



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday March 21, 2023

Regular Time 6:00 PM

Meeting Roll Call

DRAFT

In Person Meeting

University City High School – Media Center/Library Room

6949 Genesee Avenue, San Diego, CA 92122

6:07 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: Andy Wiese

Roll Call:

Members present:

Roger Cavanaugh (RC), Melanie Cohn (MC), Keith Jenne (KJ), Debby Knight (DK), George Lattimer (GL), Katie Rodolico (KR), Jason Morehead (JM), Aidan Lin (AL), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Joanne Selleck (JS), Anu Delouri (AD), Andy Wiese (AW), Veronica Ayasta (VA)

Members Absent:

Kristin Camper (KC), Kris Kopensky (KK), Petr Krysl (PK), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Laurie Phillips (LP), Carol Uribe (CU), City Staff: Nancy Graham – Sr. Planner, Planning Department Suchi Lukes (SL) – Associate Planner, Planning Department

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

Members not present:

Some members of the public are identified below as:

- Public member (Public)

Carey Algaze (CA) to take the minutes.

6:07 Call to Order –Andy Wiese

6:07 Roll Call –Andy Wiese

See list of members present and absent above.

6:11 Approval of the Minutes: February 21, 2023, Meeting

AW: One (1) edit requested from RWR that has been incorporated into the edits. Are there any other edits. None requested. Will entertain a vote of the group to approve the minutes.

- Public: The meeting minutes reference Katie Witherspoon, misspelled Standley Rec Center and Spreckels Elementary.
- AW: Noted, will be replaced with Nancy Graham and corrected spellings of Standley Rec Center and Spreckels Elementary. Will call for a vote of the group to approve the minutes:
 - o *Minutes approved: 8 - in favor, 0 - objection, 3 – abstentions for absences*

6:14 Overview of Meeting: Topics, Expectations for Conduct (Andy Wiese)

AW: Will provide an overview of the meeting itself, why we're here, and what we have in store to kick us off.

Meeting tonight is without city staff in order to continue to take feedback from the public and the plan update subcommittee. City Planning staff is hard at work completing community discussion draft by end of month or early next month and lacking anything new to present, they proposed to not hold a meeting this month, but CN and AW did not want to miss an opportunity to organize feedback from the subcommittee to take comments on material that has been presented as part of the process. Plan to take feedback and obtain specific, detailed, and focused comments on all matters that have been proposed and try to organize that feedback to make it most effective for the city to use and for the subcommittee as a work product to understand what has been provided to the city and what has been incorporated in the plan.

Many of you here may be new. We've been at work for 4.5 years; we were promised 3 at the outset. The process has been long and dynamic. Begun in 2018, we've been through 2 mayors, 3 councilmembers, 3 community planners, urban designers, transportation planners, park planners, new policies on parks and on housing, a global pandemic, and an affordable housing crisis. One lasting body of this process and one with institutional memory has been the community plan subcommittee that sits before you.

What is the committee and who is on it? It includes members of University Planning Group – the elected community planning group for the city. It includes residents, business representatives (real estate and biotech) and real estate firms, representatives from UCSD and MCAS Miramar and community stakeholder groups like Friends of Rose Canyon, the UCCA, and Biocom. We are volunteers.

What is a community plan? What does it do? It provides a map, rules, and expectations to govern land use and development in an area for the next 25-30 years. It includes sections with policy guidelines on issues including land use, mobility, bikes, multi modal transit, parks and recreation, open space, public facilities, and infrastructure on city land for parks and rights of way which could include libraries and city streets/parks. What does it not do? It does not develop real estate on its own, but it does provide incentives in the form of increased land values which represent free land for property owners who may or may not choose to redevelop their properties.

A Community Plan is fundamentally a vision for the future about the kind of city/community we want to live in and leave to the next generation. It's a message in a bottle, to the future, that will be read and we will be measured by the message we write.

