

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes
Hybrid Meeting
July 9, 2024
6:00 PM

Directors present, directors absent

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Neil de Ramos (NR), Joann Selleck (JS), Daren Esposito (DE), Jon Arenz (JA), Anu Delouri (AD), Kristin Camper (KC), Petr Krysl (PK), Carol Uribe (CU), Georgia Kayser (GK), Karen Martien (KMar), Andrew Wiese (AW), Linda Bernstein (LB), Fay Arvin (FA), Alex Arthur (AA), Anna Bryan (AB), Sasha Treadup (ST), Coby Tomlins (CT-City of SD Planning).

1. Call the Meeting to Order: Chris Nielsen, Chair. Chair CN at 6:05 pm.

2. Agenda: Call for additions / deletions: Adoption.

CN: Any additions or corrections to the agenda? None raised. Motton to approve by JS, seconded by KM. Passed unanimously,

3. Approval of Minutes: May 14, 2024, minutes.

CN: Any changes, additions or corrections to the minutes as revised by Andy Wiese? Since that was the meeting at which we approved the comment on the revised UC plan we wanted to have as complete a record as possible. Andy spent a considerable amount of time revising the initial draft of the minutes to provide this accurate record.

- Motion by JS, second by KM. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Announcements: Chair's Report, CPC Report

CN: I'll give my report and ask Andy to give a status report on the UC Plan.

- Welcome to the UCPG meeting for July 9, 2024. Thanks to Alexandria for the use of this room with its hybrid meeting capabilities.
- This is the first meeting where voting members (of the board) may attend and vote by Zoom. We still encourage voting members to attend UCPG meetings in person.
- The schedule of city council meetings to consider the plan update is:
 - July 23: Blueprint SD general plan amendment, Blueprint SD EIR, University EIR, and Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment EIR.
 - July 30: University Plan and Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment.
 - Zach, is this still your understanding?

- Zach Burton, CM Lee's community representative: That's everybody's understanding.
- Debby Knight: So only Blueprint and the two Plan EIRs on the 23rd, then just the University and Hillcrest plans on the 30th with any amendments?
- I'll ask Andy what he thinks.
- AW: The goal is for any presentation to the City Council to be based on the current presentation plus changes made in the next few days that we see. I think we won't know what the final set of changes will be. We don't think there will be anything too dramatic from what we have seen and heard. I think it will be good to offer comments in July, but I cannot personally do that as I need to be with my family. I would be happy to share my notes from before if you wanted.
- CN: I will offer to give the comments. Maybe you and I can work on what needs to be said. I can probably use some volunteers to cede time to me for the comments.
- JS: Are we going to take a position on the plan, or just talk about our comment?
- CN: My feeling is that we gotten as much influence as we are going to get, other than the satisfaction of up or down when it's finalized. There's not much left other than advising the city of our opinion. We should just go ahead and give our comment and let the chips fall where they may rather than voting up or down. Andy?
- AW: I don't know we are able to vote up or down on the plan that is not finalized. I think voting on something that is not final is a bad practice.
- JS: I think there is value in voting. I understand we don't have something final to vote on, and we went prior to Council but it seems to me given the amount of time and significant effort involved it makes sense to go on the record. One way or another, you've done it; great job! Moving our proposal forward and getting everybody, we can listen is important. We are here as representatives of the community. We should make a decision for the future. I don't know that going on the record with our objections is sufficient. Maybe it is. Given what the city has done in terms of timing, I think the city would like to know where we stand.
- CN: We can schedule a vote on the plan in September when we come back as it is not on this month's agenda. [Some tuning of the room microphone levels.]

