



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday February 21, 2023

Regular Time 6:00 PM

DRAFT

In Person Meeting

University City High School – Media Center/Library Room

6949 Genesee Avenue, San Diego, CA 92122

6:05 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: Chris Nielsen (CN) (filling in for Andy Wiese)

CN: Calls the meeting to order, explains AW is out of town for the meeting, provides an overview of the meeting, and requests roll call.

Roll Call:

Members present:

Keith Jenne (KJ), Debby Knight (DK), Katie Rodolico (KR), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Jason Morehead (JM), Aidan Lin (AL), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Laurie Phillips (LP), Anu Delouri (AD), Carol Uribe (CU). City Staff: Katie Witherspoon (KW) – Sr. Planner, Planning Department Suchi Lukes (SL) – Associate Planner, Planning Department

Members not present:

Andy Wiese (AW), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), George Lattimer (GL), Joanne Selleck (JS), Petr Krysl (PK), Kristin Camper (KC), Melanie Cohn (MC), Kris Kopensky (KK),

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

Some members of the public are identified below as:

Bill Beck (BB2)

Public member (Public)

6:09 Call to Order – Chris Nielsen (filling in for Andy Wiese)

6:09 Roll Call – Chris Nielsen (filling in for Andy Wiese)

See list of members present and absent above.

6:10 Approval of the Minutes: October and November 2022 Meetings

DiM notes he was present at both meetings and not recorded as present.

Motion to approve meeting minutes by acclimation with the correction above incorporated by KR/ 2nd of the motion by CU.

No dissent. Motion carries by acclimation.

6:10 Non-Agenda Public Comment

- Linda Beresford: Resident and part of community organization Help Save UC. Have submitted comments to planning department on scenarios A/B and want to emphasize new scenarios should not reintroduce rezoning of streets with SF homes – thought it has been taken out of the plan want to reiterate those comments to ensure it doesn't return. Request that the commercial properties on Governor (the Vons and Sprouts) not be rezoned to increased density. This is reflected in scenario B, but request scenario A to reflect these comments. The community will be disappointed/dissatisfied if that is not incorporated.
- Andrew Barton: Concerned about growth in the community, request no rezoning of the commercial properties along Governor Drive. Those properties already allow housing and that density is not practical. Requests to limit density in the plan to have no density higher than 140 du/ac. This would allow for greater housing units to be provided, while minimizing negative impacts to community. Requests outdoor spaces/parks be required to be provided by developers. Affordable housing should be provided and with no option for in lieu fees. No high-density development near open space and MSCP lands. No transit infrastructure on MSCP lands including bike lanes/bridges. Encourage all members to advocate for these changes.
- Thomas Barman: Resident & UCHS Treasurer for Centurion Foundation. Haven't found one person that understands what these plans mean and how they will impact us. Have perused website for plans – but for those who have not pursued careers in planning, it is hard to understand what you mean by low density/medium/high density – they don't tell us which pieces of land city will reclaim for eminent domain, doesn't tell us when you tear down Vons shopping center what it will be. When you need our feedback, we don't know how to provide it because we don't know what's going on and it hard to trust. People who will benefit are the developers, student housing, and politicians. Ask have better transparency on how to communicate moving forward.
- Chris Margraf: My girlfriend and I are employed fulltime in University – it is hard to see a future where we can live here. Without increased building, we will have to move further out. Looking for walkable and dense development, in favor of scenario A.
- Ann: UC resident, will be hosting rally protesting city proposal to add enormous density to the community. Want to raise attention, and specifically media attention, to this issue. The rally will take place on March 11th 10am-1pm at Governor and Genesee.
- Rachel Graham: Graduate of UCSD, disappointed the new scenarios reduced the amount of housing. Urge the city to continue to consider scenario 1 since Planning Commission spoke favorably of that option and, if anything, said the proposed density was too low. Need to maximize density in housing and jobs in transit rich area since not everything zoned for housing will actually get built.

