

**College Area Community Planning Board (CACPB), College Area Community Council (CACC)
Minutes from the Regular Meetings: July 14, 2021 at 7:00 pm
Held via Zoom Conference Call**

P	Jim Jennings	President	A(A3)	Chris Luna
P	Tom Silva	Vice President	P	Robert Montana
P	Ann Cottrell	Secretary	P(A4)	Ja'Mar Montgomery
P(A2)	David Cook	Treasurer	A	Troy Murphree
P	Rachel Gregg	SDSU Appointee	P(A2)	B.J. Nystrom
P	Shawki Moore	SDSU AS Appointee	L	Jerry Pollock
P(A1)	Jim Schneider	BID Representative	P(A2)	Eva Yakutis
p	Saul Amerling			
P	Ellen Bevier			
P(A2)	Andrew Gade			
p	Robert Higdon			

TOTAL BOARD MEMBERS: 20 (momentarily 18)

P= present L= Late A – Absent (1),(2),(3) = 1st, 2nd 3rd absence

CP 600-24, Art. IV, Sec 1: “A vacancy exists upon the 3rd consecutive absence or 4th absence in 12 months (April May)

M/S/C = Moved/Seconded/Carried

The College Area Community Council (CACC) and the College Area Community Planning Board (CACPB) are two separate entities with a common board and officers and joint meetings. The items highlighted below with asterisks are CACPB business items, subject to City Council Policy 600-24 governing community planning groups. Items are reported in agenda outline order, although some items may have been considered in a different sequence.

COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY COUNCIL MEETING

I. Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.

II. Approval of Agenda

Montgomery: Move 6A, elections to new business in Planning Board agenda, & replace with report of bylaws committee.

M to replace elections with by law committee report in CACC agenda: Montgomery S:Silva

Y: 15 N: 0 A:0 *Carried

Amended agenda approved by consensus.

III. Approval of Amended Minutes of June 9, 2021

M approve minutes: Silva S: Nystrom Y: 12 N: 0 A:3 (Cook, Montgomery, Yakutis, absent) *Carried

IV. Public Comments on non-agenda items within CACC Jurisdiction None

V. Law enforcement, elected officials, business district, SDSU

A. Le for Congresswoman Jacobs

Reported on funding bills supported & introduced, appearances.

B. Nguyen for Council member Elo-Rivera

There was parking policy forum email any questions. This is Pride celebration month.

C. Lara for State Senator Atkins

1. State budget passed, still working out details, will report next month.
2. There is lots of misinformation on SB9. Current law allows 3 units on single family lot; SB9 allows 1 more unit, total 4 on a parcel. Lots of communities are exempt, e.g. they must comply with local zoning requirements such as high risk fire/flood areas.

a. College Area Opposition to SB 9&10

Jennings: We're very concerned about SB9 AND 10. This Planning Board voted overwhelmingly to oppose both.

Lara: I'm surprised the College Area opposes this with minidorm issues, overcrowding. This allows streamlining the process, & some local control; there won't be 17 kids in a house. I'd like to have you meet with someone from our housing staff.

Silva: I'm concerned that you are surprised by opposition. We are concerned about the minidorm challenge; we see flagrant abuses of the ADU process for use by minidorms.

Jennings: I'll call a forum with anyone you choose to help you understand the opposition,

b. Discussion on SB 9&10

Hamilton: We understand SB9 allows for an owner to divide a property, creating a 2nd lot if it had an ADU, making 4 units on each lot.

Lara: no, this is allowing ADUs in backyard. It allows 4, no more than 4 duplexes. There's ratios so not everyone can apply. I haven't heard of lot splitting.

Hamilton: You're saying SB9 allows 4 units on 1 parcel; that puts heavy burden on cities providing infrastructure, & burden on local communities. It eliminates significant porous surface & landscaping necessary to control heat. In addition to impact. it takes away local control. SB 10 allows local government to allow 10 units for a single residential parcel in Transit Priority Area, most of College Area; this will be significant crisis. Services & infrastructure are already challenged & there's little likelihood of mitigating for fire response, trash pickup, lack of parks. This is creating urban blight.

Montana: Complete loss local control is bad urban planning; adding density in vacuum, puts the burden on residents to deal with negative consequences.

