

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes
Virtual Meeting Via Zoom
May 10, 2022, at 6:00pm

Directors present, directors absent:

Chris Nielsen (CN) (Chair), Roger Cavanaugh (RC) (Vice Chair), Neil de Ramos (NR), Joann Selleck (JS), Isabelle Kay (IK), Rebecca Robinson (RRW), Jon Arenz (JA), Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV), Anu Delouri (AD), Kristin Camper (KC), Petr Krysl (PK), Carol Uribe (CU), Andrew Parlier (AP), Georgia Kayser (GK), Karen Martien (KMar), Andrew Wiese (AW), Linda Bernstein (LB), Fay Arvin (FA), Carey Algaze (CA), Steve Pomerence (SP), Sasha Treadup (ST), Nancy Graham (NG-City of SD Planning).

1. **Call the Meeting to Order:** Chair CN at 6:05pm.
2. **Agenda: Call for additions / deletions:**
 - No additions/deletions to the agenda.
 - *Motion passed without objection.*
3. **Approval of Minutes: April 12, 2022.**
 - No additions/corrections to the minutes
 - *Motion passes without objection*
4. **Announcements: Chair's Report and CPC Report:**
 - CN:
 - We have an action item for a Conditional Use Permit and an information item from the City's Capital Project and Engineering Department on a water and sewer project east of Genesee and north of Governor Drive.
 - We will also decide between zoom and an in-person meeting for June and discuss the status of Community Planning Group changes led by Roger.
 - Stephanie Saathoff, representing the Towne Centre View project being developed by BioMed Reality, is ready to have a subcommittee meeting on traffic impacts. I'll work with them and the subcommittee members to come up with a time in the next two weeks.
 - Many residents have noted the posting of a Notice of Application for the Easement Vacation for proposed vacation of an open space easement, located at 8293 Gilman Drive, by the Robinson Wood Revokable Trust. I am told by the Planning Department "that nothing in the current Easement Vacation request has caused the department to change its recommendation for denial. The applicant is always allowed to submit

more information to be taken into consideration, but nothing to date that has been presented to the Planning Department has changed the department's position since the last time that this issue was reviewed.” This gives a good summary of where we are. I don't expect to have additional information near-term but will keep the UCPG, community, and environmental organizations updated.

- For tonight's agenda I'm going to alter the order of reports:
 - Tait Galloway Planning Department
 - Nancy Graham Planning Department
 - Andy Wiese Plan Update Subcommittee
 - Kaitlyn Willoughby CM LaCava's office
 - Anu Delouri Membership
 - Elected officials
 - Kristin Camper MCAS Miramar
 - Anu Delouri UC San Diego
 - Roger Cavanaugh CIP
- CN asked SP if there a comment he would like to make about Cost Verde.

5. Presentations:

- Planning Department: NG
 - Tait Galloway: Interim Deputy Director of the Planning Department
 - Thank you everyone for your emails and phone calls. We haven't gotten a chance to return all but wanted to acknowledge we have received them, and they have been providing the content to various decision makers within the city. Reassure you that the message is heard. We understand there is a lot of concern from the last subcommittee meeting and a lot of questions about the proposal specifically for the South UC area. We are tentatively planning to have a meeting next week. I would like to have more detailed comments on content of meeting but we are still working out those details – we are discussing with the council office and mayor's office and we ask for your patience and look forward to being able to release more information about the meeting within the next couple days. Thank you for your patience and understanding I know this has been frustrating and many have been concerned. Thank you and we hope to get that information out to you shortly.
 - Katie Rodolico: Do you have a location?
 - Tait: Tentatively planned at University High School, but don't want to give any more information until it is all confirmed. But expected to be at the normal evening time.
 - Jennifer Martin-Roff: is it possible for the meeting to be a hybrid meeting? Both online and in person:

- Tait: Have been looking at it, we need to have a wired internet connection. Concern about using a hot spot as the quality could be really spotty and we don't want people to get online and lose connection. We will continue to look at it but need to have hard wire connection.
 - CW: how are you going to advertise about the meeting because it is so late?
 - Tait: Will be posting it on the Community Plan Update webpage, sending out an email to those on the email list, sending out constant contact from the overall email for the community planning group, as well as next door and other social media venues.
 - Bill Beck: Can it be outdoors? We're going to have a lot of people and people might be worried about COVID.
 - Tait: Will look at an option for a speaker to be outside and listen in as an option.
 - JS: It has been requested to have stations set up and focus on different topics with poster boards you can see and go into granular level. Is that what you're contemplating or is this a question/answer presentation?
 - Tait: Right now, though tentative, the approach would have an open house and then followed by a presentation and then question and answers.
- Plan Update Subcommittee: AW, Chair
 - April meeting of Plan Update Subcommittee – highly attended over 440 attendees on zoom. Lasted for about 3 hours. Meeting began with opportunity to make comment on South UC including the proposal for townhomes and for the shopping plazas at the Vons and Sprouts shopping plaza and significant comments taken on that. Second half of the meeting focused on Northern University City. A variety of comments taken regarding planning for parks and public facilities and focusing that conversation as part for the land use, affordable housing, appropriateness of density levels, rezoning of land use designation of single-family area for multifamily housing and a number of other comments were made. A lot of constructive comments were made and heard.
 - Planning Department shared the proposed meeting for next week and it looks like the message is “stay tuned”. We are in conversation to come up with a plan to meet the needs of the community as well as the City.
 - JS: Since it's a plan update issue, do you have any information on the college area plan and the push back happening there? It has been reported as if City planners are overruling community with respect to the plan they've developed?
 - AW: Don't have much to contribute on this, not very familiar with what is going on at the college area and their materials are

up online as ours. I believe there is a proposal for similar type of single-family rezoning.

- NG: The college area also going through a plan update. just as this community. Prior to the City kicking off a process, they had developed a draft framework for an update. That community just completed their online engagement activity. Some of the people were not excited about the alternatives and the City received that feedback and are looking at that and analyzing it. As we're going through the input, we will be having a meeting later this month with the update regarding the information collected and where that leaves us from a policy perspective.
- LB: Had been told that the notes from the chat would be available but haven't seen those yet.
 - NG: It is not posted currently, needed to read through all of them to ensure there is nothing inflammatory and some comments are not appropriate, but we can post those this week.
- Councilmember Joe LaCava: Kaitlyn Willoughby
 - Kaitlyn: Thank you to everyone who came to the budget townhalls, he took your comments and address those as questions to the department heads themselves and take them into consideration as drafting his budget priority memo. Community Power Residential Roll Out beginning this month – 700,000 residents have the opportunity to transfer to 100% renewable and clean energy at a competitive rate.
- Membership Report: AD
 - AD: If you are attending for the first time, the UCPG officially recognized organization representing north and south university city, provides reviews and recommendations on land use and development related project and issues that fall within university planning area. These meetings are held 2nd Tuesday of each month and being at 6pm. No fee to become a member and they do not expire. You may email me for a membership form. Thank you for attending tonight.
- UC San Diego: AD
 - Director of Campus and Community Relations at UC San Diego. Last Thursday the university sent a UCSD Community Update. Highlight 3 items: (1) UCSD Rankings – 2022/23 rankings Undergraduate and Graduate top 10 public Universities in the US, Jacob School of Engineering was ranked 6th public engineering and medical is also 6th in public medical schools (2) Living and Learning Neighborhoods – the development of these neighborhoods has become a model that many universities are adopting around the country requesting incorporation on how we development. Pepper Canyon West start construction for transfer students, it is located on campus interior 1,300 transfer and upper division students. Ridge Walk North – undergraduate students approximately 2,000 beds. UCSD recognizes there is a housing shortage and would like all students to live on campus but the University is doing its best to reach 65% housed on campus goal (3) Campus Commencement planned for June 11th.

