UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes
Hybrid Meeting
March 12, 2024

Directors present, directors absent

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Neil de Ramos (NR), Joann Selleck (JS), Isabelle Kay (IK), **Jon Arenz (JA),** Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV), **Anu Delouri (AD),** Kristin Camper (KC), Petr Krysl (PK), **Carol Uribe (CU),** Andrew Parlier (AP), **Georgia Kayser (GK),** Karen Martien (KMar), **Andrew Wiese (AW), Linda Bernstein (LB), Fay Arvin (FA)**, Carey Algaze (CA), Alex Arthur (AA), **Anna Bryan (AB),** Sasha Treadup (ST), Coby Tomlins (CT-City of SD Planning).

1. **Call the Meeting to Order: Chris Nielsen, Chair.** Chair CN at 6:05 pm

   CN: Thanks for attending in person or on zoom. We hope you appreciate the zoom broadcast as convenient for those who cannot show up in person. Thanks to Alexandria for providing the meeting room with hybrid capabilities at their GradLabs building.

2. **Agenda: Call for additions / deletions: Adoption.**

   CN: Any additions/deletions to the agenda? None raised.

   - *Motion to Adopt by Andy Wiese, Second by Anna Bryan. Motion carried unopposed.*

3. **Approval of Minutes: February 13, 2024, minutes.**

   CN: Sasha Treadup was unable to submit minutes far enough ahead of the meeting. We will approve the minutes next month.

4. **Announcements: Chair's Report, CPC Report**

   CN: Welcome to the UCPG meeting for March 2024, held again in hybrid format in Alexandria GradLabs building; we thank them for the use of the room that supports hybrid meetings. Thanks to those attending in person and on zoom. Thanks to Diane Ahern for co-hosting the zoom part of the meeting. Some past business:

   - There is no news on the Tentative Map Waver for the Aventine property. This has not been rescheduled.

   - The Miramar-Sorrento double-tracking project presentation is still on hold. The SANDAG consultants need to update their Biological Technical Report for MSCP and respond to some issues to Parks & Rec.

- Costa Verde. Alexandria is not ready to present their revised plans for the project currently. They will defer their request for an extension of time for the project until they can present a realistic picture of their final plans for the site.

- The Planning Department is still reviewing our revised governance documents.

- The 2024 Land Development Code Update will be going forward to the Planning Commission, Land Use & Housing, and Council over the next few months. CPC formed a subcommittee to review the Update on which I participated. We recommended approval of all the update items (67) except for one.

- Coming up in April / May. We must redo our training. I'll find out the details at CPC later this month. We also must submit our annual report very quickly. I'll have a preliminary version of the annual report ready for April.

- Revised University Community Plan Update Draft comment period. The revised University Community Plan Update and Environmental Impact Report will be released on Thursday March 14 or Friday March 15. Public comments on both the DEIR and Revised Plan Update will be due on Monday April 29. Comments from the UCPG will be Wednesday May 15 or Thursday May 16.

  Timeline:

Plan Update / DEIR Release	Thursday 3/14 or Friday 3/15
City Planning Presentation	UCPG April 9 meeting
CPUS / Public meeting (Zoom)	Tuesday April 16
Public Comments DEIR / Plan Update	Due Monday April 29
UCPG Comments DEIR / Plan Update	Due Wednesday 5/15 or Thurs 5/16

  All reports will be on *planuniversity.org*

  This will be discussed further under agenda Item 7.

5. **Presentations:**
   - **Councilmember Kent Lee (Zach Burton)**
     - Zach Burton: Some items from office. Civilian Board executive director search will be held next week. This is a chance to have your voice heard. The dumpster day event for UC was held, and about 5,000 pounds of trash were collected, even with the rain. Thank you for attending, because the more you attend these events, the more of them we can do.
   - **Membership Report (Anu Delouri)**
     - AD: We are doing the election outside. The UCPG is the officially recognized planning group for the North and South University City and advises the City on matters related to planning and land use. Meetings are held on the 2nd Tuesday of every month. There is a membership form to

join and it doesn't cost anything to join but it does allow you to vote in advance in the annual election. The form is available online.

