

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday, April 16, 2024 Zoom Meeting Only, Time 6:00 PM Meeting Roll Call

6:05 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: AW

AW called the meeting to order.

6:06 Roll Call:

Members present:

Debby Knight (DK), Katie Rodolico (KR), Laurie Phillips (LP), Carol Uribe (CU), Andy Wiese (AW), George Lattimer (GL), Joanne Selleck (JS), Keith Jenne (KJ), Veronica Ayesta (VA), Aidan Lin-Tostado (AL), Dinesh Martien (DiM), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Melanie Cohn (MC).

There are 13 of 18 Subcommittee members present.

Members absent:

Anu Delouri (AD), Kristin Camper (KC), Kris Kopensky (KK), Jason Morehead (JM), Petr Krysl (PK).

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

Suchi Lukes (SL), Senior Planner, City Planning Department, is present operating the Zoom meeting. This meeting is recorded.

Chris Nielsen (CN), UCPG Chair, is present and will take minutes. Draft minutes will be prepared from the meeting recording.

6:10 Overview: Meeting Topics, Expectations for Conduct

AW: Thank you everyone for your attendance tonight. This is a meeting of the University Community Plan Update Subcommittee. The UCPUS is a subcommittee of the University Community Planning Group. This is an opportunity for members of the public, from the city, and the committee, to hear feedback on the draft community plan. This is a community meeting for feedback for members of the community, Subcommittee, and UCPG members. Our goal tonight is to take feedback and over the next few weeks we will take the report that was submitted by the UCPUS to the UCPG, and finalized in July 2023 CN and AW will compile and incorporate the feedback received into a revised comment on the Draft Plan released March 14, 2024, and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), released March 14, 2024, and at the May 14 UCPG

meeting in may these comments will be finalized and sent to the city with a May 15 deadline. Although the UCPG has a bit more time to comment based on its meeting schedule, public comments on any part of this draft, short or long, are due from the public on April 29 to the email addresses shown on the agenda.

The intent of this meeting is to take feedback in three groups: 1) Land Use, Urban Design, and the DEIR, 2) Mobility, and 3) Parks, Open Space, and Conservation. We'll have a brief presentation on the DEIR at the start of the meeting, followed by comments on each of the three groups. Comments related to the DEIR, implementation, or SDRs may be given with their topic.

AW: We have taken roll earlier, and we do have a quorum although we don't intend to vote. I will recognize the following subcommittee members who have joined this meeting:

- **Debby Knight (DK), Friends of Rose Canyon**
- **Katie Rodolico (KR), UCCA Rep**
- **Laurie Phillips (LP), Business Rep**
- **Carol Uribe (CU), UCPG Business Rep**
- **Andy Wiese (AW), CPUS member.**
- **George Lattimer (GL), Business Rep**
- **Joanne Selleck (JS), CPUS member**
- **Keith Jenne (KJ), Resident Rep**
- **Veronica Ayesta (VA), Resident Rep**
- **Aidan Lin-Tostado (AL), UC San Diego Student Rep**
- **Dinesh Martien (DiM), Resident Rep**
- **Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), UCPG Business Rep**
- **Melanie Cohn (MC), BIOCUM Rep**

I intend to start with non-agenda public comment, for topics within the purview of the UCPG but not on the agenda, with a one-minute limit. Agenda comments will be limited to two minutes, with comments possible for each of the topics. We will give priority to CPUS and UCPG members, with a three-minute time limit. Groups may also aggregate time by arrangement with the chair; we have at least one comment like this at the start.

Let me review as we have not seen each other for nine months. We are developing a community plan that will be a guiding framework we will use over the next thirty years. Our current UC plan was updated 37 years ago in 1987. We have seen over 20 community plan amendments to the University Community Plan to meet the needs of our changing community, and that includes a major biotech expansion last year that was the largest in our Planning Area history. These projects were recommended for approval by the UCPG. The city is updating plans all around town. We're not the only ones who have a plan that is 30 plus years old that is in need of updating; we are one of the 40-odd planning areas in San Diego. The city is about half-way through; we are in the middle. Our neighbors of Mira Mesa, Kearney Mesa, and Clairemont Mesa have gone through community plan updates. The College Area and Hillcrest are undergoing community plan updates now. All of these recent plan updates are proposing increased opportunities for new housing and new density related to public transit. SANDAG provided a grant to begin our community plan

update to the city in 2018 with a target of 20,000 to 30,000 new housing units and that's the place where we began.