Why are we updating it? Why now? The current one was completed in 1987, GL sat on that committee, and I graduated college in 1987 -and I have needed some updating since then, and so does the plan. There have been more than 20 different amendments in the community plan to modernize and update facilities, most taken place in the last 10 years, including expansion of biotech project approved last week. The City is updating plans all around the city - we are not the only ones who have old community plans, they are ½ way through a process that began in mid-2010's-2019. All include plans to propose increased opportunities for new housing - the proposal in our community plan related to housing are greater than others, but within the ballpark. The process began with grant from SANDAG in 2018 with a target of 20-30,000 new units of housing over the next 30 years. Our first two land use scenarios ("1" and "2") both meet that threshold. We met almost monthly (almost 40 meetings), started with community vision statements, to ensure the area remains a leader in economic development and sustainability and remains the center of economic activity, with a safe and integrated mobility system, integrated with parks/open space, is sustainable with regard to climate change, a leader in green infrastructure / green building, and to remain the leader in innovation as it has been. And to ensure that UC remains a good place to live, work and to study.

Why does it matter? To whom? We are one part of a larger city, UC is the heart of the most robust and dynamic economic hub – biotech, life science, top 20 global university, world class hospitals, leading theatre cluster, world class shopping, most biodiverse part of the city of San Diego.

Given all of this, it is not surprising emotions run high here. It is a place that is facing pressures, compromises, balance, and thoughtful conversation and discussion.

We should expect tonight and throughout this process to disagree – these are important matters for the city and for those who call this place home, concerning the future, that reasonable people can disagree about. No reason we cannot disagree without being disagreeable. People who live here and work and study here are my neighbors – I know you're community oriented, you are generous, accomplished, serious people. Expect us to disagree robustly but with respect and civility with one another – we should expect that of ourselves.

Timeline of the Plan Update Process:

- Spring 2023 Community Discussion Draft Plan: End of next week/early April.
 - o City to present to UCPG, Subcommittee will hold meetings in April/May/June to take feedback for draft. UC subcommittee will vote recommendation to take to UC planning group for a vote
- Summer 2023: Draft Community Plan July/August
- Summer 2023: EIR
- Late 2023: Planning Commission and Council for vote before end of 2023.

For tonight's meeting:

- Goal to receive and organize feedback from the community plan update subcommittee and stakeholders – in advance of discussion draft. These comments will be shared with planning department to shape discussion in next months. These comments will be organized in a matrix (a copy of the matrix was attached to this agenda). It is an incomplete list but it is a start and will be updated. Verbal and written comments tonight will be included.
- Tonight, we will work through the group’s comments geographically – Starting in the NW of the community, then Focus area 2, then Nobel square area where trolley is at Nobel and I-5, then community core – UTC, then south UC. The City proposal is scenario A and the subcommittee scenario B. Please keep comments to 2 minutes per area per speaker.

6:13 Non-Agenda Public Comment – 1 minute per speaker

- Katie Rodolico: I would like to comment in response to the letter posted on the Circulate San Diego website and signed by a coalition of groups including two members of the UCPU subcommittee. This letter proposes that the dense scenario 1 proposal be included in the EIR analysis. This scenario was eliminated because it proposed growth well outside the studied focus areas. The letter ignores that the survey only looked at these five focus areas. The letter also criticizes some of the subcommittee business members and appointed members suggesting it is a problem that they live in the plan area. One of the repeated goals is to have people live and work in the same area. How can they criticize subcommittee members for doing just that? The letter criticizes the subcommittee make up as, paraphrasing, too white, too old, and homeowners. I am all of those. I’ve shown respect to my fellow subcommittee members, even when I disagree with them, I’m not reactively NIMBY, and try to consider ALL of the residents, including students and renters. I have worked hard to represent the members of UCCA, and the broader community. I feel insulted that my voice is being discounted because I am old, white, and own a home in the planning area. I would strongly oppose including Scenario 1 in the EIR study because it dismisses 3 years of prior study by proposing changes far outside the focus areas. I also hope that the two subcommittee members who signed this letter would treat the subcommittee members with respect rather than damning us by demographics.
- Diane Ahern: Construction of the City of San Diego Pure Water Pipelines and Tunnels project in University City is scheduled to begin this week on Genesee Avenue from State Route 52 to Governor Drive – weather permitting. There has been a delay in the traffic control set up. Traffic control setup is now scheduled for Thursday night, March 23, on Genesee Avenue from State Route 52 to Governor Drive from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., weather permitting. Pipeline construction in this section is expected to begin as early as Friday, March 24. Work hours will be Monday through Friday from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. Most of the pipeline construction in this section (on Genesee between SR 52 and Governor) will be in the median. Two-way traffic will be maintained, and there will be no intersection closures as part of this work. Work in this section is expected to be completed in late 2023. Details on the City website at: phase1.purewatersd.org and on UCCA's site at: UniversityCityNews.org
- Tom Mullaney: I live in the Uptown community near Balboa Park, wanted to share our experience with community plan update and warn this group not to let same thing happen. We spent 7 years on it and in last month, Councilmember Gloria changed everything – it included high density no infrastructure and no building heights whatsoever, it’s a mess. I

