CHAPTER 1.0
INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) assesses the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed University of California, San Diego (UCSD), 2004 Long Range Development Plan (2004 LRDP). The 2004 LRDP is a land use plan based upon increased academic and research activities, as well as the anticipated space requirements and land uses associated with the expansion of UCSD’s academic, administrative, and support programs through academic year 2020-21, projected student enrollment, and campus population growth. In addition to analyzing the potential impacts of campus growth under the 2004 LRDP at a program level, this EIR addresses the project-specific environmental effects associated with three projects: the Rady School of Management, San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion, and Hopkins Parking Structure. Discussions specific to these projects are included in Volume III of this EIR.

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this EIR:

1. Assesses the potentially significant direct and indirect environmental effects of the proposed 2004 LRDP as well as the potentially significant cumulative impacts that could occur from implementation of the 2004 LRDP;
2. Identifies potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and
3. Evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed 2004 LRDP, including the required No Project Alternative.

This EIR was prepared in accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.09, which specifies how CEQA applies to University of California (UC) long range development plans, and other UC planning activities. According to PRC Section 21080.90:

- A “Long Range Development Plan” is defined as a physical development and land use plan to meet the academic and institutional objectives for a particular campus or medical center of public higher education.
- The approval of a long-range development plan is subject to CEQA and requires the preparation of an environmental impact report. Environmental effects relating to changes in enrollment levels shall be considered in the environmental impact report.
- Approval of a project on a campus may be addressed in a tiered environmental analysis based on a long-range development plan environmental impact report.
- Compliance with PRC Section 21080.09 satisfies the obligations of public higher education to consider the environmental impact of academic and enrollment plans as they affect campuses or medical centers, provided that any such plans shall become effective only after the environmental effects of those plans have been analyzed in a long range development plan environmental impact report or tiered analysis.
The University of California is the “lead agency” for the UCSD 2004 LRDP EIR. The University of California is governed by the Board of Regents of the University of California (The Regents), which under Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution, has “full powers of organization and governance” subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The Regents has the principal responsibility for approving the UCSD 2004 LRDP and UCSD projects. When certified, this EIR will serve as the base, or first-tier, environmental document for the 2004 LRDP.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The University of California requires that each campus and medical center maintain an LRDP, a general land use plan, to guide capital project development and approval. The process of periodically updating an LRDP provides the University of California an opportunity to plan for enrollment growth and make certain that physical plans remain solidly based on academic program goals. Therefore, the purpose of the UCSD 2004 LRDP is to provide a broad, coherent, and adaptable policy framework to achieve UCSD’s academic and support program goals and to inform decisions concerning land use.

The Regents approved the first LRDP for UCSD in 1963 with subsequent revisions occurring in 1966, 1981, and 1989. The LRDP adopted in 1989 was the fourth comprehensive long-range plan for the physical development of the UCSD main campus and the 2004 LRDP would be the fifth such plan for UCSD. In general, the 1989 LRDP consists of the following elements: (1) a facilities assessment identifying physical development needed to meet the academic and institutional goals of the campus during the planning period, (2) a description of five general planning principles for the campus, and (3) a land use plan to guide the siting of proposed new development and related circulation and parking needs. The 1989 LRDP identified land uses which would create a campus environment compatible with the natural environment and the surrounding community, and which would meet the academic goals of UCSD. The 1989 LRDP considered a 16-year planning period with a horizon year of 2005-06. Similarly, the proposed 2004 LRDP considers a 16-year planning period, which would extend the plan horizon year to 2020-21 and would revise the estimated student enrollment and total development allocation articulated in the 1989 LRDP.

In accordance with the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, which guarantees access to the University of California for the top 12.5 percent of California’s public high school graduates and community college transfer students, all of the UC campuses are now planning to increase enrollments to meet the anticipated demand. Based on 2002 University of California enrollment projections, enrollment through 2015 would peak around the year 2012-13 with a projection of 236,500 “full time equivalent” students (University of California, Office of the President [UCOP] 2002). With an actual system wide enrollment of 183,058 “full time equivalent” students in the 2002-03, this represents an increase of 53,442 students or 29 percent (UCOP 2003).

The actual rate at which campus headcount grows in the future depends on a variety of factors, including demographic trends, state and UC policy, and available resources. In the near term, funds may not be available to support further growth in enrollment. However, the projections in the 2004 LRDP are based on underlying demographic needs through the year 2020-21, rather than on near term funding considerations.

