

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes
Hybrid Meeting
April 9, 2024

1. **Call the Meeting to Order: Chris Nielsen, Chair.** Chair CN at 6:20 pm

- **CN:** Starting recording. This is the UCPG meeting for April 9th, the last meeting of the year. We should hopefully end early.

(Directors present, directors absent)

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair)

Neil de Ramos (NR)- Zoom Attendee, not voting

Joann Selleck (JS)

Darren Esposito (DE)

Jon Arenz (JA)

Anu Delouri (AD)- Zoom Attendee

Carol Uribe (CU)

Georgia Kayser (GK)

Karen Martien (KM)

Linda Bernstein (LB)

Fay Arvin (FA)

Alex Arthur (AA)

Anna Bryan (AB)

Andrew Wiese (AW)

Georgia Kaiser (GK)

Sasha Treadup (ST)

Carey Algaze (CA)

Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV)

Kristin Camper (KC)

Andrew Parlier (AP)

Petr Krysl (PK)

- 2. Approval for Andy Weise and Karen Martien to attend next meeting remotely. Carol Uribe Motions to approve Karen and Andy to attend remotely. Karen Seconds. Motion passes unanimously.**
- 3. Agenda: Call for additions / deletions: Adoption.**
 - **CN:** Any additions/deletions to the agenda? None raised. Both Feb and March Approved.
 - **AA:** Motions to approve February minutes.
 - **CN:** Seconds
 - Motion carries unanimously.
 - **AB:** Motions to approve March minutes.
 - **AW:** Seconds
 - Motion carries unanimously.
- 4. Thank Isabel Kay for her 9 years of service. She is now termed out.**
- 5. Karen Motions to approve nominations listed below. Alex Arthur Seconds. Motion passes unanimously.**
 - 1) Chris Nielsen was nominated to be Chair.
 - 2) Fay Arvin was nominated as Vice Chair
 - 3) Anu Delouri was nominated as Membership Secretary
 - 4) No forthcoming volunteers for Recording Secretary. This role will rotate between Board Members.
- 6. Announcements: The Annual Report is due in 14 days. Similar format as annual report in fill- in style.**
- 7. All Board Members Required to do written workshop for training.**
- 8. Alex Arthur and Darren Esposito must do this online orientation (ECAL) immediately.**
- 9. Council Member Lee's Office: Zach's Report**
 - Creek to Bay Cleanup upcoming April 20th, multiple locations. Please join us!
 - The Marcy Park project is funded. Construction projected to start Summer 2024.
 - Henry Foster was sworn into the City Council yesterday.
- 10. Mayor Todd Gloria's Office: Michaela's Report**
 - Gloria is seeking to appoint Scott Wall to assistant chief of police. Call for public accounts of positive experiences from when Wall was captain of the area. ('City as a Whole' Special Council Meeting, April 29th)

- Also seeking Community Fire Chief and looking for feedback on what San Diegans like to see from their chief.
- Unsafe Camping Ordinance follow up- 1000 beds have been added in Middletown (Kettner and Vine) as a congregate shelter. Lease is going to Land Use and Housing Dept. on April 18th.
- Lease is going to housing. Public comment is welcome during the land use and housing meeting.
- Barracks adjacent to the airport to be put forward as a future safe parking site for 100 vehicles.
- Enforcement we are seeing has been a consequence of increased safe sleeping sites. We welcome public comment on April 18th during the Land Use and Housing Meeting.

11. Public Comment: Comments on items not on the agenda but within the scope of the UCPG. Two-minute limit.

- **CN:** This comment period is for non-agenda items. Please reserve public comment on Agenda Items until Item 7.
- **Tom Malaney:** This program is designed to take away citizen's rights to analyze impacts throughout the city. Please give this program your attention.
- **CN:** Tom, this is an item covered under item 7. Thank you.

Becky Rapp: I'm Public Health Advocate focused on youth- There have been proposed Municipal Code Changes to allow more Pot Shops and remove distance requirements from parks schools etc. I'm grateful that Mayor has put this change on hold by Mayor but concerned that when it is picked back up the issue facing children could re-emerge. Please comment directly to the Office of Child and Youth Success (OCYS). It is critical to protect our children from the normalization of drug use in our communities

Cody Vierra: Representing Office of Congressman Scott Peters. Reminder about the Annual Congressional Art Competition open to High School students in 50th district. April 19th at 3:30pm Pacific Time at our office in UC at Torrey Pines bank Building. Congress Scott Peters recently got \$14.8M funding for art projects in 50th district. View the funded projects at scottpeters.house.gov

Please subscribe to his newsletter. Constituent services help with Federal Agencies, Medicare, IRS, Integration... please reach out to us or to me codi.vierra@mail.house.gov

JS: Codi, please update us on the prospects of an additional post office in UC following our loss of the Post Office which used to be in Costa Verde as well as one that used to be in La Jolla Village Square.

Codi: I will reach out to our Post Office representative for an update for you.

