



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday, June 20, 2023

Regular Time 5:30 PM

Meeting Roll Call

DRAFT

In Person Meeting

Nobel Athletic Center

8810 Judicial Dr, San Diego, CA 92122

5:39 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: AW

AW called meeting to order and noted that he will make his chair comments while awaiting a quorum.

AW: First, I would like to recognize a number of people in the audience including NG who is here from the City of San Diego with some members of her team. Also, we have a representative from Councilmember Lee's office Zach Burton. I do not see anyone from the Mayor's office at this time. NG, Zach Burton and the Mayor's office representative are here in a listening capacity.

I would start this meeting with some thanks – we have a lot to do, and I don't want to forget the thanks before we get started. This is where the plan update began in 2018 and we have come back full circle to this place with our meeting tonight. There has been an enormous amount of work, energy, time, and commitment, and I would like to thank each of you on the subcommittee for the commitment you have brought, the expertise, the ideas and interest you have shared. Public engagement does not work without a public that is engaged and you have been a model of that and that should be acknowledged. Also, thank you to Diane Ahern of UCCA who has made it possible to have these meetings broadcast to a wider audience via livestream. This is just one of the ways that the ways that Diane and UCCA have supported the UC Community. Sitting next to her is Carey Algaze who you will see sitting quietly throughout this meeting and taking minutes. There is not a better minute taker west of the Mississippi who can so quickly, so accurately take minutes, and that makes our work so much easier. So, to the unsung heroes, thank you for your help. I'm sure I'm forgetting someone, but those are on my list for now.

We are here to discuss the University Community Plan Discussion Draft, which was first introduced in April. There are links to the Discussion Draft and presentation in the agenda. It is our expectation that the subcommittee and audience have reviewed the draft and come with feedback and ready to discuss. This is the third of three meetings to develop feedback for the Discussion Draft that we will use to provide a recommendation to the UCPG which will provide its own feedback/recommendations to the City at its July 11 meeting. Tonight, I will summarize the recommendations that we have generally come to consensus on, noting the dissenting opinions.

The UCPG will prepare its own recommendations, then the City will use those recommendations and comments from stakeholders to prepare a revised draft of the community plan to undergo environmental review this summer. The Planning Department hopes to present the new plan/EIR to City Council before end of 2023.

As an informational item for the UCPG at the June 13th meeting, I prepared a preliminary report and summary of the community plan subcommittee of areas of consensus, which was up to date from our April/May meetings as well as dissenting views and chair recommendations. The report was favorably received. That report is linked with the agenda for the subcommittee. Tonight, we will work on further refinement of that report. To note, the deadline for public comments to the City on the draft will be accepted through June 30th. Those comments can be sent through planuniversity.org. Please cc awiese@sdsu.edu.

Tonight's meeting is a working meeting, with an eye towards producing a set of recommendations that the group can support. We will move carefully but with dispatch.

The Last two meetings were focused on land use, commercial plazas, parks, sustainable designs, etc. and tonight we will try to discuss mobility and other areas of interest to the subcommittee. I note that a consensus is not same thing as unanimity. Dissenting views will be recorded. At the end of the meeting, we will vote.

I think the Community Discussion Draft can serve as basis of a plan that the UCPG can support in the future for commercial/residential progress. It includes robust commercial/residential development, maximizes transit potential, supports climate action plan, reinforces commitment to open space/habitat, makes contribution to housing and jobs, 32.5K new housing units and 59K new jobs for City version of the land use plan and 22K housing units and 55K jobs for community plan.

The Discussion Draft includes things that the subcommittee has asked for including 3 new linear parks, a pedestrian promenade on Executive Drive, regulations for context sensitive design to protect open space and adjacent to open space, onsite park requirements for a subset of residential development, urban public space requirements for commercial development over 50,000 sf. It preserves community serving retail and does not rezone single family residences in south UC.

5:52 Overview: Meeting Topics, Expectations for Conduct

AW: This is an important moment for people in the community, for people who call this place home, who want to call this place home, people who work here and for those who have enterprises here. Given this, emotions might run high, and also there's a great deal of money at stake. This is why a careful balance is so important in our plan. We should expect to disagree. These are important matters that reasonable people can disagree about, but we do so with respect and civility for one another.

We have a quorum as of 5:53 so we will move onto the action items on the agenda.

5:54 Approval of the Minutes: May 16, 2023

AW: Are there any changes to the May 16, 2023, minutes? Seeing none, are there any objections to approving the minutes by acclamation?

- *Meeting minutes approved by acclamation.*

5:55 Non-Agenda Public Comment

- KR: I am the UCCA representative on the subcommittee, and I would like to announce a meet and greet with Supervisor Lawson-Remer on June 26th at 6:15pm in this same room. This event is co-hosted by the UCCA and Sorrento Valley Town Council. The Supervisor wants to meet constituents so if you have any items you want to bring up to her, this is your opportunity to do so.
- PK: AW would not be willing to thank himself, so I want to express sincere thanks. Without him, we would not have the draft in front of us. He's done an excellent job.
 - AW Thank you, PK. I realize I left out Chris Nielsen in my thanks. Without him and his leadership and guidance we also wouldn't have this plan in front of us.
- Barry Bernstein: Reminder to all about the UCCA newsletter. There will be a 4th of July celebration at Standley Park. We hope all of you will be able to attend and enjoy a wonderful community event.
- Lisa Heikoff: I was going to say what PK said. I would like to express thanks to AW and Chris Nielsen. You have negotiated through very difficult times and did it with grace and honesty, so thank you, we really appreciate it.
- RC: I told the group last time I would send an email that would take a look at where we can expect/not expect the type of growth the City would like to see, why that growth will not happen, and why it will not happen in the way they think it will happen. The email will be in two parts: First part is technology – there is a lot in the oven technologically, but not out in public, which will make a huge difference in climate goals and relationship we have with biotech and pharmaceuticals and new medical technology. The other part will be contextual factors, the bigger picture that will affect us, and there are some wildcards in there. People who use intuitive abilities who have a particular take on what's happening now, it will be hopeful. You can contact AW or Chris Nielsen to get my email if you would like to receive these emails.