In order to meet the increasing enrollment demand based on these underlying demographic needs so that the UC system may fulfill its obligations to the citizens of the State of California if funds are available, UCSD projects enrollment to increase by approximately 30 percent through 2020-21 with a commensurate increase in faculty. This projected increase is reflected in the proposed 2004 LRDP. The 1989 LRDP proposed a student enrollment of 26,050 students (excluding summer sessions) and total development of 15,856,000 gross square feet (gsf) through the planning horizon of academic year 2005-06. The 2004 LRDP projects accommodating a regular academic year (i.e., the fall, winter, and spring quarters) headcount enrollment of
29,900 by the year 2020-21. The 2004 LRDP also projects accommodating a regular academic year total campus population (faculty, researchers, students, and staff) of 49,700 (instead of the 42,950 in the 1989 LRDP) and total development of 19,159,000 gsf throughout the campus by 2020-21.

To ensure a framework for cohesive growth that addresses both functional and aesthetic objectives, the 2004 LRDP sets forth land use designations as well as revised population, square footage, parking, and transportation parameters. Like the 1989 LRDP, the 2004 LRDP describes a physical vision of the long-term development of the campus.

Preparation of the proposed 2004 LRDP was accomplished under the auspices of the Campus/Community Planning Committee (C/CPC), which is advisory to the UCSD Chancellor. The C/CPC’s membership includes representatives from the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate, representatives from six Vice Chancellorial areas (Academic Affairs, Business Affairs, Health Sciences, Marine Sciences, Resource Management and Planning, and Student Affairs), the UCSD Staff Association, the Associated Students, and the Graduate Student Association. In the course of developing the 2004 LRDP, the campus considered the following nine factors:

- Academic and non-academic program requirements;
- Distribution of student enrollment across the academic programs;
- Optimum rate of student and faculty growth;
- Appropriate ratio of graduate students to undergraduate students;
- UCSD’s unique characteristics in light of its history and culture;
- Environmental resources;
- Need for services such as student housing, parking, transportation, recreation, childcare, appropriate retail operations, and administrative support;
- Opinions of campus constituency groups and community stakeholders; and
- Needs and interests of the surrounding community, city, state, and nation.

In 2003, the campus distributed a draft version of the proposed 2004 LRDP to various campus groups and the UC Office of the President, made copies available for public review at the Geisel Library and through the UCSD website, and distributed draft copies to appropriate public agencies and private groups. Finally, UCSD representatives presented preliminary versions of the 2004 LRDP and solicited comments at numerous public meetings. In sum, the preparation of the proposed 2004 LRDP represents almost four decades of analysis and a great deal of contemporary consultation. The proposed 2004 LRDP is described in further detail in Chapter 3 of this EIR and is available in its entirety from the UCSD Physical Planning office or can be downloaded from the UCSD Physical Planning website (http://physicalplanning.ucsd.edu). The 2004 LRDP is final if The Regents adopts it.
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

UCSD and the University of California have prepared this EIR for the following purposes:

- To satisfy the requirements of CEQA, pursuant to PRC Section 21080.09;
- To inform the general public, the local community, responsible, trustee, and federal public agencies, and others of the nature of the proposed 2004 LRDP, its potential significant environmental effects, potentially feasible measures to mitigate those effects, and reasonable potentially feasible alternatives to the proposed 2004 LRDP;
- To enable the University of California to consider the environmental consequences of approving the proposed 2004 LRDP;
- To provide a basis for tiering subsequent environmental documents pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152 and 15168(c);
- To provide project level review for individual projects where sufficient detail exists; and
- For consideration by responsible agencies in issuing permits and approvals for the development that occurs from the implementation of the proposed 2004 LRDP.

As described in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects, with consideration of other conditions, including economic, social, technological, legal, and other benefits. This EIR is an informational document, the purpose of which is to identify the potentially significant effects of the proposed project on the environment and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be avoided or significantly lessened; to identify any significant and unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated to below a less than significant level; and to identify reasonable and feasible alternatives to the proposed project that would avoid or substantially lessen any significant adverse environmental effects associated with the proposed 2004 LRDP.

The lead agency is required to consider the information in the EIR, along with any other relevant information, in making its decisions on the proposed 2004 LRDP. Although the EIR does not determine the ultimate decision that will be made regarding implementation of the project, CEQA requires the University of California to consider the information in the EIR prior to project approval and make findings regarding each significant effect identified in the EIR.