don't want to see this community become this. People will say to focus on number of housing units – If that were true, we could get rid of all of the planning programs and focus on the most density. But demand has not grown that much. Discussed Complete Communities which allows high floor area ratio, any number of units at any height. We have a 200-foot-tall project in Bankers Hills on historic quiet street on 3rd Avenue, so if they can do it here, they can do it anywhere. Look at complete communities. The community will still be overbuilt of these special programs. Make sure your councilmember supports you.

- Linda Beresford: Timeline is unrealistic that they can take 3 months of public comments, final vote in December - in 6-month time period - with August hiatus is unrealistic. Disappointed city staff isn't here tonight - the people writing the plan need to be here, in person, to hear the comments. It demonstrates lack of leadership that Mayor Gloria has directed staff not to hold this meeting and attend. The reason why I want the city here is one of the communities in our community plan is considering incorporating, La Jolla, while this has been discussed in the past, everything I hear is it has legs. They are starting the LAFCO process and meeting with the mayor. What happens when La Jolla takes the area west of 5? How are we moving forward until that's resolved?
- Katarina Shackbosova: Concerned about the trees in front of Sprouts, like to know what will happen to them? Are they going to cut them and remove them or will they save them in some way?
- Genie Howie: Received a flyer. We're supposed to be doing a survey this month about Blueprint San Diego? This was news to me. Surprising because its coming from the City Planning Department and I had no idea we are supposed to be participating in a survey. It was distributed by Suchi Lukes and Tait Galloway. This is news.

6:46 Comments on Land Use Scenarios A and B, Mobility and Parks

- AW: We will begin to take comments on the Land Use Scenarios, Mobility and Parks by geographic area:
 1. Area 1: Starting with Torrey Pines, City Park, Glider Port, Blacks, Torrey Pines Road, Biotech, Lifesciences Cluster
 - o AW: Overview of changes – relatively limited because of the crash zone, 30' height limit, state coastal zone – focus on existing uses, no residential, much less changes proposed here.
 - JM: Work for Alexandria who has done the majority of development in Torrey Pines, not a tremendous amount can change in the next 30 years because there has been so much redevelopment that conforms with the height limits. Suggest that the subcommittee focus on alternative transportation and last mile transit in this area– we have MTS busses but connection to trolley needs help and that's something the subcommittee can do. We just installed a pedestrian bridge to connect 2 different campuses so pedestrian mobility improved, but we can advocate for better micro mobility and pedestrian access in Torrey Pines.
 - AW: Critical part of ensuring good and safe transit for bike/pedestrian – is to consider through bikeways. Mobility plan should add through bike/ped

connection from John Jay Hopkins across the new bridge to Science Park Rd. Safer, parallel to Torrey Pines Rd.