- AW: appreciate statement that UCSD would like to house all students on campus but only planning to house 65% only so there is a disconnect. What plans does the university have to get to 100% how can we help you get to that level?
 - AD: It is still the goal to provide all undergraduate students with housing on the campus, but with the demands on enrollment and enrollment numbers going up and challenges with scarcity of land, have a goal of housing 65% of students on campus. In 2028, I believe, we will be one of the largest residential campuses within the United States. The 100% is wishful but in reality, what we are aiming to provide at least 65%.
 - AW: Would like to encourage you and urge you, of 79,000 persons from 2010-2020, that 22,000 well over 25% directly attributable to faculty, students and staff at UCSD. Time to rethink that development plan and some difficult decisions might need to be made.
 - AD asked who the presentation was made by. AW responded he preferred to take the conversation off-line.
- Capital Improvement Projects – RC
 - GK is now the Chair but RC indicates they are working on safe access and safe crossing on Governor Genesee. If you want to get in touch with GK, we can further that conversation.
 - GK did get two people interested in supporting efforts related to CUP. If you are interested in getting involved, please let us know.
 - Bill Beck: Lights for Vista La Jolla, going to be changing districts and Joe LaCava was going to be funding with special fund.
 - RC: Have not received an update but will ask again.

6. Public Comment: Non-Agenda Items (2-minute limit).

- Tommy Hough:
 - His campaign doing a fundraiser with Sierra Club Sunday 2-4pm. Details on the website Tommyhough.com. Fundraiser in University City Sunday 22nd from 3-5pm for issues particularly important to the issues the South UC neighborhood. He is the candidate that will be defending single family zoning in South University City. We have good options for affordable housing in Mira Mesa and North Side of Miramar Road. Opposed to the rezoning proposal in South UC. Thank UCCA for the forum. Can all be accessed from the website.
- Diane Ahern:
 - Hello and good evening; it's Diane Ahern from University City Community Association two quick announcements:
 - Thank you so much to all you contributed to UCCA's "University City News" print newsletter. Much of this May issue features news and

thought-provoking articles about the University City community plan update. If you haven't had a chance to take a look at the print version, I'll put a link to the PDF version in the chat

- <https://www.universitycitynews.org/ucca-newsletter-archives/>

- Guest columnists for May included the planning department, Andy Wiese, Debby Knight, Jane L. Glasson, Kent Lee, Tommy Hough, Jennifer Martin-Roff, Richard Carson, Aidan Lin, Helen Lebowitz, Lisa Perry, Ron Belanger, Jayna Lee, Roger Cavanaugh, Katie Rodolico, Matty Wuest, and Chris Nielsen. Many thanks to all our community contributors, volunteers, and advertisers.
- UCCA will host a public meeting via Zoom on Wednesday, May 11, at 6 p.m. Our focus will be housing legislation, proposals, and options; and presentations by ElderHelp and the Humane Society about the new Park Patrol.
- You'll find more information on UCCA's UniversityCityNews.org website
- Kent Lee:
 - Candidate running for SD Council in District 6, have had a lot of conversation with folks here. There will be a few meet-and greets in the University community. Many have heard me discuss that housing is a crisis in the SD region but most important is how we implement housing, where, and how we look at density. Not just haphazardly doing it. Understand there's been a sense of frustration with how the City has been handling communications. Would love to chat with many of you. I am someone who has spent quite a bit of time within the month or two about why the city is trying to implement this housing policy - what's driving it.
- Barry Bernstein:
 - Double down on what Diane said, the newsletter was super. 4th of July celebration is a wonderful community event so come join us.

7. Action Item: PTS 0683552 Conditional Use Permit 98-0533 renewal, the Stars & Stripes car wash and convenience store with gas station, located at Miramar and Eastgate Mall. The convenience store sells beer and wine, requiring a CUP. No additional development or change in hours of operation is requested. Process 3. Vince Kattoula, Kattoula & Associates, presenting.

- CN introduces the item. Vince Kattoula represents ownership of stars and stripes car wash and convenience store with gas station. Has car wash and detail along with a gas station, located at the Northeast Corner of Miramar and Eastgate mall. Convenience store sells beer requiring a conditional use permit. No development or change is requested with this use permit application. Typically, CUP are required for take away liquor, wine or beer. Purpose of expiration is to allow community to weigh in on poorly performing stores from a community standpoint.
- Vince Kattoula presented the request for a renewal of the CUP issued in 1999. SDPD has recommended approval for the renewal and there has been no alcohol related issues at this site at all.