5:59 Roll Call:

Members present:

Debby Knight (DK), Katie Rodolico (KR) Laurie Phillips (LP), Carol Uribe (CU), Nancy Graham –Planning Department (NG), Andy Wiese (AW), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), George Lattimer (GL), Joanne Selleck (JS), Petr Krysl (PK), Keith Jenne (KJ), Jason Morehead (JM), Veronica Ayesta (VA) Aidan Lin (AL).

Absent: Dinesh Martien (DiM), Anu Delouri (AD), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Suchi Lukes, Associate Planner - Planning Department (SL), Kristin Camper (KC), Melanie Cohn (MC), Kris Kopensky (KK), Kristin Camper (KC).

Note: MCAS Miramar representative Kristin Camper does not vote per US Government policy.

6:00 pm Action Item: Comments on Discussion Draft of the Community Plan – Topics: the Community Discussion Draft

- AW: Tonight's process will follow same practice as last two meetings - focusing on developing areas of consensus. We will discuss mobility first until about 6:30pm, summarize our consensus and then move on to new business.

Mobility:

- **Discussion of: Reduction of Governor Lane form 4 lanes to 2 lanes, Traffic Study needs, and Funding sources**

- KR: It is pretty clear that we need to be very specific - the plan calls for 2 lanes on Governor Drive - we need a traffic study. The plan talks about separate bike lanes but at what expense on Genesee? We need sidewalks, bike lanes, and rapid transit. We need a transit study. For the big changes the plan proposes, we need a traffic study before anything is put in stone.
 - AW: We have heard the reduction of 4 lanes to 2 on Governor Drive and have heard public comments from the community opposing that idea but didn't get to a consensus on that. What does the subcommittee think of the proposal in the draft to reduce the number of lanes from 4-2 on Governor?
 - PK: I agree with Katie, a traffic study will tell us if it's feasible.
 - KR: If you don't have a traffic study, we need one to show if it works.
 - AW: And to clarify, you mean not the 2015 data?
 - KR: Correct, there needs to be new data and it needs to be done when school is in session at pk up/drop off times.
 - DK: I agree about a traffic study on Governor, but we also need one on Genesee. Also, how are they going to ever pay for these improvements? We have yet to hear a single idea on how they are paid for except that if a developer builds nearby, they may have to build a segment. So, we need a clear plan of implementation for how these bike lanes will be built and not a block-by-block approach.
 - JS: I agree with KR, and we should keep in mind this is not a static plan. The concept of parking for the influx of people on East /West streets is a recipe for disaster and is not feasible. We

need to do something to insist on traffic studies while looking at it on an ongoing and regular basis. That should happen at some sort of regular interval.

- LP: Agree with KR, we need an independent traffic study and not one that just supports the plan the City is putting forward. It will be difficult to find sufficient space for traffic on Genesee without the bridge over Rose Canyon. That needs to be studied as well. A study needs to include egress from South UC in fire conditions. I think that is a tremendous risk, so it is an important piece for response by the City.
- KJ: The increase on Governor / Genesee should be in the traffic study. I'm a big proponent of protected bike lanes and I think the bigger issue is Nobel Drive and adding the volume of individuals without an appropriate traffic study. re a round Whole Foods development will be a nightmare.
- DK: The issue of the Rose Canyon bridge is settled and done and under a separate EIR. I would strongly oppose any recommendation that considered that in the process. A traffic study needs to be done given the current configuration in the plan update that's going forward, and that's the basis it should be on.
- KR: I supported the bridge, but it is not on the table. What we learned in that process is that Genesee flunks every traffic study, we're talking about wider sidewalks, bike lanes, primary ingress/egress, and we need a traffic study to evaluate this.
- LP: Also, the traffic study should not assume that all new developments will not have parking.
- AW: I'll summarize what is the consensus: that the subcommittee strongly recommends the need for a new traffic study prior to adoption of any of the proposed lane reductions or transportation changes in the Discussion Draft. That it includes current configurations in the Discussion Draft, that it be independently conducted when schools are in session during school drop off and pick up times. That it includes Governor Dr. but also Genesee, Nobel, and Nobel/Campus connections to UCSD That it assumes new housing does not have zero parking spaces.
- AW: Another topic – protected bike lanes. Is there a particular proposal regarding protected bike lanes in plan?
 - LP: I support Joanne's point that those bike lanes need to be continuous. It's actually more dangerous to work your way into moving traffic if bike lanes are discontinuous.
 - AW: I'll summarize that there is strong subcommittee support for protected bike lanes throughout the plan and that the expectation from the subcommittee is that those be continuous. In addition, there must be greater language in plan to show how this will be implemented. Piecemeal bicycle infrastructure is not safe or effective.

