

## UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

Meeting Minutes  
Hybrid Meeting  
February 9, 2024

### 1. Call the Meeting to Order: Chris Nielsen, Chair. Chair CN at 6:07 pm

- CN: Starting recording. This is the UCPG meeting for February 13<sup>th</sup>
- (Directors present, directors absent)

Sasha Treadup (ST) Y Y

Fay Arvin (FA) Y Y

Georgia Kayser (GK) Y Y

Karen Martien (KM) Y Y

Joann Selleck (JS) Y Y

Chris Nielsen (CN) Y Y

Carol Uribe (CU) Y Y

Jon Arenz Y Y

Linda Bernstein (LB) Y N

Andy Wiese (AW) Y \_

Neil de Ramos (NR) Y Y

Anna Bryan (AB)

Kristin Camper (KC)

Amber Ter-Vrugt (ATV)

Anu Delouri (AD)

Nancy Graham (NG-City of SD Planning).

Petr Krysl (PK)

Andrew Parlier (AP)

Carey Algaze (CA)

Isabelle Kay (IK)

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

- **CN:** Any additions/deletions to the agenda? None raised. Agenda passes by acclamation.

**4. Approval of Minutes: January 9, 2024 minutes.**

- **CN:** Any changes to minutes?
- **CN:** None given.
- **JA:** Motion to approve.
- **AW:** Seconded.
- **CN:** Minutes are approved unanimously.

**5. Announcements: Chair's Report, CPC Report**

- **CN:** The Tentative Map Waiver for the Aventine property along La Jolla Village Drive that was continued from the November UCPG meeting still has not yet been rescheduled.
- A prospective double-tracking proposal affecting MHPA and Open Space in the LOSSAN rail corridor in the eastern portion of our Plan Area. Currently waiting for SANDAG to reply to the Parks and Recreation Department. Both sides of this back-and-forth exchange are desired so the committee can be well informed. We expect to see this project tentatively scheduled for March.
- No news on Alexandria project. They have requested a three-year time extension. This item is also tentatively scheduled to come before the BOD in March.
- Three Tower Nobel Drive/Cargill project- for which a height greater than 95 feet requires a process-2 decision from the UCPG does not yet have a date for review. It is unclear which points of the project will be reviewed. Expected to be 10-12 months for assessment.
- The Planning Department is still reviewing our governance documents. May is anticipated for approval by Land Use and Housing Department, then followed by Planning Commission.
- Chris Calls for 3 volunteers to help Anu with the March 12th elections. Or counting ballots. 5-8 PM March 12th. Volunteers to be selected during Agenda Item:

**6. Presentations:**

- **Councilmember Kent Lee**

- **Zach:** Kent Lee wishes all a happy year of Dragon. All are welcome to the Tet festival. Council member will have a booth staffed Friday Evening, and Sat-Sun ALL DAY
- **Zach:** No cost dumpster day, by signup March 2nd - Timeslots and location disclosed on flyer. This is organized in partnership with the UCCA and EDCO. Info is on website and on the flyer.
- **Zach:** Thanks to all who came for the Police Chief Search Forum.
- **CN:** For those interested, there is also a Miramar Location that takes e-waste at low prices.
- **AD:** Membership Report. Anu says no updates. Discussion will take place during agenda item 7.
- **CN:** No planning department report.
- No Michaela.
- No Tasha Boerner office.
- No Mark Schaeffer.from Brian Jones office.
- None from Terra Lawson Remer's office.
- No Ali from Scott Peter's office.
- Kristen Camper from MCAS Miramar is present:
- **KC:** Thanks to all who sent me condolences from the crashed helicopter carrying marines.
- There will be a tour hosted on the 23rd. For those interested email Kristin, there are only two spots left.
- The new C.O. for Miramar has been selected. Col. Robert Herman. Taking command July 26th. Community members are invited to the change of command ceremony. Currently he is at the Pentagon in DC. He was briefly at HQ Squadron in Miramar a few years ago- the squadron is its own Admin branch that manages training for Marines. The col. is an EA 6 pilot, those aircraft are not hangered at Miramar.
- **CN:** Was Col. Bedell here when Col. Carmen was stationed here?
- **KC:** I don't think so. Although they do know one another.
- **CN:** We don't have a CIP subcommittee report. Nick Reed is not on the call.

## **7. Public Comment: Non-Agenda Items (2-minute limit).**

- **CN:** Open for Public Comment.