- Questions:
 - AW: Understand there are underlying covenants on the property that the department of defense may hold that restrict certain types of uses. Does the covenant restrict the use of the site for the uses or the ways you have to operate the business?
 - Vince: The covenant is for a developmental covenant; we are required to notify the federal government of the application and have not heard from them.
- Motion to Approve as presented: Jon Arenz, Andy Wiese second.
 - *Motion passes unanimously. (Yes: 13. No: 0. Abstain:0.)*

8. Information Item: City of San Diego Engineering & Capital Projects Department's citywide pipeline replacement program to replace the ageing infrastructure of the water distribution system and the sewer collection system. In Council District 1, specifically in the University City community, the E&CP Dept. currently has in design the AC Water & Sewer Group 1048. Alex Sleiman and Santiago Crespo, presenting.

- CN introduces item
- Alex Sleiman, Deputy City Engineer, presents the capital improvement project coming into the area which is a water and sewer main replacement.
- Santiago Crespo who is the Project Manager to go into the details of the project. The project will replace approximately 3,205 LF of water mains with a 16-inch PVC along Genesee. The project will also replace approximately 11,960 LF of sewer mains with 8 inch and 12-inch PVC mains.
- Construction Timing is approximately 2 years 5 months. Starting February of 2023, completing July 2025.
- Questions:
 - Katie Rodolico: How does this fit Pure Water construction on Genesee?
 - Alex: Same construction management team, so we don't overlap construction at this location. Tentatively scheduled to start working in March 2023, but their schedule is much more fluid than ours. Setting up our contract in such a way that we will be in before them and Pure Water will come afterwards.
 - AW: How deep are the holes?
 - Santiago/Alex: Water Main on Genesee will be 5' to 7'. For sewer generally they are 9' but in some areas existing pipes are 20' deep.
 - AW: On any given block how long does construction take?
 - Alex: comment specifically on this project, but traditional we expect 200-500 feet per week. There are a lot of unknowns that exist under the streets.
 - AW: What is the proposal for water main replacement at end of Rose Canyon? What about Huggins way, one goes down very steep area?
 - Santiago/Alex: Just ends at the street, doesn't go into the canyon at all. That will rehab close to the train tracks and just doing rehab where a

liner inside the pipe that extends the service life of the pipe without having to excavate it.

- LB: Is this the beginning for replacement in all University?
 - We have another project west of Genesee; this is the first one in this specific area.
- Katie Rodolico: Is the work similar where there were open trenches but they put plates down? It was disruptive but we were able to get in and out of the houses.
 - Sounds similar to the project, where we would have trenches and they would be plated. Residents would have ability to get in and out.
- KMar: What about areas south of Governor? Have those already been replaced? Will this rotate around the neighborhood?
 - Alex: there are these two projects then there is a pipeline rehabilitation project but believe that is targeted West of Genesee South of Governor but that is only sewer main rehabilitation (5 years out) beyond that, don't have much information on new CIPs coming out.
- Bill Beck: is there anything happening North of Nobel?
 - Santiago: No.

9. Action Item: AB361 provisions for ongoing UCPG virtual meetings. A vote will be required each month to authorize the next meeting to be held virtually. Public health reasons must be cited. The room at 10300 Campus Pointe Drive (our previous in-person venue) is available. A decision between zoom and in-person will have to be made. A hybrid meeting may be possible but there is no assurance of this. Chris Nielsen, presenting.

- Room available, not certain a hybrid will be possible. In the meantime. Board can discuss and authorize one type of meeting or another:
 - Cheryl Stigall: It needs to be both even if the meeting has to be put off (comment specific to the Subcommittee meetings)
 - NR: Joined UCPG during pandemic, prior meetings when they were in person, it was only live no call in or video?
 - CN: Correct
 - Bill Beck: Will people attending the in-person meeting be asked to show identification of being vaccinated and be required to wear masks? The room gets crowded. I don't want to put my life in jeopardy. Do feel if we do something to make sure everyone is vaccinated, we need to do things to protect ourselves.
 - JA: Until we can ensure have a virtual component, need to keep it virtual, having both is great. Yesterday, was in close contact with someone with Covid, so to keep everyone safe this for the time being is still the way to do it.
 - CN this is why I don't decide this unilaterally and we need to discuss. It makes sense when you choose to go to an event, but in this case where it is somewhat required it is something to discuss. These are all valid points. Perhaps we ought to take a vote and decide where the board feels we are on this.
- CN: Motion to continue virtually in June and will discuss from there / 2nd Steve Pomerene.