Silva: Want to make clear we are very concerned about the challenge of minidorms & concerned that we are seeing flagrant abuses of the ADU process for minidorms.

- c. *Schneider:* I advocate increased density in College Area but where will all these people work? We should create jobs AND housing. We should incentivize mixed commercial residential on commercial corridors, not in residential neighborhoods.

D. Cabiles for Assembly member Weber

Described work on rental relief programs & introduced bills Weber is working on at state level.

E. Estrada for Mayor's office

1. Report on Mayor's/cities activities.
 - a. Concentrated homeless outreach, targeting downtown then expanding.
 - b. Budget: provided details on budget items, including roads & streets. If potholes, streets need maintenance tell me.
2. Questions, comments

Jennings: My Get It Done submission has been open 2 months; the reported road is much worse. What should we do in such a case?

Estrada: in such cases send me the GID number & I'll connect to the appropriate department.

Hoeger: a) We appreciate that a big homeless camp in Talmadge was taken care of quickly. But we were told by SDPD that the mayor has directed that if homeless persons don't move willingly SDPD is not allowed to remove them. This is a big concern.

b) Streets in CVE are in terrible shape. Part of our recent undergrounding project was that streets would be redone (not slurry). Now we're told funding has expired so repair is not slated to be done.. Who is responsible for this failure?

Estrada a) The Mayor made no such direction to SDPD regarding homeless. This critical issue is now handled in the mayor's office with a more compassionate approach, using proper social services etc. toward homeless b) contact me about the road contract.

Yakutis: I bicycle a great deal, but roads are so bad it is dangerous to bike.

F. Schneider, Business District.

1. BD held in person business awards June 30.
2. Over 20 new businesses have located in College Area during pandemic. Openings are announced on our social media sites.

G. Moore, Associated Students

1. Classes resume Aug. 23, faculty are returning to campus
2. ARC grand opening will be the end of the year; it will be fully open Spring 2022.

H. Gregg, SDSU

1. 83% of classes will be in person, dorms will not fill all beds. move in is August 19 & 20.
2. Mission Valley Stadium moving along. First game will be Sept. 3, 2022.
3. When vaccinations are fully approved proof of vaccination will be required on campus; proof will be required to remove masks. About 50% of students are currently vaccinated.
4. *Hoeger, Cottrell*: CVEA is very concerned about move in for the dorm on Remington. We understand the EIR for that dorm specifies the road on the north will be used for moves in & out. That has never happened; we want to pursue that to make sure it does.

Gregg: I'll follow up & let you know on Friday or when I return.

VI. New Business

A. Elections: Moved to Planning Board agenda

B. Bylaws committee report: Montana

1. This committee developed a proposed relation between CACC (Council) & the new 501(c)3 (Coalition) and between the Council and CACPB (Planning Board) in response to confusion about which body is responsible for which issues & about whether the current CACC-PB board is following Council rules or Board rules.

a. Council & Coalition.

- We rewrote the purpose of the Council & Coalition which we suggest merging. It would be proactive, identifying community issues, finding ways to solve them & finding money to implement the solutions.
- We raised questions about how this would operate: membership or non-member organization, board size & composition, are meetings public? We recommend a different meeting day from Planning Board.

b. Planning Board

- No changes are proposed; the purpose & rules of operation are set by the city.

c. Tonight we want input so we can work through August & make concrete recommendations in September.

2. Comments, Questions

Amerling, Higdon: this needs to be clearer. Diagram would help to show differences, relationships etc. Terms need to be clearly defined, advantages & disadvantages of some choices should be explained, e.g. membership or not, different board sizes.

Higdon: Why use the same name, CACC? A small board would disenfranchise long time involved community members. My real objection is no limit to number of terms on board.

Jenkins:

- In response to these questions: confusion over terms is because the 3 groups use different definitions. Remember this structure is not a recommendation but a suggested starting point .
- Here are 3 comments from Reynoso. 1) Expand Council’s purpose to include education as a purpose of the new merged organization. 2) Regardless of new board’s size there are advantages to having representation of geography of College Area, its neighborhoods. 3) Whatever financial arrangements are determined we should remember the purpose of the original Coalition was financial support for Planning Board. I understand city is beginning to provide some financial support to Planning Boards.