12. Information Item: Presentation by the City on the second Draft of the University Community Plan

- **CN:** There will be a meeting on April 16th on Zoom to provide feedback. Please keep comments brief and concise.
- **CN:** I expect civil conduct during this community discussion.
- Suchi Lukes sharing screen and introduces colleagues Nathan Causman (Senior Planner) Sean McGee (Development Project Manager III) Coby Tomlins (Program Manager) and Leo Alo (Senior Traffic Engineer) and others from Park Planning and Conservation and Open Space (Dan Monroe).
- **Suchi's** Agenda Slide is displayed.
 - What was the feedback on Discussion Draft Plan
 - What is in the second Draft Community Plan?
 - What is the Draft Rezoning Map?
 - What is the environmental review process?
 - What are the next steps?
 - Q & A
- **Nathan:** Why are we updating the plan?
 - UC has had several plans but no update since 1987, it is a blueprint for growth. The timeframe is 20-30 years. My current plan is 37 years old.
 - Changes since then: Trolley, Biotech and Hi-tech Industry Growth, Large density of Jobs particularly in UC and Sorrento Mesa (Largest employment area in region by total jobs), Large commuter population in UC. The city is trying to do its part to plan for new homes and reduce the housing crisis by planning more homes near job centers.
 - Policy documents that provide framework for plan updates: Climate Action Plan, Climate Resilient SD, Parks Master Plan, and General Plan
 - Guiding Principles for UC plan: Renowned Institutions, Vibrant Mixed-Use Urban, Diversified Housing Investments.
 - Plan Priorities:
 - Thriving Economy
 - Transit Investment Success.
 - Allowing a variety of New Homes
 - Ensuring a Sustainable Future
 - Streets Designed for People
 - Discussion of process for plan and timeline including Open House,
 - March 14th meeting is public review period.
 - April 29th, Public Comments are due.

- May 14 Request for action, additional comments, and recommendation from UCPG.
- Summer 2024 City will provide final draft, hold Public Hearings and Adoption, as well as host Planning Commission, Land Use and Housing Committee and City Council Meetings on this subject.
- We received a lot of feedback on the Discussion Draft Plan which we did our best to reflect in the Second Draft we are reviewing today.
- We received a mixed response to housing density.
- We heard the following needs: need for additional mobility analysis, need for affordable housing, need for neighborhood serving retail, improved transit on Governor drive, need to protect natural resources and the need for supporting infrastructure.
- What is in the Second Draft Community Plan. Download it at planuniversity.org
- Land Use: We have discussed two scenarios in 2022, One with max density of 290 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), another with 281 du/ac.
- These scenarios were updated in 2023 with 218 du/ac and 145 du/ac
- The preferred Draft Plan scenario outlines a max density of 218 du/ac with capacity for 30,000 new homes and 72,000 new jobs.
- 130+ Acres of open space to be dedicated.
- See slide of Land Use Illustrations.

Suchi: Urban Design

- **Conceptual Design Concepts.**
 - Plazas Promenades etc.
 - Executive Drive Promenade
 - Six Design Districts: North Torrey Pines, Nobel/ Campus, South University
 - Urban Forestry and Street Tree Plan.

Leo Alo: Mobility

- Pedestrian Network Map
- Recommended Bicycle Network
- Planned Transit and Potential Transit Improvement Maps
- Planned Vehicular Network
- Mobility Analysis PEQE (Pedestrian Environmental Quality Evaluation)
- Bicycle Level Traffic Stress (BLTS) increase amount of protected bike facilities.
- The city projects reduced travel times through main corridors such as Genesee Ave.
- The city projects reduced Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) in UC. Level of Service is a previous metric for this which is included in the report.

○

Suchi:

- Regents Road North and Regents Road South with Roadway. (Illustrations show black asphalt road alongside narrow park).
- Governor Drive Greenway West End.
- Community Plan Identifies pocket parks, trails, overlooks, etc.
- Charter 55 identified protection.
- Public Facilities for Public growth: Key Services. Police Protection, Fire-Rescue Department (35, 50, 52), Schools
- Implementation
 - CPIOZ Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone
 - Supplemental Development Regulations
 - Public Space Requirements: 25K sq ft plus (exemptions for less than 25K sq ft or procedures 600-33)
 - The North Side of Executive Drive must provide options for promenade.
 - Building Transition Setback and Step-back requirements
 - Open Space Transition: 20-foot setback and 65 degree angle transition plane
 - Design related regulations: Required street trees, prohibition of common open space near freeways
 - Pedestrian Improvements and Crossings
 - Complete Streets concept requires right of way and flexible lanes
 - There is a provision requiring Community Village sites to provide 25% of gross-floor area for community serving retail
 - Increasing inclusionary housing requirements. Citywide Inclusionary Fee +5% Homes @ 80% of AMI (Area Median Income)
 - Citywide Inclusionary Fee + 10% Homes @ 120% of AMI (Area Median Income)

● **Nathan:**

Land Development Code: Regulates Development Chapters 11-15 of the San Diego Municipal Code, CPOIZ

EIR Process covers 3 projects, Blueprint, General plan, University and Hillcrest community plans.

What topics are in the EIR: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources etc.