- *Motion passes unanimously. (Yes: 13. No: 0. Abstain:0.)*

10. Action Item: Community Planning Group change proposals from Councilmember LaCava's office. Roger Cavnaugh will present the latest information on these proposals based on discussion at the last CPC meeting.

- CN introduces the item RG to present on the item.
- RC on 26th CPC meeting, filled in for Chris. 2 items of particular importance:
 - One sent as board members an email with documents that outlined some of the issues on Planning Group Reform.
 - The other item of interest at CPC had to do with the Climate Action Program and City staff presented a new set of GHG regulations and Climate Consistency Regulations. They approved those 23-2-2. Did not send information on that process since there is a lot of detail, may be better to digest the more important issue of planning group reform this evening and then look at Climate Action Program – it is significant and there is detail in the proposals that were approved and were some changes to how the City approaches Climate Action. Bottom line is we will be required to look more carefully about how projects comply or do not comply with Climate Action Goals – which are pretty demanding because overall goal is net zero carbon emissions GHG by 2025. Proposals were presented to Planning Commission on May 5th will provide a link to the YouTube recording, that summary is more digestible so will outline that on a follow up email. If you didn't get the email, please send the email to Chris or Andy and they will get that to RC.
 - Planning Group reform based on idea there is limited representation of the community so built into the reform are several things that will hopefully open the planning group to more representation. Something that is a little problematic, because north of rose canyon is a lot of renters. Renters be represented according to their population which means a real change, since most are homeowners on the board. What I like about what Joe has done, there's flexible that we may not get a lot of representation from renters and make a good faith effort and we need to document that. Nothing provides any incentive to serve on the board and questions have been raised as to whether people will serve on the board because of the proposed changes including the membership qualifications for voting and sitting for office now no longer require any attendance. \$500 stipend not enough to run a website – city will post websites but wants to separate them from us for legal reasons so their support may be limited. Is this really a poison pill? Are developers pushing this? It is sort of a moot point for us since it requires that we function differently.
- Next Steps:
 - June 2022: Land Use and Housing Vote

- July 2022: Council Hearing
- Summer 2023: Deadline for CPGs to apply for recognition under the updated CP 600-24 by filing organizational documents
- Winter/Spring 2023: city council to grant recognition under updated CP 600-24
- Discussion:
 - Bill Beck: If you require renters, what does that do to the makeup of the board. How many on the board? How many from each group? I could see the group becoming almost double in size:
 - RC: total size somewhat flexible, representation needs to follow “a good faith effort” to recruit people who are renters. My personal experience is 9/10 people to become members are homeowners and renters know about the existence of the board and don’t care, there are exceptions of course. Joe seemed to suggest he knew what we were getting into and that we couldn’t force people to run for the board. So, we are in a bit of a bind, so if we document the effort and make the effort, we will have representation from renters but probably not in proportion to the role in the population.
 - CN: Joe’s basic comment was we’ll know it when we see it. Which is not helpful when you want a set of rules to know if you’re meeting something or not meeting something. He wants to see the effort across the city to make an attempt to implement the rules and things will evolve over time.
 - Diane Ahern: question about Brown Act, if all changes go through, will planning group still be held to the Brown Act?
 - RC: Yes, and the need for training remain at a higher bar.
 - Diane: UCCA does produce a newsletter but we are volunteers and do not follow the Brown Act, I don’t know if we UCCA can guarantee that we public information in a timely manner as required by the Brown Act, would hate to mess up something because we missed it in a timely manner.
 - CN: most important thing is the posting of agenda. City will host agenda posting on their website.
 - Katie Rodolico: newsletter does not go widely in the North UC area, so not sure that is necessarily a perfect fit. Also, as UCCA member, paying member and those fees are not necessarily for UCPG items. So, they would have to manage that. Would the city post minutes? Agenda used to get posted in the library: will that still happen?
 - CN: Do not believe that is part of the proposal. The stipend given could contribute to the management. Posting in the library is probably good form, its not required because we are virtual but will probably go back to posting those proactively.
 - RC: Because we have to do outreach, we can look to other venues to post these agendas. Explore help from news media and planning district to see