- Public: In the area lovely eucalyptus forest belongs to university – are there plans for university to build out that area? How protected is that area?
 - AD: UCSD is not in the plan update area, but we dialogue and communicate regularly with the City. The eucalyptus grove is part of campus open space - 1/3 campus is open space and planned to stay that way. We are building a lot of housing and currently have 18,000 beds on campus and the UC regents just approved adding 2,440 beds.
 - JM: and you go higher to allow for more preservation?
 - AD: Yes, we plan to go higher to preserve open space, use the footprint but we provide for potentially more open space than low rise buildings
- JM: Responding to the comment on the 200' building, if all those buildings were brought down to 30' we'd have no open space. I'm an environmentalist and LEED accredited, by going vertical, it allows us to preserve land.
 - AD: We have the 2018 Long Range Development Plan; we are reaching capacity in terms of student population. Will do a long-range development plan update but you can refer to that plan from 2018 which sets forth blueprint of the campus to grow and vets for environmental impacts. This was approved by the UC Regents.
- JS: North Torrey Pines Road is slated for some sort of change – seems to be unrealistic that the road isn't going to need to be enhanced to cover bike lanes and traffic – particularly where there is a eucalyptus divide down the middle.
 - JM: Eucalyptus divide updated in last decade, median will be preserved. Plan doesn't change the structure of the road.
 - AW: JS, You can make that question into a comment if you think it should be preserved, and we can write that down.
- AW: It is important we think of native landscaping in this area – street trees on Torrey Pines Rd should be Torrey Pines. Recommend that plan incorporates use of native landscaping/trees throughout this sensitive area.
 - JM: Maintenance district completed 6-7 years ago, they used recycled purple pipe water, was previously irrigated with potable water.
- Public: UCSD preserved 1/3 of the land for open space, but looks to University City for housing solution for students. We don't have to be the largest campus in California, we are not the solution to maintain housing for your students.
 - MC: Right, who cares where the students live? Fuck 'em.
 - AW: We won't have that kind of comments, you came late and missed the tone of this meeting.

- Jeremy Bloom: Policy Director for Circulate SD. San Diego faces a housing crisis, has potential to create opportunities for families in transit rich area. In Feb. 2022 the subcommittee reviewed Scenario 1 which created 150K jobs, 83K homes, unlocking potential for homes and job opportunities. We recommend this be included for study in the EIR. Also, there were 3 op eds in the UT this morning we suggest reviewing by the public.
- Susan Nelson: Born in University, breaking my heart to see what's happening and the division. I could never afford to live here after graduated. I wasn't admitted to UCSD because I was white, even though I was raised in a mixed-race family. The division is very upsetting because it's my home. The community has always been open to UCSD, I attended preschool on campus. We've allowed a lot of density. I'm sick of hearing these comments about white and NIMBY.

2. Area 2: Campus Pointe, Town Center Drive, Genesee, area adjoining Preuss School, East Campus of UCSD

- AW: Quick overview. This is an area of tech parks that remain fundamentally for scientific research, prime industrial real estate, increases in density are limited by flight path/airport, accident zone. Scenarios propose increasing the commercial density and providing increased construction of housing along Genesee north of Eastgate Mall. Possibility of Campus Drive for mixed use – both commercial and residential.
 - DK: Read spreadsheet of comments, some of the comments were reported only on Scenario B or old scenario 2. I'm concerned that while we provide all of the comments as responding to Scenario B, the City will choose Scenario A. The comments (even if made about Scenario B) should apply to both scenarios – because Scenario B will be the alternative in the EIR. I have comments that apply to Scenario B but also apply to Scenario A. Suggest we say the comments apply to either scenario. Struck me when I saw the spreadsheet, we are being relegated to Scenario B which won't work.
 - AW: Spreadsheet will be updated with those comments.
 - JM: Campus Pointe area – didn't sign any letter advocating for support on the EIR for Scenario 1. But as a subcommittee member, I would like to voice to support of Scenario 1 to be included for study in the EIR for this area. The max intensity won't be built but want the EIR to study it. Also suggest changing the mindset to the development of life sciences community – colleagues of mine showed up last month – we are working with UCSD robotics and design labs to implement autonomous shuttles from campus point to blue line and think about a future – ex of Cambridge, where Alexandria is building a net zero building, build net zero lab buildings, scientists benefit you.
 - Nancy Powell: Last meeting out of control - it was exciting and I admit I was part of it. But it's because we have not had a say in this, the city has rammed it down our throats, and we are angry. We are asking the questions

and not getting the answers. So, you are dealing with a community losing its patience.