What does it not cover? An implementation Plan, A planning document

Next Steps: Key Dates (Repeat Slide), March 14th, April 29th, May 14th, Summer 2024 Final Draft from City.

For comments on the community Plan: planuniversity@san Diego.gov

For comments on the EIR send to planningceqa@san Diego.gov

Katie Rodolico: Question was traffic study and modelling done for high density alternative? How does the EIR say the VMT is going to be lower if it was never modeled? The conclusion in the EIR is that in the alternative scenario, VMT is lower and therefore better. Is this realistic?

Q2: Coby or Heidi is it fair to introduce a land use map in the alternative plan when it was rejected in June 2022.

Q3: Were added jobs reanalyzed in the high-density version? There is a discrepancy between the jobs. Do we get fewer jobs with the high-density version?

Suchi: Please submit your questions online at Planning CEQA for documented response.

Leo: Higher density was not included in modeling.

Katie Rodolico: What we did model was what's in the proposed plan

We had looked at high density version one in February of 2022 and by June 2022 they were removed from the plan due to community outcry. Now it's reappeared as the alternative in the EIR. Why have they resurrected this dead plan and selected it as a preferred alternative.

Coby Tomlins: We will get back to you after touching base with the EIR team.

Katie Rodolico: Why are there fewer jobs with the high-density plan, but the numbers seem to not have been. Somehow, there are fewer jobs with the high-density alternative. How does the EIR determine that the numbers will be lower. So, it's like this was resurrected from the dead but the numbers weren't updated? You might want to take a look at that.

CN: Will the city recommend the second draft community plan together with the EIR that corresponds to it?

Suchi: What's in the second draft will be what's presented to City Council. In the EIR there is a Project Description. That project description gets analyzed as the preferred alternative and the draft community plan would be the Project Description that gets recommended and analyzed. There are other alternatives.

CN: I think that's important for people to understand. The staff is recommending what's in the current draft of the community plan just released, plus the EIR project alternative that corresponds with that.

AW: What is the planning department's preferred alternative and is that the same as the draft plan. If that's not the case why is the high-density alternative described as the preferred alternative in the EIR.

Suchi: The purpose of the EIR is to analyze a range of scenarios.

Why is the EIR vs draft plan looking at different densities? The range of analyses allows a lessened environmental impact by VIT or greenhouse gas emissions. That is a legal requirement that can lessen one or more environmental impacts. That's why the Draft plan recommendation of 290 units per acre is being considered. That scenario increases the number of homes near transit which *could* "reduce" environmental impact. So that is analyzed for CEQA.

AW: The scenarios that are to be analyzed will provide an environmentally superior alternative on one or more alternative but that was not studied, so you don't know the numbers.

Suchi: at the next meeting we will have a better explanation of the alternatives.

AW: Why wasn't the community presented alternative studies or included in the EIR?

Suchi: If I'm understanding the question as "Why isn't the subcommittee Scenario included as one that's analyzed in the EIR" That's great feedback for us to give you as a written response. "We'll have to get together internally to get together on that".

CN: We recognize Andrew to speak on zoom.

Andrew Barton: I have a two-part question.

Existing commercial properties along Genesee and Governor which are largely to be rezoned as CC-3-8, which I understand allows for commercial plus possibly housing, 73 Dwelling Units per acre and height limits up to 100 feet.

Q2: What were the specific criteria used to select CC-3-8 vs CC-3-5 which allows for commercial and increased housing but would be much more in line with the contours of the community. Specific Criteria please.

Suchi: The land use Map proposes a community village of 73 dwelling units per acre. Based on our assessment the CC-3-8 zone most closely aligns with the community village land use designation.

Nathan: The comprehensive list of allowed uses for that zoning permits community serving retail and affordable housing.

Barton: But all of those points could be met with CC-3-5.

Suchi: Thanks Andrew, that feedback can be provided online and we can take a closer look at that comparison.

Jenn Dunnaway: **Q:** Regarding schools and Appendix I2 in Draft EIR which says, "The implementation of this plan will require significant expansion of school facilities and land for this use should be set aside" and "City of San Diego needs to partner with the district for developer funded new school construction *in advance* of occupancy of new housing." It also says this in guidelines appendix G. You didn't talk about this. The school district sent you this six months ago, so I'm wondering why is there not land identified and what will the city do to make sure impacts are mitigated?

Suchi: The plan horizon covers 20 to 30 years so it's difficult to identify opportunities at this point that cover that full horizon period. But we do work with the school district's real estate assets team to provide opportunities as new development moves forward and once those proposals are provided to the city, we can better understand what options are for a new school facility. We try to work collaboratively but there is a need that we will have to address in the future for sure.

Jenn Dunnaway: Well, the letter is pretty clear, it says that land should be set aside in the Plan Update. That's pretty clear.