- Bill Beck: By saying nothing it almost appears that we say we agree with the city. You have to go there, you have to say to the city that you will do what you want but we still disagree, because if you say nothing, you're saying to the Mayor we agree with you and we're OK with it.
- CN: We will be going to the Council meeting, and we will be saying that we disagree with substantial portions of the plan as presented. Andy can't give the comment this time, but I will.
- LB: I agree with JS. I think we do need to make a very strong statement again because we haven't gained anything from the city. I haven't seen one thing we've gained from the UCPG. We need to make the statement that people have been meeting for five years, and it's so disheartening that the developers and students were the only voices that were heard.
- Debby Knight: I agree with Joann, Bill Beck, and Linda. I've been on that committee for 5 ½ years and I consider that we got very little. The city never incorporated a log of the community's comments. It's a diverse community. The city listened to the features developers wanted but not the people who live here. They said there were not enough parks, you're not adding new parks, but you're adding tens of thousands of people. I saw what happened in Mira Mesa, their PG Chair giving a one-minute comment on zoom. That felt wrong, and I see the same thing happening here. I feel a chill in public involvement and public engagement. We spent years in those meetings, listening to many different opinions. Andy put God knows how many hours and days of work, and we got only a small percentage of what we asked for. The affordable housing report they did as part of the plan that allows developers to buy out at double the normal fee. In our community the average rent is double. I don't see affordable housing happening in this community, I don't see any family housing, I don't see any worker's housing. I don't see a diverse community. Many on the City Council, even the Mayor have this as a goal, yet I don't see it happening, and all of the time we raised the issue, the reality never changed, and found that deeply disturbing. This has been a 5 ½ year process, and I don't see why the city cannot take more time to finish rather than making changes at the last minute in the last few meetings in July.
- JA: I was just going to add one thing to Debby's point. The theory of it is great, and maybe I don't agree with this, but if you can collect the fees it's actually way more efficient and affordable to take those

fees and then build 100% affordable projects, with the city hiring an affordable developer. That's what they do, and it's more efficient. They know how to get the grants. The fact of the matter, though, is that's not really what's happening and if they are going to allow paying double the fee to get rid of affordable components of a project. The stipulation should be that money is going to stay in UC and is going to go to an affordable project in UC, but I don't that requirement is there, so I think it defeats the whole purpose.

- JS: It seems to me that our position is confusing to the press and public. I think it's important for us to be able to articulate where we stood on the plan, apart from our long comments. People like simplicity.
- AW: I'd like to clarify. We have made our position clear. 65 pages were clear. I don't know how much more there would be, and at the level of detail that we provided to the city to improve the plan. It's not that we did not get anything that members of the community had pushed for over the 5 ½ years. We demanded, and the planning department said no, to affordable housing at a higher than 10% level. We asked for specific SDRs, they put in policies. It's not a rule and not quite what we'd like, and it's not as strong as we wanted, but it's there. We have a watered-down affordable housing plan, but it's there because we asked for one. We wanted urban public spaces. Developers said, please take that out of the plan. We have the possibility that there will be more publicly accessible space throughout the community. That's not something that is in other cities. We're asking, the City is asking, for developers to do their part. We asked for the linear parks, we got the linear parks. They see them partly as stormwater reclamation; we call for that as well. Open spaces are included in the plan, and they did that the way we asked for it. They gave us a lot of effective bike lanes but no implementation. You keep going down the list: there are many things that are in the plan and that we asked for; almost all were watered down. The canyon adjacent SDR is a good example: the SDR applies to two properties in the entire plan area, about 150 feet, or three residential units. So, for me, it's disappointing that the city misses an opportunity to create a much more progressive vision for the community plan, and I think they have been given materials to continue to make improvements, whether we vote up or down. I'm not sure what the usefulness of simplicity is compared to detailed criticism. I don't have a clear opinion on whether you vote for them.

I consider everything we've done with the 65-page report to be part of a negotiation which you all worked on. Thank you; you were very successful on your part. The question remains, can we live with what we have got, whether we have a choice. I don't think there is a particular need to do it, and it's not an action item on tonight's agenda.

- CN: If we decide we want to take a position on it, I can add it to a future agenda. It could then be on the record. I agree with Andy, I think our position stands on the comment letter we delivered to the city. We spend a lot of time working on that, refining it, tuning it, and our position is clear.
- KM: I want to make sure I'm clear on the process. After the meeting on the 30th, is it done?
- CN: Assuming the city certifies the EIRs and passes the plan, yes. There will be some technical corrections. Andy has worked very hard to fix all the bugs, particularly maps and figures that were inconsistent. [A schedule slide is shown on the screen.]
- CN: We don't know exactly which amendments will be made to the plan; we think our CM is working on a few but we have not seen any wording.
- Michaela Valk, Mayor's office representative: The planning department is still working with various council members on aspects of the plan and it's likely to be closer to the meeting than not.
- CN: We'll move on.
- CN: At this point I have no agenda items for August, and unless we get a last-minute item, we won't be meeting August. The Miramar double tracking project is on hold while the city works out details on an exchange of land with SANDAG / LOSSAN. This land involves MSCP, which makes it very complex.

