

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes

Virtual Meeting Via Zoom

6:09 P.M. May 12th 2020

Directors present, directors absent:

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Roger Cavanaugh (RC) (Vice Chair), Meagan Beale (MB), Dan McCurdy (DM), Andrew Wiese (AW), Nancy Groves (NG), Caryl Lees Witte (CW), Joann Selleck (JS), Isabelle Kay (IK), Ash Nasserri (AN), Rebecca Robinson (RR), Jon Arenz (JA), Amber Ter-Vrugt(ATV), Jason Moorhead (JM), Anu Delouri (AD), Kristie Miller (KM), Michael Leavenworth (ML), Kristin Camper (KC), Petr Krysl (PK), Erin Baker (EB), Carol Uribe (CU) Katie Witherspoon (KW)(City of SD Planning)

Not present summary: Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV), Jon Arenz (JA), Kristin Camper (KC), Petr Krysl (PK), Erin Baker (EB)

Seat vacant: Business 3 (was held by Ryan Perry).

1. **Call the Meeting to Order:** Chris Nielsen 6:09 pm
2. **Pledge of Allegiance followed by a Moment of Silence**
3. Agenda: Call for additions/deletions: Adoption –
Approve the Agenda by Acclimation Vote:
4. Approval of Minutes from Mar 10, 2020. Adoption -
Motion: Motion to approve the minutes by ML seconded by JS
Vote: Yes: 9 No: 0 Abstain: 4, Chair not voting, motion passed.
5. Welcome of New members – **Carol Uribe**
UCPG Re-elect the Board:
Chris Nielsen – Chair – adopted by acclimation
Roger Cavanaugh – Vice Chair – adopted by acclimation
Kristie Miller – Secretary – adopted by acclimation
Anu Delouri – Membership Secretary – adopted by acclimation
6. **Announcements: Chair Report and CPC Report -**

7. PRESENTATIONS:

A. Councilmember Barbara Bry Rep – Justine Murray for District 1

- a. Thank you to CN, KW and AW – thank you for making a great community
- b. COVID-19 Updates – Resources. Daily meetings to start now 3 to 4 times per week. Nurses and Teachers Webinars. Info to help
- c. Budget hearing – just happened last week
- d. Neighborhood Services – Should be available so call if there are issues or emails

B. Membership – AD – UCPG: sign up to be a member.
Membership does not expire.

C. CPU Process by the Plan Update Subcommittee – AW

Zoomed last month with 65 people able to join. See the community plan website *planuniversity.org* for agendas, minutes, and presentations.

The presentations by the city were: 1) Economic Design, 2) Housing Design, and 3) Urban design.

Next meeting will be May 19th, detailing the 5 focus areas to work on with the planning and design consultants. The Focus Areas are:

- 1) Torrey Pines Rd.
- 2) Tech Parks – Campus Pointe
- 3) UTC Core area
- 4) Nobel straddling I-5, and
- 5) south UC.

We will craft a tool for online set of options for different scale and density to give the community

D. Planning Department- Katie Witherspoon – 90% of the Planning department is working from home. – this may cause delays

- Plan Update Project is moving forward with online engagement
- If people have other in person suggestions please email Katie
- Parks and open space master plan – talking about this in June

Community member – Housing city wide will be talked about next city planning commission meeting

IK – CPU helps implement the city plan. So how does the housing plan affect UC Plan? Long Range Plan – 20 – 30 years down the road?

8. Public Comment: Non-Agenda Items (3-minute limit)

- a. Louis Rodolico – See appendix A following these minutes
- b. Joe La Cava – appreciates us volunteering
- c. Barry Bernstein – UCCA President – next meeting 5/13 Virtual with Zoom:
CN from UCPG will speak, Mark Salata from EDUCATE will speak, Ruth DeSantis from UCCF, and John Lee Evans will speak.
- d. Will Moore – City Budget still needs to be funded – running for District #1

9. Action Item: Costa Verde DEIR Comment Letter

The UCPG must edit, amend, and approve a comment letter to the City for the Costa Verde Draft EIR based on a draft comment letter produced by the Costa Verde subcommittee. The deadline is Tuesday May 26. CN recommends that the UCPG appoint a couple of people to help him with the letter after the UCPG approves a draft.

Review of the DEIR and the Costa Verde Subcommittee comments:

Scoping: The original scoping meetings were held in 2016 for a much different project. The City should comment on how much a project needs to change in order for a new scoping meeting to be required.

Traffic: This is the primary impact this project will have on the community. Noted were:

- Proposed project will lead to large traffic in a congested area and looked at several alternatives
- Draft EIR – climate action plan
- Transportation demand issues – proposed mitigations
- Biking in the area – develop a methodology
- Parking – where? In the neighborhoods?
- Pedestrian Safety

Community Member comment – Louis Rodolico – Parking needs to be larger, because employees will park in the neighborhoods

Debbie Knight – Traffic Study – negative impact of Project on Traffic need to be reduced and positive should be increased. Development Rights – city has to give them these rights and there is a major benefit for the community to have the rights increase.

