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** asked if are we a position with our water plans for the City that we would be providing recycled purple water to use so the water the course seems to be lacking won't be impacted on water that we'd otherwise use for other uses.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** doesn't believe we have a recycled water source that's within the immediate proximity for them to use.

**MR. TAYLOR** stated from a golf course operator's viewpoint it would be no problem. At Pico Rivera we have both recycled water and regular water. We use the regular water for the greens and recycled for the fairways.

**CARI DALE**, Water Utilities Director, stated recycled water isn't planned specifically for that area; however, we will be updating our Master Plan for recycled water. If you choose, we could focus on that area and see what the cost would be to provide water to that area.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** thought it seemed to be an ideal use, and we can have a win-win situation as long as the numbers work out.

**MS. DALE** stated that it would be our preference, too, to provide recycled water to all of the golf courses in the City. Those are the areas we try to target. In this instance, the infrastructure is just not in that area at this time.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** asked if any of the proposals require any kind of City subsidies, loan guarantees or City financing.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded we haven't gotten to the point of making that determination. He doesn't believe the golf ones do at all. For the alternate uses, we haven't gotten to the point where that's the case.

**MR. KUNIS** responded no, we see this as a privately funded project.

**MR. AGIN** responded 100% privately funded with the land being owned by the City during that process of entitlement until the first phase of construction.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** stated this is about Goat Hill, which is a public park. It is one of the City's several parks, and we do not look at parks to produce revenue. We hope that the parks could, especially given Goat Hill and that entire project, be sustainable. It seems like the challenge and the main reason we're talking about this is because we're seeing that it is not sustainable at this point.

With respect to recycled water, Goat Hill is one of our municipal golf courses. Why isn't that already happening if it's happening with our other golf course?

Having said this is a park, as a child she spent time at the park on Mission and Brooks Street and never understood why K-Mart was more important than Little League fields. There were a lot of kids that used that park. Understanding the history, there was a promise made by the Council that was in a way of mitigating. They said it was a better site for commercial; it will make money; and we'll be able to share those proceeds with the community by making sure this other piece of land, Goat Hill, would benefit the entire community at some later time. The City did not fulfill its promises over the years and decades.

Not being a golfer, she still sees a lot of value in this land. It has a lot of potential. The site is phenomenal. This started with Stirling Properties being interested in this land after the whole process happened with El Corazon. This started as a subject in Closed Session. It went from Closed Session to open session via an RFP. She disagreed with the notion of going straight to an RFP, she would have preferred to do a whole community process so it was the community deciding what it wants out of Goat Hill.

We shouldn't be making our parks produce revenue. That's not what our parks are supposed to be about. If there is a potential for having it sustainable, that would be great. What she's hearing today, with this not having gone through the process she would have preferred, are 2 proposals to maintain it as a golf course, and both say it can be sustained and we might be able to provide some revenue to the City, which is not the primary goal. The primary goal is recreational for our community. She prefers the golf course notion. She was excited to hear about maximizing community access and the idea of having a community garden with kids being actively involved, closing it on Sundays to use as a picnic place, the botanical gardens; why didn't we think of that before?

She likes Mr. Ashford's enthusiasm and the fact that he's been using this golf course and considers it a special place. She finds herself attracted to the proposal of Goat Hill Partners, although there could be a partnership with Golf Links, as was suggested. She sees a golf course here and kids getting excited about golf. She sees a place for meetings and weddings, which we lack. She sees a much higher use of this land by the very people that this was meant to be used by: the general public. We want

to strive to make it affordable. She doesn't want to see any money, especially General Fund money, going to developing any other potential project that would divide us as a community on the 2014 ballot. We need to focus on positive things. By November of 2014, we could have a wonderful golf course. We might not have the meeting place by then, but we'd be a lot farther down the road if we decide to keep it a golf course. Let's do it for our residents.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** asked how much the Parks & Recreation Department pays for water at Martin Luther King Park.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded the Parks & Recreation Department does not pay for water for any of the public parks. It's absorbed by the ratepayers.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** stated if we're going to classify this as parkland and everybody talks about this as a park, our water bill at Center City was \$95,000 last year. If we classified this as a park and they paid the same rate as the other parks in the City pay, there's \$95,000 that we could invest in this park. If we treat them all the same, then let's treat it all like parkland and get out from underneath the \$95,000 a year water bill. With that alone, we could keep the same operator and let them take that \$95,000 and invest it in Goat Hill. The reason we're here is because we're struggling, and part of the big struggle is paying for the water.

