

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes
Hybrid Meeting
May 14, 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
- 2. Community members would like to formally recognize and thank Colonel Bedell for his focus on safety for both military personnel and civilians who live and work in the communities surrounding MCAS Miramar.**

CN: I'm going to ask Ron to come up and give his presentation to Col. Bedell who is ending his Tour of Duty at Miramar.

Ron: We've had the pleasure of knowing Col. Bedell now through his tour here and since he'll be leaving the station, we wanted to take this occasion to present him with a letter of appreciation from CASA (Citizens Advocating for Safe Aviation) for all the things he's done to make our lives better, to make things safer – Reading from the letter: This is CASA (Citizens Advocating for Safe Aviation), we're in University City. The residents of University City sincerely express our appreciation and gratitude we've made our lives better by minimizing noisy, less safe, off-route departures at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar. We realized that this was not a simple task and given that MCAS Miramar handles a lot of transient traffic which may not be familiar with the area and the rules. San Diego is one of the densest air traffic areas in the world and so the discipline airmanship that you've achieved is even more important to Aviation Safety. We appreciate your visits when you come to University City for community meetings as this one is. Your outreach explained the complexity of our airspace to residents and the strong measures being used to ensure compliance with flights. Your patience and ability to communicate is commendable. We also want to thank you for inviting groups of residents from University City to join you in personally leading tours of MCAS Miramar. At each step of the facilities tour, we'd stop, and you'd let the Marines expertly explain their assigned duty, your pride shows. Your initiative, dedication, safety awareness, and person-to-person skills are exemplary and the credit to MCAS Miramar and the US Marine Corps. Thank you.

Col. Bedell: I'd love to say something if you don't mind, thank you. Good evening, everybody, thank you very much for that. I appreciate that very much. I have been here for just under three years and at the end of July, I'm going to be going down to Third Fleet, so I'm staying

in San Diego. I've been telling all my Marine friends that after 27 years I'm finally joining the Navy. I'm really excited about this prospect. I want to share with you that this is one of the most difficult and most important accomplishments of my career because I knew when I got here that there was a problem that was in my pass down. The way it was phrased was not something I agreed with, it was a contentious Us vs. Them. Us being the Marines on the base and them being everyone outside the base. That didn't really make sense because us is all of us, all of us are Americans. The mission of the Marine Corps is to defend our nation and protect everyone so my conception of what the base is not just the base that's inside the perimeter fence, but all of the community around the base. 90% of our families live in the communities all around the base, so it's short-sighted to not be concerned with all of you as part of the base, especially if we're all living together. I really wanted to get after this. I will absolutely invite all of you to come to the base as Ron mentioned in July; we'll try to set up another visit so that when my replacement is here, I can introduce him and make sure that you get your eyes on him. He's also dedicated to safety and to continuing the progress we've made. Three last points I want to make, I just wanted to share some really excited and good news. First Ron mentioned the ability to interact with the Marines on the tour and that the Marines came off looking pretty good. That is the least surprising thing I have heard. I appreciate you are putting that in the letter. I often get asked on tours, 'Did you prep those Marines? Did you pick the right ones?'. Absolutely not. That's not how we do it. We have the finest citizens of our nation serving in the military today and not just in the Marine Corps. It is wonderful. The best part about being a Marine is to be able to work with the Marines and Sailors who are serving all of us and all of you. If you hear anything concerning about the quality of our Marines, Sailors, Airmen, or Soldiers that is not the case. We have the finest who have ever served, and I would love for you to come meet them. I'll share kind of something relevant to the flying course rules. Visiting aircraft were really the main problem, with some notable exceptions, but for the most part the Marines who are stationed here very clearly understand the course rules and apply them very deliberately. It was the visiting units that often would make mistakes, would be flying very close to where we are right now, which is not where they're supposed to be flying. So, I instituted a couple of things. First a face-to-face brief with our Airfield operations officer for every single pilot who came to the air station. You had one landing and then you weren't allowed to fly again until you had had that brief in person. Additionally, every single unit that came the commanding officer or the detachment officer in charge would have to come and sit down with me one-on-one and I would explain to them why it was so critically important that they fly the course because the credibility and the professionalism of the aviators is called into question when they aren't able to find the correct course rules and it's absolutely is a safety concern. In that face-to-face brief I make them sign a memorandum of understanding that they have seen me, and we've talked about this. There were three units after all of that, that failed to apply to course rules, and they are not going to be coming back to Miramar. I've attempted to not just come before you and say, 'I'm telling them and I'm trying, I've done everything I can'. Any other ideas you have, I'm willing to try as well. I'm glad that you've noticed a difference, which is a huge important win for me. The last thing I want to share, in case it's of interest to you, there's a huge amount of effort being spent right now across the Department of Defense on quality-of-life initiatives. On trying to get better barracks for our Marines, and I'm incredibly proud of the work that my team has

done at Miramar getting that right. We've spent about two years fixing the barracks, the administration of the barracks, how we're running the complex, the maintenance, and the command engagement. We're getting it right on that front. I think we are showcasing what's possible for the rest of the Marine Corps, a lot of good things going on at the air station. I think there are a lot of things that you should be very proud of. I would love to come show you those things and let you meet the Marines and take you to the officer's club if you'd want to come afterwards and discuss anything that you've seen. Please put on your calendars the 27-29 of September for the Miramar Air Show, America's Air Show as we have recently rebranded. You would be more welcome to come as well, it'll be busier then, so come on the tour first and you can get a closeup look at the time. The new Commander Col. Eric Herman call sign Peewee. He's a spectacular individual. He's an EA6B electronic countermeasure officer. He's been stationed here at Miramar before and knows the city and the base. He's a very thoughtful, professional officer, and I know him very well.

CN: Thank you, very much.

3. Agenda: Call for additions / deletions: Adoption.

CN: Any additions or corrections to the agenda? None raised.

4. Approval of Minutes: April 9, 2024, minutes.

CN: Any changes, additions or corrections to the

- Motion by Jon Arenz, second by Fay Arvin. Motion carried unopposed.

