UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes
Hybrid Meeting
October 10, 2023

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),** Nancy Graham (NG-City of SD Planning).

1. **Call the Meeting to Order: Chris Nielsen, Chair.** Chair CN at 6:08 pm

   CN: Welcome to UCPG meeting for October 10th. This is a hybrid meeting – we have a zoom and in person audience. We thank everyone for coming in person and the link to the Zoom will be posted on the UCCA website in a day or two.

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

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

   CN: Request motion to adopt?

   - *Motion to adopt the agenda by AW/ 2nd by KMar.*

   CN: Any objections? None raised. The agenda is approved by acclamation.

3. **Approval of Minutes: July 11, 2023, minutes, August 1, 2023, minutes, September 12, 2023, minutes.**

   CN: We have three (3) sets of agenda minutes. We will go through each, one at a time for people to raise concerns/additions:

   - CN: July 11, 2023: Are there any additions/corrections?
     - KMar asked if corrections she provided were included. CN responded yes and that AW made series of corrections to statements he made also and those changes are also included.
     - CN: The July 11th meeting is important because it is where we approved the final comments on discussion draft of the plan update and we want these as accurate as possible. I will entertain a motion to approve.
       - *Motion to approve the revisions discussed and included by KMar motion/ 2nd by CU.*

- *CN: Any opposed, any abstentions. None Raised.*
- *CN determined approved unanimously.*

- CN: August 1, 2023: Any corrections/changes? None Raised. Will entertain motion to approve?
  - *Motion to approve by KMar / 2ⁿᵈ by CU.*
    - CN: Any opposed? Any abstentions?
      - AW: I abstain as I was absent from that meeting.
    - *CN: Motion passes unanimously, with AW abstaining for absence.*

  - CN: September 12, 2023: Any additions/corrections? None Raised. Will entertain motion to approve?
    - *Motion to approve by AB motion 2ⁿᵈ by FA.*
      - CN: Any opposed? Any Abstentions?
        - CA: I abstain as I was absent from that meeting.
      - *CN: Motion passes unanimously, with CA abstaining for absence.*

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

CN: Provided overview on agenda topics. UCPG had booth at Oktoberfest and signed up 3 additional members. Based on the results, it appears our efforts are better spent on the 4ᵗʰ of July celebration, rather than Oktoberfest. Thank you to AB and CU who staffed the booth for the event and to Keith Jenne of the University Community Plan Update Subcommittee who did set up and tear down and also provided. The next UCPG meeting is on November 14ᵗʰ. The UCCA has an early meeting in November and there is a late UCPG meeting in November. We may need to schedule a UCPG meeting for December 12ᵗʰ for any unfinished business needing to be completed by the end of the year, but the date is to be determined.

5. **Information Item: City digital information systems. People in San Diego should be able to get information, access resources, and request services from the City easily. City employees also deserve easy-to-use technology and optimized processes to effectively serve customers. This draft strategy identifies gaps in how the City of San Diego currently serves people, suggests tangible ways to improve, and provides long-term recommendations to meet - and ultimately exceed - customer expectations. Moriah Gaynor, City of San Diego, presenting.**

   - Alex Hempton: City of San Diego Performance and Analytics Group. Thank you for allowing us to present tonight, with me is Marcus Lostracco, Program Coordinator, Moriah Gaynor Program Coordinator, and Kirby Brady Chief Innovative Officer and Director. We strive to provide excellent customer

service in simple and easy ways. Along with that, we need to provide employees with strong digital platform to support those customers. We are excited to present to you to night and to receive feedback through online survey.

- Marcus Lostracco: Will present the core values & guiding principles which will are lasting values and principles guiding us for the next 10-15 years:
  - <u>Three (3) Core Values:</u> (1) Accessible from digital means (i.e. language/display/easy to pull up). One example of this is reserving a pickleball court – our goal is to help you easily make that reservation. (2) Reliable: Trust the resource which means that the reservation will be there when you arrive at the court. (3) Gratifying: Having people feel good about the experience and to become a net promoter to advocate for that service and to tell others to use it too.
  - <u>Guiding Principles</u>: (1) Human centric design – industry accepted standard for digital tools – what updates should they receive (2) Wholistic Digital Innovation – taking digital first approach – not only make front end user portal, but on the backend employees are empowered with state of the art tools to make that connection to the person interacting with the city (3) Harmonized Service Delivery – synchronizing customer experience – aligning with other digital services that exist across the board. For example, if you reserve a pickleball court, maybe you will receive an email in advance to let you know there is a paving project going on and parking might be tight**.**
- Moriah: The Recommendations are how we plan to achieve this and ensure those recommendations are actionable, trackable, and show progress. The ways we do that are:
  - <u>Living CX Report Card</u>: Index all services in the city and catalog how often they're used and how good they are so we can track their usefulness.
  - <u>No Wrong Front Door</u>: You can know how to get to where you are and ensure you're not getting dead-end pages and that the system is working together as one system.
  - <u>Drive process improvements with CX feedback</u>: Ensure we're getting feedback and people can let us know how we did. And we need to ensure employees are reading it and responding to it.
  - <u>Technology to enhance equity</u>: The digital divide was created because of technology – so we want to focus on outreach, marketing in lower represented communities, and ensure digital means are being used in less tech areas.

