



## UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday September 20, 2022

Regular Time 6:00 PM

MEETING BY ZOOM

**DRAFT**

### 6:07 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), Debby Knight (DK), George Latimer (GL), Katie Rodolico (KR), Joanne Selleck (JS), Aidan Lin (AL), Jason Morehead (JM), Veronica Ayesta (VA), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), Laurie Phillips (LP), Petr Krysl (PK), Carol Uribe (CU), Anu Delouri (AD), Melanie Cohn (MC), Carol Uribe (CU), Anu Delouri (AD), Melanie Cohn (MC), Laurie Phillips (LP)

##### *Members not present:*

Kris Kopensky (KK), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Petr Krysl (PK), Kristen Camper (KC)

##### *Non-voting Member:*

Kristin Camper (KC).

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

##### *City Staff:*

Nancy Graham (NG) – Sr. Planner, Planning Department  
Suchi Lukes (SL) – Associate Planner, Planning Department  
Diego Velasco (DV) – Consultant, Citythinkers

Some members of the public are identified below as:

|                 |           |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Barry Bernstein | (BB)      |
| Nancy Groves    | (NGroves) |
| Diane Ahern     | (DA)      |
| Isabelle Kay    | (IK)      |
| Andrew Barton   | (AB)      |
| Neil Hyytinen   | (NH)      |
| Jeff Dosick     | (JD)      |
| Public member   | (Public)  |

**6:03 Call to Order – Chair Andy Wiese**

This is the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> year for this process and members of this group. I'm excited to hear from the city, and happy to hear you all, too.

**6:04 Roll Call – Chair Andy Wiese**

See list of members present and absent above.  
Fifteen members present.

**6:11 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – February 15, 2022, and March 15, 2022**

No minutes this month to approve.

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

**6:08 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT**

Linda Beresford: Resident of UC. In response to requests by Help Save University City, the city produced a FAQ document, but changed the questions. The city's response was general not specific. The city has proposed more housing than the RHNA projections or their grant applications suggest; the city's response is that they consider many factors when setting housing targets. The city needs to present data in support of their proposals, and we hope they present more data tonight. The Governor and Genesee does not meet the criteria for a Transit Priority Area (TPA). MTS has proposed additional bus service in four years but does not explain how this will be accomplished in the face of a driver shortage. Has the park point plan been implemented in any other city? Is the Jobs/Housing ratio appropriate? Just because UC has been identified as a sub-regional jobs center does not mean the jobs/housing ratio is appropriate. Our research indicates this is more appropriate for a larger area, such as a city. Where else has this been done in the country?

Diane Ahern: Tomorrow, Wednesday, September 21, 2022, the date - 9/21/22 will Meet the University City ZIP Code- 92122. The University City 92122 Post Office will commemorate this once-in-a-century alignment of the date on the calendar – 9-21-22 — with its ZIP Code — 92122. Stop by the 92122 University City post office on Governor Drive from 8:30 AM to 5 PM to purchase commemorative envelopes, to obtain the custom cancellation mark on your mailable items, and for free refreshments. Why not send a letter to yourself on this special day and get the special cancellation mark as your personal souvenir? Councilmember Joe LaCava will stop by at 12:30 PM to congratulate the community and to thank the post office staff. There will also be a special concert and other activities to celebrate at Standley Park beginning at 5:30 PM.

The MCAS Miramar Air Show returns this week after a two-year COVID-related hiatus. The Blue Angels and other aircraft performers are expected to arrive on Wednesday, September 21. Practice day will be in full force on Thursday, September 22. The Air Show and ground displays and tech expo at MCAS Miramar will be open to the public from Friday to Sunday, September 23-25. The Blue Angels and Fat Albert are scheduled to perform at approximately 3 PM.

Suzi Shamsky: On March 2022, I submitted a Public Records Act Request for plan update records. I have received no documents for about five months then only non-substantive documents without attachments. The mayor's office has provided no documents. The city has not produced documents on land use scenarios, etc. It's hard to believe the city can produce a plan without these important records. We are requesting immediate release of these documents.