A- The project is in a transit priority and dense area so you would hope there would be fewer people driving and higher mode share but 13% only - walking / biking / transit with a Climate Action Plan goal of 20%.

B- No green house gas analysis – city gives their approval via a check list. Not a lot of TDMs proposed. Need more climate action plan check list items on their TDM plan. CN – we have asked the city to comment on each TDM, that the DEIR should set measurable goals for each TDM, and if TDM is not measurable then why?

Comment: Are you going to charge market rate parking to employees / workers as well?
John Murphy: it is written into the leases of the businesses.

Comment: For pay parking – should all employees, salaried and hourly, pay the same for parking?

C-Bike issues – Community Plan issue – Area problem

Draft EIR should note how unbikeable the CV area is – needs to be bike friendly

Costa Verde is bike friendly but AREA is not

City must make a serious comment about bikes

Debbie Knight – Costa Verde is a bikeable island in a sea dangerous for biking.

The DEIR does not describe a solution for the lack of bike friendly roads and infrastructure in the neighborhood of the project.

IK – mitigation/alternatives could make Nobel bikeable from the University

AW – CPU – shows pictures depicting the idea or possibilities of what this might be for Nobel Drive, but this is not concrete at this point.

IK – what about some kind bike infrastructure / mitigation bank?

What is the project going to give back to the community – not a park? Maybe they could add 1 mile of bike lane?

D – Draft EIR – has adequately handled pedestrian safety – especially on S. Genesee and N. Nobel

Community Member – Louis Rodolico proposes garage in this development as a conflagration shelter from fire.

Response: project approval or denial letter should handle these things

JS: Bike lanes yes, but we don't really have the ability to make the Developer do this.

Community Member: We need jobs – this Developer is willing to pay for this major development that will bring jobs to this community.

AW and CN – visual section of the comment letter should be removed

We need the Draft EIR comment on overall design cohesiveness so Regency sores will look like the Alexandria buildings.

John Murphy – Rendering might look different but same designer and will be integrated and look like it should in the middle of the community – Open Air Center

Dan Ryan (Alexandria) – we are local, not outside but inside the community

IK – more space to carry out community functions. Life Science business/Alexandria – More to life sciences than tech.

E. Noise Impact – treats skilled nursing at the corner as a sound receptor and should be treated as an appropriately sensitive receptor.

The DEIR should include mitigation measures with the City for the record

Truck noise, specifically heavy construction noise, is an important impact.

Debbie Knight – Greatest noise impact is found at Genesee and Nobel.

Tamara Milic (CV subcommittee member): How does the Draft EIR address the construction traffic and heavy truck noise?

-3 years of construction – 140 to 160 heavy trucks per day coming and going with this split of heavy truck traffic:

1 – 40% LJ Village Dr to 805

2 – 40% Nobel to 805

3 – 20 % Genesee to 52

We need the Draft EIR comment to recommend moving trucks to LJ Village Dr from Nobel Dr.

This takes away noise from residential to make commercial noise on LJ Village Dr.

Stephanie Boudreau (CV Subcommittee) – CN should make this change.

There should also be an operation noise measurement of current CV center for 12 hours to more accurately measure noise on project.

Lou Rodolico: There should be additional noise and dust appendices

F. Last topic – Storm water (EB and JA they are not present)

Question: How will Chevron and McDonald's water runoff be handled?

Answer: All water runoff, no matter the source, will go into the storm water recovery system.

Visitor comment – Dike Anyiwo – Regional Chamber of Commerce – supported the project unanimously.

Community member – Melanie Cohn, a director with BIOCUM, supports this project as proposed. We need more Life Sciences.

NG and AW - What do we need to do for the letter?

AW - Supports the letter and it is a better project – Traffic transit, mode share and mixed uses.

-Highly suggests – get to 20 % mode share from 13 % mode share

-encourage to find housing – Residential – people should be able to walk to work

CN – the 13 % number comes from SANDAG – TDM is disappointing proposal

John Murphy – Shankar – traffic engineer

-Ran a model with SANDAG – they came up with 13% model, approved by the city

- multi modal – because people will park once and walk to lunch and shop

- Business walk to retrain customers to the Regency portion

CN – Need to make sure TDMs are real so city can measure – non driving mode shares

Debbie Knight and JS will volunteer to help make the letter clear and uniform

IK – added noise impact of comment reroute heavy truck traffic away from Nobel

JS – Comment needs to very clearly state that design cohesion and consistency needed.

Motion: Move to approve the letter content by IK seconded by AW. DK and JS are to assist in the final preparation of the letter.

Vote: Yes: 13 No: 0 Recusal: 1 (JM, reason: employed by ARE), Chair not voting, motion passed.

A copy of the draft comment letter to be finalized by CN, DK, and JS is in Appendix B. The finalized copy of the comment letter will be found in the published EIR.