- **Plan Update Subcommittee (Andy Wiese, Char)**
  - Andy will defer comments on the Plan Update since it's on the agenda,
- **Planning Department (Coby Tomlins)**
  - No Report this month for the UCPG.
- **Mayor Todd Gloria (Michaela Valk)**
  - Good evening, I was reassigned to the team handling the flood impacts after the first of the year, and now that we have gotten a Federal Disaster Declaration for the county, I am able to return to these community meetings. I wanted to be here when the community plan update was discussed; Andy and Chris got updates earlier today from City Planning. I wanted to be able to take your input back to the Mayor's office. Three quick updates. The City Council did approve the citywide DIF allocation, about $15.8 million, for use in citywide park allocations, including $750,000 for Marcy park. We had multiple discussions on mobility and I wanted to make sure everybody ere knows tat our sustainability and mobility department is hosting a series of public meeting about our mobility master plan. The closest to UC is Mira Mesa, with one in PB. The IBD is hosting a meeting to explain how the budget works.
- **UC San Diego Anu Delouri)**
  - CN: Robert Closen from UC San Diego Planning will introduce the Update to the 2018 Long Range Development Program.
  - Robert Closen: You're probably aware over the last several years we have rapidly increased our enrollment. Our LRDP is designed to run for 10 to 15 years, and we have met our population goal in the LRDP sooner than we expected. In addition, we're expecting more development, more density, more housing development, and we have a mandate from the state to increase enrollment. Specifically, we will update the environmental report with a "Subsequent Projection" of the LRDP with new population projections to the year 2040. We are looking at going from 43,000 students today to a little over 55,000 or 56,000 students in 2040. We will redo all the analysis that is dependent on the population. Some of them do not require updating but we will look exhaustively at all the impact areas. We are not updating the LRDP itself because it's more of a land use plan at a programmatic level. Planning development is not changed. The Scoping Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released on February 29; comments will be dune March 19. There will be a scoping meeting next week on the 20th at the Faculty Club; this will be recorded. The Draft EIR

will be available in the summer with a 45-day comment period. We'll be back then to get more input from neighbors on the plan.

- o JS: Sorry I missed the beginning, but is this a new analysis of the potential growth only going to focus on the campus here, or include Downtown and associated projects?
- o RC: Good question. The Scripps Campus, SIO, West and East Campus are included.
- o AD: This is a public meeting; registration is not required but it helps us with logistics if you tell us you're coming.
- o AW: I ask as a concerned citizen and taxpayer. I know it strikes me as a little bit odd in a state that's got such a dramatic budget crisis that it's expanding and it's given the green light to go ahead and spend money while there are a dozen CSU campuses that are built and are not at capacity. Are you addressing this as part of your Update?
- o RC: The University itself receives very little funding from the state so a lot of our funds are from other sources. There is a "compact" with the state regarding increasing enrollment. There is a small amount of funding coming from the state but it's never guaranteed. The same concerns about the state budget affect us, but we are attempting to correctly anticipate the future with this plan for the long term.
- o AD: We want to properly evaluate the environmental impacts of what this might look like if we did a build out to the plan.
- o CN: Thank you, Robert.
- o RC: Everyone is invited to the 20h at the Faculty Club.

- **CIP Subcommittee (Georgia Kayser)**
  CN: Georgia, is there any news about our traffic requests?
  GK: No. We're still trying to figure out how best to maintain our CIP lists.

- **Pure Water Construction Group (Sarah Rosetto, Mariah Hugo, Clem Wassenberg)**
  - There has been a change in the public engagement team for the Pure Water Construction Project. Mariah Hugo Almasco will be taking over Sarah Bowles's duties, mhugo@sandiego.gov. She will be the dedicated point of contact for the project.
  - Clem: Short update, Summary of the project to date. Towne Centre work proceeds southbound to Nobel Drive. Genesee work proceeds towards the High School. We will start the next phase north from the High School across Rose Canyon, expecting to be done with the tunneling machine by the fall when it has another commitment.

- o Bill Beck: I have a comment about what's been going on at Vista La Jolla. We have been inundated with problems. Twice we have had our water shut off. We have been blocked from exiting the development. We have supposed community outreach. This consists sometimes of door hangers to the homes that are thrown on the ground. This is not acceptable community outreach. I hope the next group of people have better results than Vista La Jolla had.
- o Barry Bernstein: I am concerned about the tunneling and the rain.
- o Clem: The tunneling machine may be operated in dry or wet conditions.
- o GK: Is there any effort to revegetate the medians?
- o Clem: We will restore medians to pre-existing conditions. We have not damaged trees so far. Additional vegetation is not part of the Pure Water Project.