5. Announcements: Chair's Report, CPC Report

CN: We have already taken care of item 4 which was the formal recognition of Col. Bedell.

- A roster has been turned in to for the UCPG to allow the city to schedule training for all CPG members, including the UCPG. The online live training on May 29th
- The City council will likely approve the new UCPG Operational Procedures ("bylaws") on Monday 21, scheduled for 2pm.
 - An amendment to the CP 600-24 will allow remote attendance of the planning group by voting members without an excuse.
 - A provision of our new UCPG Operational procedures is a new District 4, comprising of the residents of the UC San Diego campus. Our first action on the agenda seeks approval of the timetable of D4 elections.
- The planning commission will meet to consider the University City community draft plan on May 30th at 9am in the council chambers. The council doesn't have anything else on the agenda that day.

- Debbie Knight: Can we hear from Suchi if the final EIR will be out by then?
- Suchi: the final EIR won't be available for the planning commission meeting but there are revisions underway that we are working towards releasing. They are targeting the July 8th for the final EIR.
- Debbie: Does that mean the planning commission will not be recommending approval of the EIR?
- Suchi: Correct, they will not be asked to review the plans and accept public testimony.

6. Presentations:

- **Councilmember Kent Lee (Zach Burton)**

- We are holding a town meeting tomorrow night from 6-8pm
- You can RSVP. It will be the office of independent budget analyst and Councilmember Lee. You can pre-submit questions on the budget and help provide feedback.
 - Zoom user: when and where is the town hall tomorrow?
 - Zach: 9605 Scranton Road.
 - CN: It's adjacent to the Karl Strauss Restaurant

- **Membership Report (Anu Delouri)**

- **Mayor Todd Gloria (Michaela Valk)**

- Report is written and will be sent out to the community.

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

- Sal & Purita Javier: We are victims of toxicity in our neighborhood. Thank you for allowing me to join use this meeting. I am a senior vulnerable taxpayer with a medical existing condition. Ceramics manufacturing and kiln operation has been operating in a home occupation business since 1984 at 5238 Stream View Drive, San Diego California 92105. A Neighborhood dedicated as residential zone. It is known to be producing toxic poison gases from its kiln fumes and other airborne chemicals, and dust. The potential impact to health and safety is real. Starting on June 13, 2021, from the police fire hazards materials department, air pollution control district, City District 9 councilmen office. However, they cannot stop the operation, because the owner has a business permit. Ceramics kiln by code 11 county or municipal or city I mean is exactly the same Revis 2021 at county level followed by the city 2022 rule says, ceramic kiln is exempt. The owner says we have a permit. Npbody could investigate us, nobody could stop us. We have been hospitalized. This should not be in a populated area dedicated as residential zone. I believe it is a violation of five state and local laws. Proposition 65 says, if you

operate industrial activities, you should notify your community, so they could have choices and options. If get clean air to the people.

- Tom Mullaney – I've been involved in community planning for 20 years. This plan is the most excessive plan I've ever seen, in many ways. This plan may have been appropriate 25 years ago. San Diego had a plan forecast that a million people would be added to this region over the period of time. The next series forecast that came out was 700,000, the next time it was 300,000. The forecast now says 15 years the region will grow by about 113,000 between now and 2050. The City of San Diego what's our share? It shows 65,000 more residents between now and 2050. So, take a fair share for this community and it's a few thousand homes. Yet this plan includes enough housing units for 65,000 people. They're saying all the forecast anticipated for the entire city could fit in this one community. It's completely absurd. You might have seen an article by Dr. Richard Carson, UCSD economist, he says this plan and this effort unnecessarily pits residents against students against other kinds of people fearful they won't have enough housing. This article was in the times of San Diego, it shows that whatever housing shortage there might have been no longer exists. The population has been roughly stable since 2015 in spite of the fact that many new homes have been built. What's the danger of excessive zoning, why not plan for tens of thousands of units that are not going to be built? You can plan the infrastructure. Why would you plan water and sewer and electricity and schools and parks and everything? It makes the developer the urban planner; he can buy one portion of one shopping center, but in a huge project and then it's really all the demand for the community for the next five or 10 years. Excessive upzoning is dangerous.

CN: This is on the agenda.

Tom: Okay, so that's on the forecast, the context is that a plan like this is not needed.

CN: I think we have some people on zoom that want to speak to item 8. This is non-agenda public comments, but the timetable will allow for comments on item 8 after public comment.

- Larry Webb: I'm here to speak about Larry Turner. Larry is a retired Marine Corps Lieutenant Colonel, current San Diego Police officer, not a politician. He is a life long independent. He is not beholden to either the Democratic or Republican Party. I'm here because I believe we need a change in the leadership of the City. Under the current mayor, infrastructure citywide has crumbled as a result, thousands lost their home this past January. Despite spending million on it the homeless crisis, the

City has continued to grow, deaths about the homeless population is skyrocketing. The current Mayor has continued to work to remove transparency and public input by trying to remove local planning boards from discussion on building and growth. Larry will work to ensure our infrastructure spending goes to where it is needed, not underused bike lanes and other unneeded projects. He will significantly reduce the homeless population with a compassionate and comprehensive plan that will not include saddling the city and our grandchildren a 35-year billion-dollar warehouse lease. He will prioritize transparency and engage with communities on decisions that impact their lives and respect the needs and concerns of residents. On Tuesday, May 28th Larry will be holding a Larry Listens session in the North University Library from 5:30-8:30. He wants to hear from your community, your concerns, your needs, and give you an opportunity to talk to him one-on-one. Learn about his goals and his plans moving forward with things. I will be here throughout the meeting if anyone has questions. I have come cards and different things and would be happy to talk to anyone after the meeting. Thank you very much.