- Please visit: htpps://:sandiego.gov/digital-engagement-plan to look at the plan, read a few vignettes, and let us know your thoughts on whether this is something you want to see the city progress in the future.
- CN: Any questions?
  - AW: The City has the "Get it Done" App and various city websites – will the city have a single unified customer experience? Will all the city websites be revised/connected/uniformly done?
    - Alex: With the digital strategy, the goal is to make sure whatever digital service the city is providing - it is simple/easy to use and follows the principals in this document.
    - Moriah: We found that the city is siloed when it comes to digital technology, so each department maintains its own website. This would be implemented citywide so you can expect the same level of service across various departments.
  - CN: Do you have buy-in from development services?
    - Alex: These initiatives would require investment in future budget seasons, but to get the ball rolling we wanted to get aligned for this approach/values in the future and ask, "Do these guiding principles make sense?"
  - AW: I am having trouble figuring out who the customer is in this approach? Will this singular approach include feedback to departments?
    - Moriah: Appreciate the feedback about customers: it could be a resident or business owner, but if the term is confusing, we can make some changes there. Do you mean, is this something that you could use to provide feedback to your representative on policy issues?
      - AW: All around, but yes, more about policy. Yes, its good to be able to reserve a pickleball court, but also there's a need to provide input on new policy and general operations on government.
        - Alex: In the strategy now, one of the goals is that every city service should have a feedback loop – primarily service request oriented.
        - Moriah Gaynor: This would not be a platform for policy, it would be more tied to specific actions tied to governance/operation of the city.
  - AW: The idea of bringing all departments together makes a great deal of sense. The Get It Done app does not include open space areas and some departments are missing. Some departments don't have access to

maps - so they can't address these concerns. To the extent you can integrate and fix in one single place that would be great.

6. **Presentations:**
   - **Councilmember Kent Lee (Zach Burton)**
     - Zach Burton: Thank you to KMar, GK, and Jeff Dosick for arranging the delivery of the CIP letter. We had a meeting about 1.5 weeks ago with the Director of Policy for the Councilmember's Office and Michaela Valk from the Mayor's office and their policy representative. It seemed like there was some positive movement on bike lanes and mobility concerns that the UCPG board shared, so we appreciate the time/engagement. There is also a mattress recycling program at Miramar landfill that provides help with unloading. This takes place on Convoy from 7am – 4pm M-F. The D-6 office is hosting a prescription Drop Off on October 28th at Miramar. You can see our website for more info but generally includes an opportunity to drop off/dispose of expired/unneeded prescriptions partnering with pharmacy. Any questions/comments?

   - **Plan Update Subcommittee (CN)**
     - CN: Not much to say on this, other than the latest information on the City website indicates that EIR and the update to the discussion draft will be released after the first of the year. The Planning Department decided not to do any document release over the holidays.
       - JS: Any news on affordable housing?
         - CN: We have been told that will happen simultaneously with the release of the revised Discussion Draft and EIR.

   - **Mayor Todd Gloria (Michaela Valk)**
     - CN: Michaela is not here but will be at UCCA tomorrow.

   - **Senator Brian Jones (Marc Shaeffer)**
     - Marc Shaeffer: Senator Jones finished legislative session with policy victories; bill regarding sexually violent predators in neighborhoods, audit for liberty health care who were doing displacement of sexually violent predators. SB31 – regarding homeless encampments, Escondido moving forward moving homeless encampments near schools/parks. SB 14: regarding human trafficking – passed through both houses that makes it a felony to traffic people and was somewhat controversial. Open house this past week on Wednesday, honored educate as nonprofit of the year – 1300 people in attendance.

- **Supervisor Tasha Boerner (Mariah Kalhoff)**
    - Mariah Kalhoff for UC office, new point of contact for Assembly District 77. The Governor has until the 14th to sign bills. There are 4 bills that assembly members have had signed, including an early warning system developed by Scripps Institute of Oceanography researchers for coastal bluff collapse.