The UCPUS is made up of volunteers and between 2018 and the summer of 2023 we met almost every month, held over 40 public meetings, and helped the city to craft plans for economic development, for transportation, for housing, Parks, and Urban Design, and other features of the community plan. I would like to take this opportunity to thank those of you who participated in this process and who have contributed to this process, who have demonstrated through your efforts and contribution to public spiritedness that's required for a democratic society to function and that is required for a city to improve and to become a better place to live. I'm deeply grateful to you and I hope that our city and its representatives likewise share that feeling. I'd also like to note that this is a community plan update for one part of a great big city, San Diego. We are a part of a larger whole but what you see here is a distinctive, important part of that whole. This is the heart of the city's dynamic hub, the core of its regional biotech, life sciences industries and increasingly a core of the city's growing high-tech activity. We are home to a top 20 global University here in University City. UC is home to world class hospitals, leading theater clusters, and world class shopping. University City is fundamentally a great place to live, to work, to get an education, to build families. I would also note that the University Community is perhaps the most biodiverse place in the most biodiverse metropolitan area in North America. We are literally a place where it all comes together. There is a lot to balance here and are many critical issues for us and the species with whom we share the region. It's not surprising that emotions will run high when we talk about this because the interest is high, but I hope that in this conversation tonight we will be respectful of one another, we'll maintain the sense of dignity and the same high standards that we have through so much of this plan update. There is no reason that we cannot disagree with one another without being disagreeable. I not only expect that we will be agreeable even as we disagree, but I also think we should expect it of one another.

I will take non-agenda public comment, one minute per speaker.

6:17 Non-Agenda Public Comment

- Barry Bernstein: I want to thank you, Andy, for the timing and effort that you have given to this and everything you have done. I think the community shares that appreciation for what you have done and for Chris. I do want to include something that I do not believe is any of the main topics tonight but it is the uniqueness of University being the only area to have a large DIF fund. We have asked multiple times to have it clarified, but I don't know, and if anything like that can be included in some of the comments of a final draft plan to fund those public entities like libraries and rec centers. We need to do that, look at some foundations and structures to find out who is going to be responsible to at least try to monitor and assist the city in developing priorities for some of the money. That's just something I'd like to bring up.
- Diane Ahern: There will be a one-on-one conversation with CM Kent Lee at the University Library on Governor Drive at 6PM Monday April 22. This will be in person. To all the volunteers who have stuck with it since 2018, thank you Andy. It's great to see everybody.

6:20 Information Item: Subcommittee and public comments on the Draft Plan (March 14, 2024) and Draft EIR (March 14, 2024).

The subcommittee and community may provide comments on the draft community plan, including Land Use, Urban Design, Mobility, Parks, Open Space, Conservation, Implementation, and other community plan details. The focus of the discussion will be on specific recommendations and changes to the draft community plan and draft Environmental Impact Report.

Andy Wiese: We'll begin with agenda public comment on Urban Design, Land Use, and the DEIR. We have requested a short presentation from UC Peeps on the DEIR, using aggregated time.

6:21 Comments on Urban Design, Land Use, and the Draft EIR

Bonnie Kutch: I'm Bonnie Kutch and I'm a resident and homeowner in South UC, a founding member of UC Neighbors for responsible growth, also known as UC Peeps. Our attorney, Andrea Contreras, is going to be giving a presentation on the main findings in the draft EIR. When it became clear last May that we would need an attorney, we set up our web site to raise funds and raised \$7,200. Since then, we have raised considerably more and we are extremely grateful to those who donated and want to extend our sincere thanks to them. Andrea Contreras, from the law firm Dirt Law, has 25 years of experience in land use law, CEQA, endangered species, and is a former deputy district attorney. She has a BA from Stanford, and a JD from American University. UC Peeps hired her to examine the DEIR using contributions from the community.

Andrea Contreras: I represent UC Peeps, and they asked me to do an analysis of the Draft EIR. The purpose of the EIR is to inform the public and decision makers about the environmental impacts that will result from a discretionary project and proposes measures to mitigate significant environmental impact where feasible and identify impacts that cannot be mitigated and therefore remain significant. The DEIR is not legally deficient because there are significant impacts but that doesn't mean that there cannot be very legitimate objections to a plan where the impacts are significant. Members of the public will have until April 29 to submit comments and once the comment period is complete, city staff will begin reviewing comments and preparing responses to them. This may take several months and there will be comments on the other sections of the EIR that address the Hillcrest plan and Blueprint San Diego. CEQA requires recirculation of either the entire EIR or portions of the EIR if staff makes significant changes. I have concentrated my comments around four principal areas: 1) the reduction in capacity for Governor Drive, 2) the placement of schools which is in direct contradiction to evidence in the record from the school district, 3) the alternatives studied in the DEIR, and 4) the deficiencies of the DEIR as a legal document:

- The DEIR is set up so future projects can tier from it. However, program EIRs cannot defer analysis of specific projects included in the project or defer analysis to subsequent environmental reviews.