- **Statement from Anne Marie Groves**– Do I understand correctly that Alexandria asked for a 3-year extension on the Costa Verde project? Will the site sit, the mess that it is for another three years? It's taking too long.

**8. Candidate's Forum: Candidates who have announced their candidacy for a UCPG board seat in the March 12 election may give a two-minute candidate statement. Candidates may participate in person or via zoom.**

- **CN:** Let's move to our Candidates Forum
- **CN:** List of candidates are as follows.
- **GK:** I'm Georgia Kayser a resident of UC running for R1B. I have children in public elementary school here: Spreckels. I am an Asst. Professor for the school of public health of UCSD. I am running to preserve the aspects of UC that make it enjoyable for its residents.
- **GK:** I want to build a stronger safer healthier community for us and our children.
- **GK:** I participate in community events through my kids' events.
- **GK:** My #1 priority is open space preservation.
- **GK:** Want to see the Plan Update reflect the goals we have for our children and for governor drive be a safer place for our kids.
- **GK:** I care about air quality, public planning and how our spaces are being use to improve human health.
- **JS:** I am Joann Selleck
- **JS:** I am running for re-election as R2B district. I have served for the past 6 years on UCPG. I continue to wish to do so for however long I'm eligible. I have learned a tremendous amount about planning and development.
- **JS:** Democracy is Messy and there's no occasion to abandon it.
- **CN:** Alex Arthur is not here. I will request a candidate statement from him as an R3B candidate.
- **CN:** For R2C, we have an open seat previously held by Isabelle Kay who is termed out.
- **DE:** Hello, I'm Daren Esposito.
- **DE:** I have lived in UTC since 2021 and plan to stay for a long time.
- **DE:** I love the neighbors, dog parks, and easy access to shopping centers.
- **DE:** I'm a lawyer and I have a collaborative approach.
- **TG:** Tim Garret:
- **TG:** R2C- I work as a regional planner at SANDAG. Not representing my employer.

- **TG:** I'm a graduate/ master's student.
- **TG:** I'm joining to support making safer, sustainable success.
- **TG:** I want dignified to use public spaces and without fear of being hit by a car.
- **TG:** I am a biker. I want safer routes. Especially Nobel Drive.
- **TG:** I want to encourage Developers to make great spaces.
- **TG:** Vision for community for future residents. UC offers great access to jobs etc.
- **TG:** Maximizing opportunities close to daily destinations, have healthy social and fulfilling lives.
- **CN:** Candidates, please email your statements to me if you haven't already done so.
- **Debbie Knight-** Doesn't one have to have attended by tonight to vote?
- **CN:** Procedural clarification. No, one does not have to have attended previously to vote in the upcoming election. One does have to live in the sub area to vote. Not all members must be homeowners, all residents may vote. Renters are encouraged.
- **CN:** Can I get three volunteers for the subcommittee. Thank you for volunteering: Niel De Ramos, Nancy Groves, Sasha Treadup and Jeff Dosick.
- **CN:** Chris will send out election procedures in 1.5 weeks. Same as last time. Drop offs at community Ballot Box. (Only available during Library Open Hours), Balloting will close at 7pm on Monday prior. Anyone can vote. Registration is not required in advance but must be done at time of voting. Voting starts on Monday the 4th of March. Ballots are available online. CITY's agenda page for UCPG or beside the box.
- **CN:** To be a candidate one must join by tonight. And voting must be in person if one is not registered. The guidance we received was that Planning Group rules can't be stricter than CA voting procedures.
- **CN:** That was the only change from the by-laws.
- **CN:** Voting closes at 8pm on the 12th.

**9. Action Item: Approval of a resolution to ask for a 60-day comment period for comments on the upcoming Draft Environmental Impact Report for the revised Community Plan Update for the University Community. Chris Nielsen, presenting.**

- **CN:** A revised community plan draft update comment period, specifically applies to draft EIR.
- **CN:** For Environmental Impact Report- CEQA, a minimum duration for comment is 45 days. I have made a comment that 60 days is more appropriate.
- **CN:** I open the floor for discussion:

- **AW:** I am in favor of this motion. A request for 2-week extension to comment should not be a hardship for the city which has delayed this period by 5 years. This will give us more flexibility for our own calendar.
- **AW:** This timeframe gives three weeks until next UCPG meeting, but seven weeks to the following meeting. And the meeting after that would be beyond comment period. Two meetings is required to get to comment.
- **AW:** Two documents will be analyzed. Draft plan (200+) pages plus 47-page UCPG report and Draft EIR (a few thousand pages) Even a few hundred pages requires time to read and digest. We want enough time to receive public comment, get comment from the subcommittee, incorporate it into a report. Comment on the Draft plan as well as on the draft EIR. Doing it in 60 days would allow us to review without holding special meetings. We as a group are volunteers. This work will be done in our spare time for the community. I would be happy to hear what other people think.
- **CN:** We will help people understand how to review Draft EIR- Details are in Appendices.
- **JS:** Do you know if the city's response will incorporate any other city or housing development plans. For our 4+ years of work. With upcoming Graduations, Wedding Season, Summer, I am concerned that 45 days is too short. Joann advocates for 90 or 120 days.
- **NR:** Why only 60 days?
- **CN:** 45 days is nominal. It's not uncommon to request an extension of 15 days.
- **Kerry Santoro:** As a former DSD employee; the 15-day extension is driven by it being a private application on a development timeline. That's why they don't usually grant longer periods. Since there is no applicant losing time and money here, based on a schedule like typically found in a development environment it is reasonable to ask for an extension
- **Debbie Knight:** Sept 2018 start- It's been 5.5 years since the start of this process. It will be a tremendous amount of work even for those who have been extended to 90 days.
- **Debbie Knight:** The EIR will have technical documents, biology, water quality, noise impact. There will be a lot to review.
- **Debbie Knight:** told us that they were going to embed our draft EIR inside an even bigger EIR which is Blueprint San Diego. Which is a city-wide revision to the general plan. Therefore, we will need to be able to look at the entire blown out scope of changes which previously has never revised something of this scope. 60 days is short. And even that seems almost disrespectful to disregard public input after such a long and hard effort by communities.

- **CN:** Blueprint San Diego has not been approved. It keeps changing, but as far as Chris is aware from CPC discussion Blueprint is tabled until Spring in another draft form.
- **AW:** I support 90 days, which feels like a lifeline.
- **JS:** Motions to make a 90 day, and to specify and summarize some of the points mentioned above. Anna Seconds motion.
- **CN:** No further discussion.
- **CN:** Call to vote: All those in favor of asking for a 90-day comment period.
- None opposed. Motion carries unanimously. Twelve to zero.
- 1) Sasha Treadup Y
- 2) Fay Arvin Y
- 3) Georgia Kayser Y
- 4) Karen Martien Y
- 5) Joann Sellick Y
- 6) Chris Neilsen Y
- 7) Carol Uribe Y
- 8) John Arentz Y
- 9) Linda Bernstein Y
- 10) Andy Wiese Y
- 11) Niel De Ramos Y
- 12) Anna Bryan Y

**10. Information Item: Pure Water Project Construction Update. Sarah Bowles and Clem Weissenberg, Presenting**

- **CW:** Current area of work is Towne Center Drive. From 7am to 5:30pm. Right now, we are working in front of Excalibur and shifted traffic control to the south. Now installing pipe between Towne center and renaissance.
- **CW:** See slide of Golden haven and Towne Center Drive. This area was paved the day before the big rains.
- **CW:** Genesee Ave north of Governor. Daytime work from 7 to 5:30. Southbound lanes are close. A single lane of traffic proceeds on northbound side. Student Gate will be closed in AM to avoid traffic. In coordination with UCHS. In the afternoon the gate is open for students to leave.
- **CW:** So far not one single tree has had to be removed due to damage to roots. All trees in median have been saved up to this point.
- **CW:** Here is a slide of our Tunneling Work taken from the San Clemente Parking lot. Today they poured the slab in the bottom of the launching shaft. And they are now starting to dig the receiving shaft. The contractor is modifying

the tunneling machine to be able to accommodate the much harder ground than anticipated. You can reach us @PureWaterSD on social media.