- **CIP Subcommittee (Georgia Kayser)**
    - GK: Capital Improvement Projects are community recommended ways to improve the community. We have an ongoing list of projects and have prioritized that list as a community and as UCPG. One we've worked on over the past few months is related to the Governor/Genesee intersection with the goal to improve pedestrian/cyclist safety. We had 3 items listed under that goal that we would like to see improved (1) Reprogramming signals for pedestrian priority ($28K) (2) restriping plan for Genesee Avenue to include painted bike lanes and bike boxes, and (3) reducing the speed limit in that section. We met with Councilmember Kent Lee on September 26th and he had three others in the meeting Rowan, Madison Coleman, and Zach from his office. We discussed the letter and discussed restoring bike lanes eliminated over the year. We are still trying to get more information on restriping plans for the Pure Water alignment. We also met this morning with Mayor's office and Michaela Valk and Randy Wiles (head of transportation) to discuss the letter and discussed the restoration of bike lanes that have been removed. Jeff Dosick brought in maps and pointed out priority areas and needs in community. My take-aways from those meetings are (1) continue to talk to the offices about the CIP priorities and (2) the mayor's office would like to see a list of priority bike lanes to be restored; we should provide that to them. They have said it is easier for the city economically to do that when they are already resurfacing areas. So, I suggest we follow up with emails on (1) status of funding for crossing (2) assistance in obtaining draft restriping plan and (3) help getting speed data reanalyzed.
    - KMar: Great summary, thank you to Zach and other staff members for meeting with us. We expressed our desire to prioritize infrastructure projects, particularly cycling, and that idea was met with enthusiasm. I think there's a need there for that level of input. The City got grant money to update the bicycle master plan, which is needed, but will take a while. So, we should have our list of priorities ready to go.
    - CU: In the absence of Bill Beck, I would like to ask about his lights.

- GK: We didn't discuss that in these particular meetings. With some of the other CIPs, I think we should do the same and request meetings to discuss them, but we shouldn't come to the meeting with all of the requests for each one, we need to be focused in our asks.
- JS: When the city goes in and repaves an area – does anyone give thought to restriping? There has been done around La Jolla Colony and it seems like a complete oversight that restriping wasn't done.
  - KMAR: The city policy is that anytime they repave and re-slurry and need to restripe, they look to the community plan if there are changes needed for restriping and that is what they follow.
  - Jeff Dosick: One of the key points we're working on is to try to get a review of the draft PDF plan before its done so we can review and comment on it because they're often missing some areas, so we need to look at it beforehand before they do the plan and restriping.
- AW: I'm pleased to hear D6 and the mayor have agreed to prioritizing bike lanes. Prioritization is not feature of community plan at the moment –and we should communicate to the city that it would be a great idea to prioritize that list.

- **Clairemont Planning Group (Chair Nicolas Reed)**
  - Nicholas Reed: Chair of Clairemont Planning Group. I am leaving the planning group in March 2024, due to time commitments, but hoping to be part of any action thereafter. Regarding your discussion about CIP items, Clairemont would be happy to provide comments on meetings. There have been no updates on the Community Plan for Clairemont, it is still going through the process for review by City Staff. We are having a few community members coming in to talk about ADUs of large sizes and large numbers of units being built in the community. We expressed that we can't do much about them because they are permitted by right development, so we have suggested to reach out to planner/council district staff for those items. Next week we are looking to form a planning group reform subcommittee and initiate changes to the bylaws. We have elections coming up in March and beginning that subcommittee meeting next month. If you know anyone in Clairemont that would like to join our group, feel free to reach out. Looks like you have a great operation and room there.
    - CN: We can't take credit for the room, but we thank Alexandria for it.

7. **Public Comment: Non-Agenda Items (2-minute limit).**
    - Diane Ahern: Hello University City … it's Diane Ahern from University City Community Association with three quick messages. Our organization is the one that produces the University City News … it's filled with local news and features. It's available in print at our local libraries and online as a PDF on our website. The University City Community Association (UCCA) will hold its election for officers at our November 8 in-person meeting at the library on Governor Drive. The elected officers of UCCA are President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer. I'm excited to tell you tonight that we have four candidates … one for each office. Many thanks to our University City friend and neighbors who have volunteered to run for an elected officer position. I'm not going to reveal any names tonight. You'll have to attend the October UCCA meeting, tomorrow night, via Zoom, for the big reveal. Each candidate will provide a short information so that you can learn a little more about them before we vote in November. And that leads me to my final message. The UCCA is a community organization that supports the community newsletter in partnership with our advertisers and our dues-paying members. We also support many community events such as the 4th of July UC Celebration, the Summer Concerts, and last week's Oktoberfest. Dues-paying UCCA members are eligible to vote in the officer election in November and also have the satisfaction of knowing that they are supporting our local community. I'll put links for more information in the chat. Thank you for all you do for University City. UCCA's University City News : https://www.universitycitynews.org/ UCCA Contact : UniversityCityNews@gmail.com
        - KMAR: Has there been any progress to expand banner district along Nobel drive?
            - Diane: Yes, it has been approved but we are holding back for two reasons: (1) is the pure water construction project and (2) is funding. We also lost 1 light pole when someone backed into the pole and another one when a resident was removing a tree and knocked down a pole.