David Broide: The city's response in its posted FAQs was too general. I request that the subcommittee chair and members produce an alternative Land Use Scenario (LUS) so we can see how the numbers can go together to form a plan. We need the numbers. The subcommittee should prepare a third option. This is being done by other communities such as Mira Mesa. I'd like to see the numbers developed.

Jen Dunaway: I'm interested in what the city presents, collaboratively or directed. FAQs are great, but when the questions are changed, this adds to the distrust. You took these questions away. We can figure out the numbers: give us the numbers. We are not stupid. What is the barrier to moving more slowly? Anything that is proposed needs to be vetted by the community. Not everyone will get everything, but everyone gets involved and gets a say.

Jesse O'Sullivan: Circulate SD. I recommend you recommend the greatest capacity for housing and transit-oriented development. We have a \$2 billion trolley, a world-class university, and a world-class biotech sector. We have a housing crisis; prices will not go down without more homes. Half of all GHG is due to vehicle emissions. The best way to address that is to put homes closer to transit. UC is the perfect place to do both of those things.

Vedant Patel: UC San Diego student. The vast majority of land in UC is zoned Single Family (SF). This is not sufficient to satisfy the needs of the University and businesses. Minneapolis shows a way this can be done without huge towers. Both cities have similar demographics, so there are things we can take from there. Housing has lagged job growth for a long time here; there are opportunities with the trolley to really improve this situation.

DK: I'm concerned we haven't received information in advance. We come in as cold as the audience. There is not data that can be reviewed in advance. It is hard to have a meaningful discussion this way. I urge the city as before to please send the substantive information ahead of time so people can be prepared with thoughtful questions and comments.

AW: I have asked for this repeatedly as chair, that meeting information and documents be shared preferably a week in advance. The city has missed this 100% of the time. This time is probably the worst, at the bottom of the list. It makes a mockery of public input to withhold

information at a public forum and then expect substantive, valuable, useable feedback to be supplied under the circumstances. I understand that there were extenuating circumstances in this case, but this is a pattern, and is disrespectful and wasteful of 1,000s of hours of community time that has been invested in this project during the last four years. It is not the best way to get to a resolution for this project. That's my public comment.

Rachael Graham: Graduate of UC San Diego. I want to thank NG and the staff for the all the hard work. I support zoning changes that will allow us to add the housing we badly need over the next decades. I understand that people are concerned about the traffic impact, but many are forced to commute in because they can't afford the housing, increasing GHG and traffic. The recent heat wave was a reminder of how we need to increase the housing supply in coastal areas. In short, please maximize the housing capacity in the plan update.

AW: At this point we are four minutes ahead. NG will now discuss the city's approach to Smart Growth (SG).

### **6:23 Approach to Smart Growth – NG.**

Reference: "September 2022 – Approach to Smart Growth Presentation PDF" on [planuniversity.org/meetings](http://planuniversity.org/meetings). PDF page / slide numbers are given in [ ...] below.

[2] Smart Growth Concept Study will be presented tonight.

This is a deliverable under the SANDAG grant.

[5] What is Smart Growth?

[6] Promotes good community design in housing and transportation. There is a smart growth concept map. Directs funding for transportation. Informed by local community feedback.

[7] Smart Growth Concept Map. A reason we have the trolley built here is that this area was identified in 2004, with north UC identified as an urban center. A special use center at UCSD, and an urban center at UTC, and a town center at Nobel.

[8] Smart Growth Incentive Grant has this work as a deliverable.

[9] Urban Form Framework. Community Atlas, work from 2021.

Turn this over to Diego Velasco.

### **6:28 Urban Design Framework – Diego Velasco, Citythinkers.**

Reference: “September 2022 – Urban Design Framework” on [planuniversity.org/meetings](https://planuniversity.org/meetings). PDF page / slide numbers are given in [ ...] below.

DV: Started working with the community in 2019, in 2020 presented urban design concepts. In April 2020, came with concepts for the community in the defined Focus Areas (FAs). Incorporated feedback and in April 2021 with land use including 3D views. Then the online engagement tool. This is the culmination of the work. Urban design is not about land use or intensity but how to create spaces in the community. Everything is on [planuniversity.org](https://planuniversity.org) so you can re-view. This is an introduction but you really need to review the document in detail.