- Does not adequately identify the existing condition that Governor Drive as a four-lane major arterial. EIRs are supposed to discuss changes like this. "Major arterial" is not a designation that's included in the San Diego Street Manual. I also believe there is inadequate analysis of emergency access on Governor Drive. They are making a claim that emergency access based on existing conditions is adequate and are not analyzing the proposed change to support that.
- Inadequately analyzes emergency egress from the community.
- No school sites are proposed in the draft Plan. This issue is ignored.
- The range of alternatives considered only considers one alternative related to UC, high density, and it does not analyze the community's preferred scenario.
- I believe the EIR is inadequate as an informational document. I don't have any case law to support this, but in 25 years I have never seen a document that includes an analysis of a community plan for an entirely different geographic area and a general plan amendment for the entire city.

Charles Frazier: I have lived with my wife in South University City near Marcy Park for 50 years. I have three degrees from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in math, electrical engineering, and Naval architecture. I spent 25 years consulting for the Department of Defense, doing analysis and developing large computer models with 100K lines of code that were used by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Airforce Space Division. I think I am familiar with analysis in the UC Plan Update. I reviewed the Mobility Technical Report, 540 pages, concentrating on issues related to Governor Drive. This proposes a conversion of Governor from a four-lane major arterial to a two-lane major arterial with bike lanes. The conclusion is that converting Governor will have a significant CEQA impact on environmental quality. SB743 established Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) as a standard to measure impacts. Vehicle counts were done in 2015. The average traffic volumes were projected without regard to growth in the community. Level of Services (LOS) measurements were covered. Regents Road to I-805 was covered in section 7.4, Appendix A, with LOS covered in Appendix B. With four-lanes, the existing conditions LOS rating was an acceptable B, but with two-lanes, the existing conditions LOS was rated and unacceptable F. The major conclusion to be drawn from the mobility analysis is converting Governor Drive from four-lanes to two-lanes with continuous buffered bike lanes will have a significant impact. I request the UCPUS recommend that Governor Drive remain a four-lane arterial.

Andy Wiese: Here is a summary of the people ceding time for the previous 15 minutes: For Andrea Contreras, Julie Meier Wright, Michael Cosma, Deborah Rossi, Barbara Gellman, Suzi Shamsky. For Charles Frazer, Josh Jones, Angie Jones, Brandon Dunaway, Mike Devens, , Jan Devens, and Lisa Clark I will take a speaker's list for comments.

Andrew Barton: (time ceded by Linda Beresford) We want to relate our requests that the two shopping centers in south University City have the following:

- The Sprouts center, AKA the UC Marketplace, should density of 29 Dwelling Units / Acre (DU/AC) with a 40-foot height limit, significantly less than the proposed 100-foot height limit for zone CC-3-8, and crucially, 30-foot setbacks, with 80% of the built ground floor

area reserved for community serving retail. If this property is redeveloped there should be retention of the vital services that residents require.

- For the Von's center (University Square), we request 54 DU/AC, a 50-foot height limit, with 30-foot setbacks. 80% of the ground-floor area should be dedicated to community serving retail/office.
- I request that the four gas stations at Governor and Genesee and the buildings to the east along Governor (Chase bank, Carl's Jr.) be 29 DU/AC, 30-foot height limit, with community serving retail at 80% of the ground floor.

The city's proposals are excessive and out of context with the existing neighborhood and should be scaled back.

Linda Beresford: I would propose these comments in addition to Andrew Barton's comments. The DEIR does not seem to account for double the current population. Increasing the area's population places additional stress on our biological resources. The city does not really know what these impacts are. The time to analyze these effects is now. Fire and Police to be "provided in the future" is incorrect. The alternatives analyzed are in error and do not measure impacts correctly. The high-density alternative is not feasible. They are supposed to do analyses of alternatives which are feasible. There are conflicting conclusions at the end. They do say the high-density alternative is environmentally superior yet if one looks at table 8.1 and their conclusions two sections earlier that's clearly in conflict where they admit the higher density alternative has significant impacts. We will circulate our comments to the committee and community when finished.

Katie Rodolico (UCPUS member): Comment on Land Use: I agree with Linda Beresford that the DEIR included a high density alternative but this was not modeled. Off-site for affordable housing is great and I am appreciative that it would need to be within the community and within a TPA, but in-lieu is also allowed. Just offer off-site. We will never get the affordable units if it's cheaper for them to just pay in-lieu fees and walk away.