For the proposed 2004 LRDP, CEQA requires the University of California to prepare an EIR reflecting the independent judgment of the UC regarding the impacts, the mitigation measures and alternatives proposed to reduce impacts, and the level of significance of the impacts both before and after mitigation. The EIR is circulated to responsible agencies and trustee agencies with resources affected by the project, state agencies with jurisdiction by law, federal agencies, and interested parties and individuals. The purpose of public and agency review of the EIR includes sharing expertise, disclosing agency analysis, checking for accuracy, detecting omissions, discovering public concerns, and soliciting comments. In reviewing the EIR, reviewers should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing potentially significant effects on the environment and avoiding or mitigating the significant effects of the proposed project.

As discussed in the introduction of Volume III of this EIR, this EIR has also been prepared for similar purposes with regard to three specific proposed projects: the Rady School of Management, San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion, and Hopkins Parking Structure.
1.3 **TYPE OF EIR**

The proposed 2004 LRDP is a land use plan that would guide the physical development of the campus. It is not an implementation plan, and its adoption does not constitute a commitment to any specific project, construction schedule, or funding priority. Rather, it describes a potential development capacity for the entire campus through 2020-21. Each development proposal undertaken during the planning horizon of the 2004 LRDP must be approved individually at an appropriate level within the University of California and the approval must comply with CEQA. Therefore, as provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, this EIR is a Program EIR that evaluates the effects of the entire 2004 LRDP at a program level.

A Program EIR is recommended for a series of actions that are related geographically, as logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions, or in connection with the issuance of plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 [a]). The advantages of a Program EIR include the ability to provide a more exhaustive consideration of alternatives and cumulative effects than might be possible in a single project specific EIR, to avoid duplication of basic policy considerations, and to provide the Lead Agency (University of California) with the ability to consider broad program-wide policies and mitigation measures that would apply to specific projects within the overall program (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 [b]).

As discussed in the introduction of Volume III of this EIR, this Program EIR also addresses three specific UCSD projects at a project level.

1.4 **USES OF THE LRDP EIR**

This EIR will be used by The Regents to evaluate the environmental implications of adopting the proposed 2004 LRDP. Once certified, this EIR would also be used to tier subsequent environmental analysis for future UCSD development projects. In addition, the EIR would be relied upon by responsible agencies with permitting or approval authority over any project specific action to be advanced in the future.

With respect to future UCSD development projects that could be proposed during the 2004 LRDP planning horizon (up to 2020-21), CEQA and CEQA Guidelines state that subsequent projects should be examined in light of the Program EIR to determine whether project specific actions are consistent with the LRDP and additional environmental documentation must be prepared. If no new significant effects would occur, all significant effects have been adequately addressed, and no new mitigation measures would be required, the subsequent projects within the scope of the approved LRDP could rely on the environmental analysis provided in the Program EIR, and no additional environmental analysis would be required; otherwise, subsequent environmental analysis must be prepared. The subsequent analysis may rely on the Program EIR, as appropriate, for general discussions, some analysis, and cumulative impacts, but would be tiered to allow the subsequent analysis to focus on more project- and site-specific impacts not covered in the Program EIR. In either case, appropriate documentation would be prepared pursuant to CEQA and CEQA Guidelines for subsequent projects.

As discussed in the introduction of Volume III of this EIR, this EIR will also be used by the University of California to evaluate the environmental implication of approving three specific projects: the Rady School of Management, San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion, and Hopkins Parking Structure. Once certified, this EIR could also be relied upon by responsible agencies with discretionary authority over those projects, as well as future projects that would occur as anticipated in the 2004 LRDP.
1.5 OTHER AGENCY APPROVALS

Under CEQA, state and local agencies other than the Lead Agency that have discretionary authority over a project, or aspects of a project, are considered responsible agencies. No other public agencies would have discretionary authority over the 2004 LRDP; however, one or more may have discretionary authority over subsequent projects that may be implemented under the 2004 LRDP. The following is a list of some federal, state, and regional agencies that may have discretionary authority over subsequent projects implemented under the LRDP. Federal agencies are not responsible agencies under CEQA.

- California Coastal Commission
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- City of San Diego
- San Diego Air Pollution Control District
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
- San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

As individual projects are proposed, permits and approvals may be needed depending on the characteristics of the projects. A list of potential permits and authorizations is presented below:

**Coastal Development Permit.** The California Coastal Commission regulates development in the Coastal Zone, which covers Scripps Institution of Oceanography and the northwestern half of the west campus. In accordance with the California Coastal Act, new development in the Coastal Zone generally requires a permit from the Coastal Commission if it includes the placement of any solid material or structure; a change in land use density or intensity (including any land division); change in the intensity of water use or access to water; or removal of major vegetation.