Regarding recycled water, we could probably bring it into Goat Hill, but the cost would be about \$8,000,000 to \$9,000,000 because the only place we produce recycled water right now is at San Luis Rey. The reason we have recycled water at the municipal golf course is because San Luis Rey is close. We do not have the infrastructure to bring recycled water to Center City right now. It is Council's plan to be 50% water independent by 2030, and a large part of that is to use recycled water, not only for golf courses but for Eternal Hills, medians, etc. As we go on, the Water Master Plan that they're working on will bring recycled water throughout the City.

How much does it cost for a program EIR for that size property?

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** believes, if you want to compare it to El Corazon, the cost would be roughly \$400,000.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** stated that would be a \$400,000 cost just to get it to the election, which the City will have to invest before we even take it to a vote. That's a daunting task, and it's rolling the dice with the taxpayer's money.

Is there an opportunity for wells on that property?

**MS. DALE** responded not that she's aware of.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** asked what the future is of golf. The municipal golf course is well maintained, but it seems like rounds are down right now. What's happening out at the municipal golf course as compared to Center City?

**JIM BELLOWS**, Operator of Goat Hill and the Municipal Golf Course, responded the big difference is the municipal golf course is a championship golf course, so it appeals to a greater group of golfers. Center City, being an executive golf course, is an attractive place to start players and have them learn the game. The problem with Center City is when the previous operator redesigned it, he designed it in such a way that it's very difficult for juniors and beginners. We've designed some forward tees that could help and in a renovation situation you could make the golf course better. The difference basically is championship golfers versus executive golfers.

The industry in general has lost something like 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 active golfers. There is another 60,000,000 that have claimed to be golfers that we could tap into and bring back. Both of these presentations talked about growing the game and

that's very optimistic. If certain improvements were done, the facility could grow the game. Right now with the economy being what it is, it's a slow process. If somebody's looking to grow revenue as the only way to financially make the golf course viable, it's a big leap of faith right now. Not that it can't happen, but over the recent years it's been very difficult to project revenue growth and participation.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** had breakfast with the Vice-President of TaylorMade and he said basically the same thing. He's struggling with that. We talk about golf uses, but if we decide to do that, are we going to be back here in 5 years again because the game is in such decline?

**DAVID EMERICK**, PGA Golf Professional and Oceanside resident, stated what's wrong with golf now are 3 things: it takes too long, costs too much and is too difficult. What's great about Goat Hill is we can play 18 holes in 2 hours, and it costs us \$10. It's not that hard if you play it a few times. He is also the President and Founder of the North County Junior Golf Association, and they do about 32 tournaments a year. We're actively looking for a site to bring the kids and have tournaments. What's wrong is you're building Jack Nicklaus courses that cost too much, take too long and are too difficult.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** stated that was one of the complaints - it takes too long. The future of recreation is going to be more active for the younger generations. He's not willing to make the leap of faith right now to spend \$400,000 to bring this to an election that we don't know the outcome of. That's a daunting amount of money, especially in this time. Today we're looking for direction. Right now he's leaning to maintain it as a golf option, but he's concerned we may be back here in 5 or 6 years discussing what we're going to do with this property because golf doesn't pan out. He doesn't think taking 1/7 of potential playing time out of circulation for picnics will be workable. Sunday is one of the busiest golf days.

He recently held his 60<sup>th</sup> birthday at Oceanside Municipal Golf Course, and it was a great setting. Golf courses have the potential of being more than golf courses. Mr. Bellows wants to have weddings at the golf course, and Camp Pendleton has wanted to do weddings and other activities on the golf course. There is other potential revenue for that golf course.

Is that entire parcel classified as parkland? Are there some edges that have hotel potential?

**CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN** is not aware that any of it has been dedicated as parkland. The Planning Department would have to weigh in on that. In terms of the ordinance, if you were going to sell the property for any use, including a parks and recreation use, you'd have to get voter approval. If you're going to take any action that prevents it from being used as a parks and recreational purpose, it would require a vote. There is a lot of case law that addresses what a park and recreational use is. We would have to brief Council on this, but there are cases that suggest that a hotel use could be considered a parks and recreation use if it were incidental to the overall park purpose. For example, all of Mission Bay Park is classified as parkland, but there are hotels there because they serve that area. We would have to do a legal opinion on that. That's not what he's doing right now, but there is potential.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** asked if we spent money trying to bring the Chargers here.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded just staff time.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** stated there are a couple of cities in the State that haven't watched the bottom and they go bankrupt. He's played golf for 52 years, and Goat Hill is the most dangerous golf course he's ever been on. It was a pretty good 9-hole golf course and he's not sure why it got increased to 18 holes. Were either one of

the golf companies thinking of changing that back? He asked the amount of rounds played there now.

**MR. JACKSON** responded the amount of rounds have decreased over the last few years, but currently it's about 28,000 to 29,000 rounds annually.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** asked what the thought is about disc golf in this. They're kind of a rough bunch, bringing their own alcohol and other things, and he's not sure that's the mix we're looking for, especially if we're going to bring kids out there.

**MR. TAYLOR** responded if you look at the number he provided, you'll note that revenue was about \$480,000 in green fees 3 years ago, and zero in disc golf. Last year, disc golf brought in \$35,000 and the green fees were under \$300,000. Disc golf is dangerous and waters down the golf course. They bring alcohol; there are Frisbees going everywhere; and there will be a liability issue at some point in time. That liability will be on the City. He would recommend making it a good golf course and doing the things we can to help, like the community gardens, botanical gardens or walking paths. Let's make it so the City can get some money. His proposal includes the water bill and gives money back to the City. His proposal allows the City to keep the golf course, but get money that can subsidize, if not pay for, your other recreational activities.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** doesn't think it would be feasible to close it on Sundays.

**MR. ASHWORTH** responded there is a way to do it and still get the revenue for that day. You could have a shotgun on Sunday morning starting at 7:30.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** asked about allowing dogs and the problems that go along with that.

**MR. ASHWORTH** responded it's a matter of being a good citizen and maintaining decorum. That's the problem with the Frisbee people. At first when he was against Frisbee golf, but he eventually came around. The problem is they don't have good etiquette. He would like to see Frisbee golf go away, but at least set aside a certain time for them so they don't interfere with the golfers.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** wonders what the gateway that everyone assumes is on Oceanside Boulevard would look like. Tell us about the gateway of your project.

**MR. AGIN** has a different perception of what the gateway is to Oceanside. Mission Avenue has been the gateway that we've perceived. It's goes straight down to the pier and over to City Hall. When you look at our design, we've oriented the primary access off Mission Avenue, because the topography off Oceanside Boulevard to get up to Goat Hill makes the infrastructure costs even more significant. We've oriented our whole development concept to enhance Mission Avenue and provide this as an Interstate 5 exposure gateway. We have enhanced that intersection for the City.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** stated it's probably a challenge at best, but he's sure engineering can solve a lot of problems.

**MR. AGIN** suggested the City sit down with Camp Woodward to see if there were a way of incorporating just that element. There is so much excitement and demand around that action sport category because they are making it an educational benefit. It is relevant and progressive and attracts a lot of corporate sponsors that want to be a part of that. The U.S. Open in Huntington Beach evolved over a few years to become an international event that has every major sponsor involved, and not just for surfing; they now have showcased action sports there. Oceanside with the coast and the inland location can combine those two and create a venue unlike anywhere. We have a vested interested in Oceanside and want to see it continue to be successful. He wants to do his part to help the City look at opportunities where jobs can be generated.

This is a recreational category and it wouldn't hurt for the City to sit down with Camp Woodward just to see if the economics could be viable.

**MR. KUNAL** stated we see an entrance off Oceanside Boulevard being 4 lanes with landscaping on both sides and down the center. We also see, in some way, improving the existing retail component along Oceanside Boulevard because right now it's unattractive. We also see a trolley system or some kind of access from the Sprinter station to the site.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** stated we have 465 acres at El Corazon, and 25 of that was designated for commercial. Even now he doesn't believe that's going to be the ultimate generator out there for revenue. He asked for status on the commercial at El Corazon.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded Council authorized staff to negotiate an agreement with Sudberry, which we're in the process of doing. The total commercial acreage is well over 25 acres, it's closer to 60 acres for the entire El Corazon. At this point, there is no active marketing of the commercial because we don't even have an agreement with the developer yet. We expect to bring those agreements to Council in October for the DDA for commercial and a portion of the recreational components.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** asked if we voted as a City for the harbor.