Next steps – submit by 5/26 – city will comment on our comments – then final EIR 7/20 (estimate by Regency). Function of now quickly city moves

This may necessitate a meeting in August. CN asks UCPG board for objections – none.

We may need to think about August an August meeting.

14. **Adjournment** at 8:23 pm. Next meeting will be June 9, 2020

Thank you, Chris

Appendix A – Public Comments

Public comment by Lou Rodolico

I'll start with a recent statement from our previous U.S. President, quote: "we are fighting long term trends: being selfish, being tribal, being divided and seeing others as the enemy, these have become a stronger impulse in American life". End quote

As corporations gain more influence, shed medical insurance responsibility and pay less taxes they have entered a period of dividing the population in order to take the spotlight off themselves. To improve their profits the big retailers on the Genesee corridor want all the traffic funneled up to their stores. Westfield paid a half million for an Environmental Impact Report to remove the Regents Road Bridge. A report that somehow did not include ambulance service times. Universities political organs were then stocked with residents who want to live on cul-de-sacs not the planned Regents Road.

Victims come to me with their stories of difficulty getting to the emergency room. They are wary of being victimized a second time by going to the local paper, city or other entity.

Since I see the need to build the Regents Road Bridge and connect Governor to Gillman I am automatically banned from membership on the planning group or getting anything published in the University paper. It's not personal it's about money.

When I asked the UCPG Chair why I was banned from a Costa Verde sub-committee he directed me to a document section which does not exist. I pressed him to quote the imaginary document and his answer is silence. In effect the UCPG Chair was saying that the Planning Group can lie to Louis Rodolico. He is correct, the local paper will ignore the lie, the city, lobbyists and corporations silently look away. Rejecting any resident under a false pretext diminishes the value of a planning group's recommendation.

I will continue to be the voice for the victims of corporate greed and selfishness. Corporations are in an era of privatizing democracy with instruments like planning groups and lobbyists. I have put forward four public safety issues some of which represent additional effort by Costa Verde. All four have been rejected by well paid lobbyists. Like Westfield in 2008 I would not be surprised to learn that lobbyists and Costa Verde have already cut a private deal.

Louis Rodolico 5/12/2020 Member UCPG

Appendix B – DRAFT comment letter to be finalized by CN, DK, and JS:

Costa Verde Sub Committee
DRAFT EIR Comment Letter May 8, 2020

Date:

To: Ms. Shearer-Nguyen, DSDEAS@sandiego.gov

Subject: Costa Verde Revitalization, Project No. 477943

Dear Ms. Shearer-Nguyen,

The University Community Planning Group is the City’s officially-recognized planning group for the University Community Plan area. As stated on the City’s Community Planning Groups webpage: “The recommendations of the planning groups are integral components of the planning process, and are highly regarded by the City Council and by staff.” (<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpg>)

The UCPG has grave concerns about many of the impacts of this proposed project, about the adequacy of the DEIR, and about the process by which this Project morphed over the course of three and a half years from one proposal that was disclosed via an NOP and Scoping Meeting to a very different project that was analyzed the Draft EIR.

This letter provides the UCPG’s comments and recommendations on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Costa Verde Center Revitalization Project (“the Project”), dated March 2020.

Notice of Preparation and Project Scoping

The Notice of Preparation and the Scoping Meeting for the proposed Project were done in July, 2016 for a very different project (DEIR p. 1-4 and Appendix A). The DEIR for that project was released in 2018, and a UCPG Subcommittee and members of the community met multiple times with Regency Centers to review and discuss the proposed Project. A number of comment letters were submitted on the DEIR.

When the Project changed dramatically, there was no new NOP or Scoping meeting. The DEIR needs to explain why these two legally mandated public disclosure steps did not occur for this Project, and why there was no official notice to the public of the Project until the DEIR was released in March, 2020.

This timing compounded the problem of the lack of prior public notice. Due to the COVID-19 prohibition of in person public meetings, the Project could not be presented for public review, and in order to discuss the DEIR and prepare comments, the UCPG had to meet via Zoom. The severe limitations of both the restricted meeting format and

the short time frame has meant that the UCPG and the public have constrained opportunities to review and comment on this very large proposed Project.

CEQA mandates that a NOP be issued that an EIR will be prepared for a particular project. The purpose of the project description is to describe the project in a way that will be meaningful to the public, reviewing agencies and decision makers. In this case, the NOP and Scoping meeting that the DEIR cites occurred almost four years before the current DEIR was released and was for a very different project. ***The DEIR needs to explain at what significance level of change a new NOP and Scoping meeting would be required.***

The Proposed Project and Project Alternatives

1. Regency Centers is at its development entitlement for this property and is requesting a large increase in development rights. The proposed Project includes:
 - a. 178,000 sq.' of retail (the existing amount) – this would include keeping the gas station and McDonald's and tearing down and replacing the rest
 - b. 40,000 sq.' of commercial/office
 - c. 360,000 sq.' of research and development
 - d. a 10-story, 200 room hotel (c. 125,000 sq.')