- Jesse O'Sullivan: Policy council at Circulate SD, recently released a report: Making the Most of the Mid-Coast Trolley (on their website). The region invested \$2.2B in the midcoast trolley and we have an obligation to taxpayers that we get the most out of that investment – increased capacity for homes/jobs. Following the recommendations in this report will help meet housing goals. On personal note, have friends who have left the city because they can't afford to live here – we need more housing. We will be hosting a lunch and learn Thursday at noon, information on the website.
- Tom Ruff: Noticed Scenario B was changed from last time this was presented – looked like changed back to not rezoning Vons/Sprouts shopping center -but can't tell because colors are so similar. In favor of removing rezoning from A/B. if scenario A is selected you have an astronomical amount of density very close by; you don't need those two properties to be redeveloped. Appreciate an answer to the question or key to be updated.
- Linda Bernstein: Long term resident of University, local real estate agent, and part of Save UC Group. Reassured by seeing crowd turn out tonight. We walked the street and spread the message to our neighbors since this process went under the radar and none of us knew about it so we had to educate the local residents as to what the huge changes are that the city plans. You are listening and we hope that you at the city are listening. Encouraged we got changes in, but how we do change the label to Community Preferred on Scenario B?
- Jenn: Owner in University City, mom. Care deeply about infrastructure that it is in place around schools. We took tour of district elementary school given by the principal – one question that stumped her was when I brought up the plan update and asked if there has there been any communication for how schools would accept growth in the community. She said they will approach that when and if they have to. Made me very nervous – hesitant to support increase in density. Also, people with young children aren't able to attend so I want to make a point to come, want to make sure we're fully represented. Think there could be a lot less friction with my demographic if infrastructure and supporting school staff and new students are included.
- Peg Daily: Long-term resident of University for over 35 years, moved into the area because of the great schools, convenience, a good quality of life, and peaceful. To have that robbed- I feel violated. With high density increase. As a voter, I will not support you in the future should this go ahead.
- Lisa Brusina: Planning Commission/politicians are in the pockets of the developers. Need to stop that. Affordable housing is never going to be available in University City. If you can't buy one now you won't be able to buy one later.
- Thomas Draper: Moved here 4 years ago. Feel great to see this many people standing up. We went through a similar thing where I previously lived. The entire community was against it happening, they put it to a vote at large. I thought it was disingenuous, increased traffic, and was far more money driven than good for the community. Please think about the community before money.

6:27 Overview of Proposed Mobility Networks

CN: Nancy Graham, AICP, Planning Department, City of San Diego Leo Alo, senior T.E., Department of Sustainability and Mobility, City of San Diego City staff will provide an overview of proposed mobility networks, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and roadway facilities, for consideration in the community discussion draft plan update.

- NG: Provided an overview of the Community Plan Update Process and schedule.
 - o Reiterated that the process started in 2018 and that tonight we are discussing the Draft Mobility Network and the work up until this point is leading to a discussion draft plan
 - NG noted there was a slight change to Scenario B- noticed Regents Road bridge inside the open space so we fixed that error.
 - o This Spring the City will release its discussion draft plan, there will be a few months of community review and incorporating comments. Then the City will release its Draft Community Plan that will be the basis of the environmental analysis. All will be shared publicly and there will be another commenting process on that environmental document to review and comment on. Then there will be a Final Draft Community Plan for review/adoption before Planning Commission and City Council.
- NG was interrupted by many out of order questions and comments from various attendees:
 - o But we don't understand the plan.
 - NG: We haven't put out a plan, all we have released are imagery – plan hasn't been released yet.
 - o Have you coordinated with schools?
 - NG: Schools are involved meet with SD Unified.
 - o What will be in the plans? What are the sections in the plan?
 - NG: Land use, mobility, public services facilities, and safety, etc.
 - o Why is there a disconnect between the school principal and the community plan?
 - NG: We meet with facility planning facilities quarterly and update them. When we do a plan, we share it with them and we receive comment and are closely coordinated. What happens on the communications between facilities and principals, I can't say since we are not SD Unified, but we do coordinate with them closely.
- CN: Called the room to order stating we needed to move on.
- Leo Alo began the presentation on transportation explaining that the City has completed a study on existing conditions, provided an overview of the mobility goals developed early on in the process, and today will cover 5 different network maps:
 - Planned Pedestrian Route Type Map
 - Planned Bicycle Network Map
 - Planned Transit Network Map
 - Potential Transit Improvements Map
 - Planned Roadway Classification Map