Jenn Dunnaway: Q for Leo Alo about Governor Drive on the discussion of VMTs, I've looked at the Mobility Plan and I want to discuss VMTs as single source for measuring impacts. In your own appendix F6 and F7 the disclaimers at the bottom of that say that information should be resource only and is just interpretation data. All the feedback I've heard from the community since you attended, Mr. Alo, in February of 2022, has been to say that Governor Drive should stay at 4 lanes. Especially with new development and more people. There's a number of things stated in that Mobility Report that highlight why the city wants to go to two lanes. But I'm looking at data and level of service. So can you tell me, besides VMT, which seems to be experimental from your own appendices, what other data are you using?

Leo: Regarding CEQA, VMT is now the metric used. It used to be Level of Service, but no longer. We are looking at levels of service in the Mobility technical report just to see impacts to motor vehicles but the primary metric is VMT for determining traffic impacts.

Jenn Dunnaway: Ok, thank you. I did ask for updated traffic data via email many times, for updated traffic count data. The last one was in 2015 and I think at that Feb 22 meeting you mentioned that there might be newer data? That's important as 9-year-old data is probably not very relevant for UC.

Leo: We did include that information, it's in there now. I'm sorry it took that long.

Jenn Dunnaway: Appendix A is an existing conditions summary and it's a draft so it should be updated to final before this process is completed.

Leo: We plan to finalize those documents by the time we get to adoption of the plan.

CN: recognize Charlie on zoom.

Charlie Frazier: My wife and I have lived in the same house for 50 years near Marcy Park. Why is the land use plan anti-Semitic? Figure three shows lots of Christian worship locations, but Congregation Beth Israel is going to be some sort of H3 high density and Chabad UC is some kind of community place? My question is: Is this an example of Anti-Semitism in the planning department of the City of San Diego?

Suchi: The intent of the plan is not to exclude anyone or to exclude religious facilities. I'll refer to the land development code that Nathan mentioned and those underlying zoning regulations which allow a religious facility in a variety of different use zones. The mixed zone will allow religious facilities to continue. The intent is not to exclude them. There are protections for religious facilities.

Nathan: Yeah, if synagogues are not listed as religious facilities on the land use map. It's helpful to know and we're happy to look into making that distinction, but as Suchi noted it's really the underlying zoning that dictates what the congregation decided to do with their facility and there are protections for existing uses.

Charlie: So, It's a matter of context like Harvard and Chicago University?

CN: We recognize Micheal Cosma to speak.

Micheal Cosma: How does the city plan to pay for infrastructure given its worsening budget?

Nathan: Developers have to pay fees or provide infrastructure to accommodate larger populations. But again, this is a community plan, it is not an infrastructure document. As the community evolves it will be necessary to look at what infrastructure is needed and find ways to pay for it. It is a city-wide issue as you noted.

Suchi: The approach we're taking is trying to require improvements on site. The supplemental development regulations are aimed at getting affordable housing built as well as park spaces built on-site. So, our approach is to require improvements on site.

Michael Cosma Q2: I'll take a look at that. My understanding is that the city has waived a lot of those development requirements in order to incentivize development, but I'll do more research. My second question is one of the main stated priorities of the plan is that the city wants to increase the variety of housing, I'm wondering how that's possible when there are no provisions for multi bedroom units or opportunities for ownership. It seems like this is a plan to increase access to rentals but I'm a 17-year-old and I don't want to be renting for my whole life. I want to be able to own the house that I live in.

There are lots of houses that are ownership based.

Nathan: There are lots of Multi-family properties are ownership based. Condos are an example. We can't control what's built in terms of whether it's owned or rented but multi-family properties are not only synonymous with renting.

Michale Cosma: Also, multi- bedroom provisions to have families living in

Nathan: We do have provisions that offer a slight Density bonus for 3-bedroom units. So, it's something we recognize city wide and at the same time the goal is to incentivize lots of different types of housing across the city.

CN: Recognize JS, board member for her question.

JS: Can you follow up with someone at Kaiser Marsten (KMA) to please explain their report and analysis from beginning to end? It's highly technical and a number of us can't get our arms around how they got to what they got and what it means.

Suchi: Michael and Paul have joined from Kaiser Marsten

JS: Please explain ultimate conclusions for the UC area and summarize how you got there because the whole financing analysis is too hard from a lay perspective to follow.

Michael Tactay with KMA: The city tasked us with evaluating various levels of affordability requirements. We concluded that projects achieved feasibility under the following set-aside option. Paying the existing fee and providing 5% of units at 80% AMI or paying a fee and providing 10% at 120% AMI. So, we evaluated the feasibility of that. Also, we concluded that if you provide units that exceed 10% that contributes to infeasibility, and when you go deeper than 80% that, we concluded, that contributes to infeasible projects. The city also asked us to identify a fee if developers don't provide affordable units. We also tested various levels of affordability. So, we looked into the fee as well. Our analysis was a feasibility analysis for providing affordable units and also if

you don't provide units what would that fee be. We were trying to get to a sweet spot. We didn't want to impede particularly on feasibility in multifamily rental development. So, they heard a lot of comments about affordability. Help them provide affordable units and make sure that it was feasible.

