



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, July 20, 2021

Regular Time 5:30 PM

REMOTE MEETING VIA ZOOM

5:32 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: Andy Wiese

AW: Calls the meeting to order and calls the roll.

Roll Call:

Members present:

Andy Wiese (AW), Keith Jenne (KJ), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), Debby Knight (DK), George Lattimer (GL), Katie Rodolico (KR), Joanne Selleck (JS), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Jason Morehead (JM), Aidan Lin (AL), Carol Uribe (CU), Petr Krysl (PK), Dinesh Martien (DiM)

Members not present:

Kristin Camper (KC), Kris Kopensky (KK), Anu Delouri (AD), Laurie Phillips (LP), Melanie Cohn (MC)

Non-voting Member:

Kristin Camper (KC).

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

City Staff:

Tait Galloway (TG) – Program Manager, Planning Department

Katie Witherspoon (KW) – Sr. Planner, Planning Department

Diego Velasco (DV) – Consultant, Urban Design and Planning, Citythinkers principal

Rick Barrett (RB) – Consultant, MIG principal

Martin Flores (MF) – City of San Diego, Landscape Architect

Some members of the public are identified below as:

Barry Bernstein (BB)

Nancy Groves (NG)

Diane Ahern (DA)

Kaitlyn Willoughby (KWI)

Isabelle Kay (IK)

Andrew Barton (AB)

Marcella Escobar Eck (MEE)

Neil Hyytinen	(NH)
Jeff Dosick	(JD)
Tetsu Kidokuro	(TK)
Public member	(Public)

5:40 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – April 20, 2021

April 20, 2021, minutes. AW moved, GL seconded, the motion to approve the minutes.
13 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain, 0 Recuse.

5:42 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – May 18, 2021

May 18, 2021, minutes. AW moved, KR seconded, the motion to approve the minutes as amended. 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain, 0 Recuse.

Chris Nielsen (CN) to take minutes for this meeting.

5:44 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

RC – CIP Projects: Get project defined, pay attention to them over the long haul and advance each whenever possible, even with partial funding.

BB – Pure Water working group will be meeting soon at the Rec Center at Standley Park.

Robert Denis – Comment on Governor Drive Traffic Calming.

RRW – Comment on housing. Housing is needed; there are 10.9K faculty and staff, and 40.5K students at UCSD, many in need of housing.

Iris Claus – Comment on Governor Drive Traffic Calming. Not aware of the issue, there may be other solutions to try first. Comments on this have been a problem.

Aidan Lin – Withdrawn.

RGD – Not present for her comment.

Bonnie C. – Traffic calming. If parents need a safe place for biking in front of the schools, they should approach the school to cede land for this purpose.

5:57 Announcements – KW

Blueprint San Diego announced on July 19.

This will be an information item at the UCPG on August 10.

There will be a scoping meeting on August 5 from 12-2PM.

5:58 Information Item #1: Public Spaces Opportunities. Urban Design #4 (Parks and Public Spaces) – Rick Barrett, Martin Flores, Katie Witherspoon, Diego Velasco.

Values in [...] denote slide numbers from this meeting's presentation deck.

DV: Recap of things so far.

June: FA 1/2/3/4/5. [Slide #7] has a brief recap.

DK: Comment on FA4. 85 feet was identified in the summary as a “sweet spot” for a proposed height limit. This was only MEE’s opinion, not a fact. Remove this comment, please.

DV: Some comments are only one person.

DK: MEE has a vested interest in FA4.

AW: Yes, please remove.

Rick Barrett (RB): Martin Flores (MF) will jump in here.

MF: The goal is to repurpose three rights of way (ROWs): Regents Road North (RRN) at Rose Canyon, Regents Road South (RRS) at Rose Canyon, and Governor Drive’s terminus at the west end. For each we ask how does the canyon engage with the ROW and the community? The three greenway projects will include bike paths, removing about three acres of asphalt. We are envisioning the ROWs for water retention as way to get access to the trails. They are maintained by Transportation and Storm Water (TSW), so anything outside of TSWs normal operation and maintenance scope will be a challenge. If we add items to a project, we need to think about how they would be provided.