- Becky Rrap – I'm here to speak to the Seed Program. The Seed Program is the cannabis social equity program that the City has proposed and that would likely expand the number of pot shops by 100%, doubling the number that we currently have in our city. They would be adding an extra 36 and removing sensitive use barriers. I am very grateful that with the new budget that the mayor has put forward he has decided to cut the program completely. I come here because now it is up to the City Council to vote in support of Mayor Gloria's proposal of cutting the seed program. I want to urge you as a parent and a resident to talk to the council member and urge them to support this discussion that the mayor has made in cutting the program. It's obvious that our city is in crisis with drug addiction, homelessness and this is the last thing that we need is to expand the marijuana industry footprint in our city. I encourage you to speak as a Planning Group sending a letter of support or individually to your council member. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

8. Action Item: Approval of a timetable to hold UCPG elections for three residential seats for UCPG District 4, residents of UC San Diego, assuming approval of the new UCPG Operational Procedures and revisions to Council Policy 600-24 by City Council on May 21. Approval of a revised membership form that includes District 4. Chris Nielsen, presenting.

- CN: Proposed timetable:
 - May 21: Council passes ordinances for CPGs. I assume no further changes to our new Operational Procedures occur at council. New Operational Procedures become effective.
 - June 11: I declare the three district 4 residential seats vacant. Since there is more than one vacant seat, an election needs to be held. I appoint an election committee and UCPG establishes the date for the elections.

- September 10: Candidates statements at the UCPG meeting. Deadline for nomination, district 4
 - October 8: Elections at GradLabs 5M-8PM. Anticipate drop-off balloting the week prior for UCPG members. New voting members seated.
- JS: If they are all elected at the same time, will they term out at the same time?
 - CN: No, this time only it will be a one year, two years, and three-year term.
- DE: Since these are likely to be students, what happens when they graduate or possibly move from the neighborhood?
 - CN: If they stay in the UC plan area they are entitled to keep their seat. We expect them to represent their district they were elected from and the entire UC area just like any of the other board members.
- Mina: I'm a first-year student at UC San Diego, I strongly approve this action item. I think it gives students who are residents here for four, five, six years the opportunity to have a voice on the UCPG board and think that's an awesome opportunity that they haven't had before. It incorporates students like me who feel our voices are not as leveraged compared to other long-term residents here. As students we also want to be long-term residents here, so I think this encourages students to get more involved on the UCPG board. I think it provides a great opportunity especially considering the revision to council policy 600-24 allowing residents who are voting board members to join via Zoom or online because at the end of the day we as students can't always make it in person to the board meetings so overall, I strongly approval of this agenda item and I thank you Chris for bringing it Forward.
- Tegan: I'm a first year living on the UCSD campus. I support the provision that introduces this because as a student it allows for my voice and other student voices to have representations. It allows us to be more involved with the community that we live in and that we want to live in in the future. Thank you very much.
- Alex Ross: I'm a representative from UCSD's undergraduate government. We and the student government are excited to get undergraduate students more involved in the local planning process. We've been working really hard at engaging students at the local level and support this provision as it allows students to have a greater voice in their community and we're excited to integrate UCSD students into the Planning Group. We thank you for bringing this forward.
- Dannie Zhu: I'm one of the undergraduate students who support this agenda item. I think it is very critical because one of six residents in the University City area is in fact a student like me who live on campus and we would really appreciate being able to voice our needs and have our needs better integrated into the University City community and become part of the University City Community in the long term. Like Mina mentioned we would really appreciate like having our specific needs integrated with the community. For me personally as a student who lives on campus, I would love to see how our student population can interact and be in this community better and I would also

be interested in running on the board. Thank you for allowing us this opportunity and I'd be very appreciative.

- Masaki Mendoza: I'm a third-year student at UCSD studying math economics and urban planning um echoing previous statements of allowing more participation by students of UCSD. I think allowing for more representative students on campus will give us a greater voice and integrate us better into the community. Many students, especially in the department of urban studies and planning, want to get more involved in the community surrounding our campus and the approved this item to reference to allow UCSD students to have a voice on UCPG, would in my opinion, a benefit to not just students but the community as a whole. I hope the board will adopt the ability for UCSD students to run for position on the board.

Chris Nielson makes a motion to approve, Andy Wise seconds this motion.

- Laurie Phillips – would like to welcome the students but note the community is not afforded very many opportunities to comment on what UCSD is going on the campus, and it does impact our local neighborhoods a lot. I think there ought to be some bidirectional communication.

Unanimously approved – will proceed with timetable following the city council adoption. 11 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain.

9. Action Item: Approval of a revised UCPG comment to City Planning for the second Draft of the University Community Plan and Draft EIR. Andy Wiese and Chris Nielsen, presenting.

- Debby Knight: Procedural question for Suchi. You noted the EIR will be out in early July, will there be revisions to the community plan that will coming to the city council or Land Use and Housing along with the revised EIR? I'm trying to figure out what the state the plan is in and where all these comments be impacting the plan that ultimately goes to City council.
 - Suchi: We are in the process of marking revision for the version that goes to planning commission. Planning commission is 5/30, typically we try to release documents a week beforehand, so around 5/23-5/24. We are trying to capture the public comments in that version, so you will be able to see changes.
 - DE: For example, on 5/1, the public comments were closed on 4/29, the University plan was submitted to the mobility board, did that include public comments?
 - Suchi: We did include comments from the March version.
 - DE: Will the updated draft be presented to the mobility board?
 - Suchi: No
 - Darran: What about the public comments since then?
 - Suchi: The public comments will be captured in the version that goes to the Planning Commission on 5/30.