Paul C: Yeah, that's a great summary. If you've seen the study, you're aware that we looked at prototype development sites under the draft plan and tested economics of those developments at various set-asides and levels of affordability and similar to what we did for citywide inclusionary ordinance update from 2019.

JS: Does your report suggest that developers can pay a fee and do not need to provide affordable housing in UC or anywhere.

Michael: Yes, they have the option. Those are supposed to be equal / equivalent.

JS: Is that a one-time fee or an annual fee?

Nathan: What KMA found is that the current city-wide inclusionary fee as it exists right now would not result in new affordable housing being built in UC, so now they're trying to make the fee competitive. And if you don't build it will cost you just as much not to build it. But it is a one-time fee, not an annual fee.

JS. OK. I won't give you my opinion, but looking at whether it was 80% AMI, what kind of income would get us to 80% AMI. I suspect it would not house retail workers, or a three-bedroom extended multifamily with income less than 100K/ year. I'm trying to look at markers and understand what 80% would look like in dollars.

Paul C. Do you have the countywide chart, Michael? Countywide 100% of median is ~\$110K family four median. At 80% probably 65k to 80k range.

Michael: Yes, found it \$65k at the low end for studio and 3 bedrooms for \$93k

JS: Thanks

Jeff Dosick: Qs for Leo. Within the last few years, we've had presentations discussing the need for painted bike boxes at all our major intersections with lights. And tonight's presentation included 4 slides with bike boxes shown. We reviewed the three slurry projects: Regents, Pure Water and Nobel with striping and slurry and with all three projects there's only one bike box on the drawings. We as a community have been discussing the need especially at Genesee and Governor, with four schools there. So, are they going to add bike boxes? That's question one.

Q2: We have connected street policy here in SD. Regents road slurry project does not connect to Arriba and when can it be? Is it understood that it's not connected. Can you address why that isn't being connected to Arriba?

Leo Alo: Regarding bike boxes, I can't specifically say why they can't be included. Having to move loop detectors, having to do signal modification, which may be out of scope for slurry and striping, with the funding provided delineators might be included, but many other things don't fit in scope.

We do look for opportunities for funding those types for improvement. We have a concept for Genesee, which creates more protected intersections and it comes down to getting funding for this.

Jeff: From my commuter point of view in these busy streets, for the last 4 to 5 years, the city has been showing all of these bike boxes. You can exclude the loops, It's paint. It's essential for students and commuters to stop at these red lights and be seen by cars. We're talking about how 10 feet of paint saves lives. It's just paint. First of all, you need to do it, and if you're not going to do it, then take it out of the presentations! Could you address that? Could you do it at a minimum level for safety with just paint?

Leo Alo: Yeah, we can take it up with our partners. I can't speak to that particular project and implementation, We put it in a plan to provide direction for those projects but it really comes down to when we're getting to design and construction of what's feasible right now but with a 30-year plan we still have a long way to go before we implement everything.

Jeff: But with the commercial 1400 parking structure designed at Regents and UCSD, and when it was brought up that Regents Road was not connected, and we were told that the slurry project and re-striping would connect it. What we're running into is there's a splinter of departments with each department pointing to the other. The building is going on, the VMTs are discussed and projected but if the streets are not connected for the bike commuters, then when will it get connected, in 20 years? The housing and building is going on now!

CN: The city needs to take that to heart a bit. We recognize Paul Love on Zoom to speak.

Paul Love: I'm Paul, I live near Sprouts in UC. I have a process question. Maximum high of new buildings and whether governor will be 2 vs 4 lanes or any other detail- the plan is written in a certain way but what is the process for changes to occur? People write letters, but it's not clear to me, how do residents have a voice, how do we know if our voice has been heard? Is there any change of having various aspects of the plan changing and, is that known or is the process transparent. Or is it hope for the best, write emails and arbitrary decisions are made behind closed doors. I need to understand if residents are able to make an impact to the plan or make changes to it everyone needs to know what the best process is to make sure we maximize our chances to have an impact.

Nathan: Thanks Paul. This is the democratic process; we're having our meeting right now. We are near the end of this process. We have a draft to bring to decision makers. Ultimately City Council moves to adopt this plan. One of the first ways to get involved is to talk to your council member. Please comment on the plan directly with us you can comment at PlanUniversity.Org.

Paul Love: Are there any votes where the residents' input is tallied by public vote?

Nathan: The planning group will vote to recommend or not whether the City Council should adopt it.

CN: An author of our 1987 plan would like to speak, thank you George.

George Latimer: Question, how do we pay for the infrastructure in the future. I think it would be worth their time if the staff would explain what happened to FBAs that were set up to pay for necessary improvements and have since been stricken. How much money is left in the FBA left for UC.

Nathan: We have a UC specific pot of funding; I don't know how much is left.

CN: 44 Million is left.

Nathan: And there are lots of communities with rather large pots of funding, but maybe not enough to get over the hump of what it costs to build the infrastructure. So, we're moving to a citywide format and Citywide funds can be used to supplement specific infrastructure projects.

George: The truth of the matter is future money collected for development fees in UC could be spent anywhere in SD and the it's my recollection that the UC FBA of \$44M is probably one of the highest FBAs remaining in the city of SD. So consequently, the practicality is that future development fees raised out of UC are not going to be used in UC.