6. **Public Comment: Non-Agenda, but within the scope of the UCPG, Items (2-minute limit).**

   Diane Ahern: This meeting will be recorded and posted on the UCCA website.

   - *UCCA will host its in-person March meeting, tomorrow, March 13, at the Community Library at 4155 Governor Drive with networking at 5:15 PM followed by the UCCA meeting from 5:30 to 7:30 PM. All are welcome.*
   - *UCCA is the publisher of University City News and we welcome community contributors and advertisers. We are beginning to gather content now for the April newsletter so please send it our way.*
   - *For more news and information about the newsletter and upcoming University City events and meetings, including over 50 Spring Festivals planned this year in San Diego, visit the University City News website at:* *https://www.universitycitynews.org/*

   Michael: (resident of University City). I'm not sure this is the correct forum but there was come communication about the Costa Verde Project. I would like to say that there is some confusion about the redevelopment project here. A hotel would be great if there wasn't the Marriott and Hyatt and UCSD was not building a hotel on the east part of their campus. I think increasing housing where Costa Verde was would be a much better use of the space. Thank you.

7. **Action Item: Plan Update and Draft EIR. We will discuss the plan update and Draft EIR timing. At the time this agenda was published, we did not have release dates for the Plan and DEIR. The board may direct the Chair and Plan Update Subcommittee Chair to establish a meeting schedule or take other action to receive community input and approve comments to the city. Chris Nielsen and Andy Wiese, presenting.**

- CN: Introductory Comments. Andy and I have been briefed on the timeline. I'll have Andy describe where we are in the plan update process.
- Andy Wiese, Plan Update Subcommittee Chair: We met earlier today with Coby Tomlins, Director of Community Planning, along with Nathan Causman and Suchi Lukes. You'll remember that Suchi was the assistant planner on the project for the last several years under Nancy Graham and she is now the senior lead there with Nancy's promotion to her new position. We talked to them about timelines and content of the revised plan. We'll talk about the timelines first, and largely only about the timelines and our process going forward. We are not at liberty to discuss the content yet. The City plans to release the revised plan and EIR either on Thursday or Friday. On a larger scale we go through the process here in the community planning group and go to council before the end of the summer. They would release the draft this week and people would have an opportunity to engage with it and then the planning department would make a presentation on the draft on April 9 at the UCPG meeting. The parks and transportation departments with also be at this meeting. Chris and I will work with them over the next several weeks to prep them for likely questions to make sure that it's the most effective presentation possible.

  To review, nine months when the UCPG voted and presented them with a final report with community feedback based on the four and a half years of community feedback at that time. That document is available and is on planuniversity.org. You can find this document in the July 7 meeting materials. We will go through the document and try to identify the concerns the city has and has not addressed. I'll also make some comments about how the comments should come in. There are two documents for review, the draft EIR and the revised plan. Comments should be addressed to the specific document as each will be different. We will prepare people for how to make comments on each of the documents at the next meeting. The goal will be to follow the April 9 meeting with a working meeting on April 16. Chris and I had a follow-on meeting to determine how to take community feedback. The April 16 meeting is designed to take comments from the community and especially the from members of the Plan Update Subcommittee. We'll take the comments, and based on the approved comments, we will ask for approval from the UCPG at the May 14 meeting. There are a couple of deadlines to note here. The city did listen to the concerns of the UCPG about the short timeline of a 45-day timeline and they've attempted to split the baby. They will release the documents on Thursday or Friday where the public will be required to turn in their comments with a 45-day deadline (April 29). The planning group will have about 60 days to make its responses. That gives us an opportunity to see the plan and discuss it at two meetings, April and May. This will allow us to develop our responses a bit more fully. Our comments would be due to the city on May 15, the day after the UCPG meeting.
- CN: We're prepared to do that. We will come up with something that can be edited quickly and turned into the final set of comments from May 14. We are hoping the documents are released on Friday to give us two days.