- Public: Ali – I live at the UC campus and work at Executive Drive, and I use bike lanes on Genesee almost entirely. Having 4 lanes is terrifying, and it's not easy to cross that street. I understand the fears when it comes to parking, and there are schools, so you don't want 4 lanes of traffic, and reducing lanes will slow down traffic, but will make it not as scary as it is now. We need to reduce our dependency on cars, understand entire life low density zoning, and with high density housing near transit, we all don't need to have cars.
- Public: I would agree with the addition that the class 2 and 3 bike lanes are not any sort of protection whatsoever. I bike along Executive and Genesee, making broken bike lane changes are an issue I'd raise. Class 2/3 are not really bike lanes. Any significant protection we can offer should be to prioritize class 1 and 4, which are the truly protected by post or protected bike lanes.
- Public: Linda Bernstein: slowing down speed on Governor Drive and improving safety of pedestrian crossings. I lived here 35 years and seen something like 2 bikes a day on Governor Drive. I support having a shared lane with bikes but to designate a single lane each way for bikes is not productive. E.g., Park Blvd, 350 parking spaces removed and you'll see only 1 or 2 bikes a day there too Clearing Governor of cars for very few bikes it doesn't make a lot of sense to me.
- Bill Beck: I mentioned that I took a rolling stick to measure the width of Mission Bay area where bikers/pedestrians walk, run, and walk their dog, and measured Governor, and it's the same width. That would be an ideal way of taking the sidewalk from Scripps Street to Genesee, where it's wide, and there's no place you have to do much to add a bike lane. You may have to put some striping. But you can keep your car lanes. If they can do that on Mission Bay, you can do that here.
- AW: Summary of Consensus, we have support for continuous protected bike lanes throughout the plan area, and we need to have them implemented in a way that does not lead to a broken chain. We have a comment and consensus on a priority for class 1 and IV lanes which are protected bike lanes. Also, because of costs and limited budgets, specific streets/segments should be prioritized so that the ones that we need most are built first. The Plan needs to give us a path to infrastructure most likely to be built and most likely to work.
 - Public Commentator: From someone who cannot bicycle, I suggest you reconsider making Governor Drive impassible [for cars]. Also consider infrastructure when we get density, and where are parents going to drop off their children?
- **Campus Point Separate Access at Grade/ Connection from John J Hopkins to Science Park Road**
 - AW: Another mobility comment we have talked before is supporting a separate access at grade from Campus Pointe Dr to Genesee Ave. UCPG saw a

presentation on that in the April meeting, but we didn't address by way of consensus on the subcommittee. The Owner (Alexandria) is willing to build that connection, which would make it possible in event of emergency to make possible a second exit onto Genesee. This appears in the urban design recommendations in the Discussion Draft but not included in the mobility section of the plan. If the City could include in mobility section that would be important. Any objection?

- No objection raised by the group.
- AW: We also talked about extension of bicycle/pedestrian connection from John J. Hopkins to Science Park Road via Cray Ct (or new Spectrum Bridge) This would be a safer, parallel route to Torrey Pines Road. This also appears in the urban design drawings for North Torrey Pines Area, but it is important to include in mobility section as a priority as well.
 - LP: Those of us on the bike lane committee brought up the importance of connecting the Genesee bridge bike lane (the I-5-Coastal Rail Trail) from UC to the train station to the Carmel Valley Bike Path. Without this connection between those two bike paths, we cannot reduce driving and increase bicycle use to UC. It is also important to reduce traffic driving to the campus - 85% of the people who work in North UC/Campus Point live in Carmel Valley and North, and there is not a trolley/bus that brings them down.
 - AW: That area may be outside of our planning area purview, but as it affects mobility in UC, we might make this recommendation. But is there any objection to recommending that the City connect the I-5 bike path (Coastal Rail Trail) with the Carmel Valley bike path?
 - No objection raised by the group.
 - Is there any objection to including the connection from John J. Hopkins to Science Park Road in mobility as a consensus idea?
 - No objection raised by the group.
- Public: What about protected sidewalks for people to walk? I don't feel like we should have to share with bikes.
- Public: What about a safe way for children to go to school?
 - AW: We have to have safe bike/pedestrian infrastructure so kids can go to school safely every morning. That's why protected bike lanes and protected pedestrian lanes are important.
- Public: Has the subcommittee ridden from Nobel to Governor on Genesee? I did my own traffic study. Go ride that and see the feasibility of that. It's the biggest weakness of this plan. Today, Genesee went to a 1 lane bottle neck up to Governor – it's not feasible to add bike lanes. This is the biggest weakness in this plan as I see it.
- Public: Genesee and Governor need pedestrian bridges.
 - PK: there aren't enough pedestrian bridges in the plan. Look at the traffic patterns. it is very unsafe to cross at signal crossing because of California 'roll through' stop sign habits.

- JS: I second PK's comment. It is important in the future, but on our streets with various mobility modes, signals aren't forgiving, and you cannot cross if you walk at a normal pace. It's an ADA access issue as well.
- LP: The City has tendency to look at distance from transit in a radius that doesn't take into account our canyons, HOAs are fence-to-fence lines w/o through ways. Determinations need to be done on actual bike/pedestrian distances not as the crow flies.
 - AW: City/state law is a radius, but walksheds for our mobility plan were calculated by time it takes to walk given streets.
 - KR: And TPAs are a one-mile walkshed.

- **Discussion on Preliminary/Final Report to UCPG**

- AW: We have two hours to discuss specific ideas that are raised in the Preliminary Report. I propose that we begin our work with what's in the Preliminary Report to UCPG on the Community Discussion Draft. The Report includes a variety of ideas including consensus ideas reached by the subcommittee through the first several meetings. It includes areas of differing views/dissent and comments/suggestions of the chair to apply general principles to specific policies/ actions. I added those to our report not only because I have read the plan very carefully, but I have listened carefully. I have reviewed the public comments from our meeting minutes as well as written comments (over 600 written comments with some commenting having ½ dozen sub-comments). I have tried to bring this experience to bear in the Preliminary document, to try to make connections to where these issues appear in the plan and to apply the general principles to specific locations in the Draft. The report describes areas of disagreement as "dissenting views," but I have had a request to have it be called "supplemental views," so it doesn't evoke a sense of an adversarial process. I will take that recommendation to show it was not adversarial. A few things are missing from the Preliminary Report that I would plan to add, including dissenting/ supplemental views from before the April meeting that didn't get included, including views on density and recommended higher levels of density in the plan. What I recommend we do now is to open the Preliminary Report to members of the subcommittee to highlight or any areas that they think may need additional work. If there are areas we can't live, areas that you think need to be changed or need to understand better to win your vote or to make this a better plan. Let's talk about those things. If we can find consensus on them, we'll include them. If we can't, we'll subtract them and if we disagree, we will note areas of disagreement or differing views. I'll keep a speakers list.
- PK: I'd like to draw attention to a big issue which is recreational opportunities that the plan should provide for future inhabitants of a City of 150K people. Current recreational points support around 32,000 people. What about the remaining 120,000? City staff recommends that we rely on improvements to current infrastructure and also obtain recreational facilities provided by developments that will occur in the future. Improvements to current infrastructure are around 2,700 points. Developer provided recreational opportunities are around 3,300 points. That's about twice as many points as we