C. Request for \$1,000 donation to College Area Tree Program: Yakutis

1. this is maximum requested to advertise (electronic & printed flyers) the existing College Area tree program. Developer concessions provided \$20,000 for street trees & installation. The Urban Corps holds the money & plants trees for property owners; 60 trees remain. I want to help get the word out, door to door or neighborhood social media.
- 2 a. M we approve up to \$1,000 to market the College Area Tree Program: *Yakutis S: Montana*
 b. Discussion.
 - *Cook*; We do have sufficient existing funds outside the coalition to cover this.
 - *Bevier*: \$1,000 is- \$16/tree planted. Maybe we should give people \$16 to plant a tree.
 - *Higdon*: Send the proposal to the coalition; its objective is funding community projects.
 - *Schneider*: If you remove the motion you & I can talk about how set this up in a way that makes sense & you can come back with request
 - *Yakutis*: I withdraw motion, *Montana*: I agree

D. Adjournment of August 2021 Meeting

M to adjourn August meeting: Montana S: Amerling Y: 16 N: 0 A:0 *Carried

VII. Treasurer’s report: *Cook*

No activity this month; the balance is \$23,979.89. \$9,75904 is in the Coalition account.

VII. Committee Reports: None

IX. Delegate reports

- A. CARPUS: Hoeger* CARPUS has not met since December 2020.
Jennings: CARPUS is extremely valuable. Estrada (Mayor’s representative) will you see if it can begin meeting again? Please facilitate meeting at least quarterly & get Eastern’s CRO Lieutenant, & Captain to participate at least for first meeting.

X. Adjournment: 8:35 p.m

M to adjourn: Schneider S:Montana * Carried by consensus

COLLEGE AREA COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD MEETING

I. Call to Order/ Agenda approval: 8:36

M approve agenda: Nystrom S: Montana * approved by consensus

II. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items in Jurisdiction of CACPb: None

III. New Business

- A. Elections: Jennings*

1. Elections, usually in April, have been postponed. With open meetings now, we can hold them. If we call for elections in September & vote in October 7 seats will be open for a short term—Cottrell, Higdon, Montana, Pollock, Yakutis + 2 currently open seats. If we wait for Spring elections another 5 seats will be open.

M to call for elections in September & vote in November, Jennings: S: Nystrom

2. Discussion

Montana: Opposed, adhoc election will have poor turn out, wait for regular election in March.

Schneider, Hamilton, Higdon: there's time to get the word out. Even if turnout is low it is for a short term & having to elect 12 to a board of 20 simultaneously is a problem.

3. M to call for nominations in September, vote in October: Jennings S: Nystrom

Y:12 N:2 (Higdon, Montana) A:1 (Jennings, chair) *Carried

B. Adjourn August 2021 CACPB meeting

M to adjourn August meeting: Cook S: Schneider

Y: 16 N: 0 A:0 *Carried

IV. Committee reports

A. Community Plan Update Committee: Montana

- 1 No meeting. Meeting in July

2. Planning Commission held a workshop on College Area plan in Jun.

- a. We complained about lack of outreach to communities to get participation. We need lots of community input. Hopefully we can now have in person workshops etc.

- b. A member suggested a way to fund new parks by using transfer development rights. The idea is to upzone a lot of the area; new units pay fee to generate income to buy land for parks

- c. Planning Commission's staff map identifies all properties that might have some changes in zoning & plan designations. It shows the entire College Area north of Montezuma to canyon edges. I'm concerned about a) how did they spring it on us & b) scope of changes.

Commission feedback was this is intended to help community respond to minidorm issues. I don't know how increased density on single family lots helps. But if 9 & 10 pass, on top of ADUs there is no single family zoning in the state, a real issue.

V. Delegate Reports

A. Community Planners Committee: Bevier

1. City plans for funding parks. CPC is doing battle with city planning department, continuing to raise issues about how that would work.

2. Each Planning Board needs proposals for what projects we think are needed in our neighborhood.

Silva: We have not submitted our Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) rankings. Our sub-committee identified 10 proposed projects. We recommend a CACPB meeting in July to review sub-committee's priority list before submitting it in August

VI. Chair's Report: Jennings

Most material has been covered elsewhere. Jose Reynoso had surgery today, we wish him well.

VII. Adjournment: 9:05

M to adjourn: Cottrell S: Nystrom

* Carried by consensus

Minutes by Ann Cottrell, Secretary