The proposed Project would lead to a large increase in traffic in an already congested area and result in Unmitigated Transportation/Circulation Impacts.

Regency Centers has stated to the UCPG that the current ADTs at the site are 8,720. The proposed Project is requesting an addition of 4,981 additional ADTs, for a total of 13,700. As the DEIR explains in its Traffic Analysis, the proposed Project will lead to Significant and Unmitigated Transportation/Circulation impacts (DEIR, p. 8-21)

- The DEIR states (p. 5.2-15), that the projected increase of 4,981 trips incorporates a 13% reduction of projected trips (a reduction of 744 trips). The assumption is that 13% of the trips will be non-vehicular (walking/biking/transit) because the Project is in a Transit Priority Area. The 13% rate was determined by SANDAG, and is not broken down between walking, biking and transit.

2. **The DEIR contains Project Alternatives that would reduce many of the Project's impacts.** Two of the three "build alternatives" would reduce or avoid some of the projects impacts that are of major concern to the UCPG, although many would still remain. **The No Hotel Alternative would reduce or avoid some of the impacts that are of greatest concern to the UCPG.**

a. The No Hotel Alternative: the DEIR refers to this as the "Retail and Office/Research and Development Alternative" (DEIR p. 8-21). This project would include all of the retail/office and the R&D but no hotel. The DEIR identifies this as the **"Environmentally Superior Alternative"**. As stated in the DEIR, "This alternative would meet most of the identified Project objectives, and would reduce significant and unmitigated traffic impacts, as well as reduce significant but mitigable

operational noise impacts. Specifically, it would result in the least amount of traffic generation of any of the build alternatives.”

- **The hotel is projected to account for 2,000 of the 5,000 new ADT for the Project. Thus, removing the hotel reduces the Traffic/Circulation impacts (although Traffic/Circulation impacts of this alternative still remain Significant and Unmitigable). Removing the hotel reduces impacts to all of the following (DEIR p. 8-21)**

- Transportation/Circulation
- Visual Effects/Neighborhood Character
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Energy
- Noise
- Paleontological
- Public utilities
- Public Services and Facilities

- *The DEIR misrepresents the proposed hotel and its impacts: The proposed 200-room hotel would be 10 stories high (DEIR Public Notice). It would be 135’ (DEIR P. 5.3-20). Yet the Conceptual Elevations for the Hotel (Figure 3-31) inaccurately show it as six stories high.*
- *The DEIR claims the hotel will have no significant visual effects or neighborhood character impacts. Yet this claim is elsewhere contradicted by the DEIR itself: “At a maximum height of 135 feet, this building would be a fairly prominent new vertical element within this viewshed.” (DEIR p. 5.3-28)*
- Hotel use has been removed from the Costa Verde Specific Plan. As the DEIR acknowledges (p. 5.1-10) hotel use has been removed from the Costa Verde Specific Plan. It was removed when the Monte Verde Project was approved for residential towers at the location previously proposed for a hotel.

b. The Reduced R&D Alternative

This alternative would include the retail, hotel, office, and a reduced amount of R&D (210,000 sq. ‘ of R&D instead of 360,000 sq.’) It would “provide a mix of uses while reducing the intensity of development on the site relative to the Project, with associated potential to reduce significant traffic and operational noise impacts (although Traffic/Circulation impacts would remain Significant and Unmitigable.” (DEIR p. 8-6) This alternative reduces impacts to all of the following:

Traffic/Circulation

- Visual Effects/Neighborhood Character
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Energy
- Noise
- Paleontological Resources

Public Utilities
Public Services and Facilities

3. Regulatory Framework: the University Community Plan (DEIR p. 5.2-11)

The DEIR states, “The updated Community Plan will consider current conditions, Citywide goals in the Climate Action Plan and the General Plan, and community specific goals to provide direction for the long-term development of the community.”

However, the Project’s major increase in vehicle trips by single occupancy vehicles and its very low mode share of 13% biking/walking/transit is far below the City’s own vision for the area presented for the Update to the University Community Plan. In the University Community Plan Update Existing Conditions Report, p. i.i.i. (April 2018, prepared by Kimley Horn), the City’s vision for the University Community Plan Update is: “No increase in driving alone, and a substantial increase in transit, biking, walking and carpooling.” Although located in the most significant Transit Priority Area (TPA), and in the heart of the community, the proposed Project falls far short of the vision the City has laid out in the community plan update that is underway. The DEIR must address the proposed Project’s location in the Community’s prime TPA while falling so far short of the City’s vision.

4. The Climate Action Plan (CAP)

The proposed Project falls far short of meeting the CAP’s goals for increasing Mode Share in Transit Priority Areas. These mode share goals are important in achieving the Greenhouse Gas reductions called for in the CAP.