- JS: Our comments are due tomorrow?
 - CN: Yes, our comments will be submitted tomorrow.
- AW (from Cz Rep): This has been a long process; we have been at it 5.5 years. Those of us who have been involved are quite familiar with the issues. Chris and I have updated the UCPG's Final Report on the Discussion Draft of the Plan from July, 2023, in response to the Draft Community Plan and public presentations held since its release. The 2023 report was adopted unanimously by the UC Plan Update Subcommittee and approved by the Board of the UCPG. You have received a copy of the revised Report, which is a draft. Tonight, I will present some of the key ideas captured in the Report and provide an opportunity to discuss it. After my presentation I will make a motion to approve with the comments. What you see in the report includes a significant amount of the original report in black text with blue text reflecting new language proposed for your approval, and green text reflecting the recommendations we made last year. This presentation will consist of 9 highlighted areas from the updated report.
 - Intro: Plan Update began in 2018 with the selection of a subcommittee including members of the UCPG, representatives from UCSD, MCAS Miramar, community organizations, businesses representatives, and community members. Over 40 meetings over the past five and a half years we have been a consistent voice in the process. We have not just a stake in the but also wisdom, experience and understanding of the issues and offer these recommendations.
 - Strengths of UC Plan:
 - The plan provides an opportunity for robust commercial and residential development in a future UC, a UC that will grow in the next 25-30 years.
 - The plan includes the potential for more housing near transit and jobs in the University Community. This should support our climate action plan and the goals that all of us should share to lessen the carbon footprint for this major job center, residential community, and educational community in University City by allowing people to travel less by car and live closer to their work or school and their daily activities.
 - The plan includes proposed supplemental development regulations (SDRs) which are enforcement measures supplemental to the City municipal code. We asked for an SDR regarding affordable housing requirements above and beyond the City's main code, which the city has included in the Draft Plan.
 - The plan provides the potential for new bike and pedestrian infrastructure including the potential for protected bike lanes on key corridors (note: implementation and funding will be challenging).

- Improved connection between UCSD and UC East Campus along Regents Road and a new promenade feature along Executive Drive that will integrate transportation systems.
- The plan includes more flexibility for development through mixed-use zoning that allows developers to adjust their proposals for development on the land/properties that they control according to the needs of the market.
- The plan includes improved open space protection including proposed dedication of four parcels of City land in Rose Canyon and the Sorrento Valley Headlands, which the UCPG supported.
- The plan includes the potential for three new linear parks.
- The plan includes on-site requirements for urban public spaces in commercial and residential developments.
- The plan includes the possibility for shopping centers to be revitalized.
- It does not rezone single-family residential areas.
- It does not include the high-density “Scenario 1” as a part of the plan. However, this scenario was brought back for study in the EIR.

UCPG Recommendations incorporated in the Draft UC Plan

- Chris and I would both like to thank the Planning Department, Suchi, Nathan, Coby, Tait, and Heidi for their incorporation of a wide range of recommendations that the UCPG made last year to the Discussion Draft. These include:
 - Better transition between low to medium density housing and new development in adjoining commercial plazas.
 - It includes SDRs expanding inclusive housing in UC and
 - The rescoring of parks and recreational value for UC, which gives a more accurate base to understand and plan for our recreational needs.
 - It provides opportunity for a new neighborhood park. We appreciate the creative proposal for Torrey Pines Neighborhood Park on City-owned land west of North Torrey Pines Road.
 - It clarifies the status of Weiss Eastgate Park and the JCC facilities. We don’t like the answer, but it is clarified.
 - The plan solidifies the dedication of 4 open space parcels.
 - It includes policies and language to protect against bird strikes.
 - It improves new language on stormwater regulations.
 - Includes improved language related to biodiversity and native landscaping.
 - It improves MSCP adjacency regulations and supports the Gilman Drive open space and Coastal Rail Trail.
- Summary of recommendations/topics of concern:
 - Affordable Housing:
 - Housing affordability was a significant concern throughout the plan update process.

- The draft UC plan shows a potential for approximately 30,000 new housing units, a substantial increase over the existing 1987 plan. The draft includes an inclusionary housing requirement specific to UC, which the UCPUS and UCPG supported. The Draft plan estimates an increase of 72,000 new jobs and a potential doubling of the residential and commercial density in University City over the next 25-30 years.
- Recommendations in the Report include support for UC-specific affordable housing regulations above the citywide requirements.
- The UCPG also recommended an alternative community planning scenario, based on the model of the Mesa Nueva housing development on the UCSD East Campus (145 du/ac). This scenario would provide space for 22,000 new housing units and 55,000 jobs. We believe this scenario better meets the goals of the Plan Update with a better balance between growth and infrastructure the environment, and future quality of life.
- The Report recommends that this scenario should be studied as one of the feasible alternatives as part of the F-EIR so that decision makers have an opportunity to fairly assess it.
- We note that UCSD is concurrently developing ~ 10,000 new housing units during the Plan update period, contributing significantly to the overall housing supply. Including these developments, either land use scenario would provide opportunity for more new housing in UC than any recent community plan update.
- Displacement of housing and community-serving retail/services and additional Density with limited parks
 - The community is also concerned about the potential displacement of community-serving retail due to rezoning and changes in land use/intensity.
 - In the Nobel/Campus area, the two commercial plazas (WholeFoods and Ralphs/Trader Joes), the Report reflects concern that the proposed zoning and land use designation of Employment Mixed Use (EMX) will lead predictably to the displacement of affordable housing and community serving retail in the location where these uses are most suited and needed. These are the two largest community serving retail sites in North University City. They serve students and residents of UC and La Jolla Planning Areas and are the best location for future housing growth and the retail to serve it. EMX will

unnecessarily put housing and retail in competition with higher value uses such as tech and bio-tech without the requirement that any housing or retail be built on these sites. We note recent closure of grocery/retail at Costa Verde under just such pressure.