- Lisa Heikoff: Glad we have LEED buildings, intelligent development, but wonder about amenities companies put in place for employees. We don't have new park land and /or recreation – is there any sharing concept on weekends for these amenities? Can they be shared with the communities?
 - JM: Alexandria purchased land and opted not to develop any of it and transfer the density to other areas. DK spoke best about the lack of parks in the plan update. And I agree. There should be more space for public parks, but it is hard to take private development where a tenant may have intellectual property concerns and open the space for public use, there's liability issues, etc. The subcommittee should push hard for public parks.
 - AW: reminder, we can frame these questions into comments – e.g., that we encourage the city to form these relationships to explore shared recreational / joint use for commercial properties.
 - DK: When high density occurs adjacent to MSCP, it has significant negative impacts on biodiversity and habitat - that's the big concern about Campus Pointe – to date, what Alexandria has done has been respectful. That area is not an area I'd like to see great height for that reason. Can't undo that damage – lights, noise, everything. Suggest higher density not adjacent to MSCP lands. Adjacency to MHPA would undo that commitment – It has to be built into the community plan that there are limits to where the higher density should go. But for other areas would agree to have higher density.
 - JM: If we look back more than a decade at this area, manufacturing was done. We retain everything onsite, the building code and our ambitions play out, I think even with more density and height we can be more sustainable than what was previously.
 - AW: Ask city to consider opening new exit way from Campus Pointe Ct area to Genesee at grade. Private property across there. City should pursue opening that area to have 2nd way to get out of Campus Pointe. Fire safety, reduce congestion at Genesee/CPte Dr. Mobility plan should include this connection.
 - JM: Support the comment – we are interested in a 2nd egress from Campus Pointe. Would cut through Alexandria's property and we would support it.
 - CN: This issue is on the agenda at the April UCPG meeting as an information item and will go well with the introduction of the discussion draft.
 - Public: Campus Pointe – how will we mitigate the traffic there? Will they open Genesee to maximize that area?

3. La Jolla Village Drive/Focus Area 4:

- AL: We're all part of the community – this specific area the Nobel Square, La Jolla Village Square, Shops at La Jolla Village – one of the first things I noticed was how expansive that parking lot is and how hard it is to get across between these shops. If that area was mixed use development, adjacent to trolley, housing, commercial, where you could hop on the trolley, go into downtown to the border, that would be an amazing place to have higher density/mixed use with more housing opportunities. To live in the area, use the trolley and less cars and less traffic, wonderful idea to focus development and mixed use development in the area.
- KR: Agree with Aiden, this is an area that has the trolley and a lot that could go for it. The biggest detractor is 30' height limit - I've said many times, if there was a way to eliminate 30' height limit here I would support it because this area doesn't have ocean views which was what that height limit was supposed to protect. I think it's perfect for mixed use and more increased density, as was said about UCSD by building taller, you can have a more pleasant area than navigating parking outside of Trader Joes.
- Linda Beresford: Would support increased density within ¼ mile of transit station, but should have some sort of housing component, if there are biotech within ¼ mile trolley they should seriously consider housing in their areas and they need to have parking. I know we hope people will use transportation, but I don't think it's realistic, it should also be zoned in a way that requires community serving retail (grocery store, etc.)
- JS: Increased height limit is going to become an issue – seems that the best reason to increase height limit is for residential combined with retail. Yes - we need grocery stores on both sides of Nobel here but I'm in favor of increasing the height limit for residential and retail. Other component – essential to reduce the number of cars in that area at hazardous intersection – suggest plan create ped bridge from Ralphs to Whole Foods side because it will be heavily used and don't have to use cars.
- VA: Bridge is a need. University can subsidize housing for students here to make this solution on campus be helpful.
- AW: One of the features superior in Scenario B for this area is retail is specified to be preserved, but housing also allowed. Community village zoning focused on retail and on housing – not the generalize mixed use zoning because that allows for competition with other types of commercial uses. Most competitive is biotech or high tech. Last thing we want is to take an area ideal for housing and lift the height limit and see community/regional serving retail and housing pushed out by biotech and scientific research. Plan should have an overlay or a specific zoning selected for the site to preserve for housing and retail.
- Public: Scenario A/B map would be more helpful if estimates of allowed units in both scenarios that came from the city were included. Hard to assess how we feel when we don't have those numbers. Get its difficult to do precisely.