[2] Introduction. Transform the community from auto-dominated to a more fully realized, placemaking, community open to transit and walking. Make connections to transit.

[3] Key opportunities are in the Focus Areas.

[4] FA1 – Torrey Pines Employment Center, concepts, components, and main opportunities.

[5, 6] FA1 – Key ideas. Circulation current and proposed. Protect open spaces, and connections to transit. Some areas for potential development. Opportunities to cluster development. Scientific Research area. Topology challenges, opportunity for traffic calming on North Torrey Pines.

[7] FA1 – Summary of all three previous slides. Growth opportunities, connected paths, and connections from the area to UC San Diego and points south.

[8] FA2 – Campus Point and Towne Centre Employment Center. Components and opportunities. Single uses, large parking areas. Canyon edge important. Many comments from the community included from past discussion.

[9] FA2 – Vision. Support an employment center, some residential mixed use, campus like environment, focus development away from the canyon edges, create canyon edge pathways, and connections to transit.

[10] FA2 – Growth, community, and mobility opportunities. Internal neighborhood loop concept to improve mobility within the areas. Reinforce Genesee and Executive Drive connections to transit.

[11] FA3 - Large area, UTC Transit Village. Key is the two transit stations to the trolley. Area has commercial, office, and residential. Lots of superblocks that make navigation difficult. We need to find better connections. What would it take to create more green spaces.

[12] FA3 – Create a high density, mixed use, core urban area. Build up the edge along La Jolla Village Drive, Nobel Drive. Not a back door, but a front door for the people living in the

areas. Locate most new housing near current housing, wrap the parking structures. Transit stations are again key. Executive Drive “Rambla” is a key idea for pedestrian activation.

[13] FA3 – Activate near transit stations. Establish connections to transit stations and create neighborhood loops for internal by employees and residents. Find ways to provide greater connectivity to the area, including cars, bikes, pedestrians so we can strengthen connections to the transit stations.

[14] FA4 – Nobel Transit Area. Key is the Nobel trolley station. Has two significant retail shopping centers. How do we improve access to the station? Lots of pedestrians and bikes even now. Need safe crossings. People want to live here since it has everything. A good area for housing.

[15] FA4 – Key ideas. Do some traffic calming on Nobel. Opportunity with redevelopment of the centers to keep all the services now but also create a Main Street environment, north to south. Relieve the stress on Villa La Jolla Drive. Strengthen the areas immediately near the transit center. Connections from the east side of I-5 important.

[16] FA4 -- Opportunities. Street wall on Nobel and Villa La Jolla. 30’ height limit on the west side of I-5. Neighborhood loops, and open space loop through La Jolla Colony.

[17] FA5 – Governor Community Village. South UC. Area has two shopping centers, and a business park along I-805. Low density residential and schools. Rose Canyon Open Space Park. Comments about outdoor spaces attached to the two grocery stores. Traffic calming along Governor Drive. Do we need all four gas stations? Connections to the UC Library.

[18] FA5 – Key ideas. Infill in the shopping center areas. Build a street edge on Governor Drive, internalizing the parking near retail.

[19] FA5 – Opportunities. Connect UC High School to reduce isolation. Transit infrastructure issues. We want your input moving forward.

End.

## **7:02 Land Use Scenario Basis – NG.**

Reference: “September 2022 – Approach to Smart Growth Presentation PDF” on [planuniversity.org/meetings](http://planuniversity.org/meetings). PDF page / slide numbers are given in [ ...] below. This is a continuation of the earlier presentation by Nancy Graham.

NG: I know the group is frustrated but we spent only 20 minutes on the presentation. I want to also share what will be presented to the Planning Commission. This is the reason we have the presentation. No way this is final. You can mark up the PDF document so please do this as we'd like to use these documents in the final plan.

[10] Land Use Scenarios

[11] Background slide. Shows the inputs to land use scenarios (LUS). Some people have been on the project since the beginning, but others are newer. We want everyone on the same page. There was some consensus around form and urban design so revisiting this work so moving forward, design and form are important, so we wanted to get back to that foundation so we have a common basis for understanding.