- The Report recommends that these two commercial plazas be designated “Community Village” with a potential zone of CC 3-9 to ensure that housing and retail remain the primary uses on these sites. If the city is serious about building new housing in UC, it should zone for it in this location.
- At the SW corner of Nobel/Genesee: The UCPG recommends that the city rezone with lower intensity to preserve affordability and strengthen anti-displacement protections for renters in apartment developments with the most affordable housing in the plan area.
- UCPG is also concerned with impacts of new developments on surrounding neighborhoods.
- The UCPG recommends better protection for community-serving retail and smoother transitions between new developments and existing residences, including density and height limits for the University Square and Sprouts Plaza, reference SDR C1.
- The Report identifies issues with SDR H1 (for smaller sites) and H2 (for larger sites) in terms of their applicability and impact on community commercial plazas. SDR H1 appears to apply to no properties in UC. We recommend revising and consolidating these regulations in terms of their applicability and impact on the commercial plazas.
- The UCPG would also like to see alignment between the plan guidelines for redevelopment of the commercial plazas and the visual models presented in the Draft and throughout the update process, especially regarding heights, setbacks, and overall density.
- The UCPG is also concerned with the large deficit in parks and recreational facilities relative to the population increase. The Plan projects a deficit of ~4,100 park points (facilities for 41,000 people). We recommend that the City meets Parks Master Plan standards to ensure adequate recreational spaces for future residents.
- In addition, the UCPG is concerned that the proposed “linear parks” be developed and maintained as *parks* (and not as “greenways” managed by the transportation department).

- Generally, the community is concerned about the potential overbuilding without adequately addressing the community needs for parks and retail.
- Sustainability
 - We acknowledge and appreciate the City's adoption of the policies related to native landscaping and protection of wildlife corridors. It can go further.
 - We'd like to emphasize University City's unique position in the most biodiverse metropolitan area in North America and the need to leverage and protect this environment. We recommend further enhancing these provisions to better reflect and promote the biodiversity of the area.
 - We appreciate the City's support in dedicating open space parcels under the Miramar airport flight paths for future green belt. City must correct inconsistency between the plan description and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) regarding these parcels before the ordinance is finalized.
 - We appreciate the City including options for native trees in the street tree palette and advocate for expanding the use of native trees in University City, drawing parallels with successful implementations in other California communities like Palo Alto. We recommend increasing the planting of native trees for environmental and aesthetic benefits, emphasizing their adaptability and reduced water needs (see recommendations for parkways, corridors, and streets adjacent to open space).
 - The community is concerned with the recent revision to the SDR affecting developments adjacent to the canyon edge. The current version sharply narrows the application of these guidelines to just a few properties (and about 200 linear feet in the Plan area as a whole). UCPG recommends a return to the more inclusive approach of the Discussion Draft to better protect against wildfire risks, preserve open space canyons and views, and enhance environmental sustainability.
- Mobility & Implementation
 - Community concern over road diets and street streamlining, particularly on Governor Drive and other thoroughfares. The UCPG is requesting updated traffic studies (last conducted in 2015) before finalizing these changes. Additionally, we would like to advocate for the prioritization of continuous bike lanes and comprehensive bike infrastructure. There needs to be a clear plan for financing and implementing the

infrastructure improvements to support the new developments noted in this plan sustainably.

- Andy Wiese moves that the UCPG Board adopt the updated Report and Recommendations to the City of San Diego related to the draft University City Community plan.
 - CN seconds the motion
- Melanie Cohn: I have been a member of the Community Plan Update Subcommittee since its Inception and I want to be very clear for the public record that Andy's comments do not represent a consensus of that committee. I've been a minority voice often personally attacked in these meetings and outside of them for advocating for housing options for UC San Diego students who are interested in staying in San Diego to work in the life science industry and for young professionals in this industry who cannot find any housing within a reasonable distance from their employers or potential employers in this industry. These people often do not have the time or resources to devote hours each month to these meetings, but their interests do deserve attention. The plan update committee has never been representative of the diversity of this community. The city's data as collected through this process and outlined in the community atlas shows that 79% of this community is under 50 years of age and 53% is non-white. The survey that Andy referred to, the response there showed that a majority of residents in this area want more density this process has been dominated by single-family homeowners in a specific demographic many have owned their homes in South UC for many years, and I wonder if they would be able to afford a home in this community in today's market. Over the past few years, especially over the past 18 months, the number one highest concern we hear from life science employers is housing related to their ability to attract and retain employees. The life science industry is providing good-paying jobs with upward mobility to people of every background and every level of education. These people deserve the ability to own a home in a community that has great potential for growth, especially in the area of 80 to 150% of area median income. It is a disingenuous narrative to require a high percentage of covenant-restricted affordable housing. This high requirement would automatically make housing projects unfeasible to gain financing. These comments are meant to restrict density via requiring an impossible number of affordable units. Young people from UC San Diego and young professionals are the future of the city's highest concentration of good-paying jobs and they deserve the opportunity to live here and to afford housing in the future. Thank you.
- Tom Mullaney: What a tremendous presentation by Andy. I've been to some of the subcommittee meetings and a lot of thought has gone into this. As far as the overall density, I think the plan that Andy recommended, the alternative, is a high-density plan. In fact, it would provide almost half of all the forecasted density for the City, so it is a high-density plan. I don't think anyone would be deprived of a home. The phrase has been used "pushing on stream", you can't get developers to build more than they think there's demand for it. You've seen that the Riverwalk project in Mission Valley is on hold for a year or two.

Vacancies downtown are high. Landlords in many places in the City are now offering incentives. There's a slowdown. But again, let's consider the long-term SANDAG forecast is only 65,000 people and even the lower levels of this plan would accommodate close to that. You want to mention parks, so even if you didn't add 65,000 people, even 10,000 people, in this plan, where would the soccer fields and baseball fields go? Where would the picnic areas go? Would there be a good golf course in place? This plan does not provide enough land with parks, and it's not that hard, you can collect impact fees and you can obtain land. It just takes the will to do that. I strongly support the notion to get more parkland. The week after this plan is approved, whatever plan it is, developers can go forward any place they want in the whole community without the guarantee that facilities would match that, would keep pace. This plan is lacking some kind of phasing to make sure that that public facilities keep pace with development. I want to caution the group about recommending approval with conditions. Our planning department always forgets the conditions. What this really needs is to reject the plan until the changes that have been recommended are incorporated. The alternative plan appears to be a wonderful plan that the plan the City should adopt. I have one more comment about the City council. Council Member Kent Lee needs to be approached again. Your Councilmember either can support the community's version of the sound plan with the proper parks and setbacks or he'll wind up being the villain of University City. The City's tendency is to force through these plans, saying we're out of time and we're out of budget. This is a 20–30-year plan that shouldn't be forced through. Thank you.

