

I'm not sure whether it's the imminence of another hot spell, accumulated tension from the continuing pandemic (and the associated cabin fever), the approach of the election and especially of a new set of incomprehensible and probably misleading ballot initiatives, or what--but assembling LJCPA's September agenda has been, let's say, a bit different than usual, in part because everyone seems a bit, let's say, testy.

Since various folks have only seen various parts of the process, and we should all be on the same page, I thought it useful to summarize how Thursday's agenda evolved and why. The Brown Act being what it is--and hey, there's another reason for testiness!--I'll also post this note publicly on the meeting's Materials site.

We've tried, with only limited success, to hold each monthly meeting to one major Action Item on the agenda--be that a project getting a full review, or a substantial issue being discussed in advance of a LJCPA possibly taking a position.

For September there were two possibilities:

- a request from the Remley applicant to pull that project (which DPR had approved) off Consent and give it a full hearing, and
- a request from UCSD for us to host a forum and consider taking a position with regard to the Theater District Living and Learning Neighborhood (TDLLN).

The UCSD request involved time pressure, since the Regents are to vote on the project in mid-September. The University asked LJCPA to formally endorse the project; some community members asked us to formally request that the Regents delay their vote. So there was an action item--which of those positions to adopt, if either. We put the TDLLN discussion on the agenda and told the Remley applicants their full hearing wouldn't be until October.

It seemed to us that a "forum" clearly required hearing a diversity of perspectives. About a week before the agenda deadline we suggested a format to UCSD, namely a presentation by them followed by a formal response from a community member representing opponents, to be followed by a highly moderated period for public comments and questions and then a Trustee discussion and possible vote.

A few days before the agenda deadline UCSD informed us that they were withdrawing from the forum, citing their preference for something more akin to a simple presentation and repeating their request for LJCPA to endorse the project. We told them that LJCPA could not act on the basis of a simple presentation, since that would not be a "forum" consistent with earlier LJCPA decisions.

When UCSD stood by their withdrawal, we told the organized community opponents that the forum would not occur. The opponents asked us to hold the forum regardless, repeating their request for LJCPA to demand the Regent vote be delayed. We told the opponents that a discussion without a UCSD presentation would not be a "forum" consistent with earlier LJCPA decisions.

So we removed the TDLLN Action Item from the agenda. Instead, several Trustees suggested that LJCPA might write the Regents to let them know about the aborted forum. Whether to do so is now an Action Item as part of the President's Report. (There are two different drafts of such a letter on the Materials site, and others may be added.)

We told the Remley applicant and the neighbor who had organized opposition to it that it would now be possible to hear that project as an Action Item. The applicant agreed; the opposing neighbor asked for more time to commission new studies and reports (that is, beyond those discussed at DPR).

We told the opposing neighbor that whether to delay a vote on the project for additional reports is one option Trustees can consider (instead of findings CAN or CANNOT be made) following a public discussion. The Officers cannot make such a decision based based on private communications.

The final agenda thus has one Action Item, a review of the Remley Place project as approved 5-0-1 at the August DPR meeting.

As of 4pm on Wednesday, the applicant has submitted a presentation and some other items, all of which are on the Materials site. The neighbor who organized opposition thus far has submitted no new materials for publication (his earlier submissions to DPR are on the Materials page, as are many other items pro and con). Other individuals have submitted new

items, including a letter supporting the project and various items regarding the project's height vis a vis the 30-foot and sloping-lot rules, and there may be a few additional items appearing this evening or tomorrow.

(Just to keep things non-simple, we also had a project pulled from consent by its architect, and then unpulled once she spoke with her clients. But in the overall scheme of things that almost seemed normal.)

_____ greg jackson
_____ 1-773-936-9235
_____ <https://gjackson.us>