- DK: So, the comment period for the EIR is either 45 or 60 days and includes comments on both the plan and EIR. I find it very bizarre that they have taken 5 years to develop the plan and they can't give the public an extra two weeks to comment. This is ridiculous. Just my comments.
- CN: Your comments are noted; we have discussed this with the city repeatedly.
- JS: It's not next Tuesday where you will take UCPG comments and subcommittee comments?
- CN: No, it will be the Tuesday April 16 meeting, after the April 9 meeting, May 14 will be the meeting where we vote our comments and turn in those comments May 15.
- JS: Does it make sense to get things started with the Plan Update Subcommittee, perhaps by having groups of people look at various aspects of the plan update. It might be more effective than everyone looking at the same material.
- CN: Andy and I have discussed what it the most useful product that can be done quickly. The most useful product is a comparison between the two drafts of the plan. This will tell us what has changed and compare it with the July 7 comments to the city. It does make sense to try to see what has changed between the drafts.
- JS: The second question is, between the two documents, which comments will be the most impactful. We want to make sure.
- CN: My personal opinion is that commenting on the revised plan is more effective; I have not seen a meaningful change of results from commenting on an EIR other than technical corrections.
- JS: Except for the bridge.
- CN: Which was essentially a political decision. There are formalisms for commenting on the DEIR, and we'll make sure the public knows what these are at the April meeting.
- JS: For those who want to get started on the comparison process could one of you post the documents and the UCPG comments all in one place?
- CN: These should all be on planuniversity.org shortly.
- AW: The final UCPG comment is there along with the 6,000 comments received by the community and drafts of comments from the subcommittee under the June 20 CPUS meeting materials. We asked for the city to keep the (first) discussion draft of the plan on planuniversity.org so you can see both the revised and discussion drafts. Michaela, I hope the mayor's office will support having both documents available. We hope planuniversity.org will include all of the relevant materials.
- CN: We have a copy of the discussion draft just in case.
- GK: My question is about timing. We will not receive the presentation from the city until April 9. Could there be any benefit in the subcommittee meeting before April 9? The first item to do seems to be comparing drafts and this could be done prior to April 9 and might make the presentation more effective.
- AW: We can look at it. I will be out of town for two weeks prior to the April 9 meeting.

- GK: My concern is that you have done some much work that we should try to divide and conquer so others can help.
- CN: If we have the comparison documents ready this would be the most useful at this point.
- AW: There are three Tuesdays between now and then.
- CN: We could hold the meeting on zoom or in person. In person is sometimes easier for document comparison but since the plans are electronic, maybe zoom works OK.
- NdR: Our ultimate deadline is Wednesday May 15, right?
- CN: Yes, that's the ultimate deadline. It's a question of getting useful information as soon as possible and making good use of the city's time. The public wants to give feedback. We have certain specific requirements that we would like to city to address.
- AB: Do we know what format the city will give it to us in? Can we do a simple compare of PDFs? If they give it to us in the same format as the last one, you can use a program to do the comparison and don't have to sit down and do it manually.
- GK: This is a great idea.
- CN: OK, I'll send out an email when the draft is released. We're not as concerned with the Draft EIR. We might be able to do it as a strikeout underline.
- Michaela Valk (Mayor's Office): I know they have done this with other plans, so if there is a program I could do that it might be easier.
- AB: We might be able to do this quickly
- CN: We can do this as soon as the documents are released. Everybody that has made comments here: Joanne, Georgia, Debbie, Neil, Anna, thanks. I'll send an email out on Monday asking if anyone has been able to do a comparison. Michaela, should we expect the same format?
- Michaela: Yes, you should expect that the two plans will have the same format. Be sure to keep me in the loop if I can help.
- JS: I thought about what we do with the comparison. I wonder if it would be useful to share the comparison with the city. I can see that at the April 9 meeting there will be some people who have not been involved in the process until now. Maybe we ask them to discuss the differences at the April 9 meeting. Is the planning department going to discuss the DEIR?
- CN: I really don't know.
- Michaela: I think it's just the plan, perhaps very briefly on the EIR. The EIR is like an overview. The focus will be on the plan, and whatever the body decides to vote on. And that's the next planning group meeting but between now and the comments submitted on May 15 is what the city will take into account moving forward with the plan.
- DK: I assume they will put all the documents on planuniversity.org. There should be a link to the CEQA page with the EIR; this can be complex to find on the city's website.