- JS: I'd like to get clarification on what the motion is. I thought we were moving to approve this.
 - CN: We are.
 - Joann Selleck: does the motion also incorporate the rejection of the draft plan unless it includes our 70-page analysis.
 - Andy Wiese: No, there's not a recommendation to approve or disapprove the Plan, as it is a draft. There hasn't been a final draft, and I think it's bad policy to vote on a draft.
- Jeff Heuter: To cut to the punchline, and then I'll explain why. I think in our community plan update, you should have an ordinance override to suspend Complete Communities Housing Solutions in the University City. Even your most aggressive plan, say you put in 50,000 housing units, we've done a review of all the zoning in San Diego including UC and you can already put over 200,000 units in University City without doing anything to your plan. We've gone through a lot of work to develop a plan that's actually 1/4 the size of what's already available under the existing zone now. Why not just leave it that way"? Because how it does it is very disadvantageous. You can't plan for townhouses for example because the threshold is 20 units per acre. If you look at what's possible in the UC area with the 8.0 FAR which is the highest allowance in your Complete Communities, you take the Sprouts you can put about 375 units per acre on that site. That's higher than anything you've talked about today and it means if you want to make that townhouse or some other low-density use, you

won't be able to do it. Regardless of what you think about narrowing the street, if you're going to put 3,000 units, 10,000 people, on that site that changes all your infrastructure, all your traffic assumptions, and everything else. You've undone that part of the plan. You've done a lot of work on affordable housing, the percentage of affordable housing you get from Complete Communities Housing is small, single digits. Complete Communities is a way to undermine the inclusionary housing ordinance of San Diego and make sure that we don't meet our affordable housing needs. You put a lot of work into the commercial planning at these sites well, Complete Communities tries to put the most amount of housing on the least amount of space which discourages creating neighborhood residential walkable communities. Everything you think you're trying to do with this plan is sabotaged by Complete Communities. Why do we have Complete Communities? It was an emergency measure because our community plan update process was so far behind, but as we do our community plan updates, we should be setting Complete Communities aside, so the community plan updates actually do the work they're intended to do. I would recommend that you add suspending Complete Communities as it applies to the UC area through the next RNHA cycle and second significantly raise the threshold for Complete Communities. For this area, it should be 75 to 100 before you add on the additional so you get a reasonable percentage of affordable housing similar to what you get with inclusionary housing and then you could get rid of the 8.0 FAR which is based on people flying over Rose Canyon from UCSD for example. There are several things you can do, but I think just suspending Complete Communities would be the right thing to do. Thank you.

- Debby Knight: Can I ask if people understand exactly what Jeff means by suspending Complete Communities?
- Jeff Heuter: I would say it shouldn't be applicable in the UC Area
- Debby Knight: It's a City-wide policy that allows for a significant increase in density in exchange for certain things. So basically, disallow Complete Communities because we are getting the density by the plan which is probably better in terms of what it provides for the community. Is that what you're saying?
- Jeff Heuter: Yes. Complete Communities is a random overlay of density on a community plan. Whereas you've done a lot of up zoning in specific areas you plan for certain things to happen in certain places including commercial you tried to put together a sensible plan for affordable housing it just blows all that up. Again, Complete Communities was meant to be an emergency measure to get housing production going in San Diego because it's been a long time since we've done our community plan updates. As we go through our community plan updates, those should determine how communities evolve, not some random overlay that's City wide.
- Joanne Selleck: So, what you mean is that Complete Communities can come in and preempt all the other good stuff.

- Jeff Heuter: All the stuff you've put on the board today and presented is overridden by Complete Communities. Your 40ft height, your density per acre, your setbacks, your park spaces, your affordable percentages all goes out the window.
 - Debby Knight: That's probably what we are getting at the Nobel Drive (cor Genesee) parcel right now. Two 30 stories and a 40 story because they're going to skate underneath the rezone of this plan.
- Nancy Groves: I just had a question for Andy. I think this wonderful analysis it was very helpful. I had gone through it before but having him walk us through it really helped a lot. You didn't say anything about the Costa Verde Shopping Center. I'm really concerned about that. Will there be a grocery store or pharmacy? If they are going to build stuff, we should be able to look at it again and comment.
 - CN: I received notice of a future decision having to do with the extension of time on this project so I believe they will be bringing it to the UCPG for discussion in either June or July. I haven't had time to contact their counsel yet, but we'll set up a date for them to explain what their intent is with the property.
- Charlie Wright: I want to say I support and applaud the revised comments to the plan. I'm particularly grateful for the request on page 15 to incorporate the UCPG's recommendation for consistent Zoning for religious institutions. Thank you. I also want to bring your attention that in section six which is mobility, beginning on page 21, the specific recommendation for a new bicycle connectivity in item D. which is John Hopkins to Science Park Road and item C which I Genesee to Campus Point Court but that contrasts with the generalized recommendation for new traffic studies for Genesee, Nobel Drive, and La Jolla Drive in item A. I would recommend adding a specific recommendation to item A that the new traffic studies include converting Governor Drive from four lanes to a two-lane with continuous buffered bike lanes. I also would recommend that we strike the next to last statement in item A which begins with the traffic study with similar conditions because it is redundant to the first item in item A which begins with the city should complete a new traffic study. Thank you.
- Jennifer Dunaway: I appreciate all the comments that went into the presentation today. I agree with many of them, I just wanted to provide a few reminders on the recreation center discussion. The new recreation centers need to be where the population increases are going. Torrey Pines really isn't where the population densities are going to be increased and besides the Torrey Pines new recreation center, no other new recreation centers were provided in the plan. I'm very concerned because the recreation centers are already very busy. My family uses them, and we can see the impacts to them now. With the increase in population, I cannot imagine what it would be like. The mobility, if you recall the UC Peep's lawyer at one of the last meetings this past spring mentioned that the egress in terms of emergencies was considered by the city using the current roadways, not on the road diets that the city is proposing. Like Charlie brought up, I think a new analysis needs to be done. We all want to be able to escape if

there is an emergency, fire, earthquake, etc. and we don't want to be stuck on the roadway like what happened in Lahaina back in last August where people were stuck on the roads. In their car, they burned to death. The last thing I was going to mention is the community-preferred scenario that many of us commented on, a lot of our comments were integrated into that community-preferred scenario. We felt like we were having input and the City discarded that in this analysis. At the April 9th meeting I asked Ms Lukes the question about what happened to that scenario and why it was thrown out. The answer that we received at that time was that she needed to regroup on that answer. What is the barrier to providing a transparent answer since this is a City document? Thank you.