When we create LUS, there are a lot of things that go into it. Existing conditions, planning principles, community input, commercial surveys. These are not the only things, but these are the major things we consider.

We create a series of alternatives or scenarios that can be based on Land use or a mobility network. If you make adjustments to the mobility network, they can be compensated with land use, for example.

[12] LUS has many inputs we want to create land use and mobility scenarios.

[13] Goes into Regional Transportation Model (ABM 2+).

[14] Inputs are a land use scenario, a mobility network, and the SANDAG series 14 data, with output a Travel Behavior Model, with information produced for the entire day.

[15] This output produces some data. The most important is Per Capita VMT and a Mode Choice Report. Where are people? Transit lines, car, bikes. Where do the trips happen, and how far are they? What is the daily mode choice for people? Daily mode choice and peak mode choice are produced.

[16] Climate Action Plan Goals. This is a table of choices for both 2030 and 2050 and the measures they employ for various aspects of the CAP. This is very important as the targets are legally mandated. The table summarizes the targets for 2030 and 2050 and what measures are used to achieve these targets.

[17] Optimization step. We want to feedback the Travel Behavior Model into the Land Use Scenario and cycle the process. About a year ago, a group of us wanted to know if there was a land use plan that is based on the CAP target goals. This policy plan is the foundation of Blueprint SD.

AW: To clarify, this is a citywide approach.

## **7:07 Blueprint SD Basics – SL.**

[18] Blueprint SD will be presented to the Planning Commission on 9/22.

SL: Blueprint SD is a proactive effort to create an equitable and sustainable framework for growth – including more homes, jobs, and better transportation options – to support current and future San Diegans.

[19] BP SD objectives: Refresh the General plan and the City of Villages Plan. Reflect SANDAGs latest transportation network. Align land use with the CAP. Create a more efficient and equitable environmental review.

[20] Existing Village Propensity Map is the city of villages, developed in 2008. This map is included in the 2008 General Plan.

[21] Land Use Optimization Process. Blueprint SD identifies the areas in the plan for homes and jobs considering connectivity, availability of transit, and potential for mixed use development to capture daily trips. The output is areas where housing and retail should go that would mostly likely shift mode share. Goal is to shift 50% of daily trips over the next 13 years.

[22] Blueprint SD DRAFT. Uses a machine learning algorithm to predict locations for homes and mixed use to maximize benefit. Incorporates policy assumptions, and includes bike, walk and transit competitiveness.

[23] Transit Propensity (Competitiveness). Cost, speed and reliability and convenience. Supportive land use policies that support this.

[24] Sustainable steps forward. Convenient and affordable travel, to and from work in a climate friendly way, more homes and jobs near transit, and complete neighborhoods.

[25] Timeline for Blueprint SD. Summer & Fall: Data modeling, in progress, citywide engagement, drafting of updated policies. Winter: Draft General Plan amendment, Draft program EIR. Spring 2023: Public hearings and adoption.

## **7:19 Applicability to Plan – NG.**

This is a continuation of the previous slide deck.

[26] Scenario Development Framework. Bridge the work under the Blueprint process with the work this group has done with land use scenarios.

[27] How to Use Blueprint SD. Does not mandate specific land uses in any community. It is designed to guide decisions and supplies a basis for comparison between scenarios. It is data



driven.

[28] Blueprint EIR. Will be a proposed amendment to the General Plan and will require environmental analysis. Plans completed after the adoption of Blueprint can tier off that environmental document. This will be done in the draft Community Plan.

[29] Scenario Comparison: LUS #1, Village Propensity Map, and LUS #2. This tells us where the best places for homes are, along with complimentary retails (including supportive services). The idea is that the closer we get to the Propensity Map, the better it will perform in the CAP. We are giving you a month to look at this presentation in anticipation of next month's meeting. We keep hearing from people that they want to know the data and the objective. The objective is to affect mode share and how do we meet the CAP goals.

[30] Discussion. Staff will be building a revised scenario based on this data, but before we do that, we want to hear from you.

[31-32] Form Letter. Iterative process: Tell us what you would like to have different on the next scenario iteration that we'll be working on for the next month.