8. **Action Item: Approve an excused absence for Carey Algaze for maternity leave from November to March, the exact dates approximate. AB 2449 permits remote attendance for members for the care of family members. Chris Nielsen, presenting.**
    - CN: Item to approve excused absence for CA for maternity leave from November to March with exact dates approximate. This is permitted under AB2449.
        - *Motion to approve by JS / 2nd by AW:*
            - CN: Any objections/abstentions? None.
                - *CN: Passes unanimously.*

9. **Information Item: The Pure Water Project team will be providing an update on construction activities. Sarah Bowels presenting.**

- CN: Sarah Bowels and Clem Wassenberg Presenting:
- Sarah Bowels: It was great to see you at Oktoberfest. I'll turn it over to Clem Wassenberg, our Construction Manager for the Pure Water Project for an update.
- Clem Wassenberg: Construction Manager for the Northern Pipeline and Tunnel project.
  - Overview of the project: We are installing 2 pipelines from Genesee and Appleton to NCWRP, installing 3 tunnels under SR52, Rose Canyon, and I805. The project has already installed 8,265 linear feet of pipe and 100 linear feet of pipe installed in steel casing so far and 196 linear feet of tunnel. Next major milestone is Genesee Avenue from Governor to Luigi Court. Work will occur during daytime with occasional night work: M-F 7am – 5:30pm, occasionally Saturday work from 8-4pm, night work areas are governor drive intersection 8pm – 5:30am and night work at Towne Center Drive in front of UTC from 9pm -6am. K rails are set up for public/worker safety, access for resident business and emergency vehicles will be maintained where possible, some delays expected. There are possible full time intersection closures and short-term closures due to weekend work, posted detours for traffic, bike lanes and sidewalks. Trails are to remain open wherever possible. No parking in construction zones. Impacts such as noise, dust, construction vehicle traffic, bright lights.
  - Current work sites
    - Towne Center Drive South of La Jolla Village Drive – working at night between 9pm-6am. Work has started and tentative completion of current phase October 2023.
    - Genesee Ave at SR -52 in Caltrans ROW – casing installation of 72" diameter, all 500 linear feet of casing has been installed. Contractor started inserting pipe inside the casing.
    - Genesee Avenue South of Governor Drive - all pipe installed, contractor started paving and median restoration, work ongoing through Fall 2023, soon open lanes back up for traffic. Night work occurs 8pm to 5:30am, intersection open at daytime and trench will be covered with steel.
  - Look ahead:
    - Genesee Avenue – Governor Drive to Luigi Court: Divert all traffic into the northbound lanes, single traffic north and south bound separated by traffic control, will maintain the bike lane in the direction of the high school. Have met with the high school and they have agreed to close the student gate in the morning to avoid having backups on Genesee so all traffic (student/parking/drop off) will be asked to use Centurion Square to access in the morning. In the

afternoon, the student gate will be open again. Once intersection work is complete, the contractor will shift all traffic into the northbound lanes of Genesee, and the daytime work hours form 7-5:30pm. will shift to daytime work hours of 7am to 5:30 pm.

- Status of trees: Contractor and city team will evaluate options related to the trees. They will look at representative samples to understand the root configuration. They will review 4 trees' roots selected by arborist and the arborist will evaluate the exposed roots and make recommendations to the city based on observed sample size. In construction, will excavate trenches with the arborist present and will determine if we can save the tree, mark it for future observation, or remove the tree.

  - San Clemente Tunnel at SR 52 at Marian Bear Park: Temporary closure of Marian Bear Park Parking lot, receiving shaft construction is ongoing in the center of Genesee Avenue, park and trails are open for use, alternative parking at 5233 Regents Road.

- Sarah: overview of ongoing and upcoming community outreach. Can find more information on website, phone line, social media, media relations, e blasts and mailers, and community meetings.

- CN: Any Questions?

  - JS: The area down near 52 showed that the city has allowed space for fiber optic cables. Are those going in simultaneously?

    - Clem: Yes, they are going in at the same time.

  - KMAR: In the early presentations in January – Appleton and SR 52 – the bike lane was closed and that was to be the only section where you anticipated needed to a close bike lane and you said there would be room to keep bike lanes open in both directions. I see they're now closed, why the change? Throughout the project – at least one area was closed for bike lanes – which if one area is closed it doesn't really allow use of the bike lanes. You said you would not be closing bike lanes north of 5.

    - Clem: The bike lanes in southbound Genesee south of Governor were closed. As far as I know, all bike lanes are open with the exception of that section. Developing traffic control plans as we go, we are trying to apply lessons learned and minimizing impacts, with traffic engineers chiming in to ensure everything is safe. There was not enough room for a separate bike lane, it's the traffic lane and "sharrow". We try to keep them open wherever we can, and if not, it's simply for safety and we don't have any room to provide a separate bike lane.

  - GK: One safety concern is passing the high school when students get out. Many students leave on bikes, they turn left, and go in opposite directions of traffic and bike up to the neighborhood. There will be students that don't do what you think they're going to do and it's a concern I have for those kids coming out of high school. So be aware.

- Clem: Yes, we are aware and it's a discussion we had with the principals' office.
  - Katie Rodolico: Regarding the sewer project on Governor Drive, is that done? What is the timeframe?
    - Clem: It is ongoing, We installed a couple of sections on Governor, now working on Huggins.