currently have. Is this going to happen? Currently we have recreational improvements in the plan that have never happened. How do we make developers actually include recreational opportunities for the 70,000 people in what they build? Residential/mixed-use developments must include recreational opportunities – pools, what have you, or pocket parks if over 2 acres or 75,000 square feet. But even if developments are predicated on the fact that they will do this, the expected implementation rate is about 50%. How is it possible that we are going to try to make them commit to develop these recreational facilities and they have some way of backing out of it? I suggest that we put into the plan that no one is allowed to buy out of this, that they need to provide those recreational points on-site. That's the only way we will get enough points to support at least partially, the recreational needs of the projected population.

- LP: Agree but concern about plans for on-site recreation. If you have a 2-acre plot of land, the amount of space to build anything other than a pocket park are nil. Those pocket parks don't provide for real recreation. Will cite new pocket park by the new Jewish student center on La Jolla Scenic and North Torrey Pines. It's beautiful, but it has no use for recreation. I fear that if we require smaller projects need to have on-site recreation, two concerns - will they be publicly accessible or require reservation for use? Are they big enough to provide real recreation?
- PK: Yes, but my question would be are they better than nothing?
- Public: No. Providing a little square of pocket park is not a real park.
 - Public: Janice Deady: 50 years ago, this community [the Avia along eastern Governor Drive] made a deal with a big developer: we'll all push to approve development and in exchange we'll have a Conditional Use Permit [requiring a golf course]. They built a golf course in a canyon and had to maintain it and build a tee house – which was there for 50 years. Then the developer decided they no longer wanted to maintain it. There was amazing wildlife. All sorts of owls, coyotes, deer, etc. that this developer wanted to knock down and build 3-unit housing. We approved that and now the developer is renegeing on the deal and wiped all trees off of the 3-4 holes. But they have permits and as a community we need to stand up and say whoever gave those permits, you can't renege on the deal with University City. The CUP says you take down a tree you put in like for like. But they put flowers. If we don't fight, the next developer will do the same. There is a great opportunity – teach kids how to golf. Climate action plan – take down a tree – plant a tree. This is for our community: the wildlife needs it.
 - AW: Part of that issue – permits, etc. - is not something we can address with our plan update. But going

forward, what I hear from you is that this space should be recreational space/park space. There is a recommendation in the Preliminary Report to ensure the golf course continues as park space.

- Public: Look into recreational space – what are fire hazard repercussions of open space versus golf course. If a golf course, it may have a different insurance classification than if it's a canyon.
 - KR: The Discussion Draft shows it as open space, not as golf course.
- AW: I can live with the recommendation that that space [former golf course] be considered for use as future park space in the Recreational Plan, and that proper study of permits and regulations be considered as part of the planning for that space. [no dissent]
- RC: We should take conversation about parks and rec and expand it to other infrastructure. We are under pressure to find space for parks and rec and under pressure for resources for everything else to support density – library, schools, water resources, parking, etc. We need comprehensive view of infrastructure integrated w development. I like the idea of phased/stepped development, phased based on infrastructure to support that development. We can make a recommendation here for phased development. We need political clout to do that and need to be organized as a community. We need to educate public officials and support City ordinances that would support that.
 - JS: Going back to PK's suggestion, on tying development to increase in recreational space. If a developer builds on 2 acres of land, we can't control how much land they use or don't use, but maybe do it based on percentages. I certainly like the idea of having recreational spaces open to the public, but there may be liability issues with that. Not certain we can insist on that, but it's worth a try.
 - PK: City staff relies on this, and they can only make the numbers [recreational value points for the Plan Area] work if a developer provides publicly accessible recreational facilities. Otherwise, it's not going to happen.
 - Public: There are a limited number of ball fields and soccer fields for kids to play on in UC area. When you add this many more residents, those will be at capacity. Whether a developer has a park at their site doesn't mean there will be additional playing fields for teams, which we know kids want. If a developer won't allow people on-site, if it isn't something that everyone needs to use, it doesn't do any good.
- AW: I personally am appreciative of Planning Department staff for listening to concerns in community over last few years. The City has proposed set of supplemental development regulations [SDR's] that would require developments of certain size to provide public spaces or recreational spaces. For residential development above a certain size, it would require park space accessible to the public to meet Park Master Plan guidelines. Commercial redevelopment,

and all development, of parcels over 50,000 sf are required to provide urban public spaces, which also meet the PMP recreational standard – but the City doesn't count those recreational points (so there are some 'hidden' points in the Draft). There are a couple of issues where that can be improved. I have several recommendations to add to/strengthen our document.

- 1) Neighborhood scale parks: I support the consensus recommendation for neighborhood scale parks. The 5Ps are great idea, but the overall space of those, the minimum space is 3,000 – 5,000 sf, is not an appropriate size for a park. Can't throw a ball or kick a ball in it, and you certainly can't let a three-year-old run to her heart's content in it. And we need that. I hope that the City might go back to the drawing board to develop a policy to scale the size of parks to the size of development. I would like to see an effort made to see if it is possible to scale development regulations to get us to neighborhood scale parks.
- 2) There is also inconsistency in the CPIOZ/SDRs – Rules for public space requirements for commercial/residential are different. Which take priority? Residential requirements appear in Table 5, but not in the SDR's, which are the business end of the plan. Residential and commercial requirements for urban public spaces should appear in the same place (in SDR's) and they should follow the same standard - spaces over 50,000 sf and development over 75,000 sf provide urban public spaces. That is our general regulation, and it should be applied to both residential and commercial development. There are few parcels in north UC / CPIOZ smaller than 50,000 sf.

