

CAMPUS/COMMUNITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of February 21, 2019 Meeting

PRESENT

Tara Cameron
Ramona Ferreira
David Hickman
John Hughes
Russ King
Marlene Shaver
Charles Sprenger (co-chair)
Joel Watson
Cristy Winter

ABSENT

Adrian Borsa
Neal Devaraj
Tal Golan
Ken Hall
Jeff Kaplan (co-chair)
Noah Palafox
Keith Pezzoli
Frank Silva
Rand Steiger
Andrea Tao
David Traver

CAMPUS PLANNING STAFF

Robert Clossin
Todd Pitman
Ginger Stout

GUESTS/CONSULTANTS

John Bauer, Biological Sciences
Burgundy Fletcher, Graduate Student Association
Joel King, Design and Development Services
Robert Northrop, Capital Program Management

Business Item: Approval of Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the January 21th, 2019 meeting were unanimously approved without further comment.

Action Item: Three-Spined Stickleback Fish Facility Site Evaluation (Ginger Stout)

Ginger Stout presented the Three-Spined Stickleback Fish Facility Site Evaluation for information and potential site approval. Biological Sciences is requesting site approval for an approximately 960 sf pre-fabricated modular facility to be located on the south-east corner of the existing Biology Field Station (BFS), which lies north of the Campus Services Complex. The BFS is a multi-use research facility with an apiary, arable land, algae ponds, a frog house, and other laboratory space on site. The Facility would be

compatible with other research on site, and is needed for a new hire faculty researcher with an anticipated start date of November 1, 2019. The project would include 100 to 150 35-gallon fish tanks, a recirculating water system, a reverse-osmosis water treatment system, a small food-prep area, and a generator on the outside of the building.

The project is consistent with the Academic land use designation within the 2018 LRDP. No additional parking would be provided. Construction laydown and staging would happen within one-quarter acre at the Biology Field Station, and utility connections are proposed from the southeast corner of the BFS. The Facility is proposed to be 10 feet tall, or 11 feet, if photovoltaic panels are placed on top.

The project is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process, and is within the Coastal Zone so would require review for conformance with the California Coastal Act.

Construction is anticipated to begin in August of 2019.

The Committee asked if there is a neighborhood plan or guidelines for this area of campus. Robert Clossin answered no, and stated the proposed project is sited within a 3-4 acre biological research area, which is intended to be used for field research activities and evolves over time as new biological research advances. The Committee inquired about a management plan for the modular facility. John Bauer, from Biological Sciences, explained the facility is intended to remain for the duration of the faculty member's research that is on-going.

The Committee asked if the proposed site is a good location for the modular building. The Committee concluded this site is the most viable.

The Committee endorsed the site.

Information Item: Open Space Development Guidelines Update (Matthew McCreary)

Matthew McCreary introduced the Open Space Development Guidelines Update and mentioned this has been presented to Open Space Committee twice. Campus open space provides aesthetic, environmental, and economic benefits. The campus consists of 1,158 acres, of which 336 acres are protected Open Space Preserve (OSP). The 2004 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) identified 309 acres of 'Park', which included three separate categories: Ecological Reserve, Grove Reserve, and Restoration Lands. The 2018 LRDP identified an additional 27 acres for a total of 336 acres of distinct vegetation, topography, and geography, creating a fourth category: Urban Forest. Grove Reserve was changed to Historic Grove. Development within the OSP is restricted.

The 2018 LRDP estimates the campus population will increase by 16,750, to a total of 65,600 people by 2035. Adjustments to housing, dining, parking and mobility will be required. An estimated 8.9 million gross square feet of development is anticipated under the 2018 Long Range Development Plan. To help guide the growth, and to protect and enhance the OSP is paramount to protect the health and safety of campus users.

The existing guidelines were created in 1994 and dictate a policy of 'No Net Loss' to the OSP, and a 2:1 Tree Replacement within the Historic Grove. The existing 'No Net Loss' policy refers to the 'Park', and the only proposed change recommends updating each instance of 'Park' to 'Open Space Preserve'. The existing language for the 2:1 Tree Replacement refers to the 'Grove', and the proposed change is to update the language to say 'Urban Forest and Historic Grove'.

The Committee discussed the increase in Park/Open Space Preserve acreage between the 2004 and 2018 LRDP's, the majority of which was due to the inclusion of the Restoration Lands and Ecological Reserve surrounding the University House and through land-banking along Gilman Drive. Charles Sprenger inquired about the potential for banking more land in the future. Todd Pitman explained there may be opportunity along the campus edges or along I-5 near the Biology Field Station, or also at Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Sprenger is supportive of identifying lands that would benefit the OSP and future campus community members. Pitman discussed several topics, including existing buildings in the Historic Grove, improvement of Restoration Lands, and the concept of including public spaces like Revelle Plaza and The Wedge as a protected space, which don't truly fall into one of the OSP categories. Joel King asked if recreation fields should be captured more formally as open space, and Pitman mentioned it may be something to consider due to increasing density and development. Clossin reminded the Committee that Sports and Recreation is a designated land use in the 2018 LRDP and recreational fields are included in that. Joel Watson commented that these areas need to be identified in order to be protected.