10. **Action Item: New UCPG governance documents must be submitted to the city by the end of the year. Recognition of the UCPG and approval of the revised governance documents will be made by the City Council in early 2024, with the new governance rules then taking effect. The new documents include 1) Terms and Conditions (bylaws), 2) code of ethical conduct, and 3) participation and representation plan. The T&C (bylaws) document is still being revised but will be available prior to the meeting for discussion and modification. Approval of the new governance document package is expected in November at the UCPG meeting. Chris Nielsen, presenting.**

    CN:
    - Sent copy of the proposed by-law revisions and has PowerPoint presentation to review. The 1st table in the presentation shows the mandatory requirements by the City:
      - <u>Attendance</u>: To run for board seat – Current: bylaws state you must attend 1 meeting. New: you do not need to attend any meetings to run.
      - <u>Absences</u>: Current: No more than 3 consecutive absences or 4 from April to March to retain seat. New: require you to attend 2/3 of the meetings in any 12-month period.
      - <u>Appointed seats</u>: Current: no restrictions. New: may not vote - used to represent special community interests.
      - <u>Term limits</u>: Current: 9 years on, one year off. New: 9 years, 2 years off.
      - <u>Number of Members</u>: 22 with 2 non-voting, new: 21 voting seats, three appointed.
    - o City rules are based on inclusion in board representation:
      - All residents in plan area
      - All adult age groups with and without school age children
      - Reflect demographics of area
      - All income levels.
      - Include homeowners and renters.
        - These are aspirational goals, but UCPG should be focused on this.
    - o City allows UCPG to control its voting procedures, consistent with basic principles.
    - o The biggest change is that the current UCPG bylaws exclude UCSD campus – reasoning that residents live on state property and not subject to city's jurisdiction. It could be argued that UCSD is part of UC community so those

living on campus should be able to join. A proposal could be to add a 4th UCPG district on UCSD campus.
o The populations of 4 proposed districts: South UC 15,000 people, W North UC 18,000, E North UC 21000, and UCSD 18,000 (Regents divides W from E North UC).
o Could add a 4th UCPG district could be done in 2 ways:
  ▪ Have 3 resident and 3 business x 4 districts = 24 or
  ▪ 3 residents x 2 business = 20
o I was told today that LaCava and Lee are ok with 24 seats and that they will make sure that goes through, which was news.
o We would be left with two non-voting members (UCSD Admin, MCAS Miramar)
o Petr Krysl provided me with written comments:
  ▪ Students already get a say as residents in District 1-3, hard to check student membership as to who lives on campus and who does not.
  ▪ Faculty and staff would be nominated by the University because they are employees, not owners of businesses. Both faculty / staff and students will probably be appointed by the University which would defeat purpose of proposal since they would be appointed and not elected.
o Motions I suggest we consider for tonight:
  ▪ 1st Motion: To approve items on slide 2 (mandatory changes)
  ▪ 2nd Motion: To vote on the formation of District 4
  ▪ 3rd Motion: Agree in principle on the voting procedures, including all members of district voting for one residential and one business member, and permanent use of drop off boxes for elections.

- *Motion 1: to approve changes Outlined in Slide 2 - Mandatory Changes to: attendance to run, meeting attendance, appointed seats, term limits. Decision on number of voting members to be decided in separate action. Motion made by JS/ 2nd by ST.*
  ▪ *Motion Carries Unanimously Yes: 10, No:0, Abstain: 0*

- CN: Next item to consider is voting on District 4.
  ▪ CN: I can no longer justify the exclusion of residents on campus on voting. Should we have a "district 4"? How to handle business representatives from it is not clear to me. It is not clear if you can find 3 business members that would be willing to serve on UCPG from UCSD.
  ▪ JS: I have alternative thought, we could have 3 residents, 3 business seats but the businesses there are no different than Irvine/Alexandria who have multiple locations. UCSD is a business and should be treated like a business. Would be nice to tell UCSD one of the business reps

can be admin/faculty and the 3rd can be whoever wants to be involved. Seems to be equitable way to do it.

- CN: Seems like a reasonable proposal to have an admin designee, a faculty designee, 3 students that were elected, and 1 other business.
- KMAR: I mostly agree with JS. Alexandria doesn't get to appoint someone though, they come up with someone who runs for a seat. We could have so many people running for business seat that Alexandria doesn't get elected so to make it equivalent, UCSD could put forward candidate. Would get 1 vote and businesses would get 1 vote How would they have a faculty and voting admin rep? would have to be 1 UCSD elected rep.
- JS: The other possibility is faculty and staff that live on campus could be one of the residential people?
- CN: Everyone who ran from UCSD campus would have to be a UCPG member and would have to sign up as a member. Faculty would have to sign up as well. They would vote on a member and only the people that joined UCPG would vote.
- JS: Should only be 1 UCSD business rep, faculty, or someone else. So, it wouldn't be guaranteed to be faculty.
- JA: This is a unique situation. UCSD is part of the Planning Group, but we have no jurisdiction over them, and the city has no jurisdiction over them. It seems inappropriate - maybe the wrong word - but odd, to have 6 voting members from UCSD then. If students live off campus, they could be a resident member here, but doesn't seem there should be resident members on UCSD campus.
- CN: Counter example is if the State built housing on some site in Clairemont, you wouldn't deny them the ability to join the Clairemont planning group
- JA: But that site would still be in city jurisdiction.
- AW: This starts to get complicated – I like the simplicity and elegance of what CN offered as a starting point. I don't think UCSD is a business. What the city is trying to do is provide for people who are residents to have influence on planning group that affect them. We have a weird situation and the city doesn't like it. If we hang onto that that - they are residents and they get representation. If businesses on UCSD campuses, I like 2 as a number as I think 24 gets unruly.
- GK: They are a public nonprofit institution.
- Kerry Santoro: SDSU is in the College Area community planning area and we have USD in Linda Vista. Have we had conversations with those planning groups to see what they're looking at and how they're approaching it?
- CN: SDSU residents on campus are not considered part of the College Area. They live there but they don't get any representation.
- Kerry: But would that be changing?
- CN: They should be careful as they consider these changes - those groups are still figuring it out.