Tom Mullaney: The Land Use scenario is inconsistent with SANDAG 15 forecasts, which calls for 65,000 new residents between now and 2050. The demographics have shifted. What's wrong? The plan kills the incentives for developers, shuts out public involvement as most projects will be ministerial. So, the planning group will be out of business. You can't plan infrastructure if you don't know where the growth goes. UC is 3% of the city's population, so it should get 3% of the city's needs. Even double that would be OK.

Bargiora: This plan represents an incredible chutzpah. We are fighting huge money because this is a program of many billions. We should hire an attorney and raise funds to fight the city. This is an affluent community of million-dollar homes; I suggest starting with \$100,000 which is 100 donating \$1000.

Jenn Dunnaway: I've looked at the UCPG minutes for July 2023. The community scenario from this Community Discussion Draft has been stripped out. This alternative should be in the Draft EIR. The DEIR highlighted that the infrastructure for schools is lacking. \$910 million is needed but the city cannot identify locations for schools, and this needs to be built prior to the new housing coming online. The DEIR incorrectly states on page S25 that public facilities can't be

identified but that's in direct conflict with appendix I2 that says where the new school needs to go and how much that will cost. The city knows where the density is going and if the units are going to go there, they should be able to identify the facilities.

Laurie Paulson (UCPUS member): When we started the plan update, we assumed that housing would be identified that served an infinitely expanding biotech and tech community. We have failed to refresh this view over the past four-plus years when high-tech industries have moved dramatically towards remote and hybrid work, enabling their staff to live and work further from the office. This has resulted in an abundance of vacant office space and sometimes even lab space. We failed to take the lesson from San Francisco where the city center has a 25% vacancy rate. I think it's time to take a step back and look at what's happening. I had an opportunity this week to review a report on the availability of biotech space in North UC., Mira Mesa, and Sorrento Valley. We now see two-million square feet vacant in Mira Mesa, Sorrento Valley, and UC, with minimal uptake of this footage since the pandemic. The venture capital money did not come but starting to come back a little. This means the uptake of space will take a long time. And when it's taken up, there will be considerable remote work. The underlying assumptions for north UC are incorrect that we need to concentrate housing there.

Rebecca Robinson-Wood (UCPUS member): The 1987 plan has a figure 37 as an exhibit of Open Space and recreation elements that include several privately owned properties that were listed in the 1985 resolution 29663 open space acquisition list. Several of these property owners may not be aware that the city is now proposing to identify these sites as designated open space in the proposed draft university plan. Many were set aside for future public use in the subdivision map of 1971 in the University Community Plan. It also stated that if the public did not arrange to acquire those properties for public use in a reasonable time private development of the parcels could occur as permitted under the land use allocation illustrated for the surrounding area and consistent with the planned goals and objectives. My recommendation is that you get the permission of the property owners prior to designating the property as open space.

Jeremy Bloom (Circulate San Diego Chief Operating Officer): Our mission is to create excellent mobility choices for vibrant, healthy neighborhoods. Over the past few years Circulate along with dedicated allies has advocated for a plan that not only aligns with our city's Climate Action Plan objectives but also addresses the need for more housing in our region as we outlined in our report last year about making the most of the Mid-Coast Trolley. Our community stands to benefit immensely from housing in proximity to transit, education, and employment. I want to thank the city for including the high-density alternative that is the environmentally superior alternative. This is a significant win for the community. We look forward to the City Council's decision later this year that will make the most of the Mid-Coast Trolley.

Andrew Barton: Urban Design comment. The Special Development Regulations SDR-C 1.1 (SDRs) should have a greater transition plane angle, reduced from 65 degrees to 45 degrees to avoid looming over adjacent residential and open space. Setbacks should be 30-feet rather than 20-feet (SDR C-1.2), with a setback of 50-feet for adjacent Open Space parcels, for geotechnical reasons and fire safety, and for the preservation of natural resources. There should be a new SDR that suggests that buildings adjacent to canyons should have their short edge facing the canyon to minimize their effects.

Debby Knight (UCUPS member): I strongly second Andrew Barton's comments, particularly the change from 65 degrees in the draft to the prior 45-degree angle near open space. Lights should be shielded down to protect open space. The transition angle should be a maximum of 45 degrees with 50-foot setbacks, particularly next to MSCP, but whether MSCP or not, there is plenty of habitat value in opens space. I'm concerned about the affordable housing provisions. I see 1315 units with 3.4% affordable at 4249 Nobel is proposed. What will be built at Sprouts and Von's shopping centers, what affordable housing would be required? I see more Palisades and Lux buildings rather than housing where working class people would take the transit.

Megan Beale: I strongly support Andrew Barton's comments, with the same setbacks and transition angles of the buildings be applied for projects adjacent to residences and open spaces. The projects proposed are out of scale.