The Committee discussed the idea of including language regarding the quality of the land included in the 'No Net Loss' policy, and not solely focusing on the square footage. Sprenger added the notion of replacing high value land with similar land, instead of lower quality land. Clossin mentioned that is the intention, but is not codified in the policy. Watson proposed to include language to address the quality of the land, and have the newly identified area be of higher value, or put in language that is less precise so the benefit to the campus is not diminished.

McCreary continued by sharing the development of housing and mixed-use areas within and surrounding Pepper Canyon (Urban Park under the Open Space Preserve), the complex and contextual elements surrounding the neighborhood may require reviewing existing development guidelines to enhance the health, safety, security, and accessibility within the Urban Forest (especially in this area of campus adjacent to the light rail transit (LRT) station).

Identified options for updated Urban Forest guidelines were discussed including creating an "Urban Park Overlay Zone" within portions of the Urban Forest adjacent to active public spaces by allowing paths, benches, and lighting.

Pitman shared that the Pepper Canyon Neighborhood is planned to be one of the more urban neighborhoods on campus, and safety will be a large factor. Proximity to housing, the amphitheater, and the LRT station in the middle will create a new type of campus neighborhood. Normally the campus does not install lighting and more formalized pathways through the OSP, however that may be necessary in Pepper Canyon. Existing conditions at Pepper Canyon are a disturbed open construction zone, and the

program or project for the space has not yet been determined. The design solution will return to the Committee at a later date at which point further discussion on the OSC implications will occur. John Hughes commented that it feels as if the OSP is being expanded and might need to have another designation. Watson and Cameron concurred and thought including the North Campus Wedge and rec fields into an additional category is a good idea. Russ King said the areas being discussed are each unique and may not fit into one specific category. The Committee discussed the potential for the canyon to serve as recreation area for the Pepper Canyon housing residents, but Joel King mentioned the Chancellor is pressing for outdoor rec and amenities proximate to housing. Through the project programming process, the area will be further refined and defined.

Information Item: Public Realm and Micro-Mobility Update (Todd Pitman)

Todd Pitman updated the Committee on the upcoming public realm projects and campus micro-mobility. The public realm improvements are in two categories: HDH locations, and Campus-wide locations. Three categories of improvements have been identified for each location: program, design, and mobility. The program aspect identifies spaces that would benefit from programming intervention and identification of who will manage the space. The design component identifies areas needing design interventions to be more desirable places. Mobility identifies public realm areas that would benefit from circulation and mobility improvements.

Several projects are in planning and design now, and 6 projects have received funding since the last update to this Committee. Revelle Plaza is currently underutilized. With the addition of Future College to the south, and the recent upgrade of 64 Degrees, the Plaza should be revived. A feasibility study is underway to identify what could be done and what the cost would be. Warren Mall has funding to improve the public realm on the west side, which was originally supposed to be improved with the Voigt Parking Structure. Town Square and Rupertus Lane will be improved with the Triton Pavilion project. Ridge Walk Phase 1 is fully funded and construction will begin later this year, with completion expected in early 2021. Feasibility is currently under way for Phase 2, which will include everything north of North Torrey Pines LLN up to North Point. Mobility improvements are a large portion of both phases of the Ridge Walk projects. Library Walk South, between Gilman Drive and Osler Parking Structure can be improved to create clear connections and intuitive movement to the center of campus.

Sprenger inquired if ideas are already proposed for the unfunded projects. Boundaries, existing conditions, and the possibilities have been identified for each of the projects. Cameron wondered why the Library Walk pattern would not be recreated to the south. Pitman described that it should be associated and complementary, but not necessarily identical. It's open to discussion, but Library Walk is an iconic landscape on campus.

Pitman described micro-mobility as the use of small, personal, manually or electrically powered wheeled devices used to travel short distances. Mobility across campus is an ever-changing entity, and with the reduction in parking, students are looking for alternate ways to get around, safely. Ridge Walk is a prime example of a thoroughfare with a robust mix of pedestrians and wheeled devices. Separated bicycle

lanes are proposed along Ridge Walk Phase 1, with 20 feet for pedestrian space, and a separate lane for bicycles which would include texture and color indicators.

Since the completion of Ridge Walk Phase 1 is two years away, several interim solutions include education and outreach through pop-ups and workgroup meetings, revised campus bike routes included on the campus map, and new signage and stencils on the ground indicating the paths are shared use and to always yield to pedestrians. The only current dismount zone on campus is along Library Walk but it's not enforced regularly.

The Committee discussed the idea of implementing speed limits, and the possibility of adding staff (FTE's) for enforcement. Pitman described the Arizona State University model which uses 10-20 FTE's for enforcement and their non-punitive approach: students are no longer allowed to enroll in classes if they receive three warnings. ASU has experienced over 90% compliance within their dismount zones. Noah Palafox thought 'Yield to Pedestrian' signs might help the situation, dismount zones are ineffective on this campus, and agrees that enforcement is the better solution. Hughes explained that in Pacific Beach residents understand how to use the devices and interact with each other, and he does not support punitive measures on campus. Burgundy Fletcher suggested requiring incoming students to watch an interactive video about shared use lanes during registration may be effective. Russ King mentioned the educational component is imperative. Micro-mobility training, natural punitive or non-punitive consequences, and regular enforcement, as well as a quantifiable level of safety were further discussed by the Committee. This topic will be recurring at this Committee.

This item concluded the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ginger Stout". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ginger Stout
Associate Planner