- Joanne Selleck: Andy, I'd like to hear your comments about the suggestion that we request the suspension of Complete Communities.
 - Andy Wiese: I haven't given it any consideration so I'm still thinking about it. If that's something people on the Board want to talk more about and consider what those arguments might be. I don't think I have a specific position on that. I'm not necessarily opposed to it.
 - Joanne Selleck: Would you consider an amendment to your motion?
 - Andy Wiese: potentially, would depend on what it would be.
 - Joanne Selleck: I'll propose that as an amendment.
 - Andy Wiese: Do you want to draw it up and then we can circle back to talk about the specific amendment.
 - Debby Knight: I 100% agree with Jeff and think it would be a very good idea to put that in there. Especially because we're seeing Complete Communities in that disastrous plan for the Nobel/Genesee site. That's exactly the problem with the Complete Communities, and now that the City has spent five and a half years doing our plan update and putting in something we don't agree with at all but at least it's been through some kind of thoughtful process by the City planners with a lot of help, I'm sure, from every property owner up there. I think Jeff's suggestion of suspending Complete Communities from our plan area because we assume we do have a new plan makes a lot of sense. One other thing, is anyone going to speak to the Parks and Rec board?
 - Chris Neilson: I am.
 - Debby Knight: Good, I can't go. But it seems to me that our plan is too dense. SANDAG's demographers' study and project future growth, they are projecting a total of 66,000 more people in 2050. Our plan is predicting 66,000 more people for our little plan area. That's what SANDAG says the whole City will be, clearly our plan is over-projected. It's denser than it needs to be, and it's reflected as Andy pointed out in the fact that it's massively under-parked. The City is now planning to have nowhere near enough parks for everyone. If you're talking about planning, you know your infrastructure is a key part of it. It's totally out of whack and the discussion draft the City committed to studying, the community version of the plan through their EIR process, and they did not do that. However, it states in the discussion draft that

the community version of the plan was alternative B, I think called then would be studies through the EIR phase.

- Linda Beresford: I'm a member of the community organization Help Save UC. While I support a reasonable increase in housing, I oppose the plan update and the unreasonable and significant increase in density proposed for the community. While the City proposes to more than double the community's population, the City proposes no new significant parks and cannot guarantee the upgrades in transportation and emergency services that will be necessary to support twice the population. I support the comments on the draft UC plan prepared by the Planning Group. Thank you very much to Andy and all the Planning Group members for their work putting these comments together I particularly support the Planning Group's recommendations to improve the SDR for Canyon adjacent developments. I also support the recommendations regarding the changes for the University Marketplace and University Square shopping centers regarding the reduction of height limits the reduction of proposed densities and increased setbacks to adjacent properties. A minimum of one parking space per dwelling unit must be required at both locations for future residential projects and a minimum of 80% of built ground floor square footage should be community-serving retail at these locations. I also think the proposal to suspend the application of Complete Communities is appropriate so that the plan update reflects what will occur and that we don't end up with something totally different than what we've spent five and a half years actually planning. Last, I urge the Planning Group members to support these changes to the plan update and lobby the City to put off all hearings before any committees or the Planning Commission until the city has completed its response to comments on the DEIR and issued the final EIR. It is outrageous for any of these committees to consider the Plan update in the absence of the final EIR at which time I think everyone at the City who reviews that document will realize that a. the EIR is fully inadequate. The proposed plan update is overly dense causing unnecessary harm to the environment. Thank you.
- Chris Margraf: I just had a few comments about some pedestrian and cyclist safety that I noticed in the plan. I'd like to input a comment for additional pedestrian protection at every lead pedestrian interval on that list adding no turn on red signs, no yield on left turn yield on green, and allowing for four-way Crossing and not three-way with the little chain across the fourth direction. Those crossings are in high-traffic areas that they've identified, and people should be able to cross where they see fit. Additionally, reclassifying all class three bike lanes which offer no protection to the cyclist to class two bike lanes which offer paint at the very least if not a buffer zone. Additionally, specifying that all class four bike lanes include additional protection beyond Flex posts as they do not provide adequate cyclist protection. If there's a car going about 50 miles an hour to your left and they happen to hit a flex post that is not going to protect you against a 3,000-plus pound car. Protection can include curbs, parked cars between moving cars, bike planes, or other solid objects that will prevent a collision between a cyclist and a moving car. These improvements will also protect pedestrians on the sidewalk. One additional comment about the plan, I

appreciate the work that went into reflecting the alternate views and the overall plan. I would like to echo Melanie's comments from earlier; the UCPG's views are not representative of the community as a whole and do not represent the diversity of the community in San Diego. University City is growing not shrinking and this additional demand must be accounted for unless we want more people to be forced into homelessness and priced out of their existing homes. The views of the elderly who bought their homes when housing was cheap and plentiful do not represent the views of those who have their whole lives ahead of them and would like to remain in the area. Increasing supply will lower demand and allow for more affordability integrating retail and workplaces into these higher-density areas, especially in an area like University City. Great transit connections like the Blue Line will reduce reliance on cars helping to meet climate goals. We should be planning for the future of the city and not the past and enabling an equitable, affordable, sustainable, bikeable, walkable and overall, more livable community.