**ASSISTANT CITY CLERK TROBAUGH** responded it was on the ballot.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** stated we voted for that. It probably wasn't unanimously passed, but it was thinking outside the box at the time. He appreciates how the alternative uses have thought outside the box. He doesn't know where to go with this because it sounds like it's going to be harder to do that. Mr. Agin's presentation stated it would be about 7 years. It would be 2 years before we'd even have a vote of the people. He's not sure spending the money on the EIR before it even went out to a vote of the people would be the right thing. He's still open to suggestions.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ moved** to keep Goat Hill as a golf course and direct staff to evaluate the golf programs and come back with a recommendation.

**Motion died** for lack of a second.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** would echo Councilmember Kern that it wouldn't be wise to be spending huge amounts of money before we had a vote. If spending the money is necessary for the vote, we need to look at a different thing in terms of what we're voting on. If it's possible, we should try and replicate the El Corazon process. We need to find a better way for all of the uses to do a sales job for the communities that are going to be primarily affected, as well as the City as a whole. He doesn't know that a motion is needed right now, excluding those uses without giving them a chance to do more hand-holding. Based on what he's heard today, if enough of the community is going to adamantly oppose even entertaining these type of proposals, then there's no point wasting anyone's time going down that road. The alternative uses need to get a better feel for what the larger community opinion is.

This is one of those issues where he wants to do the best thing he can for the City, while respecting the residents who are going to be most impacted by it. He's open to any use, but based on today it looks like the golf course is the most feasible direction to go with the least impediments. He doesn't know if we need to make that decision today. Possibly we should set up some more meetings for the community and be a little more aggressive in letting them know that this is a real possibility. If you do anything other than a golf course or park option, it's a one-way street. Once you go down that path, it's never going to be a park again. The City should make that decision with its eyes wide open if that's the direction they want to go.

He would like to provide some way for a little more selling and hand-holding and getting community feedback.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** would like more input before making a decision that is going to determine what's going to happen for the next 10 or 15 years. That's why he didn't second the motion. We need to evaluate whether this Camp Woodward project is a recreational use, and if it could be placed there along with the golf course. Maybe there is something we could put together because there is enough space, or a hotel use. All of these things are possible so he doesn't want to be directed down this path today. He asked if to put something on the ballot we have to have it done 120 days before the election.

**ASSISTANT CITY CLERK TROBAUGH** doesn't know offhand but it would be at least 120 days.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** asked how long it would take to do an EIR.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded if it's for a golf course, it wouldn't take any time at all. We have 2 specific proposals for the alternate use. He doesn't believe we have the ability to mix and match pieces.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** isn't asking for that. He's asking for a timeline, if we decided today that we were going to go with an alternative use.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded it would be 14 months to select a consultant and go through that process.

**MAYOR WOOD** stated this is a workshop, so we don't have to do anything today. He doesn't feel he has enough information to vote today. He believes that it's a park and a golf course. He just didn't believe that there is enough benefit for all of the citizens of Oceanside with just a park/golf course. It's really a golf course, not a park. People can't just wander into it and have a picnic. Golf is nice, but it isn't for all of the citizens. He'd like to have a separate use. Can something else be there besides a golf course? He's leaning toward having something for more sports. We can continue this, have a workshop and blue ribbon committee. He doesn't know the laws about a hotel being part of a park. If a Camp Woodward was put in there for extreme sports, which are the hot sports on the market right now? That would be a secondary use; it would be something besides golf. He'd like to have another sporting use on the golf course somehow. He'd rather continue this and have staff and the developers get together to see if any of these uses are compatible. He has concerns about a hotel. That would mean going to an election. He'd also be willing to form a committee to deal with this.

He does like the idea of closing it down one day a week and allowing people to use it as a park because it is a park. That's something new and a good thought. He'd still like to get more input on this.

**RICK KRATKOWSKI** stated these people have spent a lot of money on their proposals and we're just messing around and not giving them any direction. If the feeling is that you want to stay with a golf course, why can't you make a proposal to get more information from the 2 guys who want to do golf? We need to get someone to maintain it. He's tired of looking at the golf course because it looks terrible.

**MAYOR WOOD** isn't going to vote on this tonight.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** asked if we are month-to-month out there.