- if we can find some people who are sensitive to our needs and willing to be part of the process to increase the reach of the planning group.
- AW: Does RC have recommendation for the board? They are requesting feedback from us, did you come with a set of recommendations as amendments?
 - RC: Yes:
 - Size of the stipend, it won't work for a planning group in a low-income neighborhood to have a \$500 stipend. City will provide some venues so those planning groups don't have to rent facilities, but to run your own website, \$500 not going to do it. Ask for that to be fundamentally reconsidered
 - Affirm the fact that indemnification is going to continue, free to act without looking over our shoulder about legal consequences.
 - Issue of appeal continue to be free for planning groups. Or add to the stipend. Will be more important given the housing crisis being in conflict with those who want to build without taking community needs into account.
 - Say to Joe and Council that we need flexibility in membership, we may not have the proportion of renters that we would like or the city would like to see. If we can vote in members to fill those places, that would be a win-win for everyone.
 - Staffing: City will continue to staff with city officials but may not be able to do that all of the time. Having a city representative from council or planning department is really important. Recommend some city representation no matter what so we can have a more informed discussion.
 - AW: Is this an action item?
 - CN: It is but we could turn this into a letter with meaningful suggestions.
 - AW: willing to make a to include the recommendations from RC mentioned in a letter and maybe a few more:
 - City provides a stipend that allows these groups to function around the City and certain technical support for virtual meetings. Financial or technical
 - City to continue to host the minutes and agendas as a matter of transparency and record keeping.
 - Add that CPC be continued
 - AW: in terms of bylaws, allocation of seats to private entities and institutions. Has that been addressed as part of the suggested changes? Or will writing of bylaws of membership of non-residents.
 - RC: this issue is touched upon but seems to be some discretion for planning groups to add those kinds of memberships
 - CN: does not make mention about allocation of seats in the community. It tells us what the City thinks we ought to have across the city but doesn't say business seats or anything like that – it is silent on that.

- AW: Fundraising and funding question: CPG will have to fund themselves. Costs for zoom meetings/hybrid meetings, will it include the capacity to take donations or raise money?
 - CN: believe is allowed under the current rules and should be continued under the future rules. No prohibitions.
 - RC: providing a free bank account to community groups, direction is to have an account that money is raised goes into the account.
 - AW: How much is in the account?
 - CN: We have a \$500 credit with the city. We spend money and get reimbursed.
- KMar: do think its important to maintain flexibility with renters, but think it is really important that we try. Hope the flexibility doesn't come in the form of lip service – there needs to be an effort to do that. Should represent everyone in the planning group area not just people who can afford to purchase homes. Need to have hybrid meetings, difficult for people with young children, people who have jobs. If we make an effort to diversify members of the boards, hybrid option is desirable.
- Debby Knight: think it's good to have to sign up with some deadline before the vote because trying to sign everyone up before signing up doesn't seem that onerous. Is there an attendance requirement for serving on the board?
 - CN: none
 - Debby: that seems odd to me that you've never attended and then you can run, seems rather bizarre. That is a hard and fast requirement under the new CPG regulations, you just have to assume it doesn't happen in a way that harms the operations of the CPG. Written partially to destroy planning groups, Joe has tried to corral them so they don't totally destroy planning groups? is there any mechanism to review if it destroys planning groups? Does anyone care besides Joe?
 - CN: It is uncharted territory; we are going to end up with something we just don't know what it is.
 - Debby: Will CPG continue? If multiple planning groups fall apart to be able to unite together would be a good resource.
 - CN: Yes
- AW Motion for Chair to draft letter with the following recommendations:
 - Increase size of the stipend
 - Affirm indemnification will continue
 - Appeals continue to be free for planning groups
 - Provide for flexibility in membership following good faith effort
 - Request City to continue to staff planning group with city staff
 - Financial or technical support provided to support virtual meetings
 - City to continue to host the minutes and agendas as a matter of transparency and record keeping.

- CPC be continued
- *Motion passes unanimously (Yes-11 No-0 Abstain -0)*
 - *Note: JS and RRW dropped off prior to the vote on this item.*

Other discussion:

- Bill Beck: question on status of Seritage project?
 - CN: No update
- CN: Update on Costa Verde. Will you be prepared to do info item in June?
 - SP: Would like to defer since the project is in the works. Will be on vacation in June, could schedule in July.

11. Adjournment: Next Meeting will be on June 14, 2022, held via virtual meeting pursuant to Item 9 above.