Bill Beck: When commercial developers build their building. Building rec spaces for their employees. We're not allowed to use their spaces.

AW: The regulations in the Discussion Draft are for accessible public spaces.

- 3) The revised Draft should explain clearly how/if the City plans to count the recreational value of urban public spaces in commercial developments. Draft should report how many points they expect. A larger problem is we may not have our points counted.
- 4) Revised Draft should re-evaluate parks carefully and confirm recreational points are accurate. E.g., in Table 5 confirm sum of planned additional recreational value matches the total for specific park facilities. Undercount of approx. 400 points? We can't plan or solve deficits without accurate data.
- 5) Recommend City should study other means to support, develop and finance parks in UC and San Diego. Recommend consideration of a "future opportunities fund" to fund parks in UC, so that it can meet PMP standard. The Draft shows that current strategies cannot meet the PMP mandate. More is required, including discussion of funding - how are we going to get to that?
- 6) Land mandate. Parks Master Plan includes a requirement that 20% of recreational value points in the plan area should come from "land acquisition" [PMP, Appendix D, p 19]. My math suggests UC would need additional 336 acres in the future. There is no way the Parks Master Plan mandate can be met with the tools at hand. Even with creative development regulations for commercial and residential development, they don't get close to meeting the standard. The City needs to figure out how to meet the

Parks Master Plan it just designed. The revised Draft should explain how. Not just for UC but for city as a whole. I'd be happy to have more feedback/discussion from the subcommittee on these points.

- Public: Tom Mullaney – I have a handout – I have been involved in community planning for over 33 years. Attended the Park and Rec Board meeting last week. There was not much response on Andy's presentation. What's going on now is not urban planning. Plan is excessive in scope. The region is growing by 0.7% since 2010. The plan increases by 50% for about a 1% rate of growth. At 1%, 300 housing units per year, over 20 years would require only over 6,000 housing units. If you can't provide the public facilities including the parks, you need to scale back the plan. The Mayor thinks he understands urban planning, surrounds himself by inexperienced people who say upzone everywhere and developers will drive down rents. They don't want to drive down prices or rents. Taking away parking and parks is not urban planning. Kent Lee and Joe La Cava need to receive emails and phone calls. This is the issue for University City, and they need to get behind the community, otherwise we'll tell them we'll never support them.
- DK: Thank you for presentation at Park & Rec Advisory Board, AW. Planning not enough parks for 49,000 people means there's a problem with your plan. There is a fundamental flaw in how this plan is put together.
- Public: Janice Deady: DK made an important point – how are we going to pay for it? Rome wasn't built in a day, but how are we going to pay for it? We are the suppliers of the government. Our money is their money. If we want this, it's going to come out of our pockets.
- Public: Mobility comment – entrance to 805 and highway 52 – by reducing lanes and putting more bikes, how are people going to access those highways? People won't bike from here to Carlsbad, they need to take car. We have to keep that in mind that we have 2 big highways and we're reducing access to the highways.
- Public: Susan Baldwin – I'm working with Tama Becker-Verano [Change Begins with Me] and Madison Coleman [Climate Action Campaign] on a letter on the Draft Plan. I am a retired planner. A lot of the issues revolve around how we are going to implement the plan – how are we going to get affordable housing, parks, bike lanes. The City used to have a FBA [Facilities Benefit Assessment] plan for the community that the developers paid into and that's how the improvements in the community were paid for. Today, the City has created a city-wide development impact fee (DIF) Fees paid now go into a citywide fund that gets spent wherever the City decides they should get spent. Our letter argues that the City should be looking at Land Value Capture tools to help fund different needs of the community. Landowners, because of the increased density [in the Plan], will realize a windfall profit, Land Value Capture allows the public to share in that increase in value. And that's how you pay for some of the important needs in the community.
- JM: Someone had a suggestion to use the term "supplemental" rather than "dissenting" but I liked that there were consensus views and then "dissenting" views. I'm not opposed to dialogue on the term dissenting but supplemental sounds supportive of the consensus. I think we can use "differing views" or "alternative views."

- JM: I hold this seat for Alexandria and we are reviewing the plan and providing our own feedback but wanted to share some initial comments:
 - Staff has done a great job being responsive to the subcommittee and community, have been forward thinking and will help implement key City goals/policies such as CAP and make UC a more livable community. Our main concern relates to level of specificity and detail and lack of flexibility of the CPIOZ. This policy document should lay out broad goals and polices for long term development, but the CPIOZ and SDR's are way too detailed and rigid and don't belong in a planning document. E.g., Urban Public Space requirement – our Campus Point Master Plan – would require us to require us to provide 8.5 acres of public space at our own cost in the middle of R&D campus. It's too specific for this level of a document. Alexandria has been accommodating and reasonable allowing public access balanced with life science and R&D tenants. Our properties restrict and limit access after hours and as necessary to meet tenant needs. We support providing access to public spaces, and for the most part we provide public access to campuses, but due to tenant requirements we cannot allow this everywhere and do not want this in this planning level document. AW: Is this comment focused on the Preliminary Report or the City's discussion draft?
 - JM: The City's Discussion Draft.
 - PK: This is precisely why I broached the subject. The City staff plan relies on developers to go along with plan to provide public access to green spaces. If every developer says something like this, then we will end up with no public spaces at all.
- LP: JM, I believe when Illumina was developed, they paid for this library and park land. I know that IDEC put \$30 million into this property.
 - GL: May I correct you? LP: You may try.
 - GL: This was City land, the City required facilities benefit assessment from developer fees from north UC, the City took \$1M to pay themselves for land they already owned. This building and all of Doyle buildings was paid out of FBA and 1 developer stepped up and put-up money independently. A small part of the FBA went to parks. Most of what the FBAs were for transportation improvements – like the I-805 and I-5 entrances. The original FBA was done in the 70s and was in a phased development program that said, in order to develop beyond a certain square footage, there had to be certain improvements done with money from the FBA. It ended when City wanted to do the area that is Towne Centre Drive north of Eastgate, the City said we'll waive it for ourselves. This community had the best phased and paid for plan in SD.
- LP: I agree with you, and I'm worried about this disappearing.
- GL: Yes, and as SB pointed out, the City now won't do a specific community plan but will allocate the money to City needs.
- JS: What about the FBA money accumulated that we never spent? Do you have any suggestions for how might we work that concept that existed in the 70s into this plan? It's a great idea.