Nathan: I wouldn't say that's correct. The other metric we look at is what communities are growing. What communities are adding people and that would be reflected in the citywide process for distributing future impact fees.

CN: Thanks, we recognize Debbie and Susan next.

Debbie Knight: I'm on the Plan Update Subcommittee. I have a question about zoning map and attached chart. It describes mixed use residential and employment ranges and gives a max density and height maximums and ranges. My question is that the "Complete Communities" program and the "Density Bonus" Program at the city are apparently in addition to those densities in the zoning chart. Therefore, you can't look at that chart and assume the max density for residential is 145 dwelling units per acre. You can't look at mixed use and assume the max density is 218 dwelling units per acre. The project at Nobel and Genesee which is being proposed at 355 dwelling units per acre. If you read the land use zone and the chart with it, one would think it's impossible, it's marked as 145 dwelling units per acre max and it seems like the zoning map is meaningless when combined with other city policies. I ask that you produce a chart in addition to the chart with the zoning that gives the max mixed use residential charts with "Complete Communities" What would the height and max dwelling units per acre be? We get to look at a chart that looks at the impact of complete communities and the impact of 'Density Bonus'. Please produce that as soon as possible because it's very difficult for me to comprehend what this plan is proposing, when you are doing something different already. You haven't even passed the plan and you're already doing something that vastly exceeds what the plan allows. So could you go by all uses and what would be allowed with Complete Communities and what would be allowed with Density Bonus.

Suchi: The complete community and Density Bonus programs are incentive programs that allow incentives and waivers that relieve other requirements in order to provide additional

housing. We could look into providing more information on those changes, but as far as creating a new chart we would have to get together internally to discuss that. Changes to base zone is an incentive to provide more affordable housing.

Debbie: That's quite an incentive! The existing project is 29 DU/acre and what's being proposed is a 1000% increase? I would say this isn't really a plan since we have no idea what would be in it.

Nathan: Complete communities is already a program, so we can't have an impact on that city-wide program. It's not an incentive program but an alternative program. It's a floor to area ratio-based requirement. That exists a matter of city policy that is not reflected here in the UC plan at all.

Debbie: That's exactly my point. What you're showing the community is not what is actually what's going to happen because Complete communities as a program could completely overturn what's on the zoning map. Witness Nobel and Genesee Ave, which increases to 1000% and goes to 38 stories. Please produce the chart

CN: I think there's a dichotomy between the way the city calculates the housing numbers and the zoning map itself, which makes it difficult to understand.

Susan Baldwin: Building on what Debbie said, the Nobel Drive Complete Communities project will only provide 3.5% of affordable and (moderate, low and very low) that is much less than the city wide inclusionary. Just want to point that out.

I want to clarify that there are three affordable housing programs: There's Inclusionary, which I think was the only think that was looked at by the KMA study, then there's Density Bonus, which is guided by state law, and then there is city's only density program which is the Complete Communities which is being used by 4249 Nobel Drive Project. I noted in the KMA study that the proposal is to require 10% inclusionary housing, which if it's built off-site is allowed, that it be built in the UC area. My comment is that complete communities allow offsite housing to be built, but they do not require it be built in the UC community. They can be built in any moderate, high, or high resource area. The Density requirements also don't require those units be built in the community. So, it seems to me that the city could apply a requirement that if affordable housing is offsite that it be built in a sustainable community. I also want to note that the Nobel drive project isn't more affordable housing 3.4 % is much less than 10% inclusionary at 60% AMI.

I would like clarification on the KMA study.

Michael: Thank you, Susan. Our study only analyzes Inclusionary, it doesn't analyze Complete Community or Density Bonus at the direction of the City.

Linda Berenstein: Nathan and Coby I don't know if you were involved when the survey was released in 2022 when we went to Peggy Witherspoon and Nancy Graham. The survey showed renderings of Sprouts and Vons centers with 5 and 4 stories. You really wanted community input we rallied the people of the community. We were feeling that the developers were talking over our voices, and we felt diminished, but we were also heartened and we saw the planning sub-group working for 5 years to put together very

strong suggestions we hoped the staff would look at, and not divide us into two different plans- the community recommended plan and the staff recommended plan. You haven't even got the community recommended plan as an option right now. Nathan, you made a point today that there was a place to meet in the middle and what alarms me is all the input we're going to give is going to the city council and not you the staff. And we want you, the staff, to listen. I do thank you for meeting tonight. Suchi, you did say that you would at least look at the CC35 for Vons and Sprouts. With our modifications they look like something we could embrace. You would still get 250 to 350 units. I want to ask how we can have you really look at and examine the CC35 option.

Suchi: We do have an extra slide on the shopping centers. I can walk through that. With the shopping center looking at what's to come, we are seeing feedback about changing retail trends, we have been hearing across the city in general that it is challenging to lease commercial space so we're getting requests for additional flexibility so instead of empty retail space, getting housing. So, what that does is not only help meet housing needs but it also increases the customer base that's available to serve the retail that's on-site. So that's the justification for Community Village designations. The current proposal goes up to 73 DU/Acre, we heard the request for CC-3-5 which we can look into and see how that aligns with the goals for the plan.