5. Presentations:

- **Councilmember Kent Lee (Zach Burton)**

We would like to thank all who attended the movie in the park at the Nobel Rec Center. 100 attendees. Thanks to Parks & Rec, Library staff, for putting on the event. Special mention to Nicole who runs the Rec Center.

- Thanks to the July 4 committee who allowed us to have a booth at the celebration. The CM had some good discussions with residents,
- I'll highlight some budget wins: streetlights, pothole repair, year-round swimming at the Aquatic Center.

- CN: I'd like some clarification on the status of Bill Beck's streetlights. Bill was kind of equivocal on whether these would be done.
- The funding is there but we don't know exactly when the project will start. We realize this was at the top of your list. Bill has been more than patient, so we want to see that project move forward. We believe we have our ducks in a row.
 - Bill Beck: I want to thank the entire UCPG for supporting this small project for the 10 years it's been ongoing, and I want to thank the councilman. Hopefully by the end of summer or the year I can thank everyone again on completion of the project.

- **Membership Report (Anu Delouri)**

None.

- **Mayor Todd Gloria (Michaela Valk)**

- It's been a very busy month for items going before the City Council: housing, homelessness, appointment of a new Fire & Rescue Chief. Assistant Chief Robert Logan will hopefully be confirmed next week. University City was very involved in the search process. I know UCCA is going to have a meeting with the new Chief of Police Wahl.
- Please keep in mind any projects the group may wish to submit later having to do with parks and libraries. As last year, anyone can submit a project for the CIP list. This year, CPGs also have a specific form to indicate the planning group's priorities.
- There will be a one-cent sales tax increase on the November ballot.

- **Assembly Member Tasha Boerner (Andres)**

- The state is in recess and will reconvene in August. In the meantime, the Assemblymember has events in the district. One will be this Sunday at the San Eligio lagoon from 2:30 to 3:30. Pride parade on July 20.

- **Pure Water Project (Clem Wassenberg, Mariah)**

- Clem: I am construction manager for the Morena – Northern pipeline and tunnel projects. We are working on all three tunnels, at the 52 at Rose Canyon, in front of the High School, and crossing the 805. The contractor continued open trench work along Nobel from Towne Centre to Via Las Ramblas. Work times are unchanged. Please take care when driving along the work zone areas, and no parking in the construction zones.
- JA: I'm impressed with the speed of the project. However, as we approached the intersection of Towne Center and Nobel, where three lanes go to 1, I have seen a lot of near accidents.
- Clem: We will be switching traffic control and moving west along Nobel.

- Diane Ahern: With the help of the UCPG, the UCCA has an approval for a banner district along Nobel. Do you have an idea when the project will be complete, and we would be able to install the banners?
- Clem: Mid 2025 is our best estimate for completion.
- Question: When will you be dealing with the disruption at the intersection of Nobel and Genesee and the incredible backup of traffic at 3PM each day?
- Clem: We will save the best for last. The intersection of Nobel and Genesee is where the two pipes will meet. We will be meeting with the traffic engineers to discuss how to direct traffic at this intersection. We will have the contractor stop at Lombard Place so that the westbound pipeline will not hit the intersection prematurely. This will minimize the total impact from this phase of the project.

6. Public Comment: Non-Agenda, but within the scope of the UCPG, Items (2-minute limit).

- Becky Rapp (member of the public): I come here tonight as I wanted to share with you some good news regarding the budget just passed. The SEED program, concerning socially equitable cannabis dispensing, was cut from the budget. This program would have potentially brought 36 more pot shops to the city, many located south of the 8. Parents like me are grateful money can be better spent on youth drop-in centers, community and recreation centers as well as the victims of the January floods. Two councilmembers, Foster, and Moreno indicated that they may revisit the program. I urge you to stay informed and speak out regarding what is beneficial to your community.
- Diane Ahern: I want to thank UCPG members for showing up at the Standley Park July 4 celebration. There is more going on at Standley Park: summer concerts start this weekend for the next seven weeks from 5 to 7 PM at the park pavilion stage. This is partially sponsored by the UC Parks Council that supports all the parks in this community. Come for an evening of music.

7. Action Item: Approval of an alternate UCPG meeting location for the September 10 meeting ONLY. The proposed meeting location would be at the La Jolla Immunology Institute, located at 9420 Athena Circle, La Jolla 92037. Chris Nielsen, presenting.