Joann Sellick (UCPUS member): I am stressed by a lack of affordable housing in the plan as proposed in the Keyser Marsten study. My understanding is that there was nothing financially feasible for housing development going forward in the UC Area below the 80% or 120% of Adjusted Median Income (AMI), so no lower middle-income range. The lack of units in the 80% to 100% AMI range, as this will not work for typical jobs in the area. At 80% AMI you would expect an income of \$88,200, with AMI at \$112,000; this is not your service worker or janitorial worker. Even a salary of \$55,100 is high for a low-income worker. These workers have the highest propensity to use transit. I also doubt if this housing is suitable for students unless they are dependent on their parents for support. We need to examine this further and put some guard rails around providing housing in UC for low- and medium-income families.

Melanie Cohn (UCPUS member): I am a senior director of regional policy with Biocom, a statewide trade association for the life sciences. I have been a minority voice on this group for almost six years with this group. I wanted to hop on and dispel some myths that are often shared in these meetings. There is definitely a need for more housing in the UC plan area for life sciences employees. This is the region's largest employment enter and we need housing at every level, housing is affordable. Housing that is more affordable to anyone makes it more affordable for everyone, and insisting on covenant restricted affordable is just a way for less housing to be built. I think it is disingenuous to insist on across the board if you ask for covenant restricted affordable to be required at any percentage because that just means it won't pen out for the developers and unfortunately the comments that have been shared previously from people speaking for the life science industry are not genuine comments related to the industry. We do need more housing for people who work in our industry; we haven't heard from employers in the life sciences that housing is the number one issue for attracting and retention of employees. We need especially middle-income housing for people, probably 80% to 150% AMI but we need it at all levels. People who jump on these calls that were on the CPUS and talk about how the life sciences don't need housing are not true: we need as much housing as possible.

Linda Bernstein: I'd like to follow up with Andrew Barton and Debby Knight's comments. Argued that out at the CPUS and UCPG and Help Save UC and UC Peeps all recommended to the staff the compromise and trying to find a middle way. I spoke a little about this at the UCPG meeting that we really needed to find a middle way and I think you know we need more housing, and

that is one thing, but can we also ask for quality of life and quality of life goes to schools, parks, retail? The 100-foot limits are too high for south UC shopping areas. We can't find the right zoning that works. CC-3-4 permits 30-foot height limits, but could we find a variance to go to 40 feet at Sprouts and 50 feet at Von's? The 25,000 minimum retail density is too low; the current Sprouts market is 24,000 all by itself, and you can't imagine the retail shops in our little village will be taken away so you can't walk to them. We'll end up with a Sprouts the size of a deli. We really believe quality of life is essential.

7:23 Mobility Comments

AW: We will now turn to Mobility, Implementation, and related DEIR topics.

Katie Rodolico (UCPUS member): For Governor Drive the analysis is not complete for emergency access and with respect to the overload of cars during school drop off and pick up. Pure Water discovered that you need two left turn lanes from westbound Governor to southbound Genesee due to light cycle times during school drop off. There has not been an adequate analysis so far and without analysis, traffic is doomed to fail. The DEIR talks about the need for emergency evacuation and that we have freeways but if you reduce lanes in each direction, you don't have the capacity to get to the freeways, and the ambulances still can't get through.

Jen Dunnaway: The Sprouts is two miles from the transit area hub in UTC and there was a lot of discussion during the CPUS meeting about reducing the city's density proposals but nothing ever came of that: the city kept what it wanted and, in some ways, made it worse. The 105 bus is a minor bus route, so density should not go at Sprouts. The traffic analysis from 2015 is old, and does not account for the Costa Verde EIR analysis, and it does not account for the growth in UC since 2015. The proposed Governor Drive scenario does not account for the evacuation plan and is inadequate.

Dinesh Martien (UCPUS member): I spent time looking at the intersection designs in the mobility report and I'm happy to see some wonderful improvements there. I think cyclists and pedestrian safety will be increased dramatically. My concern is that we don't know if any of that will ever be implemented. The way this plan works is that we get money from developers of a property and then hope the city spends it to improve the adjacent roadways. I think these improvements are required at the current density in UC and so I think the city should commit to making those improvements regardless of what happens with development. Regarding the road diet, I do understand that's everyone's concern and I agree. I don't think we see a full study. I do want to point out that there's absolutely no proposal to have it be two lanes at Governor and Genesee. If you look at the diagram there's still two left turn lanes from Governor both to north- and south-bound Genesee, so there is no change there except for one through lane. Just look at that.

Joann Selleck (UCPUS member): The city has not addressed the issue of parking, which will get dramatically worse. Planned removal of parking along some streets to make biking and pedestrian travel safer will reduce the total parking available. Maybe we should have city parking structures so that those for whom developers have not provided parking can park. We'll still have electric cars that need to park.