- CN: I asked them explicitly to put a link to the DEIR on planuniversity.org. They won't post a separate version.
- Michaela: Everything will be available on the website. It might be just one link.
- DK: Could you make sure? This has been a problem in the past.
- Diane Ahern on zoom: Susan Baldwin would like to know, did the city prepare for us a summary of the changes in the discussion draft.
- CN: We should see what our PDF and word-wizards can do?
- AW: to Susan's point on zoom, we will circle back with staff, but the conversation was in the context of "We heard your feedback and here's the ways that we responded to the feedback" in these various categories.
- CN: That's what we know about the plan update.
- AW: Do we hold a special meeting of the UCPG?
- CN: I'm not hearing a second.
- CN: I can convene a subcommittee; there are no restrictions on how to do this.
- AW: If it's possible to produce a comparative document quickly, why wait?
- I think we are finished with this topic.

8. **Information Item: Information Item: Biological vegetation survey commissioned by the UC Fire Safe Council. Tom Cartier, UC Fire Safe Council, presenting.**
   - CN: Tom Cartier, UC Fire Safe Council, will now present the results of a recent biological vegetation survey commissioned by the UC Fire Safe Council. Tom?
   - Tom Cartier: I'm the treasurer of the UC Fire Safe Council. We are funded through the county of San Diego, we're interested in wildfire prevention, brush mitigation through home-hardening. We are interested in doing a brush density study since fires closer to Rose Canyon rim will be a more serious threat. We're worried that things could be as bad as Maui. We commissioned a study to look at the rim of homes on Rose Canyon. This map shows the 2024 survey. A drone was used, and three densities were identified as dense, moderate, or sparse. Green is good, red is severe. Trimming is effective well.
   - JS: North side?
   - TC: The Santa Anna winds were thought not to impact the north edge as much as the south, so we concentrated our survey there. The City did a brush management audit to identify brush to prune and get it done. Parks and Rec are responsible for the for the management.
   - LB: Is the city responsible for the brush management?
   - TC: Yes, and there is a schedule of trimming published on the city website that shows which areas are to be maintained and on what schedule.
   - LB: This looks encouraging.
   - TC: Yes, we do see an improvement.

- JS: I hope the city is watching the SDG&E issues. Many wildfires start this way. I see there are other ways to help, including house hardening.
- TC: There is a meeting at the UC library on March 23 to discuss this topic.
- CN: Tom, thanks for the encouraging report. I think it would be useful to have you back in about a year to compare conditions.

    .

9. **Information Item: Inclusive Public Engagement Questionnaire. As part of our commitment to the new CPG procedures we should become familiar with the issues in public engagement. Based on our discussion, I will fill out the questionnaire that will be used by the city to help form its public engagement policies. Chris Nielsen, presenting.**

- CN: We will discuss the City's New Inclusive Public Engagement Policy. I'll try to solicit comments from the board and zoom audience on Linda Vista's responses to the questionnaire, and we'll add to their comments. I'll turn in the comments to the IPEP team at the city based on tonight's feedback. We hope to end at 8 when the election closes.
- CN: The April 9 meeting will be exclusively on the Plan Update. There will be little regular business. Michaela, will you be able to join us, at least on zoom?
- Michaela: Yes.
- CN: At CPC a couple of months ago we had a presentation by the city's public engagement team to try to devise a general policy for engaging many different groups in a way that provides meaningful feedback on city policies while encouraging members of the community to speak freely. The initiatives on which the city is building this engagement is based on five principles: Inclusion, Respect for Community Knowledge, Clear Communications, Building True Relationships, and a Commitment to Good Process. The questions the IPEG team asked are what are your CPG's feeling on this? Linda Vista pointed out many of the issues with CPGs, particularly the "checking the box" attitude sometimes displayed, Can you suggest any other things we might include.
- CN: From my point of view, surveys are particularly problematic. They are also subject to built-in biases and dependent on access to the survey itself. I think it's particularly important to respect community knowledge. Debby?
- DK: I really appreciate being able to do this because I think Linda Vista is spot-on. There is irony in saying that we want to listen to the planning group but we see this is not always the case. Look at the plan update process. Some in the community were characterized as a bunch of old white homeowners, but these people have lived here for 50 years and know the area intimately. I really appreciate Linda Vista doing this.
- CN: There were two groups that filled out the IPEG worksheet as of the last CPC meeting, Linda Vista was one, and they made it available to every CPC member. This is the time to give our input to the city on this policy, prior to it being fully developed. Our question here is specific to planning groups only.