- CU: Does UCSD have eligibility for La Jolla planning group which they also touch?
- CN: No, we don't want to go there with the La Jolla people - that's a complicated and fraught situation and that's their business.
- CU: Then why would it impact us and not them?
- CN: Because we surround it. And our plan says it is in our planning group area.
- Debbie Knight: Thank you for doing this. I think 20 is better than 24 - with 24, people wouldn't get a chance to talk. I think 3:2 is a good idea. It worked well generally over the years. We had a series of students who were appointed by the student association and they were elected/chosen and that made a lot of sense. There's been a lot of "to do" by the students - I don't think it's a good idea - but think we should just do it. It is elegant to do the 3:2 to keep it at 20. And we'll have to try it out for a year or two. The City making us do something that doesn't seem like a good idea to me. We should do it because we're being told to.
- CN: The City proposals are not completely self-consistent. Tom Mullaney has advised us in the past to support other planning groups in the city who object to having unelected planning group boards represent their areas. When Joe LaCava was working on the revisions, we discussed many scenarios – he always said we should do the best we can and so they're probably going to take the same attitude as long as we don't contradict anything specific that we "must" do in the terms and conditions.
- AB: I'm opposed to removing business seats. Having businesses participate on the board really help cater to the inclusion and increased participation by providing a wide range of community member opinions. I have concerns if we would be able to get that many students living on UCSD campus interested in sitting on the board.
- JS: In response to that question – do we have 3 business members in each of our districts currently?
- CN: No, we are missing two business seats in District 1 and District 2.
- JS: There is USCD college, hospital health – they may be separate businesses?
- CN: We have to trust the University wouldn't do anything unreasonable.
- JS: I'm not feeling trusting. 3 business part of UCSD but separate businesses, that's 3 votes. There's no control over them whatsoever. Is including this district another thing being mandated by the city?
- CN: No, whatever injury to us is self-inflicted. Students are getting what they're asking for – here is your representation.
- Debbie Knight: We could do 3 resident reps for all 4 districts and keep the 3 business districts for other districts and don't have a business rep at UCSD district so that we don't have Taco Bell from UCSD coming

from our planning district. Just add 3 student reps. Another thing we're missing is the Petr Krysl's vote - so not sure what to do with that.

- KMar: I like that idea, makes sense to me, I don't know if it would fly with the city. The City is not forcing us to add a district, but doing so addresses key things the city is pushing hard – younger ages, renters: I guarantee most UCSD reps are a renter and chances are they will be young.

- AW: I like that solution. The issue city is trying to solve – is an issue about representation – business members are essential to operation of the board. Business members elected with 1 or 2 votes flies in the faces of greater grass roots democracy. What if instead of 2 business members – you have an appointed institutional representative and appointed faculty representation. They bring long term stakeholder views.

- Debbie: Petr Krysl votes now, but then wouldn't be able to vote.

- AW: Like 4 districts: 3:3: and District 4 with 3 residential reps and appointed faculty. It's simple and elegant.

- CA: Sorry to throw a wrench in the simple and elegant solution but I am a little concerned we may not be following the Council Policy – and I'm not sure I have enough information to propose a thoughtful counter proposal since this solution was proposed only a few days ago but I want to point out a couple of sections I think we may be in conflict with and we can think through how to address. Section 3.1 says to the greatest extent possible members should represent the entire community and community interests including: homeowners, renters, and individuals with and without school age children. Section 4.3 directs that voting members have to be affiliated as either property owner, residents, or as a local businessperson. I'm not sure I see that shown in what we're proposing based on number of seats of residents or businesses and I'm not seeing efforts to ensure how we're having seats occupied by renters. Then section 3.3 indicates that we should gather demographic data of new and existing CPG voting members to ensure community representation – and I don't see us grounding these decisions in that data. I'm also happy to hear that the council office is in favor of having more members as that is permitted under 4.1 for the purposes of better representing our community.

- CN: One of virtues of including UCSD is adding renters with a particular point of view so we do get good representation that way. To a large extent – it falls the way it falls. We don't ask everyone who joins whether they're a renter or homeowner.