- GL: It worked. There is money left in the FBA. I don't know what it's allocated for.
- DK: And the City refuses to share this information.
- JS: Maybe that could be a source of funding for improvements that we're talking about.
- DK: It might buy some park land.
- JS: And some street improvements, etc.
- AW: I heard two potential options coming out of this discussion, and maybe there are more. One option is to add more specificity in the Draft on how the money in the existing FBA will be spent. Miles of bike lanes will eat this up really quick. Also, let's put this in a larger shell. It sounds like we need a Discussion Draft with an implementation plan that gives us an honest appraisal for how all of these "grandiose plans" will be paid for. It's one thing to put lines in a plan, to put bike lanes on a map, but if the City will never, ever be able to pay for it, and if they have no plan to pay for it, then the plan is fantasy. We've spent four and a half years here and the City relies on this place to generate economic growth, and we rely on the City to provide services. And we deserve that in our plan: much clearer, honest appraisal of how this will be paid for. We aren't going back to the FBA. One problem is that it was inequitable, and that's why the City has done away with it, but it did put money for services where the growth was. We don't have a full replacement.

I suggested a "future opportunities fund" for parks would be one tool. And one idea we did have earlier in our discussion was a CPIOZ overlay zone and the City provided one, which includes requirements for urban public spaces, which is a form of a Land Value Capture. I would encourage the City to explore other options. There are other strategies in other California cities to find more money for implementation of infrastructure, and I would say specifically for not just bike lanes. I would recommend the City study the feasibility of a similar type of SDR in the Plan that would generate funding for specific segments of our bike infrastructure, just as it provides specific recommendations for park infrastructure. We should add this to our list of recommendations.

Do we have any other suggestions about this, that is to ask the City to study a more robust way to finance the plans we have: parks, bike lanes (I would say affordable housing, too, but we haven't gotten there in our discussion). for infrastructure needs.

- GL: I think we're cutting it too narrow. We need funding for the entire infrastructure – not just parks. This whole thing has become a circle. The reason why FBA was created was because of Prop 13. It was apparent at the time that there wasn't going to be adequate funding under Prop 13 for infrastructure improvements that were required in UC, and at the time there were fewer landowners and they agreed that if we're going to have these improvements, we're going to have the roads and interchanges, then we'll have to pay for them, which is why the FBA was created. E.g., Regents Road [Nobel Dr?] from about Genesee to I-805 was paid for by the FBA. That's how things got done. Now, it's been taken away from us, and we're back to where we were before, with no way to pay for it. And the City doesn't have the money. Granted, the City greatly benefits from tax revenue from development in the community, but that goes to the City and is dispersed city-wide. I don't think you get significant arguments out of the development community if you said, this is going to be a

better community because of the infrastructure, but we want it spent here. If we are going to build it here and be taxed for it, then we want it spent here. That's a problem politically for the City.

- Public: Mobility Question to Andy – in terms of bike lanes – are you taking about creating a bike lane and sacrificing one traffic lane.
 - AW: It depends on the segment: bike lanes are not as wide as lane of traffic, but in some cases, there are plans to replace a lane of traffic or remove parking with protected bike lanes.
 - Public: It is proposed to remove lanes on Governor? What I'm trying to get at is not to remove lanes of traffic for bike lanes. Increasing density and removing lanes do not equate.
 - Public: What do people do who live on Governor and park on Governor?
 - Public: There's a massive percentage for cost of building a home in fees. Like 40%? When these things get tacked on, we'll get push back from City. Want more fees on developers, how will developers do low-income housing in addition to everything we want.

AW: Today, DIF (development impact fees) are paid and a portion stays in community where the dollars are generated and larger portion goes into citywide pot. The City did this because the FBA equation was inequitable. Growing parts of City, mostly in north, had lots of money and other communities not growing had no money to pay even for swing sets in parks. City made a choice to emphasize equity of fees and spending.

- But the question remains how to pay for infrastructure in communities that are growing.
- Public: Susan Baldwin: DIF requirements state that funds be spent in communities of concern, but there is no requirement that they be spent in the communities where they are generated.
- AW: I stand corrected.
- SB: FBA was a form of Land Value Capture. Community could ask for a supplemental development impact fee that would be spent in this community above and beyond city-wide fees, which were lowered across the board when city-wide fee was created last December.
 - Public: Tom Ruff: Plan should specify that properties be purchased for park, so they can be large enough size to satisfy needs of community. I'd like to see that in the plan. Thank you to Help Save UC for comments presented recently. Consensus plan has included those ideas. The plan's Vons/Sprouts difference in my opinion is not appropriate. The difference is bus routes. Both go to Vons; one goes to Sprouts. Plan for both should be 29 du/ac and a 40' height limit.
 - Public: Ali: Someone mentioned Rome and in Rome and Europe, parks aren't only parks where people recreate – streets/infrastructure are designed for public use and aesthetics and bring great value. Instead of seeing streets, think aqueducts, infrastructure, that were built to satisfy need but also beautifully. Think of city not just as transient place or streets to move through but entire city can become something beautiful for current and future residents.