- In these maps there will be Districts (pedestrian districts), Corridors (a roadway supporting businesses/shopping), Connectors (roadway with moderate to high vehicular traffic), Ancillary Pedestrian Facilities (crossing over streets such as plazas), and Paths (paved exclusive ROW for pedestrians and bicyclists).
- Members of the public interrupted the presenter multiple times – asking questions, interrupting, provided heckling comments.
- Tait Galloway interjected asking the group to please give Leo some respect and allow him to get through the presentation. It is unfair to give a presentation and every 3 seconds get grilled with questions and comments. Members of the public booed Tait for his comments.
- Tait Galloway: At this point, we can end the presentation and have the discussion.
 - CN: Requested the presentation proceed and decorum restored to the room.
- Leo resumed his presentation and presented bike facility types: Class 1 Bike Path, Class II Bike Lanes, Class III Bike Route, and Class IV Cycle Track
 - Public member interrupted with question: I met with LaCava and he said that over 97% of emails he received were regarding the reduction of lanes on Governor were in opposition to that. Why are we proposing something 97% are opposed to?
 - Leo: Governor Drive will be reduced to 1 lane in each direction. Currently there are no bike lanes on Governor Drive and we are providing improved bike facility.
 - Leo presented Transit Strategies including:
 - Managed Lanes (HOV priority access to transit, vanpool), Mobility Hubs (transit and micro mobility), Adaptive Signal Timing (prioritizing transit), Flexible Lanes, (could be used for bus lanes, HOV, carpool only before a certain time, etc.), Smart Corridors (use technology to make intersections more efficient), Tier 3 Transit Leap (complete network of high capacity transit services – rapid bus service for SANDAG and MTS), and Aerial Skyway (which could assist in covering difficult terrain and difficult obstacles).
 - Leo presented on the Planned Roadway Classifications:
 - Prime Arterial: (serve highest volumes of traffic 4-8 lanes), Major Arterial: (less than prime 2 or more lanes for local and thru traffic), Collector (traffic circulation, 2 travel lanes with parking), Local: (service residential), and Two Way Left Turn Lane (referred to as TWLTL) in the plan.
 - Presented on concepts for Nobel and Executive Drive.

6: 58 Discussion of Proposed Mobility Networks

- **Subcommittee Comments:**
 - KR: NG was not here when the original discussion on Governor Drive being 1 lane versus 2 lanes, but one of the points I brought up early on was that any EIR has to address traffic drop off/pick up at Spreckels/Stanley before removing a lane and has to consider the construction near Speckles. Traffic needs to be studied during the school year, during drop off/pick up times, and the morning commute northbound

and southbound evening commute. Reducing lanes during these times of day will be a huge problem.

- RRW: Newer schools, elementary schools, in City of San Diego have drop off lanes for elementary school. If more cars could get off main road to drop off/slow down in a protected area have several lanes for letting children get to school so consider that.
- CU: I live on Governor Drive across from Stanley Park, during hours Katie was mentioning it is clogged every day and don't see that changing from 1 to 2 lanes. Lane of parking in that corridor across from Stanley Park – double park in the 2nd lane. Recommend share the lane there.
- LP: Resident/landlord/business member, we have seen the city allowing buildings to reduce setback between road and structures and I am concerned that the opportunity to use the area for setbacks to create bike lanes is going to be gone. From UCSD as an example at La Jolla Village Drive, the new UCSD building is almost 15' setback, but new building comes right out. Pay attention to that now so we don't lose the opportunity.
- AL: Student representative on subcommittee – young perspective from UCSD, students are one of the primary reason we have such dense and concentrated mobility in UC. We use trolley and busses to get to class. We want to continue to see those options grow because more transit options means a brighter and cleaner future. Suggest more frequent busses on super loop and more frequent trolleys would help us and incentivize students to take the trip. Support more transit options to get around university city.
- RC: Let's consider several local areas where mobility would be made more safe by pedestrian bridges – the superblock around UTC with emphasis on La Jolla Village Drive, the I-5 ramps of La Jolla Village Drive, periphery of UCSD especially at Regents and La Jolla Village Drive and the junction with Torrey Pines Road. I suggest a serious look at how local districts could be revamped to provide for pedestrian and bike access to walkable services. For example, Costa Verde and the surrounding 2 story apartments could become an "Eco district" embodying affordable housing, more green space and high rises with safer bike and pedestrian access to Costa Verde. I would rule in State and Federal funding for a demonstration project.
- DK: Like idea of protected bike lanes on Genesee but we're also having issues with huge increases in density on Genesee. We need to be planning for large increase in traffic – even if people use transit - and reducing the lanes in some cases seems counter to that. Wondering in EIR if you will model the traffic impacts in combination of reducing the lanes.