- CN: I have contacted our old UCPG friend, Kris Kopensky, who works for BioMed Realities, to obtain the first-floor conference room with hybrid capabilities at the LJII. Complimentary parking is available in front of the building. If there is no objection, we will use this meeting room on September 10.

8. Action Item: Approval of an annual Capital Improvements Project list. The City requests all CPGs to submit a revised CIP project list by 31 July. We will take the 2023 UCPG list, adjust for projects partially or completely funded, edit the list, and rank the projects on the list. New ideas for CIP projects are welcome. Chris Nielsen, presenting.

- CN: Tonight, we will be revising our Capital Improvement Project list for submission as a Planning Group to the city prior to August 15. We will go through the 2023 CIP list, remove the items that were funded last year, and submit a new list with possible additions. The list does not have to be ranked, but we may approve a ranking in September for the use of our Council Office. I will share a power point with the prior list.
- We will begin with removing the prior number one CIP, the Vista La Jolla streetlights.
- Number two is the Governor and Genesee Safe Crossing CIP. Number three was a Standley recreation center cooling system evaluation and design. Number four was the Standley recreational center modernization. Number five was the south Rose Canyon linear overlook park, six was the overlook linear park on the north side of Rose Canyon. Number seven is UC Gardens park. Number eight was a Governor Drive calming project. We can discuss whether it stays or goes. Next, we have two CIP items with at least some funding. The first is the University Community Library and the second is Marcy Park maintenance and improvements.
- CN: The streetlights got funded. Zach and Michaela, what is the status of Marcy Park or the UC library?
- Zach: We can consider Marcy Park fully funded.
- Michaela: I can speak to the UC Library. My understanding is that the library still has a grant from Sen. Tony Atkins, but it is certainly not enough. They will use the money to do some internal improvements like fix the ceiling and update the bathrooms, and perhaps some equipment. But it's not enough to do building renovations or expansions in general, or what the figure would be for them.
- CN: Do we know if this library is on the Library Master Plan list?
- Michaela: I'll have to check.
- Joann: Is there an opportunity with state and federal grant money?
- CN: Does the library need to be left off the CIP list?
- Michaela: For the planning group, you don't really need to worry about the details of how to do designs and contracting, just use the survey to communicate your concept to the city. Under updated CIP methodology, the city will ensure funding is in place prior to starting a project. This ensures that a project has funds to complete it rather than endless designs that are too expensive to build when the money is there. The city's assessment is that the entire library should be replaced. The city will use the \$1.9 million from Sen. Atkins for projects identified by the librarians, patrons, and the Friends of the Library. If the question is are there any specific plans for a new building, the answer is not yet but was discussed at the Library Master Plan meeting.

- Debby Knight: We can't develop the plans because we would not be able to know when funding is there, so the design can be integrated with construction and the costs can be identified for the entire project.
- CN: Zach, do you have any updates on funding or changes that would affect Genesee and Governor?
- KM: This was a leading pedestrian interval, bike box, and, if possible, a reduced speed limit through the zone.
- Zach: We need to chase this down.
- CN: The idea was to do something that was primarily paint on the ground and a small modification to the signaling. The idea was that the Leading Pedestrian Interval wasn't expensive.
- Michaela: I would not worry about the cost as a barrier.
- KM: This was a project we submitted prior to redistricting. This was supposed to be small and inexpensive, and justified by the multiple schools that use the intersection. We came up with the project and sent a letter to the Transportation Department but at the same time we don't understand how the budgeting works. Do we put this in as a CIP, or would it just be funded in-house?
- Michaela: It's not a CIP per se, but it could still be funded in a budget.
- CN: So, your recommendation is to keep it in as a CIP and wait to see how it interacts with the Pure Water project.
- KM: I'd still like to support the idea of painting on the ground. There are bikes to protect and pedestrians to protect, and we have interacted with the Transportation Department. We don't get clear answers. I'd like Zach to follow up.
- Zach: I'll try to see what the roadmap might be through pure water and the plan update and see if there is anything inconsistent with these projects and the proposed project that we can provide advice for. We can try to have Pure Water restripe.
- KM: it's just one lousy car length, or part of one, that will not back up the traffic. We really think this might do some good. We're just talking about the right lane with the LPI, with bikes and pedestrians getting into the crosswalk early. Even the rightmost lane delay would be a dramatic improvement and would make it easier for drivers to see.
- AW: I had a question that takes us back to the beginning of the conversation about the survey and the city's intention of superseding the input of the planning groups. What's the relationship between those two processes?
- Michaela: Prior to last year, only planning groups submitted projects. Now there is a live survey that's available to anyone with an idea or request for infrastructure. The planning group is still overweight because, for example, your CMs still will look at your priority list when they are forming the budget. It still adds weight to what the PGs submit as a priority.