Form Letter Comment: The land use scenario should not exceed actual population growth projections nor what existing infrastructure can support.

Ans: The regional forecast is based on the current plan, not predictive of what can be achieved with a revised plan. After we create a new LUS, the regional forecast will be used to evaluate the impacts of that plan. Community input regarding infrastructure is a critical part of the plan update process.

[33] Transportation Model Process. This slide explains how various components go into the transportation modeling process. Shows how the process is circular if the series 14 data is used.

[34-35] Form Letter. Various comments on how commercial services will be considered in the plan update. Transportation from mixed use development will be studied as part of the mobility in the environmental document.

[36] Discussion. Based on what we hear from you, we'll make changes to the inputs going into the modelling process.

[37] Village Propensity Map is displayed to help guide the discussion.

[38] Moving Forward

## 7:27 Discussion

AW: It is important to recognize the city is taking a new approach in how it crafts its land use scenarios. They will take the past four years' work into account, reflected by the presentation by Diego Velasco that gives us where we were about 18 months ago when we reached some kind of consensus. This represents the start of a discussion that people have been asking for some time. People should offer direct suggestions on how to construct the Land Use Scenarios (LUS). If you have questions about the model, this would be the time to ask. If you want to suggest what a land use scenario should look like, you should make them too. I'd like to keep the comments limited in time and maximized in number if we can, knowing people will be able to provide written comments after the meeting.

KR: I hope this is the start of an iterative process. With the last land use scenario released, you can see that the east end of Governor is not a not spot on the map and is not a TPA. Given the noise contours at the east end of Governor Drive ("Governor Village"), get rid of mixed use on Greenwich as there is no transit so it won't help Climate Action. If Governor Drive traffic is to be studied while the Spreckels School construction is ongoing, it will be worthless, and this construction will be ongoing for a couple of years. People want to put in bike lanes, but there is still traffic congestion related to the schools.

JS: Diego Velasco, thank you for the historical presentation, a helpful reminder of many things we have done. I still struggle with the land use issue. The rug has been totally pulled out from under us. I don't understand this, it seems backwards: Land Use first producing forecast. I don't see how projected household need fits into the scenario. I'm curious about how slide 37 (village propensity map) got created and where the data came from. When you have market driven housing, you need to look at the realities of the mode share people in the luxury housing will use. We are kidding ourselves if we allow transit to determine how we respond to land use issues. I don't think this will happen during the duration of this plan update. I will make a motion for SANDAG from our committee that there is no agreement on these issues.

Andrew Barton: [South UC resident]. Thank you, Diego. Many people would agree on the aspiration of the plan you presented to begin, but it's the question of scale where the discussion should be focused. Methodological models' projections depend on their assumptions and dimensionality of the model. The city should disclose all the model code, software code, analysis code, and documentation for all modeling decisions. This is the basis for ethical planning. Everyone should scrutinize the model which is being presented as an edifice of fact rather than outcome of many subjective decisions. Optimization is used to produce plausible scenarios and then humans need to evaluate the result and determine its usefulness. The criteria are subjective, and results from the scenario will be as well. We must use our good judgement to evaluate it.

Jen Dunaway: Show the data and assumptions. I like to see the data so we can understand. Don't drive the process with transit. We have had 1000s of homes built in UC, but this does not seem to be appreciated. Are these residents taking transit?

Linda Beresford: I agree with Andrew Barton. The first two presentations were on connectivity and GHG, etc. The scale is important. I appreciate the iterative process but this is still too fast; the comment time is too fast. Data, models, exact type of info we wanted was in the public access request. This community can evaluate the information. I still haven't seen the numbers in presentations. I appreciate the city's desire to have mode shift and have people take transit, but I think the community wants to know how the proposed land use scenarios produce the desired result and show that there are actual evidence and data that support the model predictions. Is the result fair to the community, or should the resulting density be more spread out around the city. That is the data the community wants to see.

Tommy Gibbs: VP of leasing, Shopcore, owner of the Shops at La Jolla Village Square. I reviewed the land use scenarios and I commend the city staff and think an area can supply useful, sustainable solutions for housing and retail as a partner in the update.