RB: Consider Regents Road N (RRN) at Rose Canyon and the utility access road (north side). Look at the existing conditions slide, pictures of RRN and RRS [#9 - #17]. The large asphalt area spurred on the idea of doing something with the space. Slide #18 shows RRN concept, a linear park with turn around. Right lanes (1 north, 1 south) can become unimproved areas.

KW: Brown color in pictures illustrate utility access and canyon access.

RB: Regents Road South. We want to improve the area by moving the canyon closer to the community. The area can be improved significantly. We want to improve the west side of what is now unofficially parking, including improvements in the barrels at the end. How would this translate to a concept plan? Slides 32 and 33 show it. Maintain 15-18 parking stalls. ADA access parking. Native planting. Crosswalks in the turnaround circle.

KW: I would clarify that parking would be back-in, reverse parking.

RB: For the park at the west end of Governor Drive, we are looking at the LDS (north) side for access out. During the rain, run-off goes to one side creating a bottleneck. There is an opportunity for signage at the entrance. Looking at current photos, we see a modest grade change. We need to provide access to the utilities box on the south side. There need to be two lanes of roadway for emergency vehicles and the church, with stormwater planters. The

landscape will need to be drought tolerant, native plants, and there needs to be a crosswalk.

MF: Lucas Wiese did some drawings awhile back that got us excited about the prospects here.

RB: Displayed some slides of “Public Spaces” as examples. Light touch, with stormwater swales.

RB: Comments?

JS: Where do stormwater swales drain?

RB: The intent is to capture the storm water in the swales, subsurface, but excess would go into the canyon. It’s a good question. The swales really help, treating and cleaning the water as they slow the flow. A lot of rutted erosion would be eliminated.

Margaret Petrie: Where does the park start on the RRN side?

KW: We need to study where this might be, keeping in mind residential access.

Barbara Gellman: Who pays to maintain the areas?

KW: If it’s in the plan it can be included in infrastructure planning and can qualify for grants. As for Lahitte Drive, I don’t know exactly, but it should be an improvement, a lot nicer, and would change the experience there.

Public: What about a dog park? Community garden?

MF: Water treatment for run off is a really good use for the area.

AW: Will there be new opportunities for input?

MF: These are still public ROWs, maintained by TSW, so it would be limited. There are legal issues involved in transferring land management to Parks & Rec. What goes into the area? Council Policy 400-33 input will occur as open space transitions to “greenspace”.

Lou Rodolico: What about preserving the possibility of roadway completion at the west end of Governor?

Public: Who pays for it? Northern retailers should be the ones.

Andrew Barton (AB): I like the concepts and they will improve access by the community. I wonder if RB & MF could comment on seating in the parks?

MF: This would not be in TSW's budget but could change if the ownership makes a transition.

AB: For maximum enjoyment by the community, seating will be needed.

MF: We can be creative, and there may be a change in attitude towards maintenance agreements.

AW: Planning does not have the power to take responsibility, and Parks and Rec also cannot take responsibility. Maybe the City Council will make the necessary changes as part of the Parks Master Plan. Joe LaCava and the City Council should work on this issue to make sure linear ROW "parks" can be managed by P/R as true parks. This is an opportunity to expand park space all around the city.

MF: This has to do with property ownership and is complicated by a reversion to the original property owner on transfer between city departments. [To transfer between two departments, the first department must vacate. Vacation causes ownership to revert to the original property owner, usually a developer or homeowner group, who must vacate in turn so the second department may acquire.]

KR: I compiled this list of comments from others in the community:

1. These proposed plans might restrict access to the canyon.
2. Can the CPUS consider an emergency vehicle bridge?
3. These parks could block access to Rose Canyon Open Space Park.
4. Concern about turning the space into a party spot.
5. Concern about a possible dump or trash site.
6. (My own concern) Would like to preserve the option of a fire station by the LDS church site at the end of Governor.
7. (My comment) RRS has a zigzag now, and the plan shows removal.