**MR. JACKSON** responded we have an annual contract with them. We have the right to terminate with notice, but it's an annual contract.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** asked if it's an evergreen, where it goes on for another year if it isn't terminated.

**MR. JACKSON** responded yes.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** thinks if we were to be considered visionaries about the future, it would probably take more than 2 years anyway to evaluate that kind of thing. We could probably afford to have 4-6 meetings with all of the concerned people involved, and maybe come up with some compromise or decision one way or the other. We need to go to more than just the neighbors that are directly around. We need to get people involved who don't just live in that small area. We could bring in people from various parts of the City, like we did on the El Corazon Committee.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** had recommended we do that when we first were approached about Goat Hill. She wanted this to be a community planning, but the majority wanted to go ahead and do the RFP. The community should speak on this, and she believes the community wants the golf course. It's been like that for decades. We want a better golf course and some amenities like a meeting place, more access, walking trails, and all of things that have been suggested today. It's a good idea to let staff talk to the 2 that are bringing forth these ideas, and go out and have community meetings about this, then bring it back to Council.

We've got all of these other opportunities at El Corazon. There was an opportunity for these extreme things to be presented at El Corazon and the community decided, as did Council, that we wanted 20 soccer fields and a certain developer, which closed the door to that. We have our dream of El Corazon, and that started in the 1980's and 1990's. Here we have a park that is already dedicated parkland and has been a golf course. The City has been committed to investing back into the park since the 1980's.

To invest in a golf course, we would have to have a certain number of years to get back what we put into it. We think that once we have invested in this and shown what we can do, you're going to want to keep this. She doesn't know how long that period of time would be. In the grand scheme of things, keeping it a golf course is the least intrusive thing to do. If our needs were to change in 10-20 years, then it could happen then. She believes in 10-20 years we're going to be happy we kept it a greenbelt. Everywhere else is going to be built up, and here will be this paradise island of green where you can see the ocean. That is a complete jewel.

She doesn't see action happening here so we'll kick the can down the road. We have a great opportunity to have a golf course and get people out to play and have youth discover golf. She feels she can make the decision tonight to go ahead with the golf course.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** asked if the City Attorney could come back with a list of what would be compatible uses on parkland. That way we'll have an idea of what we can do there.

**CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN** can do that. He pointed out that both of the alternative use proposals involve uses that will absolutely require a vote. Both of their written proposals acknowledge that.

**COUNCILMEMBER KERN** understands that for the residential and commercial. He means when we talk about the Camp Woodward project, which is a recreational use, and a hotel attached to that, etc.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** isn't thinking of a long process. He'd like to see something that could be resolved by the end of the year. In terms of notification, it's always frustrating that more people aren't involved in something that is such a big decision for our future. Would it be appropriate to have notices go out through the

water bills to try and get more involvement?

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded if you'd like additional notification there are numerous ways to do that. What we'd be coming back to you with are the same 4 proposals you have now. We don't have the ability, at this point, to try to tailor one versus the other.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** is looking for notification of these meetings so they can see the presentations. He would like to see if there is any community interest at all in going down the alternative use process. The hurdle seems to be something that requires a vote versus something that doesn't require a vote. He's intrigued by some of the things the Mayor said about maintaining as golf primarily but looking to see if some of the other recreational uses could be squeezed in. He's open to see if that's feasible. He's less intrigued with things that involve residential uses and stuff that is getting rid of the green. He's open to something that keeps as much green, trees, grass, etc. as possible and brings in revenue, as much as possible, to offset expenses for the City. He wants to make sure we've made as good an effort as possible in terms of notice, so we can get feedback and make a decision. We don't need a process that is going to go on for years. He'd like this part of the issue resolved, at a minimum, before the end of the year.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** stated we have the ability to put all 4 of the proposals on the website and let people pick them. If the issue is scheduling another workshop like this where the 4 would come in and do their presentation again but have broader notice, we can certainly do that if that's Council's direction.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** is interested more in the community meeting to be able to get the feedback. The El Corazon process seemed to work. We came to a consensus with the community and everyone was satisfied with the end result of that. He'd like to see if we can do something along those lines for here. We may not necessarily need a commission, but we need to be able to say everyone was noticed and had a chance to come express an opinion. He is interested in going the direction that the majority of the community wants to go, and he'd like to make sure we bend over backwards to determine what that majority is. He likes the idea of the website. He doesn't know what the expense is to put the notice in the water bills, but he wants to make sure that everyone is on board if that's the direction we want to go.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** stated if the issue is getting community input on what they'd like to see there, then we'd probably need, for at least the 2 proposals that proposed alternate uses, action to reject them. If you're looking at something other than specifically what they proposed, we at least need to let those 2 teams know we're not interested in either of their current proposals and that we would be developing some other process to come up with a different end result.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** doesn't know if that's the direction the community wants to go. It seems like we're on hold until we get that feedback from the City as a whole and people who are most impacted to see if that's the direction they want to go. An election is a big expense and is time-consuming. He doesn't see that as a road that's going to be feasible to go down unless there's been a lot of community support built up by the people who believe in the alternative proposals to get that support within the community. They ought to have a shot at trying to build that support. Based on whether they are successful at that, we as a body will know what direction we want to go. If he were to base a decision on the feedback we've had today, it looks like the golf course, with some trimming around the edges, is the direction the City wants to go in. He's not ready to make that decision yet.