- **The proposed Project will achieve only a 13% Mode Share (Walking/Biking/Transit) at its projected completion in 2023.**
- **However, the CAP’s goals for Mode Share are 20% by 2020 and 35% by 2035.**

The CAP’s Mode Share goals for 2020 are: (CAP p. 37)

12% transit
4% walking
6% biking
20% total

The DEIR thus reveals the project’s reliance on automobile trips. The Project is located at a stop of the new Midcoast Trolley and on multiple bus lines. The DEIR should explain why it cannot substantially increase its mode share and why the City should approve a project with such a poor mode share in a major Transit Priority Area.

The CAP Checklist and GHG Emissions

As the DEIR states (p. 5.5-8): “Projects that are not consistent with the CAP must prepare a comprehensive project-specific analysis of GHG emissions, including

quantification of existing and projected GHG emissions and incorporation of the measures in this Checklist to the to the extent feasible.”

The CAP Consistency Checklist

To avoid doing a full analysis of the proposed Project’s GHG emissions, the DEIR relies on the City’s policy that allows projects to avoid doing a GHG analysis by completing the CAP Checklist:

“The Project would be consistent with the GHG reduction measures contained in the City’s CAP . . .” (DEIR P. 6-6). The Project’s CAP Checklist is DEIR Appendix D. Unfortunately, the DEIR’s responses to this checklist are inadequate, vague and misleading. Furthermore, the DEIR contains no measurement or reporting mechanism and no enforcement mechanism.

The DEIR’s CAP Checklist, p. 3, states: “This intensified development would be in proximity to the new Mid-Coast Trolley University Town station, as well as existing bus lines, which would support increased use of mass transit.” This statement gives the misleading impression that the transit mode share for the project will be substantial simply due to the proposed Project’s location, when mode share in fact falls far short of the CAP’s own 2020 mode share goals.

The CAP Checklist asks: “Would the proposed project implement the General Plan’s Mobility Element in Transit Priority Areas to increase the use of transit?” In response, the DEIR cites pedestrian bridges to the trolley station and the bus terminal at UTC, and the design of the project would encourage use of the trolley.” Again, the DEIR fails to mention how low the actual projected mode share is for the Project.

The CAP Checklist also asks: “Would the proposed project implement the City of San Diego’s Bicycle Master plan to increase bicycling opportunities?” In response, the DEIR refers to the Bike Master Plan’s identification of Class II bike lanes on Genesee, without disclosing that Genesee is so dangerous to bike that few attempt it. The DEIR also refers to the Project’s provision of a one way Class IV cycle track on Nobel Drive. The DEIR fails to mention this would be for one or two blocks, would go only west bound, and the rest of Nobel Drive has only intermittent bike lanes and is extremely dangerous to bike. Once again, the DEIR gives a highly misleading impression about the potential for biking to and from the Project.

CAP Checklist – Question 7 (p. 6) Transportation Demand Management Program. This plan contains a list of measures that have no implementation requirements, no measurable goals, no mechanism for monitoring, and no requirement for reporting to the City on their impact. For example, there is no identification of which employees will be charged market rate for parking: will only professional employees who work in the office and R&D buildings be covered? (estimated at 1600 employees in the EIR. Table 5.2-22, although presumably some of these will be the companies’ low wage service workers). What about the presumably much lower wage workers who work in the retail (509 workers) and hotel (225 workers) – will they be charged market rate for parking? Who

will set the market rate? Is it the responsibility of tenants to implement this program? Who will monitor it? Instead of addressing any of these issues, the DEIR's responses on the CAP checklist rely on vague assurances and wishful thinking: "The project would charge employees market-rate for single-occupancy vehicle parking and providing reserved, discounted or free spaces for registered carpools or vanpools. This may encourage employees to use transit and thereby reduce single-occupant vehicle trips and associated parking demand." (CAP Checklist, p. 10)

The DEIR in numerous other places relies on this same vague list of TDM measures as partial mitigation for its traffic impacts.

5. TDM (Transportation Demand Management)

The DEIR states: "The project proposes a robust TDM program as a benefit to both the future tenants and the community. The goal of the plan is to reduce and/or remove vehicle trips to relieve congestion." (DEIR Appendix B, p. xiv)

However, this "robust" program has no measures for success, no tracking of the impact of its program, no requirement to report to the City on the program, and no actions to be taken if the "robust" TDM program does little to reduce and/or remove vehicle trips. The EIR needs to disclose that the impact of the proposed TDM program on actually reducing the number of trips will never be known.

For each TDM measure listed, the DEIR must set measurable goals, a mechanism for monitoring the measures, and a mechanism for reporting annually to the City on the impact of the TDM program. If a TDM measure is not measurable, the DEIR should explain why.

For example: TDM Measure: (DEIR p. 189)

"The Project will implement a parking management plan, which will charge employees market-rate for single-occupancy vehicle parking and providing reserve, discounted, or free spaces for registered carpools or vanpools. This may encourage employees to use transit and thereby reduce single occupant vehicle trips and associated parking demand."