- Public Comments:

- Bill Beck: Saw these plans on aerials for 8/9 year and have been requesting 3 streetlights – which hasn't happened. Where do you plan to come up with money for projects that are pie in the sky when you can't even fix the potholes?
- Jeff Dosick: (Comment for the meeting in writing.) How can we avoid what just was built on Genesee between Nobel and Campus Point? And not repeat this egregious

disconnect in making our city safer to commute via bike? At 4 busy intersections, the bike lane disappears into a car turning lane! This flaw leaves the rider sharing the same space with a car or truck on this busy urban roadway. No way will this unsafe design allow us to achieve the 7-10 % bike commute that is proposed. And the folks who complain that they see few bike riders on the newly built bike networks won't be wrong?

- Tom McDonnell: Resident since 1996, live off of Governor Drive and love the community and came to grow old in it because it is convenient as it is. We have already had a huge increase in density on east end of Governor and the city cancelled the bus service to that area. I am delighted that the city is studying mobility in the area. That's necessary – but other side of coin is a density issue – I have objection to pushing high density onto the community when the city has hundreds of acres of public land with lots of room for development where they can build transit corridors to support those developments.
- Tom Ruff: Question about queue jump – we are adding/repurposing lane by taking away property from gas station on governor. There are already 7/8 lanes - we don't want more lanes. Genesee widening was put to bed hope you're not planning on widening that.
 - Leo: Don't always need to widen lanes for the Queue jump – sometimes it can use the right turn lane or shoulder.
- Barbara Gelman: lived here for 33 years, question about safety regarding police, fire department, fire rescue - how do they fit in? Have you had discussions with them? What is the feedback because it will affect higher density communities.
 - NG: Yes, we meet with every department in the city – police, fire, library, park and recreation, etc. This plan has to be implemented with multiple departments. We have not had any objections to the plans, some issues we are taking a deeper dive and it is an iterative process.
- Alan Ramrus: Lived here 50 years, where comes fundamental motivation for these plans, would like a listing of the businesses involved and how these plans are going to be funded and who is behind the funding for these businesses.
- Tom Hekman: Intersection at Genesee/Governor. The elementary school had to put a police officer to establish safety and that was with 4 lanes. Now you're proposing 2 lanes. All people not going to be driving their car is a pipe dream. How are we going to ensure safety of children going to and from schools, with 600 units and 600+/1200 cars potentially. How are you planning to address?
 - NG: There are safe routes to school studies that many schools throughout San Diego have done. May be something we identify that may require further study.
 - KR: Request that that automatically be done as part of the environmental review.
- Karen Martien: UCPG board member. Want to make sure that we have detailed intersection diagram where possible. Also suggest leading pedestrian intervals, bike boxes, curb extensions to shorten crossing, center island refuges should be specifically mentioned in the plan. City's goal to increase the percentage of people

that bike and take transit, can lead to increased conflict between buses and bikes. Will become more of problem if more biking. Surprised on planned transit map that there is no mention of additional bus routes. Why are new bus routes not considered?

- NG: The intersection level analysis will be in the mobility study, so when you see community plan draft won't see intersection level but it would be in the mobility study. Regarding the potential transit map – transit planning is done on a region wide level (MTS/SANDAG). We have a potential transit map and can look at including the potential to have another bus line – but SANDAG does regional planning and we coordinate carefully, and can identify things in the community plan that they can study. This is the type of feedback we are looking for tonight
- Nina Goldberg: 40-year resident, registered architect for 40 years, UCSD released use of land for 15000 students by early 2030, those people are coming and shopping at UC and adding traffic in UC. UCSD is not applying to the city for permits – are you accounting for the density in your planning that you will have another 30K or more people using parking, schools, shopping. Is that taken into consideration?
 - NG: Answer is yes, UCSD has a long-range development plan – we review that, we coordinate with them. So UCSD is one of the agencies we talk to.
 - Nina: I worked at UCSD and I never met with you.
 - NG: provided name of contact.
- Judy Murphy: 52-years, raised children here. Are you aware that residents of North UC children cannot go to Doyle and are driving to Spreckels for school? With increased density and no space for additional schools, what will you do? Send them down to Clairemont?
 - NG: We don't control what San Diego unified does.
- Nancy Pollen: I apologize for interrupting rudely and asking question out of turn. When this started, the City of San Diego wanted to add 108K additional housing units to help city grow, of those units, they allocated 58K to University City. Why does our little community get the bulk of additional housing?
 - NG: We look to grow the community in smart growth fashion, look at where transit investments are made.
- Public Commentor Out of Order: You all are sacrificial lambs, where the hell is the Mayor and our council person?
 - Michaela Valk: I am the Mayor's office staff representative and I am here on his behalf.
 - Multiple Public Commentors: Then you answer the question. What is the answer to the question? What is the mayor's position?
 - Michaela: I respect all of you here, I hope I can get respect back. I am Michaela and I oversee community representatives and Council District 6. To answer your question, the Mayor can't be everywhere at in the city at once. I attend the planning groups and town council as well.