- Bargiora Goldberg - The city proposed 30,000 new units. Why did we come back with 10,000? I read our response that's like going to war and yielding one-third of the territory before the fight even started. California is a state that has a shrinking population, not much, but 200,000 a year. San Diego is not growing much. If you look at the projection for the for the next two decades, the metropolitan San Diego is almost 3.5 million people and they're talking about less like 1%. To add 60,000-70,000 units, I think that Andy corrected today the number is preposterous, it's probably criminal to even suggest it. I don't understand why we even offer them 10,000 units more. We should have talked about negotiating this thing in the future when it comes to it and not to start already, we already gave back we gave up 10,000 units before even fighting it. Thank you very much.
- Kathleen Amaya: I wanted to echo some of the other sentiments regarding the concerns of the narrowing Governor. A couple of weeks ago the 5 was closed during normal traffic between 8-9am. The traffic on Governor and in South UC was ridiculous, so I can only imagine if that's normal traffic during an emergency it would be impossible to leave this area and have everyone evacuate properly. Having two kids to drop off and pick up is already crazy and a lot of those students are choice students from other areas that are parents driving in. I'm a UCSD Alum and when I was at UCSD I tried to be without a car and taking the bus to get to my doctor's appointments would take an hour and 15 minutes when it's a 15-minute drive, so I ended up bringing my car down. I think you need to address the issues of trolley accessibility. It has improved since I was at UCSD. The reality is people moving into the housing we're adding won't be taking a bus to places. They are going have a car in Southern California unless you provide meaningful transit solutions like the trolley that gets you somewhere quickly. People taking the bus is not a viable solution unless you increase the express bus routes and expand the trolley line. I think that needs to be looked up before meaningfully increasing density in places that are transit corridors. Having cars as the primary mode of transposition in these

densely populated transit corridors is going to lower the quality of life and it's not going to be a desirable place to live. Thank you very much.

- Georgia Kayser: I just wanted to support the revised comments that Andy brought together. I want to thank the many different community members who have been involved in this process and the many different community organizations that have formed because of this process to help formulate and create these comments. A significant amount of effort from many people who work full-time jobs has gone into creating these comments and that comes from this entire community, so I just want to thank all those people. In listening to community feedback, I just want to reiterate a few comments that I know Andy has elaborated on in many ways, but I have heard from many different community members. I just want to say again that we really need the City to hear this, the University City 30-year plan is really a University City plan and not a San Diego plan that is put on University City. I do think that there have been some big comments made by the community members again and again about the scale of residential development in the UC Marketplace in the University Square area. It is too great for this community especially if there are 10 stories or more. The community really would like to have the 100-foot height limit reduced. The community wants to see the community serving retail preserved. The Parks and Recreation areas should grow proportionally to new population growth plan scenarios. We need to plan protected parking at the new planned residential developments.
- Susan Baldwin: The affordable housing proposal that's in the plan appears to only apply to the CPIOZ area which isn't the entire community. Is that true? Shouldn't it apply to the entire community?
 - Andy: It does only apply to CPIOZ area, which covers most of the area subject to major redevelopment. The plan is in line with the group's recommendation.
- Chris Nielsen: I'm going to summarize a few things brought up:
 - (1) Suspension of Complete Communities
 - a. Andy Wiese: I will accept the amendment to recommend suspending application of Complete Communities in the UC planning area. We can incorporate this into section 10.
 - (2) Bike lanes – move class 2 to class 4.
 - a. Andy Wiese: I'm supportive of the protective bike lanes, we could incorporate those ideas into our motion.
 - b. Chirs Margraf: I will email my comments.
 - (3) 80% community retail on ground floor
 - a. Andy Wiese: We recommended 25% GAF in lieu of the 80% of the ground floor. That issue is addressed in the report just addressed in a different way.
- Chris Nielsen: The motion on the floor is to accept the comments as presented except for adding the language on class two and class four bike lanes and to add a comment to section 10 having to do with the suspension of the Complete Communities program.
 - Motion Passes Unanimously: 11 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain, Chair not voting.

-
- Suchi Lukes – The planning commission process will accept public testimony on the DEIR and be asked to recommend the plan.
 - Debby Knight: Will they vote on the DEIR.
 - Suchi Lukes: Yes, they will be asked to take action over the comments closed on April 29th. The revised version will be released on July 8th and in that version, there will be the subcommittee scenario, but it will not be available for the Planning Commission meeting so they're voting on the comments on the Draft EIR.
- Chris Nielsen:
 - Joanne Selleck has graciously gone through a substantial portion of the DEIR and come up with a set of comments that we can use to give the UCPG comment. We object to the DEIR having three large plans at one time, particularly when they're going to be considered as a package with the actual plans. The objection to the aspirations mentioned in the executive summary. Specific comments having to do with data and scenarios that are out of date for the current traffic conditions and future projections, the 2015 counts for Governor for example are inadequate. The DEIR should explain the criteria used in the selections of the alternatives to be named. Comments note that the community scenario has not been used and question how the alternatives were selected to be analyzed. Comments note that the impacts of the UC San Diego housing buildout need to be studied by the DEIR. The DEIR should discuss the environmental impacts the choices in setbacks and transition planes adjacent to canyons and open spaces. It should also address visual impacts lighting and bird strike preventions. The comments on the impacts on biological resource should be analyzed along with the deficiency in parks in open spaces. Specific comments to housing and any displacement should study the adequacy of fire protective measures that would affect the DEIR's conclusion for the climate action plan and transit use. The DEIR should also explain the environmental impacts of increasing population without available local school opportunities. The impacts of a reduction in retail space as an environmental factor in transportation and GHG analysis. The DEIR should study the additional development without the associated infrastructure in a worst-case scenario.
 - CN makes a motion to accept the comments as a recommendation to the City. Carol Uribe seconds the motion. The motion is unanimously approved. 9 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain.

10. Adjournment: *Next Meeting will be on June 11, 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.*