Bargiora Bovory: I live here, I've never seen this plan and I'm trying to put my head around it. You're going to more than double the population and double to vehicles on the roads and you're trying to reduce the road size. That's more than the GDP of this. For me the plan tells me 'Boy, you've got to move out of here!'

KM: I have a question about the methodology of EIR. A lot of the analysis looks at VMT. We're increasing the number of people and jobs, but by increasing the number of people who live in the area, which makes sense to me. But how did you calculate the number of homes that you get in the Planning Area. My concern is that it assumes 100% build out, and you've got some residential properties with really high zoning are actually condominiums so the chance of redeveloping to zoning max is very low. I want to know if you took that into account in your analysis.

Nathan: yes, we assumed some condo properties were unlikely to be redeveloped. We looked across the community at the assessed value ratio, which is to say the value of the land vs assessed the value of the building on the land to see if it's more likely to turn over. We looked at floor area ratio as well to see which properties were already built out to max and which had capacity left. The Buildout report in 2019 goes over this a bit. We looked at those values together to determine which properties in UC were most likely to be redeveloped in the future.

AW: Thank you, Suchi, Nathan, Coby, Leo, for being here and answering some of the questions. Some of the questions. I have a question around affordable housing is opaque. Q1: Will the structure that's proposed here lead to construction of more affordable housing in UC than would be the case without it, why or why not? Will developers be allowed to

avoid UC specific requirements by using Complete Communities, or Density Bonus and will that render our proposal moot?

Are there SDAs in UC where this onsite housing would go? Where are they?

Nathan: Yes, there are SDAs in UC. Yes, the KMA found in their study that yes, reason being the existing citywide requirements right now is a lot lower. Any property owner will make the rational choice to pay the fee, which is lower than to build the housing, so we're trying to increase the fee so it competes. Will incentive programs like Complete Communities allow a property owner to get around the Inclusionary fee? The short answer is yes. That's a separate program from the underlying zone and community plan. They will have to meet Complete Communities requirements. But I think it's worth noting that the way it's calculated is based on the base zone. It's a percentage of housing that can be built based on Base Zona alone. We are increasing density and by definition increasing the amount of affordable housing to be used in Complete Communities.

AW: Thank you. Second Question is related to Mobility important in the future and bears on the question of whether the city is serious about its Climate Action goals or whether it's a façade. Will future development projects (each individual project) be required to meet the goals for Mode Share under this plan?

Leo Alo: As part of blueprint SD, which is a general plan refresh, we are including information on Mode Share. It's a city-wide goal, we're not looking at will University City meet the goal on its own, but overall, the goal is to hit the citywide goal. As for development, it's difficult to connect private development and citywide goals, we wouldn't expect a single project to make a significant improvement or increase in Mode Share by itself.

AW: I just want to point out that we can't meet an aggregate goal if the individual components don't measure up. So the math doesn't work. I hope that the decision makers will put this on their list. We can't meet our climate goals otherwise.

I have questions about parks. How will the city or the plan meet the requirements of the park master plan for median recreational value targets for city at buildout. It targets 20% of points for the plan through land acquisition. I didn't see any land acquisition in the plan. We have about a 4100-point deficit for recreation which is 41k people short for parks. The Parks Master plan uses the word "Shall". How will we meet our PMP goal?

Jonathan Avila from Parks: We did take a look at all the opportunities from the park in table 7. In the next 30 years, we will get other opportunities we don't yet know where they will be. We're hoping that in the future we will be able to identify those points. I can get back to you on the 20% language in the PMP and give you numbers on that as well. I don't have that off the top of my head.

AW: Mandell Weiss Park- please correct the name in the plan as it's a gentleman's name. The JCC is a recreation and aquatic center leased on city land and is not included in one of our rec or aquatic centers. Since that was in our last plan you must've thought about why-

Can you explain why the privately operated facilities that are designed and required to be public facilities are not counted in the plan.

Jonathan Avila: So, I know that comment came a while ago and we've talked to the facility. I think it's best to respond to you by email for a full response. The fee for day use is greater than what we would charge, so they're not really giving public access even though it's on public land.

AW: I would just note that in addition, that is city owned land and if the lease holder can't meet the public requirements, it should be included in this proposal as potential space for a rec and aquatic center.

Another question regarding Open Space: I'm particularly interested in setbacks. In the discussion draft, it contained outstanding proposal for development adjoining open space canyons to be setback. At the time in the proposal it was 50ft, you have since scaled it back to 20 ft and you have also changed the plane of setback development from 45 degrees, it's now 65 degrees. I think this is critical not just for habitat but also for fire safety and the development community recognizes that it's dangerous. The plan should recognize that and should not encourage canyon encroachment. There's also a habitat preservation issue with much of the destruction landing in the MSCP.