- **Dianne Ahern:** Thank you and may I remind everyone that the UCCA newsletter covers this each month!
- **LB:** Why were both lanes closed on Sunday.
- **Answer from all:** There was a fatal car accident.
- **KM:** Thank you for striping and including the bike lane with better marking. The dotted line that used to separate the two lines is still there.
- People are still trying to stay to the right. It was painted over with black, but it still looks like there's a white dotted line. Can the ground be removed, or can matte black paint be applied to address the shine/glare problem.
- **Clem:** We will take another look at it. The rain seems like it didn't help unfortunately, and the paint wore off much faster than anticipated.
- **CM:** Scrubbing off the old white paint seems helpful comment. Thanks Karen.
- **CM:** Everett Houser, Program Manager at city transportation department, has been asked to present on restriping to take place at completion of Pure water.
- **Everett:** We coordinate with as many resurfacing opportunities as we can. We like to bundle with pipelines which have nice long corridors. This gives us a big opportunity to enhance and update striping in the city streets. Many updated to class 4 bikeways.
- **Everett:** Improving bikeways is a council priority.
- **Everett:** See the image of existing bike network.
- **Everett:** Here is a map of different bike class types. The city is moving toward implementing more separative bikeways. Or Class 4 separated bikeways. Towne Center Drive shown, without striping. This will make connections from LJ Village Dr.
- **Everett:** Nobel will also get bike lanes with buffer.
- **Everett:** Genesee will have lanes rite-sized, and posts will separate the bike lane from traffic. Two more years of piping installation and resurfacing.
  
- Questions:
- **KM:** 4 questions.
- **KM:** First, our big concern (top CIP priority) Intersection at Genesee and Governor.
- **KM:** Will the restriping plan include bike boxes and if not specifically for each intersection, why not.
- **Everett:** Sometimes there are regulations via Traffic Dept.- Across Left Turning lanes. Which requires a countdown timer on the other leg of the



intersection. Oftentimes pockets or thru lanes allows people to get out of the turning lanes. Also, in this case we only get North South, not East West.

- **KM:** Will you include bike boxes at north and south?
- No, I believe we have bike through pockets. Separated from the turning lanes.
- Bike Boxes are used when there's not enough space between through and right.
- There are places in our community plan that shows the type of bike box that I'm proposing.
- Countdown is required only if it's in the ...
- The community plan shows photos with bike pocket AND bike box.
- **KM:** Question 2:
- Can we see the whole restriping plan. Yes, we've been coordinating with the pure water team, waiting on some curb ramp. We want to see the draft before it's finalized.
- **EH:** Yes, we can work out a way to share this
- **KM:** Question 3:
- There is a section of Nobel where there is no bike lane. Why.
- **Everett:** Nobel is not resurfacing between Via Ramblas and Towne Center- One half of the street.
- Yes, so there will be a block long gap until the next resurfacing opportunity. Timeframe indefinite for that.
  
- **CN:** Katie Rodolico is recognized:
- **KR:** I notice you have bike lanes between regents and Governor at a higher class.
- Are you considering revising this because there are schools with. Katie prefers share lanes vs removing traffic lanes.
- **Debbie:** Thank you I was interested in this. Your conclusion about Nobel drive is exactly the point that I have been trying to discuss with the city. They show protected bike lanes all over our plan with no way whatsoever to implement them. Wait until a developer is doing a project to redo the bike lane. Ridiculous for a bike lane to disappear just because there is no mechanism to provide bike lanes.
- **Kelly Lindon** on Zoom:
- I'm curious if we see the entire plan, my question would be answered. I'm glad to see protected bike lanes. Are there any sections that currently have street parking and how do they coordinate with car parking?
- **EH:** Bikeway designed with floating parking. Nobel drive will have some parking spots removed.
- **JS:** 2 comments and a request.

- **JS:** How will the city put in plans to develop bike lanes? That means that it is a complete fiction that a Nobel Drive bikeway will ever be fully continuous with bike lanes.
- **JS:** My request: I think it's important to have regular posting by the city indicating that there is no parking in Bike lanes. There is no signage whatsoever along Palmilla?
- **Everett:** Please report if a sign got knocked over via our 'Get it Done' App. We combine efforts with resurfacing.
- Capital projects also are not a full answer.
- Nobel slurry west of Genesee
- Regents has slurry that fills in gaps and bikeways. The city is always a moving entity.
- **Tim Garret:** Everett thanks for the presentation. I appreciate the city taking initiative. What are the material choices for the posts demarking bike lanes? Is there any opportunity for using stronger material that would actually protect bikers?
- Question 2 and Bus Stops.
- **Everett:** Interim Material would be used- the softer posts. Once the space is allocated. Maybe it could get an upgrade to an ABC dike?
- **Everett:** Lastly, bus stops and fire hydrants will be open.
- **Everett:** With this kind of quick builds, it's still busses to the curb access.
- **CN:** Everett has been asked to stay for Agenda item 11: Chris brings up a google map.
- **CN:** Jeff Dosick, please explain La Jolla Village Drive Northbound and the complexities of that situation.
- **CN:** Please explain the ins and outs of this segment of Towne Center Drive, heading north to La Jolla Village drive.
- **Jeff Dosick:** Two straight, two left two right, and the bike lane has disappeared.
- **Jeff Dosick:** There are two Killing Points here- The bike lane disappeared heading north. And until we can have another build, I would say that one of those lanes needs to be converted to a bike lane so it can continue onward.
- **Jeff Dosick:** One major project on Town Center Drive. It's 1300 cars coming into this area. They want to reduce the vehicle miles travel as part of meeting city metrics. If we can't have a safe intersection here then 7 to 10 percent of the city's prospective bike traffic will never happen.
- **Jeff Dosick:** During morning and afternoon rush hours these roads are very busy for cars. If there are no dedicated bike lanes, an everyday (Towne Center View project) People who would be coming from eastbound because Eastgate