- AW: So, let's say you got 500 suggestions, a list of 500 or 600 suggestions. How does the city prioritize the suggestions that come back? Would they look who is actively submitting? If suggestions are received about the library, and if there are multiple suggestions, it may look like something specific is talked about, such as leakage in a room.
- Michaela: They are basically looking for a trend in suggestions, so your items will be sufficient.
- [The submission spreadsheet is displayed.] Michaela: The project description and location are straightforward. How the project benefits the community. As an example, safety of bicycles and pedestrians is the key benefit of the Governor and Genesee project. The city uses the project type spreadsheet to divide the CIPs between asset owning departments of the city.
- JS: That seems right moving out what has been funded, or should we be trying to rewrite project for this spreadsheet?
- CN: I'm not sure, and I'm not sure the city would pay any attention to the ranking on the list other than that it's a priority for the community if it's there.
- Michaela: Correct.
- CN: I wonder if we could enter the projects on the list, and then at a later meeting rank them for other purposes since I think the discussion about rank could be extensive.
- KM: This would allow the chair to submit a list that had agreement on the projects to be submitted.
- Michaela: You can make it a cumulative list. Take 2024, add 2025 and resubmit. The departments will look at it and eliminate anything with funding.
- CN: The linear parks are an example. We would like to keep the linear parks in our CIP list to make sure they can be funded if the money can be found, especially since they are in the community plan.
- KM: Yes, based on the work you and Andy have done with the parks department and the amount of noise we've made I would think that the linear parks might have a good chance of funding sooner rather than later since the city knows how much of a deficit in park points, we're running with the increases proposed in the plan.
- Bill Beck: Was the park on the end of Governor Drive on the west end not included on this list?
- CN: Yes, the west end. Andy, do the proposed linear parks have car parking?
- AW: Yes, the west end of Governor has car parking.
- CN: I think Joann had a point about needing more projects in the north part of the plan area. We tried to come up with more projects for Doyle but failed.
- CN: Michaela, on our list we had an item to get funding for a design for an updated cooling system for the Rec Center at Standley Park. But that's not the way we want to put it, is it?

- Michaela: If it's a community priority, you can just say it. You don't need to come up with a staged project.
 - So we have Governor and Genesee, the two Standley Rec Center projects, the north and south overlook parks. There is also a UC Gardens Park CIP. This is located at Gullstrand and Governor on the northeast corner.
 - KM: I think this was expanding the parking lot onto the weeded area for additional parking.
 - CN: Number 8 on the list, Governor calming, is a flashpoint for the community. I think we'll leave this to the city, and the traffic study, to sort it out. I'll delete this item from the lists.
 - CN: I'm going to suggest I fill out the CIP form with the projects (2 through 7) remaining on the list and we rank them at a future meeting.
 - JS: I'll point out that a large part of our park funding comes from state and federal grants and there is a complicated mechanism for this. There is also non-profit money available. These may be suitable for the overlook or linear parks.
 - CN: the overlook parks are not labeled as parks in the plan, but greenways, at least for the time being.
 - Michaela: Through the project survey we can see a lot of involvement by the planning group about parks. When the survey is submitted, it echoes that to City Planning to say, OK, we should study that, and try to get into conversations about who should be the asset owner. We're waiting for the plan update to be implemented and then we can go to the Transportation department and figure out how to transfer that land to Parks. The main thing is that they are in the plan. That's step 1, no matter what we call them. And if we get them on our list we can see a groundswell of community desire for those to be parks, and we can begin the process of transferring the linear parks from transportation and stormwater to Parka & Rec. City planning does not do this but studies how it could be done.
 - CN: I'm going to move we adopt this list and adopt Joann's suggestion to rank the list in September.
 - Question: Would it be better to rank this list in August?
 - CN: No, the city does not need a ranking, it just needs a list for our council office.
 - CN: Fay has seconded the motion. Further discussion? Any opposition? Motion carries unanimously.
 - CN: We will see people in September unless something comes up in the meantime. Enjoy the rest of your summer.
9. Adjournment. Next meeting will be September 10 at the La Jolla Immunology Institute.