Third I would note that the change was made without any public comment aside from whatever comments you may have received behind closed doors. So, Why was the canyon adjacent development setback changed from 50 feet to 20 feet.

Suchi: To explain the change from the discussion draft to this draft. We got some feedback that based on different parcel sizes along Genesee on the east leading north into the UCSD area there are some narrow parcel sizes which have a depth of ~200 feet in some constrained areas, so having a 50 ft setback would be prohibitive in those cases so we've given flexibility here. Regarding development in general next to open space areas, I want to explain the SDR is specific to building bulk and mass, it's not a requirement related to fire code and fire requirements.

Dan Monroe: Hi, I'm with city planning and MSCP. The city does have standard brush management requirements. Standard total is 100 ft. Brush Management 'Zone 1' standard upper area is 35 ft from combustible area. Brush Management 'Zone 2' of 65ft. So altogether 100ft total of brush management area. All development near a canyon edge would comply with 'Zone 1', that can be reduced if there's alternative requirements. Brush management 'Zone 1' can't encroach onto MHPA; however, 'Zone 2' is considered compatible use with MHPA. I think that the 20ft setback and 65-degree angle is more the 'Urban Design' standard vs compliance with the brush management zones.

AW: Thanks that confirms what I said. The draft includes minimum lot width that would be exempt from the 50 ft setback, so if you have one parcel that would be restricted by this proposal then you could write an SDR that could exempt it from consideration. 'Properties less than 200 feet is exempt from the policy' Then one place would be allowed to develop and everything else would be protected. If that's the city's goal to put housing right on a

canyon edge, that's one way you could do it but you could protect everyone else by crafting an SDR with a depth requirement.

AW: Could you explain in more detail how the plan will ensure that future development will consider community retail. How will the plan encourage or ensure that there will be shopping locally for the 60-70k residents projected to live here. Again, this is related to climate action. And you can't tell me that quality of life in a vital city can take place if there isn't local shopping for residents. People have to buy food. How will the plan provide alimentation through groceries for local people.

CN: Particularly in North UC.

AW: North UC is particularly important west of I-5 near Nobel Square, but also in South UC.

Suchi: There is a supplemental development regulation that applies to all shopping centers in UC with the community village designation. They are required to provide 25% of gross floor area specifically for community serving retail.

Nathan: We have a supplemental development consideration in the plan, that's one way we tried to meet the spirit of the community plan when our base zones aren't enough.

Suchi: Mixed use zones require at least two uses and through those mixed-use zones we are hoping to see retail uses.

AW: A follow up on that. You've got two SDRs with one for small shopping centers, 50k to 100k sq ft then 25% of gross square area is required but it struck me as odd. Why choose for larger areas to just go to a minimum of 35K SQ FT min. Suppose you built a 10 s10-story building, say 1M sq ft, why are we only proposing only 35k sq feet; shouldn't it be a proportion to scale retail along with housing. Why limit to a smaller proportion in larger sites vs midsize sites.

Suchi: We are open to feedback on refinements to this SDR. So if there is an alternative you would like us to consider, we're open to hearing it.

AW: General question; you used a variety of types of words for the policies. Is there any functional difference between those words. We are reading "encourage, support, consider promote" vs stronger words such as "establish, increase or provide" is there a hierarchy of power that you have chosen to use for those policies.

Suchi: No Hierarchy. Ultimately what becomes a requirement is what's in the supplemental development regulations.

Tom Malaney: My comments are primarily directed at the planning group, but certainly also the planning department. I believe this plan would put this the planning group out of business. I'm the former chair of uptown planners, we spent 7 years on our plan. The hidden part is the zoning. CC zoning is very lax. CC-3-8 and CC-3-9 zero setback I don't even understand the new CC10. One person attended the North Park meetings for one year and didn't see one single discretionary project. You will be put out of business by this plan. The start of that is excessive zoning. You may be surprised to know that this plan is about 40x what UCs reasonable fair share would be. Preliminary SANDAG forecasts about 50k

more residents by 2050 for the entire city. That's less than the city planning staff wants you to add to your community. If we take our share of residents which is about 3% to your community, it's about 800 units. Not 33,000 units, it's about 800 units. If you want to assume more growth should go to UC, then maybe twice that would be reasonable, not 40 times. You kill all incentives. The developer who has a right to build 218 units per acre and only wants to build half of that. Any existing incentives you give him he doesn't need he's already going to build less. It kills future incentives. If you decide you don't have enough open space or something like that you can't invent incentives. You can't invent any kind of incentive program because the developer gets in the zoning what he wants. The city staff has not mentioned that the state grant to pay for the consultants and this work targets that projects will primarily be done by right. It's ministerial, you don't get a look at it. You won't see them. You can't plan the infrastructure when you have excessive zoning. Lastly you get a few very inappropriate projects. There's no chance that UC will wind up with 60-80k people. But when you upscale the zoning you get a few projects that are inappropriate and create bottlenecks with traffic and other problems. We're seeing that in the community of Uptown. So, excessive density must be addressed. This group should demand that this project be scaled back to something that's reasonably proportional to the SANDAG's forecast.