- Public: All these scenarios seem like they want to take away the shopping/grocery stores. If you go to Vons (LJ Colony) - they're out of stuff. There's not enough shopping for what's here now let alone what's being proposed. Regarding taking away the parking lots, families need to get a lot of groceries – you can't just hop on a bus and take home the groceries. There's an element here that is unrealistic, need more shopping and parking for that shopping.
- KJ: Opposing view and agree with comments, the area is prone to very poor traffic flow. Any increased density will exacerbate this - while we want everyone to ride the trolley – it's not going to happen
- Public: Suggest we add the amount of jobs and housing with each scenario to the website
- DK: Agree to add to these maps with the estimated number of housing units and jobs to the website. Agree that there should be more housing focus, but we definitely need some parkland. A lot of young people, a lot of people who need parkland. There should be a requirement for substantial park land – kick a ball around. There is not a 10- or 15-minute walk to any parks around here. Agree with Keith, people who complain most about that are you and Isabelle. Via la Jolla/La Jolla Village Drive intersection is really deadly.
 - AW: for reference, Scenario A proposed 30,000 new dwelling units, 70,000 new jobs, B 22,000 and 55,000 at 145 du/ac, which is the density of UCSD east campus housing – approximately 8 story buildings surrounded by open space and facilities.
- JS: suggest removing all parking on Nobel west of Genesee for safety reasons.
- JM: Folks complain how bad traffic is and how dangerous it is today - I know. I fractured my skull on Miramar - but let's ask for separate protected bike lanes. Let's think about the future, let's make density contingent on protected bike lanes. Let's think for the next generation
- MC: Biocom – trade association. I authored a letter for scenario 1 and for an economic impact report of the trolley. According to community atlas – census data related to UC community plan, 79% of the community is under the age of 50, look around the room and think of the next generation. I live in Claremont, I would love multifamily homes to be present in Claremont. 53% are non-white, so again look around the room. 68% make under \$100K / year. I don't always come to the meetings because my opinion is not shared – he just called me a bitch and told me to stop talking. I will continue to attend, but it's not representative. Because of the people in this room, it's not affordable to live here. It's sad as a member of the community – to see people climb up the ladder and cut it off behind them.
 - Some back and forth with the crowd commenced.

- AW: That's enough. She's speaking. We are not to engage each other in such a manner. Let this go and move on. We have a lot of other areas to discuss.
- Public: Younger people who are working don't have the context or time to focus on community plan. The people who have lived here, developed, shouldn't be invalidated, it took a lot of hard work and commitment, it's not like I'm judging the neighbors, people who are here have the time to pay attention and care and voice the representation of the neighbors.