- Public: I'd like to express my dissenting opinions – people in this room appear to be in favor of less density. I am in favor of more density – walkable, livable community to raise a family in that doesn't have to be single family home, choice in mobility, in housing type – in multiple family homes. I want to be a voice that expresses the counter point.
 - Public: can we boo?
 - AW: No. We're not going to do that.
 - Public: can we recognize that's a paid lobbyist?
- DK: Strongly recommend a supplemental development fee for community. This community is driving economy here bringing in tax revenue, creating huge number of jobs. Very viable proposition that we do that, and I support that, and that land acquisition, as called for in the Parks Master Plan, be a priority. I am concerned about area in the area east of the I-5, which is proposed for high density. Students can recreate on campus, which is not true for other areas. We need get to a point where we see our way to a positive aspect of growth in the community and a lot of us don't see the positive aspect of what we want the community to be. Walk, play, and shop in a 15-minute community is not what is proposed here. That people can raise a family, to recreate, to “work, play and shop” in one community. They are not giving this to us in this plan. They're giving us the density without the things that make walk, play, and shop possible.
- VA: I have 3 kids, I would like them to be able to have different ways of moving: bike, walk, drive. Want bookstores back. Book stores are gone. We have to drive to Del Mar or La Jolla because the bookstores are gone. We can achieve these goals without increasing density that will damage our sustainable development. I support low density development keeping in mind shared goals of raising a family and mobility and parks.
- AL: I would love a place where we can have all of these things - and have options, walk, ride, or drive or take the trolley where we want to go. The link between conversation and density and how we pay for things. It is worthwhile to point out that a study by Urban 3 looked at cost versus revenue of single-family homes vs multifamily. Single family homes cost the City more than they raised in taxes. Multifamily homes in median/high density were raising more money for the City. If multifamily brings revenue to City - then we have density subsidizing lifestyle of single-family homes. If we want to pay for things, we have to look at where money is. Bringing in more taxpayers. In mixed use environment, where people can walk to where they want to go, some amount of density is necessary to provide for the things we want and for expansion for things like park/public facilities and recreation. I know my comments have just gotten scoffs and laughs, but it is important to look at how we are paying for our public facilities. If we want to bring in more taxpayers and more money we need to bring density where it makes sense and doing it in University City adjacent to transit, a multi-billion-dollar investment, makes sense.
 - Public: This is an attack on single family homes.

- AW: This is not going to be a back and forth of ‘my views are better than somebody else’s views.’
- Public: Question about definition: you used the word stakeholder. Who are the stake holders? AL is on as UCSD. Why isn’t school district here. Who are the stakeholders?
 - AW: I provide an implicit overview of stakeholders in the introduction to every meeting and they include: residents, employees, life science industry, top global university, four world class hospitals, world class shopping center, residences of all kinds, all heights/density levels. This is a community that includes all of us. The people who work, who study, who aspire, who have lived here and raised families. All of us are stakeholders – we are all in this. I will not be silent to efforts to try to minimize one voice over another or to emphasize the importance of a single group of stakeholders. I think there are many stakeholders.
 - Public: To infer homeowners are not pulling their weight its insulting.
 - AW: I don’t read it that way. I would say that my understanding of the past literature is the opposite of what AL is saying. If that equation has changed that may be for the good.
 - Public: what’s the citation of AL’s study?
 - AW: Let’s focus on the conversation we’ve been having here. We have some ideas on the table about implementation. What I’m hearing is a consensus of the subcommittee that the Discussion Draft needs a much clearer and more transparent and robust explanation of how this infrastructure and policies will be paid for. I’m not criticizing the planning department. I’m saying we need a clearer explanation. I am looking at Michaela and the Mayor’s office to note this because this really is a city-wide issue. We need a very clear, transparent explanation for how infrastructure will be provided for the growth that is projected. That should be a fundamental feature of planning and it should be here. That will allow a real conversation about the plans we want to make. So, here’s what I hear: the Draft should have a clear explanation for how parks and bike infrastructure will be paid for and include in this how infrastructure at large will be paid for. How will land for parks be acquired? The land the Parks Master Plan mandates. I don’t know the answer, but I would I recommend the City, please engage in a serious study of funding and implementation similar to Kayser Marston for infrastructure – whether they want to do that for infrastructure generally or for bikes, parks, affordable housing, they should study supplemental strategies that get us to the infrastructure that is needed and mandated by City policy. I have heard further that they should consider supplemental development impact fees and other land value capture tools to provide infrastructure.
 - Is there anything else?

- LP: When you talk about land acquisition, do we include land for bike lanes in that context?
- AW: Good question. I note that the SDRs – 13-17 – include granting of easements for bike lanes on specific segments when development takes place. But you may be talking about something more than that that specifically funds development?
 - LP: The City should protect setbacks for future infrastructure. To stop development that goes all the way out to the curb, where there could have been space for bike lanes in a 15-foot setback. We had the opportunity and just in the last few years they've scuttled this.
 - AW: Can we get a consensus view on that particular point? That the City protects setbacks for future infrastructure? How about consensus or disagreement on the earlier recommendations for supplemental fees and study of other strategies to fund infrastructure.
 - GL: Which setbacks are you talking about – some streets have different setback than others?
 - AW: Protection doesn't have to be whole 50 feet setback,
 - Public: but sufficient setback to allow construction of future bike infrastructure.
 - AW: Thank you to the Dr. Ok: sufficient setback to allow construction of future bike infrastructure.
 - AW: Are there dissenting views or do we have consensus about the longer list of issues I raised related to supplemental development fees or other strategies to pay for infrastructure.
 - GL: I support supplemental development fees or FBAs. The idea of land value increase capturing portion for City/government is of great concern – What about someone in a condo? Their values increase because their community got bigger/stronger? Do they get attached a fee? What about single family homes that become far more exclusive? Are we going to have sharing of value when they increase?
 - KR: Susan, would land value capture only get paid when someone wants to redevelop the property?
 - Public: Susan Baldwin: It's a concept not a one type of thing, it needs to be looked at in more depth to figure out what makes sense in this community. It's not just a supplemental impact fee. It could be a host of things.
 - AW: Proposal is for City to study ways to fund infrastructure, including land value capture strategies – the urban public spaces is a land value capture strategies; FBAs are a LVC - and receive a clear explanation of results. I think we have a consensus on this idea. GL objection is noted.
 - KR: I think we have a consensus that the City should study a strategy to pay for infrastructure, but we don't have a consensus for how that should happen.