Julie Meier Wright: There are 62 stops on the trolley line; it's really a regional transportation issue. A lot of thoughtless things have gone into the burdens being placed on University City, primarily extending the transit area to one mile instead of to a half mile. I'm concerned about a whole range of land use and transportation decisions including the one that was just mentioned by Joann Sellick because they are not real-world solutions if we're going to have a community that satisfies residents across the board and that all areas of San Diego need to participate.

Debby Knight (UCPUS member): I'm concerned that bike infrastructure won't be realized since the city has removed the DIF and FBA funds that would have paid for something like that in the past as it paid for roadways. The city is planning for greatly increased mode shares from bikes, but the city will have no funds to build protected bike lanes since DIFs will go out of the community into a general pot. It's disingenuous to project increased bike riding when you know there are no funds to pay for safer bike lanes.

Jeff Dosick: Debby Knight is 100% correct. Building out the biotech on the east campus of UC San Diego will add thousands of cars on Regents Road. As the number of bike riders increase and use the Rose Creek Bike Path south to Pacific Beach and Mission Bay, they need connected bike paths for safety. When the Regents Road was recently slurry sealed, the last bit of Regents between Berino Court and Arriba Street was omitted as it was not part of the project. This is an example of how bike paths become disconnected. When you stand at Genesee and Governor in the morning and see all the bike riders riding to UC High, it's very encouraging. If it were to take an additional one or two minutes to transit this intersection but was a lot safer, I bet most people would prefer the safer streets. I think this makes a better neighborhood.

Carol Uribe (UCPUS member): Paint bike icons (sharrows) to share road with directions for all. Keep the current lanes on Governor.

7:45 Parks, Open Space, Conservation Comments, including Implementation and DEIR comments.

Katie Rodolico (UCPUS member): In the proposed plan, they talk about the engagement survey and two proposed parks, one in North Torrey Pines on the current Scripps-Shiley Medical Campus that has a pool and a gym since it's used for rehabilitation under a City lease. That's very unlikely to become a park in my opinion because I don't think it'll be given up easily and it's in a bad location. We need new parks and rec centers but that's a place with zero residential. The other park is over on Eastgate Mall and is a small strip of land, and in the middle of prime industrial lands and the Miramar APIOZ. We do need more parks, which brings us back to how the city seems to address park shortage: private developers will put in publicly facing amenities, which I doubt would be available to the public. They have proposed a fee the developers can pay in-lieu of park-like amenities. The city has dropped the ball on this.

Andrew Barton: For public spaces on private properties, we have SDR 8.2.3 should read a minimum of 10% on the premises or 10% of gross floor area of the development whichever is greater shall be provided as open space. The maximum amount of public space required shall not exceed more than 25% of the premises. This is an increase on what the city is proposing: in other words, we want to make sure these public spaces are significant in these properties also suggests that SDA 2.7 should include a provision such that fees or membership should not be

charged. Attention should be paid to the time the facilities are open. 8AM – 8PM might better be 7AM to 9PM. If public spaces are made, they should be public in spirit, too.

Jen Dunaway: Back on page S25 it discusses how public facilities cannot be identified and placed at this time but SD Unified has proved you wrong by stating where a new school should go based on the proposed density. Same with parks, Figure 3-25 shows 2.8 new recreation center but the plan shows only one, and that one is in a part of the plan area without residential. I don't see how you can analyze and mitigate under these circumstances.

Linda Beresford: For the Parks Master Plan, meeting the prior standard looks impossible of a certain amount of land per resident. The city has moved to a point system because it recognizes that it can't meet this standard. It's clear we will have a continuing parks deficit going forward. Complete Communities makes it still more difficult to establish impacts to density that would affect parks and every other part of the plan. The EIR should analyze that and account for it. The city completely ignores it throughout the analysis so that would be my request: a more honest analysis that shows the true deficit.

Tom Mullaney: May years ago there was a battle cry throughout California to ensure that adequate public facilities. Growth was outstripping the abilities of the cities to do public facilities and the commitment was made by our city that they would collect adequate fees, they would meet the park standards, and they would mitigate traffic. That commitment is going away. Ms. Beresford is correct, the points system is nonsense, so instead of 2.8 acres / 1000 population, you have things as points for a swing set, a bus-stop nearby. It's specifically easy to meet and yet they are not meeting it. I think the University Community needs to insist that the plan be cut back to an amount of density and growth that can be served by public facilities. At one-tenth the increase proposed, you could plan for a pretty good quality of life.

Debby Knight. I would like to hear Andy Wiese's comments.