4. Area 4-5 - UTC core/South UC

- Bill Beck: Member of UCCA and represent the north, every time we have these meetings, may be a few residents from the north attend but most are from the south. We are 1 University City - I hear people talk about these plans and saying we can't do it here – build it in the north. But please support us – we are getting split in half. It's not right. We have a great university, need to support the students – I have 2 sons and no one helped me do it. That's why you have loans. We should build the homes, but the people in the south have to join in and have some there too, can't all be in the north. Consider us 1 University City not two – we're divided by a canyon. If we're not united, we're going to lose and the city will do whatever they want.
- Tama Becker Verano: Owned a home in south UC since 1996, support thoughtful rezoning to mixed use to Sprouts and Vons shopping (Governor Drive) and responsible development in north UC. We don't have a housing crisis – we have an affordable housing crisis, would like to see us come together to prioritize equitable affordable development. Let's go big. Demand 20% inclusionary housing - people will say it doesn't pencil but the city should enter into public private partnerships to make it work. I would love to see electric shuttles, Also tenant protections – very few affordable rental units in north UC, important to think about tenants who will be displaced and have tenant protections that guarantee relocation fees and right of return. It's not about us, none of the children we raised in UC can afford to live in the community. Need to plan for the future. Important to know there are neighbors that do support this – support students at UC and elevate their voice
- Judy Murphy: lived here since 1971, concern is the school situation – specifically elementary school, they are already over capacity and creating a lot of traffic. With increased housing where will there be another elementary school? Concerns that the Planning Department is not communicating with SD Unified as the representative.
 - AW: Will reframe that as a comment that the City should coordinate openly, transparently, and robustly with city schools before scenarios with significant housing to ensure that there is a plan in place for schools to serve those living in those houses.
- Ruth Bush: Resident of south UC, graduate of UCSD - Sprouts and Vons are both within a mile of the trolley – if we are crows that is true - if we're walking it's 2 miles, a 4 mile round trip. Be careful we are using the correct math.

- Andrew Barton: Parks, in May 2022, planning staff described metrics for when an area had enough parks, and UC is woefully under park-ed with no realistic plan to address this. Request of the city is that the city identify land and funds to address the deficiency and present the results to all of us and the subcommittee as soon as possible. Plan should mandate new developments build parks onsite and not pay in lieu fees to avoid doing this. Recommend the plan update committee not vote on the plan until this is addressed thoughtfully and thoroughly.
- Public: Want to highlight process issues: Judy mentioned it was alleged that the Planning Department was coordinating closely with school system and that has not been the case, Ruth pointed out two shopping centers designated as 1 mile when it's a 4.2-mile round trip, Planning Department asserted AB9 required these changes for University City and was walked back when proven not to be true. So many misrepresentations of fact and reality coming from the Planning Department – comments from October meeting have not been updated into the spreadsheet as of March of the next year. Not to be disenfranchised, given misinformation bordering on misinformation. That's disagreeing while misrepresenting the truth – so the anger that manifests is not an attitudinal problem it's a rejecting of the opacity. Anger is because of disinformation, lack of transparency
- DiM: Concerns we hear about parks - urge the city to do plan overlay zones require they build public use parks onsite when redevelop the land. We were previously told overlay zones couldn't be part, but Mira Mesa has them. They got 10 stories instead of 5 by providing parks. Suggest this for the purple [mixed use] zones.
- RC: Taken intensity from west of Genesee and lightened it to purple color in scenario B. Need to preserve existing stock of affordable housing, some of the most affordable housing in the area [sw corner Nobel and Genesee]. These buildings are old, there will inevitably be pressure to redo this, how can we turn it into something inspiring? We have Costa Verde [nw corner Nobel/Genesee] which is reinventing itself. We want services local, walkability, have edge on climate change goals, if we go up we can reduce the footprint have more accessible land. First 2 stories are affordable, then go up, then have additional housing close to trolley close to transit. Consider an eco-district. If we think big, the concept of eco district is important. Think big and in terms of districts. Jason made some interesting points, invite Alexandria to think if we can integrate something here – housing/green space and make Costa Verde a show piece.
- Public: Main reason for coming today, even though 79% under 50, is the people who built the community and moved here when General Dynamics was the main employer are retired, and we want to see for the elderly and those retiring – we need urgent care, doctors, and pharmacies in the community.
- Public: South UC concern is a safety one. Proposed reduction in lanes. Three schools on Governor. No city support for busses. All transportation by car. If there's an emergency, there will be a lot more cars exiting at the same time.
- AW: To summarize comments. Any redevelopment in South UC plazas must preserve commercial retail [and medical] space. Any reduction of number of lanes

on Governor must be done in thoughtful/careful way, including analysis during school pick up/drop off.

- Linda Bernstein: To the subcommittee members: encourage you to listen to the community; Scenario B will be the scenario we work with. It makes our voices not heard if you don't vote for Scenario B. We are here tonight and have every right to be heard. Vons/Sprouts with talking about mixed-use – it will be detrimental for the houses next door if we go over heights here.

8:01 Adjournment