- CA: Don't we have to gather that information under the new policy?

- CN: We ask but they don't have to provide.

- JS: One way we deal with having people in those categories – say something in the bylaws or commit to doing in advertising make it clear its open to all of these groups. To put in bylaws one way to do that and is how we should be doing that anyway.

- CN: 2 places we can put this information is in the terms and conditions and participation and representation documents. The Terms and Conditions is more permanent, participation and representation and gets updated. Change those documents to have board maintain the documents – closer to the spirit of what the city intended.
- AW: How I read 3.1 and 3.3 is that we will need to show in the future – to the greatest extent possible – how we did that in a report. Collection of membership data, gathering of demographic data of becoming a member. And that will be submitted to the city. This is a future obligation, rather than today's obligation. CA, do you agree with that?
- CA: It is hard to know the intent – I could see it being interpreted that way, but if we're updating our representation now, we should probably be considering these requirements in our board make up and I continue to wonder if we should be having designated seats for each type of representation?
- CN: These are the numbers submitted for income, demographics, with no relationship to an individual person.

- *Motion #2 by JS to add 4th District as UCSD Campus; To keep representation in District 1, 2, 3 as 3 residential members and 3 business representatives; and in new District 4 to have 3 residential representatives and to keep UCSD admin and faculty as appointed seats noting that those seats will not be voting members / 2nd by KMar.*
    - AW: We haven't seen a map of District 4, is the UCSD campus ok? Clarify that just residential members have voting authority. Students don't represent UCSD – they represent residents. UCSD has appointed members only today with 2 appointed, and under the new proposal those couldn't vote.
    - AB: UCSD dorms are only 8 months out of the year - if someone is on the board and not living there year-round, how will we have representation/participation year-round?
    - KMAR; A lot are grad students there year-round, and a lot of undergrads stay year-round and go to summer school.
    - AB: They would also be held to the same attendance requirements, so they can miss up to 2/3 of the meetings.
    - JA: If they hit all meetings while in school, they would meet those requirements.
    - GK: Is this to create a new mechanism to get young renters? They could just join now.
        - CN: No, they can't because they aren't a resident of UC if they live on campus, they're a resident of UCSD.
    - GK: Why can't UCSD have 3 business seats?
        - CN: I don't think they have an opinion one way or another. When we had the Science Research Park give an information item, that was the University asking our

opinion of what they could do under their own jurisdiction. But residents – we have to try to make that work.

- JS: Can Petr be both a resident and appointed seat?
  - o Debbie: He could run as resident but then wouldn't be appointed seat.

  - o *Motion Carries: Yes: 9, No:1 (CA), Abstain (0)*

11. Action Item: Power San Diego. A proposal for a municipally owned, non-profit power utility. Power San Diego is asking for a letter to the Mayor and our councilmembers expressing support and requesting the issue be put on the November 2024, ballot. Mark Hughes, presenting.

Mark Hughes:

- Here representing Power San Diego and to give a little credibility for myself – I've spent my career in electric power industry, so I do know a lot about this. I worked for Kansas City Power and Light - an investor-owned utility just like SDGE and for the rest of my career I've worked for competitive businesses. Investor-owned utilities are monopolies which are not an effective mechanism.
- Why we're doing this: we have the highest electricity rates in the country. Significantly higher than the country. We average 48 cents and the national rate is 16 cents. Our high electricity bills are on top of this already being a very expensive place to live resulting in a lot of people being in debt while SDGE is making $1M / day in profit. They have the worst customer service in the west and 3rd worst in the county and the structure of their business means they are not motivated to fix that. CPUC is predicting that electricity will go from 48 cents in 4 years to 70 cents. SDGE putting in a $3.9B transmission line, and they will start charging customers who have solar on their roof an annual minimum fee that's as high as 1500 / year.
- We want to produce a local "polls and wires" municipal utility and have most of the production done locally. Part of the reason we have high bills are the transmission fees. Instead of discouraging rooftop solar, we would promote it, wouldn't have fixed fees, and we'd do battery storage and local production.
- Rooftop solar and commercial solar is profit limiting/growth limiting for investor-owned utilities. In AZ, an expert at a hearing said rooftop solar is harming investor-owned utility business – first time someone admitted that was the case.
- We don't need a $4B transition line, but because of the investor-owned business model, that's what they're driven to do. If we stay on this path, the cost of bringing solar/wind power in from the desert is going to continue to rise. If we invest in local roof mounted solar its going to decrease over time.
- Nonprofit power utility/municipal utility is one that reports to local board, and it reports to rate payers. You have local control, it's more affordable, tends to be more reliable and invests in the community.