Jess Ganulius: Shopcore Leasing associate. Graduate of UC San Diego. We collect food for the SD foodbank on Saturdays in October. Density along the trolley is where it belongs, and more housing opportunities will allow people to live and work in the area and take advantage of the \$2 billion investment in the trolley.

Rolf Hollstein: UC homeowner. It's clear that the presence of students here is significant. One of the things that would help would be more UC San Diego housing. That decreases the housing pressure on the community and is supported by the chancellor. Where is the incorporation of this in the plan? I don't see anything about students. It's what makes or breaks the plan.

LP: I will comment that the University has exceeded their stated growth forecasts consistently and every few years resets its goals and tells the community they will build enough housing to satisfy their growth. Building high-rise apartments in the area will not help the student housing problem; it's too expensive and drives the price for workforce housing higher. The University should provide student housing as best it can and the community should not be expected to absorb the enormous density in order to accommodate the growth of the University. I'm concerned that the plans for promenades and paseos are great but the city hasn't controlled homeless encampments in the areas. These are created with public access and high density. I've seen this in San Francisco, but the weather is better in San Diego so the problem persists. I'd like to see a plan that increases housing for the local workforce. Prices here have exceeded workforce housing wages. The trolley should bring people from less expensive areas here as opposed to building housing near transit and driving up prices more.

Richard Bartell: I've lived in San Diego for 60 years and Bartell Hotels is one of the oldest family hotel companies in San Diego. We own the Sheraton and Villa La Jolla Plaza. Thanks to staff for all the hard work. We appreciate the time to study the data. You should focus the plan on the Focus Areas and accommodate the opportunities the trolley affords.

Carey Algaze: I am Director of Development for IQHQ. I thank subcommittee members

and city staff for all the hard work. IQHQ owns the Aventine, in FA4 and right next to the Nobel trolley line. I appreciate the CAP issues and have attended these meetings from the start. I appreciate the reminders from NG and DV as the areas appropriate for higher density, education, employment, and health care. We look forward to seeing these planning principles implemented.

DK: Diego talked about public spaces. When people return from work, they want parks, not coffee houses. The plan does not yield parks. The city does not mention that RHNA needs low- and moderate-income housing, but this is not built here. You can see that the kind of housing built in our community is not low and moderate housing. This is not a significant dent in housing for the kind of residents that are typical transit riders. I see a disconnect between what makes a diverse community and the things that are considered inputs here. The city never made a dent in the previous CAP program with its programs. Our residents don't bike or take transit. I'm not sure the city policies will shift modes.

David Broide: I commend NG for the iterative process. How are the two land use scenarios derived? What would lower density look like in the models? We would be adding two more UCs; what would it look like? We can't predict what developers will build but could say 40 towers at X height would be needed. This would allow appreciation for what might be built. I'm glad to see two story buildings in south UC. Traffic flow is integral for shopping centers, not only on roads but internally in the shopping centers.

Kimberly Brewer: I concentrate hard on the UTC area. Thanks to NG for all the hard work. The plans presented will build on the expanding transit system.

Lisa Heikoff: I was expecting the most recent land use scenarios but was disappointed. I echo DK's comments about rec and green spaces. We will see some density in south UC to some degree. We already have terrible congestion along Governor Drive. Maybe some kind of min-bus transit could help alleviate traffic along Governor.

JS: I have a comment on the heat map. There is a hot spot in north UC. We need the map to have overlays. We have not discussed the land use issues. The map is hard to read, but one hot spot is in open space and single-family, low-rise areas. Maybe this map should be reconsidered. Are the focus areas in the hot spot? Should I make my motion now?

AW: No. There is no action item on the agenda. We can discuss at the end.

JS: Nancy, is there another meeting prior to the report being finalized to SANDAG?

NG: No, this is the last meeting.

Jessie O'Sullivan: Circulate San Diego.

Dear Director Vonblum:

On behalf of Circulate San Diego, whose mission is to create excellent mobility choices and vibrant, healthy neighborhoods, I am writing to urge you to update the University Community Plan to create the greatest capacity for more homes and transit-oriented development.