The DEIR should state how the "market-rate" cost will be set, and since this policy will be implemented by the tenants and not by Costa Verde, how will this be monitored and enforced? (See above comments on the CAP Consistency Checklist.) How will the number of registered vanpools be monitored? To say these measures "may encourage employees to use transit" is a meaningless measure.

6. The DEIR presents the Project as a bike-friendly development that will promote biking. What the DEIR fails to clearly explain is that the streets surrounding the project and in the entire "bikeshed" are mostly high-traffic streets with minimal to non-existent bike infrastructure.

The DEIR states that the proposed Project is consistent with the City of San Diego Bicycling Goal that states: “A city where bicycling is a viable travel choice, particularly for trips of less than five miles.” The DEIR describes its consistency with this goal by describing the Project’s safe bicycle routes through the Project itself and the Project’s design that incorporates elements such as bike access across the project and bike lockers and racks (also DEIR CAP Checklist Consistency, p. 4). However, the DEIR fails to disclose how “unbikeable” the surrounding streets are. The DEIR does describe the surrounding streets (DEIR p. 5.2-2): La Jolla Village Drive has no bike lanes; Nobel Drive, the southern boundary of the Project, has intermittent bike lanes and intermittent on-street parking; Genesee Avenue, has bike lanes but is a six lane, high traffic street with multiple driveways; LeBon Drive has no bike lanes. Regents Road has bike lanes only north of La Jolla Village Drive. ***The DEIR should disclose how unbikeable the surrounding “bikeshed” is and the challenges in terms of cost and feasibility to make the area more bikeable.***

7. Parking

The DEIR proposes between 1839 and 2,076 parking spaces (Appendix B, p. i) The total project parking required by the City is 1839 spaces (DEIR p. 185). There are currently 968 spaces.

In describing the proposed Project, the DEIR refers time and again to “implementation of a parking management plan”:

- The proposed Project would provide a total of up to 2,076 parking spaces throughout the site upon buildout of the Project, in accordance with SDMC requirements. Parking facilities would include surface lots in the southern portion of the site, with the majority of the parking below podium level. The Project would implement a parking demand management plan. (DEIR p. 5.1-43)
- The Project’s consistency with Applicable Elements, Goals and Policies in the City of San Diego’s Land Use Goals, Objectives and Policies (DEIR p. 5.1-43, p. 5.1-44 are just a few examples)
- As a Mitigation Measure in the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (DEIR p. 9-5).
- The DEIR (p. 5.2-56) states the project would: “Implement a parking management plan, which will charge employees market-rate for single-occupancy vehicle parking and provide reserved, discounted, or free spaces for registered carpools or vanpools.”
- The DEIR 5.1-13 states a NDP (Neighborhood Development Permit) is required for the Project because the Project proposes tandem commercial parking spaces for valet parking in association with restaurant use and assigned employee parking. The findings necessary for a NDP are the same as those noted above for an SDP.

Yet nowhere is the parking management plan described.

Given the DEIR's reliance on the existence of the plan, the "Parking Management Plan" needs to be spelled out in detail in the DEIR: its provisions, its assumptions, its intended impacts, the responsible parties for implementing it, the methods for its implementation, and a regular reporting mechanism on its status and impact.

8. Pedestrian Safety

Due to high expected pedestrian traffic in the area of the Trolley, the DEIR should fully explain the analysis done to ensure pedestrian safety at the uncontrolled entrances and exits to the site as vehicles make potentially dangerous right turns.

Revised 5/5/20 11:00
Combined comments from the UCPG subcommittee
Visual Impact working group

Costa Verde Shopping Center

There is little doubt that the current Costa Verde shopping center is in dire need of “revitalization”. Even a casual observer can see that it is a shopping center well past its prime. There are many empty store fronts, aging buildings, and sidewalks/walkways in disrepair. All of this is contributing to an under utilization by neighborhood shoppers.

The project proposal is a tear down/redesign/rebuild plan, (with the exception of MacDonal’s and gas station which will remain unaffected), and should be reviewed from that perspective. This is not merely a revitalization project. The site slopes down as it goes south so putting the lower height buildings on the south side facing the neighborhood is a good plan. It follows the stated purpose of opening up the center to the neighborhood, making it more walkable/accessible experience to the shoppers it serves. Having the larger, taller buildings facing Genesee will act as a noise barrier from the street traffic and trolley noise, again improving the experience.

Overall, this is a good mixed-use development, well thought out and aesthetically pleasing. There is something for everyone in the neighborhood to utilize: grocery, pharmacy, dry cleaner, fast food drive through, gas station, exercise facility, mailing/shipping facility, restaurants, and cafes.

Thoughts:

- The addition of a child care facility will be a great help to employees of the Alexandria lab buildings as well as employees of the other retail buildings enabling them to ride the trolley to work, drop off children at childcare, and go to work easily. It’s important that the child care facility be affordable given the diverse incomes of those working in the property, and that first priority go to those working in the UC area.
- Providing services such as a grocery store and fast food will serve the market in the immediate neighborhood, which includes a middle-income and student demographic, not solely a luxury market.
- There is a need in the community for “smart” community rooms that can be rented by various community organizations for a reasonable fee.