How many years would the golf proposals need to be feasible?

**MR. TAYLOR** responded his proposal predicted this outcome. It has to be this outcome. His thought is to give Council some time out, like 3 years, to breathe and

figure out exactly what you want. During that interim, he would work with Council and the City. He'll run the golf course, we'll split the profits, guarantee a certain amount to capital investment. If it's a 3-year plan, the capital investment is reduced; if it's a 6-year plan, then we increase the capital improvement fund.

**MR. ASHWORTH** doesn't have set time right now, we haven't gotten that far down the track. He's in it for the long run, so he'd be looking for a fairly longer time. He doesn't have that number, maybe 20-25 years.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELIEN** is looking for is the possibility that, if it's feasible to move ahead on one of the golf proposals, they have a buy-out option that if any of the other more sophisticated proposals gain traction, we would have an option to go in that direction. If that didn't gain any traction, we still would have been moving ahead with one of the proposals that are feasible.

**MAYOR WOOD** stated we can't do that tonight.

**DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** stated we could get a better sense by having staff write up a blurb on each one of the proposals to mail out over a 3- or 4-month period and have some way to track it. You won't get very many back, but you'll get more than 11 or 20, like we have here.

**CITY MANAGER WEISS** responded if you want to string it out that long, that's possible. The other option is we could notice a community meeting at El Corazon Senior Center, have all 4 teams there set up and put enough notices in the paper and elsewhere and solicit input. We could have each one go table to table and choose which one they like, and then we could tally the results. That would be easier than the water bills, because at this point you probably wouldn't get them in the bills until they went out in October. We could schedule something within the next 45 days that would provide an opportunity for that to occur.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** sees a problem doing it this way because, just like when they did the vision of El Corazon with a sky's the limit attitude, we can't afford everything. We've got the golf course proposals that wouldn't cost us anything. We're not sure what the other 2 will cost us. It's not fair to set it out and think we could have these extreme sports there, but there's a huge cost. It's better to have it be interactive in community meetings so people can ask those questions. Look what we've done here. We've asked all of these questions, and it's been over 3 hours. You won't get a true response, it will be skewed. We won't know what's in people's minds when they checked whatever box. What if they made a mistake? This isn't a good plan to get public opinion. We need to have community meetings.

**MAYOR WOOD** stated we should have gone a different direction before, as Councilmember Sanchez suggested, but this went forward as-is. It's here now, and we're trying to resolve it. He doesn't believe Councilmember Sanchez's motion would have passed tonight. We can try it again and he'd second it, but he doesn't think it will pass. People want more input. We need staff to get more involved in finding out what can or can't be. The City Manager and staff know what we're looking for. He doesn't want to say no to all 4 projects because that's not fair. It's probably going to be something along the lines of a golf course.

He asked the City Manager and staff to come back with something to let us know. There's a lot of public input out there that we'd like to have. We can't do it without having public meetings, which takes time and costs. We can also do a blue ribbon commission.

2. **Public Communications on City Council Matters (Off-Agenda Items) – None**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MAYOR WOOD** adjourned this meeting of the Oceanside City Council at 5:23 PM, Wednesday, August 22, 2012. The next regularly scheduled meeting is on Wednesday, August 29, 2012, at 2:00 PM

**ACCEPTED BY COUNCIL:**

---

Barbara Riegel Wayne  
City Clerk, City of Oceanside