KW: The conceptual drawing did not show a chicane, but we would maintain it. Traffic circle would be at the end. Only emergency vehicles can access the canyon. Noted about the fire station. I have had conversations with the Fire Department, and they are not looking at the area next to LDS church as an option. We are not pursuing a bridge of any kind.

KR: How would you address the comment about a late-night party spot?

MF: Open spaces do have issues, but this use is not allowed. The PD must enforce.

PK: The service road on RRN can be permeable rather than paved. This is a good opportunity to catch runoff water. What you have here looks like a decent first step, but it looks like a road needing improvement, not a Parks and Rec asset. TSW won't take care of it. It might be tricky legally, but we want to convert it to a Parks & Rec asset.

DiM: For the RRN park, do we want to maintain access all the way to Porte De Merano?

KW: Retractable bollards would restrict access to the canyon and would have ADA parking. We are working with the mobility team.

DK: Ultimately these should be parks “owned” by Parks & Rec and are a great first step. Native plants are great and are very nice in an urban setting.

TJ Zerr: You are doing a fantastic job. I live on the south side of Regents, and I’d ask for chicanes to be permanent. I would also ask that at the top of the hill on Regents south that you look at the potential blind spot near the Outcast restaurant for southbound traffic.

GK: Thanks to the planning group and KW. These open spaces will really improve the health of the community and are a great first step.

PK: Everyone is familiar with the Del Mar [Train] Tunnel. Have you heard about the Miramar Tunnel? It could be that the railroad tracks would be removed, and the entire canyon floor would be returned to nature. This would be fantastic and important for the north side of Regents Road.

BB: Bike and emergency vehicle access over Regents Road. We need this. Having a bridge for this purpose would be a compromise that could be considered. Caltrans and SANDAG could build it.

AW: The bridge idea was studied and removed by the City Council and courts.

RB: [Showing Greenways integrating public spaces and Transit Oriented Development (TOD).] This is based around FA3 but can be extended to FA1 and FA2.

Showed slide [#44] for FA3, and [#45] for FA3 Greenways. The Greenways reflect the concept of the three P’s: Paseos, Promenades, and Podiums. They make the area much more accessible to transit stops. [#46] shows paseos, [#47] podiums (near transit, on the second level). [#48] shows promenades, more urban than the linear parks on RRN and RRS. In [#49] pink is the trolley. Nobel Drive on the north and south side have paseos [#52]. There are many public space opportunities.

Comments?

AW: One question. For the Executive Drive rambla, this is on a ROW and includes benches. What’s the difference between this and RRN/RRS? Lighting, too, as a distinct category.

MF: The requirement for these developments is to be maintained by the adjacent property owners.

AW: Is it different if the rambla is in the center of the road (as opposed to one side or the other)?

MF: Some kind of business district would have to take maintenance responsibility.

AW: What would be the specific planning tools available to enforce greenways? What about public access across private property?

KW: We are working through what these would look like in RMX/EMX zones. CPOZ around transit? There are mechanisms. I don't have implementation details. Easements might be used. For example, Costa Verde has activation in the center, rather than along the major streets around it.

AW: I approve of the connected greenways, and encourage connectors to bicycle paths, and encourage using these networks to move through the community, perhaps differently every day. We need to consider bio swales as well, and native landscaping near MSCP and environmentally sensitive areas. Native planting should be used to enhance pollinators. The monarch is the canary in the coal mine. We can do our part with biodiverse planting.

AW: There are some comments in the chat about micro mobility.

KW: Let me clarify that we will maintain the Nobel trolley parking structure access.

MF: I will share the tree types and so forth with the group.

LR: On the monarch butterfly, I will point out that not completing the roadway system in UC helps add tons of pollution.

RC: Very thoughtful comment on the pollinators by AW. Pesticides are a problem as well. Microwave radiation has been shown to destroy insects.

AW: Thanks to staff for all the hard work and listening to the community. Katie?

KW: No meeting in August; September is the OCET. Thanks to all.

7:25 Adjourned.