- AW: I have a long list. The city says it wants engagement but there is no representative from the city, and that tells us what they think about engagement. Michaela, you are here from the Mayor's office, but no one else is. The city should be engaging with its citizens in the places they meet. That means the UCCA, local arts council, and planning groups. Where people are is where you should engage. Don't try to create the wheel again. Survey people where they are. You need to be here to listen. Take the feedback that you hear. A 100 people said they wanted a longer comment period for the plan. A 100 people. The city said 45 will be fine. So, when you say you want engagement, that means people give you feedback, and sometimes you have to take what you don't like. Don't game the results in advance. We had a community survey which only provided a set of already preselected alternatives for people. 7,000 people turned out to fill out the survey. Three quarters of the people surveyed said they could not fill out the survey since they did not like any of the alternatives. So, you got bogus surveys, bogusly created, designed to create an answer they want in advance and then you say you want engagement. That's nonsense. Lisen to what people have to say, survey them accurately, and then deal with the crap that you don't like as opposed to building some surveys that produce the answers you want. Staff need to be paid sufficiently to attend the meetings. One of the reasons staff are not here is they are not paid to sit through three-hour meetings as volunteers. The city needs to budget engagement. Transparency of input is another issue. We have 6,000 public comments that were given on the plan, and we have a plan in which dozens and dozens of specific examples are going to be designed out of the public view by stakeholder comments tat came in behind closed doors. Take the engagement in public. Share the information source.
- CN: The worksheet question about materials is interesting. It is the where, what, and how you would like to see for engagement materials. What methods resonate within the community? Where would you like to see materials, and how should that material be communicated? This was an issue during the plan update. We were not sure we were reaching everybody in a way that got us the information we needed. We got groups of people that had common interests but we did not get a good picture of the views of the general community. One response for "where" from Linda Vista was that there should be dedicated community spaces, and our libraries certainly serve that function, our librarians are really good at working with community groups that make sure outreach material is available. Linda Vista suggests social media places like Nextdoor and X. I have a problem with that suggestion regarding interacting over those two platforms. We should distribute materials to physical sites like libraries, community spaces, and kiosks. Other suggestions?
- JS: We should start by placing material on a UCPG website.
- CN: Yes, when I was filing the CPG recognition papers, one of the things I was asked to do is name five ways you're going to do community engagement. A lot of things I cited were on Linda Vista's list, but one big problem is a lack of understanding regarding how to use the city's website. Where things are located. It takes a lot of skill. When I became chair in 2018, I had no idea how to use the web

site and I had to learn by osmosis. This takes a long time, and if you are doing it all the time, that's one thing but if you need to access the site once a year that's entirely different. You have a lot of things to put on the web site, so it's going to be difficult.

- JS: Another thing is that more and more people engage on their phones.
- CN: That's another thing. It's the accessibility paradigm and I think that is worth looking at.
- GK: There seems to be an effort by the city to engage outside of the UCPG, and that's a good thing. I think they want to access the views of people that are not attending the meetings. I think the libraries and so forth are good, but there should be engagement at community events where people gather. I think there are other places as well, but they are more difficult. I think you start at the UCPG since they are here already and the people attending are engaged and coming to meetings. I think it's a big goal to try to reach others. We had many meetings on zoom that were over 100 people during COVID, so there is an element to what the meeting options are.
- CN: Our councilmember does do many community events, and that matters. That's a well-defined interaction with the community, and the repetitive nature means people now expect to see him at these events. There is value in the repetition. Even though Sit seems like you're not getting new information, I've found it useful.
- JS: Two instances of engagement seem to be well done. The Pure Water Project and the Mid-Coast Trolly. Having regular reports from major construction projects is very important and useful to the community.
- CN: I would agree with that. You have heard Bill Beck's dissatisfaction with the way Vista La Jolla has been treated, but at least there is a forum for making the comments on the record.
- AW; That's a good example of doing it right. They're here consistently, so Bill may have issues that they create and that make people unhappy but Bill can communicate that directly to them and the message gets through and it can be done immediately without delay. This contributes to a sense that people are listening.
- CN: The city asked for a discussion about barriers to community involvement, being able to participate in the city's engagement process, and by extension our engagement process. Linda Vista came up with a good list, including linguistic barriers. It's also an issue of technology to a large extent, and a lack of awareness of the process going on, people occupied with their own lives, and not necessarily focused on planning and city issues. Physical accessibility is an issue; we don't pay very much attention to it, and perhaps we should. Physical accessibility is a hallmark of inclusivity. There is also the economic issue. "I'm working two jobs, or I'm a student and I don't have time for this". These are all reasonable.
- Laurie Paulson (Plan Update Subcommittee Member): When we were going through the planning process, particularly in North UC, I frequently asked people in front of Ralphs if they understood what was going on in the community, and most did not. One resource we have not taken advantage of is that in North UC there are a lot of Homeowner Associations. They have email addresses for all their residents, and they can cascade information to their members quickly.