- The Sacramento rate is 17 cents, LADWP is 28 cents, and SDGE is 48 cents. The local municipalities also have less power outages than SDGE.
- The majority of your SDGE bill is transmission – that's how SDGE grows by putting in more transition/more distribution because that's their incentive structure.
- We can make this new proposal happen because it's permitted in the city charter. We can buy SDGE for 3 cents / KW hour and set up municipal bond which would get an immediate 20% off the bill. Also, we would be able to transition the SDGE people to the new utility.
- Consider you are going to the CEO of SDGE and CEO of municipal owned utility and ask them what is your No. 1 priority? The CEO of utility would say that it reports to the rate payers so its priorities would be lowest cost electricity and most reliable I can make it. The CEO of SDGE would say the number 1 priority is grow company and to grow profit. Reliable electricity and low-cost electricity are not high up on my list.
- I am an engineer and designing control systems means you design to achieve whatever end you want that system to do. I have no problem with people who work with investor-owned utilities but have a problem with the incentive structure.
- Q&A:
  - AW: If this group would write a letter, what's the next step?
    - Mark: We sent Chris a draft letter and request that it be sent to the mayor/council to let them know you are in favor of this proposal. We are gathering signatures needed to put initiative on local ballot directing city to do this also. If price of poles of wires were too high there would be offramps/safety valves. You don't want to go against SDGE in this city – elected officials can face rath of SDGE so this letter helps give them cover. We met with Rancho Bernardo and they sent the letter and we have had several that have turned it in as well.
  - KMar: How does your organization Power SD interact with SD community power?
    - Mark: Power SD is Poles and Wires only – the energy will come from somewhere else – that coming from SD Community Power or SDGE. It's municipal hardware only – only a transfer of title. It is like buying a house that already exists and you're moving in.
  - CN: Municipal utility owned by City of SD and non-profit. If you lived in the county, what does this do to your rates? Are residents outside of city boundaries put at disadvantage of rate structure?
    - Mark: This only occurs within boundaries of the city SD. It will still be the same situation - SDGE has to have rate increases go past PUC, so no immediate change in rates for those in the county. SDGE would try to recoup that loss and put pressure to raise their rates higher but no direct or immediate impact. In other jurisdictions they have part investor utility and part municipal utility – Los Angeles has ½ is Southern California Edison and ½ is LAWPD.

- JS: If that transfer were to happen is the City of SD or Power SD regulated by PUC. What would regulate our rates?
  - Mark: We would be relieved from oversite of CPUC. The business model is designed to report to rate payers so that leads to automatic feedback if rates go up, people get out of office and pressure comes to bear. LADWP goes back to 1917, their rates are less than 2/3 of SDGE.
- CN: Summary of what Power SD is asking for: a letter to mayor and councilmembers expressing support for the plan and putting it on the November 2024 ballot.
  - Mark: The City is taking a slow approach. They have done 2 studies on this possibility of going to municipal utility and their timeline is about 10 years to get it done. You are also welcome to simply say we're in support of this idea if you want to instead of being specific about the initiative.
    - CN: It may not be very meaningful?
      - Mark: It is still powerful.
- CN: Is there a motion to be made?
- AW: Is it to encourage the city council to place initiative on the ballot?
  - Mark: Just to support the idea of replacing SDGE with a municipal utility since they don't want to push an initiative for political reasons. Just to say, we're in favor of this idea, however you want to get it done.
- KMar: The actual letter is asking them to endorse and advocate for ballot initiative.
- AW: You don't have a citizens' initiative ready to go, but you're asking us to encourage councilmembers to place the initiative on the ballot?
  - Mark: They're not going to do that, we are going to gather signatures ourselves, but with this letter they will be able to support in little ways so we are not asking them to take a lot of risk. SDGE will throw a lot of money at this so its going to be tough so we're asking support form community leaders:

- *Motion by AW: To submit the letter to encourage city leaders to support the SD Power initiative and alter the letter to say that we are willing to express our support (but strike enthusiastic) and we are asking our city leaders to take a close look at this. We as a board are not making a on this but are asking city leaders to look into it/ 2nd JS.*
  - FA: In Sacramento/LA when a home is transferred with these municipal power groups there is extra process and extra reporting that has to be done which can add to the expense of a transfer. The savings is probably still significant based on presentation but will be added costs in other areas.
    - Mark: In 2 studies that have been done, the company has helped other communities form utilities that has been taken into account on

budgetary level. Still a wide range at this moment, but 3.6B is the number that had been in study that includes all hidden costs.

- o FA: But not on ongoing transaction basis.
- GK: I just researched that there have been two (2) feasibility studies in San Diego done on this that were hired by the city council. They suggested this would reduce SD ratepayers up to 14% in 10 years. The counter argument from SDGE is you may not have the same reliability. I think its important that part of the rationale for supporting this is our support for solar and a lack of support for solar from SDGE. I would like to have in the letter our support for solar in San Diego or else we won't meet our climate goals.
- CN: We should keep this simple - this time we're saying to city leaders to support this proposal and put it to vote of the people as opposed to support this project and put to a vote of the people.

- o **Motion Carries: Yes -7, No -0 Abstain AB and GK for reasons of insufficient information.**
  - CA: CN are votes to abstain appropriate here? Or are those a no vote?
  - CN: Yes, they only have to provide a reason to abstain.

12. **Adjournment: Next Meeting will be on November 14, 2023, 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. 9:40pm.*