Of the several options the City is considering, you should move forward with option that allows for the greatest amount of development in the area, to make the most of the recent construction of the Mid-Coast Trolley extension.

San Diego faces an acute housing shortage, yet San Diego's current zoning rules make it illegal to build significant numbers of homes in most locations within the city. The Community Plan Update has the potential to enhance the University community by creating opportunities for families of all incomes to live and work in this transit-rich neighborhood.

The University Community Plan Update should legalize the construction of more homes and transit-oriented development by removing zoning restrictions that stand in the way of building more of what we need.

In addition, the Community Plan should create ample opportunity to build homes and locations for jobs without the use of bonuses. If bonuses are included in the plan, they should be an additive to sufficient underlying zoning capacity. The inclusion of bonuses would be better to be implemented city-wide element, and not just limited to the University Community Plan. This would ensure that the plan is strong enough to achieve its goals without relying on bonus programs that may or may not be workable for developers and employers.

The plan should also ensure safe and efficient transportation by foot, bike, and public transit. This can be accomplished through protected bike lanes, improved sidewalks, and dedicated transit-only lanes.

The University Community Plan Update should capitalize on the opportunity to revamp the University area into a thriving mobility area for families of all income levels by creating a sturdy stand-alone baseline plan.

AW: Comment related to Diego Velasco and the planning team. I noted the mention of a "Rose Canyon bike path," but no such formal bike path exists. There are some informal SDG&E roads and informal trails. It is not in the city bicycle masterplan. The reference to the bike path should be removed. If the LUS suggests more density on Campus Pointe Drive, the city should plan to create a second access road from Campus Pointe to Genesee where the grade is equivalent, as part of the plan update.

On Blueprint San Diego, Andrew Barton's comments are right on the money. The black box should be open to ensure the data are reliable. We should be able to see the modeling code; this should be public information to ensure reliability. NG, please show exclusions file for the model the next time we look at the map to illustrate the city's work on exclusions, for example, in open space. It would also be valuable to provide Focus Area overlays so propensity data can

be viewed in detail in this context. How much existing development and intensity in UC does the model capture? The model suggests where housing and retail should occur, but not how much. It would be useful to understand this, since this is key to Andrew Barton's comments. This is what divided us in our discussion starting a year ago. It is nice to understand how much we do agree on the scenario. It will be useful to start getting serious about solving the problems we disagree about.

There were valuable comments from people about maximizing development in the Focus Areas. One of the problems with the scenarios presented earlier this year was that it threw out the concept of focus areas and proposed a community-wide scenario. We need to focus on those focus areas. Next, it's not just a question of density, but types of uses and development. It is critical to include clear and robust affordable housing guidelines, just as it was for Barrio Logan. We should be thinking of minimum 15% inclusionary guidelines. We need to think about anti-displacement regulations. The process will produce luxury housing. We need to be careful about displacement of existing affordable housing. We need to be careful about the housing at the southwest corner of Nobel and Genesee. We have the least expensive housing in the plan area scheduled for displacement. These are primarily residents of color. This is what the city is proposing and we should not do it. We can't build an affordable future by developing only at the highest density and replacing the most affordable housing with the most expensive. We want our residents to shop in the area. We need to protect community commercial in this scenario from being replaced by office and research and development. The area west of I-5 is an example. We should also be careful about the overall densities we propose. Look at Mesa Nueva for an example. It's built on UC land but shows what can be done [at 143 dwelling units/ac]. Seven or eight story housing has been successful around the world. Replacing existing housing with higher density and higher rents won't satisfy our needs. We need housing in areas closest to the trolley. But the scenarios propose mixed use all along the trolley that does not require housing, especially in UTC. We need housing closest to the trolley, but the property owners asked for a mixed-use zone that does not require housing. UTC should step up to provide housing on its site.

Edward McDaid: I'd like to see the city present qualitative and interactive data with access to the models being used. It would be useful to have intermediate work product from the planning group. There are mostly reports.

Tom Ruff: There were a lot of comments about north UC being a transit corridor. There is some truth to that, but you need to go through UC. The trolley is not that useful for getting around. They will still be driving about. These are very congested now, and I see gridlock in the future.