- CN: I'll say that for the first time since I've lived in my development in North UC, the HOA sent a notice that said the UCPG is holding an election, and here's how you vote. I'm sure Joann instigated this. That's also a method that Bill Beck targeted for UCCA to reach more north UC residents.
- Bill Beck: Yes. I have a small HOA, but I have all their emails. I make sure to blind copy everyone. I think the city should take more interest in us.
- Kelly Lyndon: It might be helpful to make sure that each of the things that are brought up can be captured by the principles. I heard that people can be very frustrated when they make a comment and it's not heard and they don't understand why. I think the city can do a much better job of explaining why they don't accept a comment. Sometimes they just can't, and they must own it. Transparency here says that this should be explained. For the plan update, keeping track of the changes over time might be a better way to help communicate with those making comments.
- CN: This would be better than just ignoring the comment as that's not a positive way of engagement. Denial by absence. Thanks for that particular comment.
- AW: I'd like to follow up with Laurie. I wonder if there are other groups or economic organizations, the workforce, that would be good to engage with. You might not be aware of the plan process because you just work here but you should be part of the process.
- AB: I think there are young professional organizations like CREW or NAOB that are active in the community. Engagement with professional organizations like Biocom would be useful. The question is, "Who is currently missing at meetings?". We don't see professional organizations commenting on the plan at public meetings.
- DK: I think there is a difference between CREW and, say Biocom.
- NdR: Irvine Co. has lots of information about people who come and work here. I was even going to say we have data, not privacy, but we have data showing percentages of people that live in UC and work in our buildings. I think those are the people you should reach out to. There are some possibilities to do outreach to those who live and work in the community, and for those who live here and work nearby. We get this data through technology, cell phones.
- AD: We should not forget schools, with their PTAs, who are a group of engaged parents in the community. If there is a way to get to the parents, this would be a good way to create a dialog going forward.
- LP: It's very hard to reach the parents directly. We should make a list of organizations where notices from the city should go, so there should be a method for cascading the information to them. I'm concerned that when the plan update is released, there will be comments from certain pockets of people that are easier to reach than others. This skews the data and we need to do it fast before the plan comes back.
- CN: This is a lot of useful information. I will formulate a response to the engagement team. They are coming back to CPC this month. I think this is a good way to get ground level information to them. "If you don't ask, you don't get." This is the time to put the input into the system.

- Diane Ahern. Educate UC is holding their Taste of the Triangle event on March 22nd. Educate is doing more engagement this time around. Maybe this is something that UCPG should consider attending.
- CN: A good comment. Carol Urive reminds us that one of the things that would be useful in our own meetings and other gatherings is placards and name tags. Maybe the real estate industry can help with that.
- AW: I'm also reminded that real estate agents put together a welcome package for new buyers, and maybe that could be extended to large rental complexes as well. This is a good way of introducing these people in the beginning and over the next 5 to 7 years, maybe some will participate.

10. **Information Item: Election Results. Results of the 2024 UCPG elections will be presented. Anu Delouri, Membership Secretary, presenting.**
    - AD: The results from our March 12, 2024, UCPG elections are as follows. Thanks to Neil and Jeff Dosick for helping this evening.

Seat	Candidates	Result
R1-B	Georgia Kayser	19 votes
R2-B	Joann Sellick	37 votes
R3-B	Alex Arthur	2 votes
R2-C	Daren Esposito Tim Garrett	Darren Esposito 37 Tim Garrett 1
B1-B	Open	Vacant
B2-B	Open	Vacant
B3-B	Open	Vacant

- CN We will welcome Daren Esposito as a new UCPG voting member (board member) at our April 2024 meeting.

11. **Adjournment:** *Next Meeting will be on April 9, 2024*, **in-person at 9880 Campus Pointe Drive, third floor, Terra Nova Conference Room and on Zoom.** *This will be a hybrid meeting both in-person and on Zoom.*
    - Reminder: The April 9, 2024, UCPG meeting will have some administrative tasks but will have the revised Plan Update and Draft EIR as the single meeting topic.

Prepared by Chris Nielsen