- There should be enough public seating where neighbors can relax and mingle. The renderings appear to primarily offer seating as part of restaurant services.
- There is an outcry for public art in the UC community. Consider adding rotating local art gallery or exhibit area to the plans.
- There should be short term parking access for bank use, postal services and dry cleaners without charge.
- There are additional concerns about the overall bike-ability to this location. Once at the shopping center, the committee would like to better understand where bike storage will be available for customers using the center.
- For those customers, arriving to the shopping center via a “shared-ride” there should be a designated area for pick-up and drop-offs and enough space for the vehicles “waiting” to pick up prospective customers for rides. The ingress/egress areas seem too congested in the project to safely allow for ride share waiting and pickups and drop-offs.
- There should be an area for community activities, such as permanent tables for chess/checkers etc.
- There should be an area assigned for periodic farmers-markets in the surface parking lot.

One concern of the group is the overall design cohesiveness. The Alexandria buildings appear to be very modern in contrast to the rest of the project. How does Regency plan to be more coordinated in their designs and avoid looking like separate buildings from different architects? While the design of the Alexandria building is innovative, the committee is concerned about the sustainability of the materials that will be used on the outer walls and the overall plan to keep this product from becoming weathered and discolored by age. ***The DEIR should more clearly state how the entire site will have design cohesiveness.***

The committee is also concerned about some of the landscaping and seek more clarity around the types of materials that will be used. It seems we have assurances that native planting will be used, but clarification on how the project will implement the Urban Forest Management Plan, if recycled water (purple-pipe) will be used on the project, and which buildings will have roof plantings or any planned solar panels need clarification. Since the lighting contributes to the overall aesthetics of the projects, the committee also seeks additional information and clarity around the placement and types of lighting that will be used.

Lastly there is concern that the surrounding neighborhood is not properly set up for additional “safe” pedestrian travel to and from the shopping center. Additional lighting, pedestrian signage and cross walks are needed for the neighbors walking from Costa

Verde Blvd. and Las Palmas with design and functionality in mind. How will pedestrians travel between the Westfield Mall and the shopping center to reduce the need for pedestrians to crossing through vehicular traffic?

We are all awaiting this new addition to our thriving and evolving community!

Revised 5/4/20

Combined comments from the UCPG subcommittee

Noise Impact working group

Noise Impacts for Project Operation:

The proposed project is directly adjacent to a senior living community and skilled nursing facility. The senior residents at this community may be more significantly impacted by noise issues than typical residential uses. As a result, **the proposed project's DEIR should evaluate the noise impact specifically on the adjacent senior living community.**

While it is technically correct that there is not a separate use category for noise impact for Skilled Nursing Facilities, skilled nursing facilities are "sensitive receptors" for which additional environmental analysis and mitigation may be warranted. For example, one of the thresholds for significance for noise impacts is when "temporary construction noise would substantially interfere with normal business communication, or affect sensitive receptors such as day care facilities, a significant noise impact may be identified." Page 5.7-6 of the DEIR presents the discussion of construction noise, its impact, and provides mitigation measures for those impacts. However, **the DEIR does not explicitly evaluate whether the impact would substantially interfere with normal business communication or affect sensitive receptors and therefore, it is unclear whether additional noise attenuation mitigation measure would be necessary.**

Further, the event plaza is proposed to be located less than 100-feet of the skilled nursing facility. However, the proposed mitigation measure for noise barriers is intended to reduce noise to "off-site receptors to the west." **The DEIR should include mitigation measures tailored to the skilled nursing facility residents who have heightened sensitivities to noise disruptions and who are located to the north east of the event plaza, in closer proximity to the event plaza than the off-site receptors to the west, as shown on the image below.**



The proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (sect. 9.0) is excellent. A representative from Vi, Garden Communities and other neighboring Townhouse complexes HOA should be included in monthly meetings to be kept advised of schedule adjustments and impact feedback.

Construction Impacts: Dust and Noise

Dirt Movement / Demolition Removal Noise

The removal of demolition material and the grading of the site will involve significant truck operation for a good percentage of the day. There will be significant diesel change of speed noise with back up alarms going throughout the day. Trucks that stand by for loading and unloading with engines idling are a constant source of noise.

Recommendation: Trucks standing for loading and unloading of dirt should be required to do so on-site only. Trucks should never use public right of ways for queuing and idling. Entry and exit via Nobel Drive should be prohibited to reduce noise and dust impact on the neighbors to the south and west of the project. Use Genesee only.

Trucks travelling to and from the site are expected to use Genesee Avenue north and south from Esplanade Court, connecting to La Jolla Village Drive and Nobel Drive, respectively, to I-805. The percentage of truck traffic using La Jolla Village Drive versus Nobel Drive will have a significant impact on the residences along the south side of Nobel between Genesee Avenue and Towne Center Drive. The DEIR should study the noise impact on Nobel Drive residences as a function of this percentage in order to be used to minimize the noise impact on Nobel residences.