Alex Tahan: I want to thank the planners and support the urban design as presented and support the idea of adding public spaces. Blueprint SD should maximize high density areas around the trolley, especially in north UC. There looks to be more potential. This should produce more housing for students and others.

AW: One more call to members of the subcommittee and others to give their feedback on the model.

AL: Thanks to the students for participating. We live off campus for two or more years and we are part of the community and we are forced to find housing in the community. We love the community and we live and contribute to the community and economy. We do what we can to contribute to the community. Students would like to see higher density solutions near transit to expand. Many students use the trolley line and this is a way for students to come to campus without a car. The trolley lines and bus lines are an affordable solution.

VA: Thanks to all for attending and everyone who is taking part in the meetings. We would like to know next steps, how feedback is to be taken into consideration. Clear steps, clear plan, and how our opinion is included in the process.

AW: NG, would you like to speak to that?

NG: Displays presentation slide [38].

We have the Planning Commission on 9/29/2022. Presenting tonight's material. Staff needs to starting working on the revisions now. Take the focus areas and bridging that with Blueprint. Andy brought up exclusions and I'll bring that information forward. Blueprint is not density but where it should be. Staff needs to start working to generate a plan. October is community input and Blueprint San Diego. November to March will be Alternatives but would need to start coalescing around a single plan but we can still continue to work with alternatives. Winter will be a community discussion draft. Spring/Summer will be a draft Community Plan and EIR.

We don't need a vote, just a discussion draft. We will work with the group on this draft. This creates the draft community plan and EIR.

Displays model input slide [14]. There is tons of documentation on the SANDAG web site and in order to understand the process you need to understand this stuff. It's very wonky but is necessary to understand. It's still the standard model used everywhere and with CEQA. The Regional Transportation Model (RTM) cycle takes two days of computer time to run, so this is a limited tool for tweaking.

The goal is to put in good inputs to get good outputs.

The information that bridges from Blueprint will have a document on this. We will say how we create the optimization at the next meeting.

The meeting at the Planning Commission is a workshop, just to get feedback from the PC. We need to understand what they want in the next scenario since the PC is an approving body.

AW: Will you present tonight's presentation to the PC?

NG: Yes. The old scenarios are there but it's clear that they are being revised in the PC staff report.

CU: I'm not schooled in planning, but part of the process is a map filled in with the most populous areas. The city owns a lot of property but sold it cheap and crammed housing and commercial into the remaining area. There is a community in Chula Vista where a whole community has been built that looks like a small city. Built from scratch. The county is huge – build where areas are not populated and not so dense.

JS: VA addressed many items with her comment. I'm listening but don't hear you say density doesn't matter anymore, but how do we need to discuss blueprint: how do we build the alternative on the FAs? It seems to be a small table-group settings type activity. It took a long time to get through the FAs originally.

Suzy Shamsky: When will the actual data be presented so we can understand the density and housing numbers.

NG: The public access records request goes through a different department, not me.

Suzy Shamsky: When will we be able to get the density and housing numbers?

NG: I cannot give you a specific date. The only numbers we get are mode share and VMT targets, not housing density targets. The only way to hit those targets is to build high density housing next to transit. This is what we use Blueprint for. The numbers do not exist, so you can't find them. We form a land use plan, including a mobility master plan, and we hope we hit the targets.

AW: I will make a final comment. I appreciate the commitment and the comments at the meeting and in the chat. This is about our shared values. This is about the future. We should find areas where we agree and disagree and keep those disagreements close to our heart. Then we compromise. I appreciate the new approach of taking mobility and sustainability and we work backwards to land use. We have been advocating for years that we start with the CAP and VMT goals. This seems like the best way forward. We are in a place where we are not starting anew but restarting. I'm hopeful. I would oppose the idea of creating an outside community land use option outside the rules of the game as its played: this would be a failure if so. We need an alternative the community can support that the CPUS and UCPG can support, and the Planning Commission and City Council can review. My reading of CEQA requires that we have No project, and at least two other alternatives. We should shoot for at least two alternatives, and I think at least one we should find that we can support. Please look over the material and make the suggestions Nancy has asked for. Let's get to work.



We are adjourned at 8:52PM.

DRAFT