- AW: Yes, and we are not the appropriate body to figure that out. But the City has the capacity to study this and come up with a strategy. Not only that they study it but that the community receive a clear explanation for how the City proposes to pay for infrastructure.

Public: One question. What do you mean when you say “affordable”?

KR: The City Housing Commission has definitions on its website.

AW: This is complicated. But what is being studied is a plan to support inclusionary affordable housing. What proportions, what levels of affordability. We don’t know what will come back.

AW: Are there other areas of disagreement or concern in the Preliminary Report to the UCPG. If there are, then let’s hammer them out. If not, then let’s move on toward a vote.

- DK: We’ve spent 4.5 years meeting on this and had 198 of 204 pages of the draft plan we had never seen before, which was just shown to us. It is disturbing from my point of view. I have concerns that the City is not going to incorporate much of what the recommendations are. I hope I’m not unduly worried about it. The City has consumed us for 4.5 years. It has been a very detailed and difficult process. I have grave concerns remaining at the end of this process. Thank you to AW for pulling this all together. Without that we would be nowhere close to where we are now. So, I make a motion to support the Draft Report that was released and brought to UCPG with consensus items last month plus the consensus items today, plus the chair’s comments incorporated in that draft. A lot of them were excellent, very thoughtful, substantive set of recommendations. I deeply urge Michaela to talk to the Mayor and Planning Department to take careful note of the level of engagement and thought that’s gone into these comments because they do reflect something the City wants which is community engagement.
 - *DK: Motion to support AW updating the Preliminary Report to UCPG on the Community Discussion Draft of the UC plan and that he incorporates the things that have been reflected in today’s discussion, and this be sent to the UCPG. PK 2nd*
 - LP: What is the implication of voting one way or another?
 - JM: This hasn’t been a voting committee for 4.5 years. Why are we voting now?
 - AW: UCPG wants a voted recommendation.
 - JS: clarification, does the motion include that dissenting comments also go in?
 - DK: yes, those also go in
 - AW: I’d like to make a friendly amendment to the motion: Motion to approve and direct the chair to prepare final report to the UCPG based on tonight’s discussion of the Preliminary

Report to the UCPG including the chair's recommendations and that the report will include specific additions and subtractions approved through discussion tonight. Chair to take a careful read of the minutes and will include alternative/dissenting views.

- *Motion to approve and direct the chair to prepare final report to the UCPG based on tonight's discussion of the Preliminary Report to the UCPG (June 9, 2023) including chair's recommendations, and that the report will include specific additions and subtractions approved through discussion tonight. Chair to take a careful read of the minutes and will include alternative/dissenting views.*

- *DK/PK accepted.*

- AW: I've been working from a position that what we're doing matters and that City will pay attention to ideas that make sense. We have responsibility to provide best feedback that we can, based on our expertise. My hope is that City will receive in spirit is it given – for a better plan and better future. Recognize that not everything will be provided. But we will offer our recommendations. The implication of the vote is that we will provide a recommendation to UCPG, UCPG will receive and discuss on July 11th and will make its own recommendation. UCPG forward recommendation to City and the plan will undergo environmental review process.
- KR: are these comments provided on both land use scenarios?
 - AW: The discussion draft includes 2 land use scenarios. Staff preferred and community. Comments are to entire document regardless of land use plan. And many recommendations speak to the community preferred scenario.
- JS: We are waiting for experts to weigh in on affordable housing. The park point count – are we waiting for that as well? Receipt of both would be another time when we should discuss.
 - AW: no timeline for future meeting but may need to meet again.
- DK: Maybe Nancy [Graham] could address issue of timing for study on affordable housing?
 - NG: They are working on it, it will be included in next draft that we release, plan will go to planning group for approval. The planning group will see that SDR prior to being asked to being to vote on the plan. It doesn't have a big impact on the EIR, but if the planning group wants to make a counter recommendation, they can do so.
 - DK: So, do we see the revised draft before the EIR?
 - NG: No, those will come out at the same time. Any revisions from there would happen at the public hearing process. If you want additional changes, bring them to planning commission to make those changes. This process now is the big public review where we have the

biggest number of changes and future changes happen in the public hearing process.

- GL: In AW comments about housing, you reference what UCSD was building, we should also have a few sentences about demand side, they're also accommodating increasingly large number of students. Address both issues.
 - AW: I will take that comment into the revision.
- AL: I would like to register alternative views: parking minimums on page 8, transportation modes citing 1 parking spaces/du required – I'd like to register dissent on that, parking minimums are generally bad practice. Prefer the focus on encourage alternative transportation modes. Page 8 change of setbacks for the SDR-7 building transition from single family residents and low density, should remain just single family. Don't have a recommendation on setbacks but remain skeptical on setbacks.
 - AW: To NG for clarification: Is single family synonymous with 0-9 du/ac, or does it include townhomes 0-29?
 - NG: It is considered single family when its detached.
 - AW: Re comments on SDR-7 inclusion of low/moderate income – looked at the zoning that borders on the various commercial plazas, only ones with single family are in south UC but intention of subcommittee was to apply the same principle to adjoining residential, which includes two story townhouses with low-moderate density zoning that were also adjacent. We didn't distinguish between people living in townhouses and detached houses.
- RC: UCSD is expanding rapidly 43-50K students, ask them for moratorium on increases in enrollment to see how development plays out.
 - AW: May be beyond our scope as they are a state agency and we are a subcommittee of a City body.

JS: Call the question.

- AW: Now time for vote:
 - Motion: *Motion to approve and direct the chair to prepare final report to the UCPG including chair's recommendations and that the report will include specific additions from tonight. Chair to take a careful read of the minutes and will include alternative/dissenting views.*
 - Motion Carries: 12 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain.

8:30 Adjournment