mall is no longer a viable bike commuter because of all the turn lanes that got put in there. The only viable route is through Nobel.

- **Jeff Dosick:** Until we have more funding to resurface or rebuild. One of those lanes needs to be a bike lane. I think the best one would be one straight to the right. Keep it as a bike lane.
- **Everett:** “Comment noted”
- **Jeff Dosick:** Nobel Drive and Towne Center.
- From the east: Three Roots Housing Development. Which increases traffic.
- **Jeff Dosick:** If there’s no bike network, then they’re stuck in their cars. This route is about access to the trolley. Nobel is the only way to get to the trolley and to UCSD from the Three Roots neighborhood.
- **Jeff Dosick:** Nobel is the only viable route going over the freeway to get this area.
- **Jeff Dosick:** I’m stressing this to achieve the numbers of bike riders that the City wants, the segment that Chris is pointing out does not and won’t have a bike lane.
- **Everett:** We work with Slurry and we also work with a “Stat Program” and we can do off-cycle installations via work order.
- **CN:** the parking along here will be removed.
- **Sasha:** I don’t have a car. This is my route. I have almost been hit here many times. I want to add my voice in support of my neighbors and thank them for their efforts to improve bike safety. I strongly support improved bike lane striping and safety along Nobel drive.
  
- **CN:** I make a motion for this Northbound recommendation of two left lanes, one center lane, one bike lane, and two right turn lanes, left to right.
- Via las Ramblas to Towne Center- recommend an offsite work order to implement the bike lane removing parking so that the bike lane is continuous.
- Seconded by Karen:
- **CN:** No further discussion? Motion Passes 9 to 1 (LB) with no abstentions.
- **GK:** Am I to understand that where we have non continuous bike lanes, we should be making these specific requests?
- **CN:** we need to understand what can be achieved by this.

**11. Action item: RideSD will present SANDAG's Automated People Mover (APM) concept to connect Downtown with the airport: Compared to a downtown to airport Trolley, the APM will provide faster, more frequent, and more reliable trips between University City and the Airport as well as preserve the reliability of**

**the Mid-Coast Trolley. It will also be more cost-effective than the Trolley and attract higher ridership. RideSD is asking for a letter of support from the UCPG for this concept. Alex Wong, RideSD, presenting.**

- **Alex:** Today I'm going to talk about why the people mover is the city's best bet. First of all, we have two main airport rail connection concepts proposed by SANDAG. One of them is the airport trolley and the other is the people mover. In my opinion the airport trolley is not a great option because it only comes every 15 minutes. Whereas the Automated People Mover is the best choice because it comes every two minutes and that's world class in terms of convenience. So, the people mover means faster trips to the airport if you were travelling between Health La Jolla Stations and the airport.
- **Alex:** The Airport Trolley would take 28 minutes to Little Italy station, with  $\leq$  15-minute wait followed by a second leg of 8 minutes from Little Italy to the new Airport Station. The Airport trolley would result in a total trip time of 51 minutes.
- **Alex:** The People Mover would take 30 minutes to Santa Fe Depot, with  $\leq$  3-minute wait followed by a second leg of 8 minutes from Santa Fe to the new Airport Station. The Airport trolley would result in a total trip time of 41 minutes. A 10-minute savings.
- **Alex:** Why can't we have a direct connection? As you can see from the Trolley Map, the connections would be overlaid on top of existing trolley system and there wouldn't be any service that goes directly from UC to the Airport. One would still have to change trains in Little Italy. And to see why you would have to change trains there it's because the physical infrastructure as proposed (See image of Hawthorne Street Rail Underpass) does not allow for a rail wye. (See slide of 2021 Feasibility study showing underground Hawthorne Street connection via rail.) In order for there to be a direct connection from UC in the north, we would need a northern part of a wye. But if you look at MTS's proposal what they want is the southern connection only. Which is why the trip from UC will never be a one seat ride. There is also another problem with putting an airport train on the existing tracks, and you see the red line (new airport connection service) will share tracks with the existing green and blue line tracks, creating a bottleneck. That bottleneck limits the throughput of how many trains per hour the blue line can run. So why does that matter? Why does the maximum number of trains per hour matter? Because it controls the frequency of service. Suppose that the Trolley tracks can handle a maximum of 20 trains per hour per direction, which is a very optimistic projection. That translates to 3-minute frequencies. The maximum blue line frequency will be 7.5 minutes as shown in the table. Whereas with the People Mover the Blue line could run every 5 minutes. And the airport line built as an Airport Trolley would