It is the committee’s recommendation that specific construction days/hours be not only agreed upon prior to the start of the project but Regency and/or its subcontractors should not seek additional construction variances from the city to bypass the agreed upon mitigation measures. We do hope that Regency will be a “good neighbor” and continue to work with the community to find mitigation measures that go above and beyond the requirements, since it is clear that this project will have huge impacts with regards to noise and dust for those living in close proximity to the project and the minimal mitigation measure will likely not alleviate the inconvenience that the neighborhood will experience for the 30 month construction project.

Traffic Noise

The DEIR shows only two noise measurements, conducted on 04/12/16 from 10.41 A.M. to 10.51 A.M. and at 12.31 P.M. -12.41 P.M. at the Genesee and Esplanade Court corner and Nobel and the entrance to the McDonalds, adjacent to the Coco’s parking.

The DEIR fails to show measurements for the 12 hour period so we can have street noise profile for one day. Two measurements of noise during the entire 24 hour period are not sufficient to generate accurate average sound variation level. The readings may vary significantly. Therefore another measurement study should be done from 7.A.M. to 7 P.M. to include 12 recordings of the street noise level instead of only 2. This should include the most impacted intersection of Genesee and Nobel where multi-family residential units are located and where residents suffer due to continuous exposure to high levels of street noise.

These new measurements will significantly improve the accuracy and predictive power of the noise model used in DEIR and directly affects future model projections.

The DEIR should present their results of descriptive statistics in table like the one below:

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Exposure Variables.

Exposure variables	Minimum	25th percentile	Median	75th percentile	Maximum	Mean ± SD
Air pollution variables						
PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³)	16.04	17.65	18.29	19.08	21.45	18.39 ± 1.05
PM _{2.5} absorbance (10 ⁻⁵ /m)	1.01	1.37	1.52	1.72	3.39	1.58 ± 0.35
PM coarse (µg/m ³)	0.84	9.29	10.14	11.13	15.00	10.13 ± 1.53
PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³)	23.97	26.54	27.43	28.62	34.68	27.74 ± 1.84
NO ₂ (µg/m ³)	19.81	26.79	29.47	32.90	62.44	30.12 ± 4.85
NO _x (µg/m ³)	24.30	41.97	49.28	57.66	126.63	50.47 ± 11.70
Traffic load at major roads (veh-m/d) per 100,000	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.50	268.19	9.54 ± 21.20
Noise variables^{a,b}						
L _{DEN} (dB(A))	0.00	46.70	52.13	60.87	84.56	53.74 ± 9.49
L _{NIGHT} (dB(A))	0.00	38.15	43.54	51.75	76.29	44.88 ± 9.17

^aDescriptive statistics for the noise exposures are based on continuous variables, without a threshold.

^bNull values were used for those addresses where noise exposure was not modeled because of low traffic volume.

Figure 1. Data from reference [1]

1. Tzivian, L., et al., *Long-term air pollution and traffic noise exposures and cognitive function: A cross-sectional analysis of the Heinz Nixdorf Recall study*. J Toxicol Environ Health A, 2016. **79**(22-23): p. 1057-1069.

UCPG subcommittee working group comments on Storm Water, 5/5/2020:

Table 5.9-1 summarizes potential sources of common pollutants, and the project site includes at least one source for every category. (See also page 20 of the SWQMP). ***The DEIR should state how much is known about the chemicals that will be used for landscaping purposes on the site and if it can be ensured that toxic herbicides and pesticides will not contaminate our waterways.***

Table 5.1-1 on page 5.1-80 mentions the "[r]euse of collected rainwater for irrigation." However, the SWQMP shows that capture and reuse for rainwater is infeasible. ***The DEIR should clarify if rainwater is to be captured and reused on site.***

In the Preliminary Drainage Study (Appendix G2, Attachment 5) page 2 states that the McDonalds and Chevron parcels will remain unchanged. However, in Exhibit C, arrows suggest that surface flows from those sub-basins (A13 and A14) will be directed to inlet #107 and then routed to the subterranean retention plant. ***The DEIR should clarify whether some or all of the drainage from these parcels will be captured and treated, and if that is not currently planned, should consider an alternative in which trash, oil, bacteria and heavy metal are removed from surface and storm drain flows from these parcels.***

Also in Appendix G2, p. 241, the efficacy of the proposed hydro-modification avoidance measures are detailed. The subterranean retention plant is described as detaining 41% (37,865 cfs of a total flow of 91,800 cfs) in a 100 year storm. ***The DEIR should describe in more detail how the slow release structure will be effective in protecting downstream areas from hydro-modification in extremely heavy rainfall events. The DEIR should also justify the use of the City of San Diego's 2005 projections for 50- and 100-year interval storm values, in light of the more recent models of future climate in the area.***