Andy Wiese (UCPUS Chair): The parks have a point system where the points are easy to meet. City staff has worked hard to find more points but (based on staff corrections announced at the UCPG meeting April 9) has 4,100 points still to go. That reflects on the future of a city in which the future residents, about whom so much talk has been made, will be underserved, and deliberately so. This plan won't serve 41,000 people. I appreciate the hard work on the part of Parks staff to address our comments from last summer to find more parks points. Still, we need a better balance. If you have a deficit of 4,100 points then that's 41,000 people you aren't planning on serving. The plan before us is planning on NOT servicing 41,000 additional residents. A critical issue is the Rec and aquatic center we have under lease in Mandell Weiss Park and operated by the Lawrence Family JCC. We need to ensure that the facility is accessible and open to the public as the lease requires. This must remain the same over the life of the current lease and future leases. There is no reason this center cannot be included in the count of the park points / rec and aquatic center requirements for the community plan. I appreciate the effort to find a neighborhood park and to respond to the UCPG which requested specifically for the city to find larger spaces. This is a creative move on your part, and Katie Rodolico is also right, unfortunately, that there's no neighborhood there. But there are workers there and this is an extraordinary space. It does include the Donald Shiley Pavilion of Scripps Hospital, and I assume when the lease comes up that building will probably remain but there is park space in

front of the building, open space to the west, and if you walk there, you will find Torrey Pines Golf Course. I would celebrate this as an opportunity. The Eastgate Mall mini park is in the 65 dB zone and the airport APIOZ, which won't allow passive recreation. There should be no park there as it's completely inappropriate. Torrey Pines City Park ("Glider Port") should be counted fully as there are even more park points than we've given it credit for. If you visit, you'll find a café, picnic tables, overlook paths, etc. Land acquisition is 20% of the Parks Master Plan, yet the Draft Plan does not mention this category of points. The PMP uses "shall" in describing this requirement. I believe it means what it's always meant. The city must have something in our plan to show how land acquisition at 20% is coming in, and it doesn't do that. Thank you for counting the shoreline and showing another opportunity that is not passed up. I think there is an opportunity in the plan for future neighborhood park in southeast UC in the defunct golf course in the Town Villa Park area, or a potential joint-use opportunity on private land just as they include several other facilities. The Linear Parks, Regents Road north and south: thank you very much for keeping them in the plan update, and we deeply appreciate the inclusion of them. Please keep the name Linear Park as we expect these will be "parks" designed and managed by Parks and Rec, not Greenways under Transportation and Stormwater. Greenways seems to be creeping into the plan and suggests that these parcels will be managed by TSW rather than Parks & Rec; TSW does not design and manage parks and will not serve the future residents of the community. They should be designed and managed by Parks & Rec. If the Mayor's office is on the call, I hope you will make sure the mayor follows up the city attorney's recommendation, which we have secured and demonstrated exists, that the mayor can designate that Parks and Rec would be the manager of these parks. Then we would have the parks that we deserve along with points that could be counted, and not Greenways that are benches and bushes with a bike path. We deserve better. Eastgate mini park 2 is where I will close. There is a wonderful Open Space Park opportunity here for an expansion of the Eastgate mini-Park #2 out on Towne Centre Drive adjacent to space that is privately held MHPA but includes a vernal pool. There is an opportunity here to partner with the adjacent owners and the City/MSCP in the creation of a new kind of nature exploration park, perhaps including an elevated walkway to restored habitat on that side. Adding this proposal would double the size of the existing mini park which has a cul-de-sac and parking and is a great place for school children to get out of a bus to see the biodiversity without taking an extensive hike. Vernal pools are rare so please include this opportunity for expansion of mini-park 2.

Debby Knight (UCPUS member): We want a commitment to family. You don't want to take your child to a podium, you want green space. By up-zoning so much, you're giving away money to the owners and land value will go up by millions. But no parks; this is absent from the city's vision. It's not the point of the park system to scrape the bottom of the barrel looking for park points. I know it's difficult with the amount of density but I feel that it's the core of the value of the quality of life, particularly if the 15-minute city concept for parks, and I'm deeply disturbed by this.

Veronica Ayesta (UCPUS member): I represent south UC and I second Andy's comments and Debby's comments. I have been with the Plan Update Subcommittee since the beginning, and through many meetings on the plan update, the thing that struck me the most is that that despite all the work, the community land use alternative was not included in this plan and I am

specifically unhappy about parks. I like to walk to the park, walk to the store, and enjoy life in the park. We enjoy the ability to circulate and to go have coffee or dinner. I also want to emphasize the ability to have these businesses that tender to people that live here. Just imagine how a ten-story tower would look over the Sprouts market. Please make sure that families can use the parks and enjoy their neighborhoods. We want to have a sense of community.