- Public: Where is he tonight? Tell him we're not happy.
- Public Commentor: There have been three plane crashes in University City. How are you going to use just one lane for evacuation – how are you going to get us out?
- Pete Heckman: Resident of UC – the community plan cancelled Regents Road Bridge. There are never going to be any answers to the questions we ask because this is a bad idea whose time has come. Never going to get the answers to these questions because the city won't let the market place manage what we develop. Step back this whole thing and step back from it.
- Linda Beresford: When the proposal came to put in the trolley and they did outreach, the pitch was UC is the 2nd densest area in the city and we want to bring the trolley so people don't have to live here and we don't have to add the housing. Its bait and switch. Concerned about projected busses, MTS has shrinking budget and shortage of drivers. Does the traffic study consider additional traffic impact from new students coming from other locations? How do we tie development to the funding? Impact fees won't stay in communities that they are generated in –so how will we ensure we get the funding to offset those impacts?
 - NG: The regional transportation model, synthesizes a population and the demographics of those added and their children. So, it is Synthesized based on population trends/growth. The regional model updated every 4 years creating demographics used in that to form the model.
 - Linda: Will the traffic study include underlying assumption in appendices – will we see the underlying data?
 - NG: SANDAG builds the model.
 - NG: there is a new process developed as part of Build Better SD for how projects will be prioritized. Supplemental development regulations can require that improvements be made as part of the project and can put additional requirements beyond the code. The Developer has to improve frontage and if it's not ready for that can pursue an irrevocable offer to dedicate.
- Emily Walker: who has the final say in this? Seems an overwhelming majority of community is against increase in density – why are there even plans being made for the density increase? Shouldn't we be considering that?
 - NG: City Council has final decision making approval.
- Tom: You said the model synthesizes demographics – what percentage is weighted toward the UCSD population? This is weighted towards UCSD to get students access in and out, students are not permanent residents of the community. I want to ask Michaela – what is the definition of a housing crisis? Are we really solving the problem?
- Kerry Schnizer: Longtime resident of UC. I see young students in the room – my two kids both went to college, one in graduate school in Stanford, she cannot afford to live in Palo Alto, so she drives an over from Alameda to go to school. It is what you have to do. Do I think community of Palo Alto has to pay for my daughter to have

housing? Absolutely not. It is a privilege to go to UCSD, but the community should not have to supply/provide housing. Is it going to take a kid/grandchild to die in a car crash to wake up?

- Jesse O'Sullivan: Policy Council for Circulate - homelessness is a housing problem, we don't have more drug/mental health issues than other communities - what we have are very low vacancy rates and high housing costs. These maps have a lot of great things on them, suggest reviewing the suggestions in our report –I am concerned that La Jolla Village Drive shows buffered, not protected bike lanes. Genesee is a slow point for busses at rush hour, and I suggest flex/transit lanes.
- Aiden Lin: I respect the hard work put in to live in the community, would like to humanize the struggle of students. Students are facing challenges too. We also pay taxes; we work in the community. We are a part of the community. I am privileged to be in the room and want to demonstrate to other students that they can speak as well and that they should be part of the conversation. No one asks you how long you're going to stay to get a vote.
- Public Speaker: Chancellor wants to build apartments for every student. Won't be so much need of students living in UC. When the trolley was planned, the idea was that people and students have access with trolley to live elsewhere. I take the trolley because I can't find parking at UCSD. After 9am, the Nobel drive transit station is full. We are already maxed out parking to take the trolley.
- Public speaker: Your poor planning doesn't make for my emergency – the rapid escalation of enrollment at UCSD, housing consequences should not place burden on residents of UC. Trained/taught at UCSD – lived in university for 42 years.

7:57 Adjournment