run every 15 minutes, in contrast to the People Mover which could run every 2 minutes. The People Mover in essence translates to more options.

- **Alex:** As you know MTS announced it will increase trolley service frequency to 7.5 minutes between trains in June 2025. Blue Line ridership grew from 67K to 81K in 2023. And 7.5 Minute frequencies may not be enough to handle ridership growth. Considering the ridership growth in the past year, in the future you mean need 6- or 5-minute frequencies between trains. Especially when ridership is going to grow with NAVWAR redevelopment for the NAF megaproject. Another problem with the airport trolley being piggybacked on existing tracks is that it would make it vulnerable to delays. As you can see if the green or blue lines are delayed then the airport trolley is also delayed and that would make passengers late to the airport. And of course, green and blue lines are largely street sharing. They run through downtown so it's definitely prone to a lot of delays. Therefore, in order to provide a smooth, reliable, experience at the airport rail connection the airport connection must run on new tracks to avoid interfering with existing trolleys.
- **Alex:** There are two options for the second track. Of course you could simply double track, or rather I should say the entire section between downtown and airport should get a second pair of tracks, but of course you would still have the problem of high operating costs because of the staffing required to run those trains. Or you could change to the People Mover which is automated. And because of the lower operating costs, much more feasible to increase train frequency. People mover 1.57B Total Cost, Airport Trolley 1.35 B Total Cost. These are the Capital Costs- The Construction Costs- But you're paying a bit more for the people mover in order to automate it and save in the long-run on operating costs. But look at this in terms of cost per mile. The People Mover is actually cheaper than the airport trolley in this regard at 538M vs 709M
- **Alex:** And the daily ridership would be 19,000 vs 14,000 for the trolley.
- **Alex:** We will also be serving the Midway since midway is rising and will become a dense mixed-use neighborhood. Midway residents will make a lot of short trips. They don't really need to leave the area in order to work, shop and play. The shorter the trip the higher transit frequencies must be to entice riders because of course a 15-minute wait time for a 45 min train that's not bad but a 15-minute wait for a 5-minute ride is bad.
- **Alex:** Please read my OP-ED in San Diego Union Tribune in favor of the People Mover
- **Alex:** Here are some examples of People Movers used outside of airport environments.
- **Alex:** I ask for University CPG to support the People Mover in a letter to councilmember Woodburn.

- **CN:** Any Questions for Alex?
- **KM:** What is it about the people mover that enables it to run at a higher frequency?
- **Alex:** Because it's automated. And drivers are a big operating cost.
- **NR:** You mentioned costs. Does that funding include a people mover over all the way up to the La Jolla area?
- **Alex:** No, both transit options only go between downtown and airport. With potential to expand beyond to Midway.
- **LB:** Where is the funding coming from because I read that they had 350M towards this effort, which seems to be a good 1B dollars short, so where is the funding coming from? And would it be blocking any residential places?
- **Alex:** Yes, some residences may be impacted, but this benefits the entire region.
- 

UCPG declines to send letter to MTS Chair Whitburn, saying we need more information.

**12. Adjournment: 9:05 PM. *Next Meeting will be on March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2024, in- person at 9880 Campus Pointe Drive, third floor, Terra Nova Conference Room and on Zoom. This will be a hybrid meeting both in-person and on Zoom.***