Laurie Paulson: (UCPUS member): I repeat my concerns from the last meeting I am concerned about the pressure that will be put on the natural canyon and preserves if we lack public parks for this density if we don't provide for adequate parks in the plan.

Rebecca Robinson-Wood (UCPUS member): When I was raising my family, I enjoyed parks for lunch and if you are working, pocket parks are great. Do something different, benches outside of Rose Canyon would be nice. Having a place for moms to sit would be good. It would be good just to be able to sit for a few minutes, afterwards you can resume your business.

AW: Seeing no more comments on Parks, Open Space, and Conservation, we'll open the floor to comments on all topics.

8:05 Comments on any part of the plan or DEIR.

Susan Baldwin: Affordable Housing comment. The affordable housing plan has a goal of housing for all. It needs to include information about three types of "affordable housing": inclusionary, Complete Communities, and Density Bonus and the likelihood that each of the three might contribute or might not be built under some circumstances. I recommend that affordable housing information be beefed up in University.

Beth Spinelli: I have been a volunteer downtown and used to take the city bus 50, a 20-minute trip. This trip, without the #50 bus, was 1 hour 20 minutes after COVID. I think they got rid of the #50 bus in favor of the trolley. I now drive to take the trolley from Nobel or Balboa. I've written to my representatives and the Mayor.

Sue Faber: I attended the last few meetings via Zoom. I am impressed by all the knowledge displayed. How can I participate in the process? Can somebody put together a bulleted document we can use? Maybe we can come up with some actionable plan.

Andy Wiese: Thank you, Sue, for your comment. It's a very complicated plan and challenging to put the various issues into such a format; we don't have that much time to educate. This is an unfortunate aspect of our timeline.

Bargiora: I appreciate the amount of time that has been put into this. But with all the moaning and groaning, and the steamroller of billions that is headed our way. The people who are behind this thing will ruin UC and very few people will make billions. What is the action plan? Otherwise, it's a waste of time.

Andy Wiese: I can field this briefly to suggest that this is part of the public process that is afforded to us as citizens and so participating in it, making comments, on the EIR as well as here to the city staff and to city officials is part of that process and I would encourage everyone to make their comments heard. The political process is open to all to engage with their political representatives, as well as legal processes.

Jen Dunnaway: The 1987 plan had six goals. I searched for community goals in the new plan and found none. Why were they stripped out? There were two of the old goals that are relevant. One, the mobility goal of accommodating a workable circulation system that anticipates traffic without reducing the level of service below D. If you look at changes in the mobility element of the plan, most levels of service will go below D. Another element of the old plan was to spread around by an equitable distribution the development intensity to make a self-sufficient community that offers a balance of housing employment, business, cultural, educational, and recreational opportunities. These are all valid community goals and yet only the city has goals in our community plan. The last thing I'll say is that there is nothing in the community engagement document regarding one-on-one meetings between planners and the special interests. It appears that the city defined community concerns based on some metric. I did not see mention of two large community groups, Help Save UC and UC Peeps, or the rallies that were held in March and May 2023.

Charles Frazer: Has submitted a written comment to City Planning about antisemitism in the plan.

Susan Baldwin: I decided I needed to comment on the parks proposals as well. The city changed the 2.8 acre / 1000 population standard to the PMP standard. Fast forward a few years and all the plan updates underway cannot meet the PMP standards. This point system has obviously failed. I know the University Community has a fair amount of park space now compared to many communities. I live in the mid-city area but we shouldn't ignore the impact adding tens of thousands of people will have on Parks: new residents won't have backyards to play in. We're planning for a crappy park system.

Lisa Heikoff: A comment on transportation. Ageism is built into this plan and assumes the boomers will die off. But many plan to stay. The transportation plan is not built for seniors. We won't be riding bikes to Scripps or UCSD. Why aren't we integrating a more local solution into the plan. This affects schools and shuttles that might be part of a solution; we need to be creative. The trolley can get us to the border but can't get us to our appointments at UCSD.

Andy Wiese: Thanks to Chris Nielsen for organizing the previous meetings and coordinating the enormous load of materials that has been coming under the transom. Thanks to City staff for making this opportunity available and to extend to the greatest extent that they would give us a comment period that would give us additional opportunities to be involved in the plan. Thanks to City Planning staff, unsung and un-thanked, who have taken a lot of heat here who are dedicated to a better vision for the city of San Diego that most of us probably share. I want to recognize the work that they do and encourage them to take seriously the many comments here that have been heated, and if so, it's because we all love the community that we live in and want to see it better. We may have different visions about what the future holds, but I think that's something we should all recognize and celebrate, and that includes Suchi Lukes and Nathan Causman of the city planning department, the Zach Burton, CD6, and Michaela Valk, Mayor's office.