**Section 404 Permit.** Implementation of the 2004 LRDP could result in the filling of wetlands and other waters of the United States. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) regulates the nation’s waterways and wetlands, and is responsible for implementing and enforcing Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA). ACOE regulations require that any activity that discharges fill material or requires excavation in “waters of the United States,” including wetlands, must obtain a Section 404 permit.

**Section 10 Compliance.** Under the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, the ACOE requires permits for activities involving the obstruction of the navigable capacity of any waters of the United States or the construction of structures or alteration of capacity in any port, canal, navigable river, or other water of the United States. “Navigable waters” under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act are defined as “those waters of the United States that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide shoreward to the mean high water mark and/or are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible to use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.”

**Section 401 Water Quality Certification.** The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) promulgate and enforce narrative and numeric water quality standards in order to protect water quality and adopt and approve Water Quality Control Plans. The SWRCB and the RWQCBs also regulate discharges of harmful substances to surface waters, including wetlands, under the federal CWA and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. If issuance of
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a Section 404 permit is required, it will be subject to water quality certification by a RWQCB under CWA Section 401.

**Waste Discharge Requirements.** Under the Porter-Cologne Act, the RWQCBs regulate the discharge of “waste” into “waters of the state.” Water Code Section 13260 requires “any person discharging, or proposing to discharge waste, within any region that could affect the waters of the state to file a report of discharge.” A report of waste discharge (RWD) is essentially an application for waste discharge requirements (WDRs). WDRs contain conditions imposed on a given discharge by the appropriate RWQCBs for the purpose of protecting the beneficial uses of the waters of the state, including groundwater.

**Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.** The federal Endangered Species Act requires a federal agency (potentially the ACOE if issuance of a Section 404 permit is required) to seek formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for species listed as threatened or endangered, or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered. Based on this consultation, the USFWS may issue a biological opinion determining whether the project is likely to adversely affect or jeopardize the continued existence of a federally listed species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat proposed to be designated for such species.

**Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act.** Section 10 of the federal Endangered Species Act provides a nonfederal applicant a mechanism to obtain incidental take authorization for federally listed threatened or endangered species.

**Section 106 Compliance.** For projects with federal funding, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended by 16 United States Code (USC) Section 470 et seq.; Section 106; 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800, includes provisions for protection of significant archaeological and historical resources. Procedures for dealing with previously unsuspected cultural resources discovered during construction are identified in 36 CFR 800 (for implementing Section 106 processes). The administering agency is the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the federal lead agency.

**Section 1602 Permit.** The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) requires notification for any project or activity that will take place in, or in the vicinity of, a river, stream, lake, or its tributaries. Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code requires that any entity, including any state or local governmental agency, provide written notification to CDFG before they begin any construction project that will: (1) substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of, or change the natural flow or the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake; (2) substantially change or use any material from a streambed, bank, or channel; or (3) deposit or dispose of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it can be transported into any river, stream, or lake.

**Section 2081 Compliance.** Section 2081 of the California Endangered Species Act permits an applicant to “take” (hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill) endangered or threatened species, provided that a permit is issued, the take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity, the impacts of the authorized take are minimized and fully mitigated, the take permit is consistent with the CDFG recovery programs, the applicant ensures adequate funding to implement the mitigation and monitoring program, and the action will not jeopardize the continued existence of the species.

**NPDES Permits.** The Clean Water Act requires a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for any discharge of pollutants from a point source to waters of the United States. This law and its regulations also apply to storm water in certain circumstances. In 1987, Congress amended the CWA to require implementation, in two phases, of a comprehensive national program for addressing storm water discharges. Phase I requires NPDES permits for storm water discharge from a large number of priority sources, including medium and large municipal separate storm sewer systems, and several categories of
industrial activity, including construction activity that disturbs five or more acres of land. Phase II of the storm water program requires permits for storm water discharges from certain small municipal separate storm sewer systems and construction activity generally disturbing between one and five acres. Any future projects may be eligible to participate in one of these permit programs.

**Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate.** Pursuant to Section 40002 of the California Health and Safety Code, jurisdiction for air quality and regulation of air pollutant emissions from all stationary sources (that is, other than motor vehicles) within San Diego County has been delegated to the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). SDAPCD has adopted rules and regulations to implement this delegated authority and regulate the emission of air pollutants and achieve and maintain good air quality within the county.

**Other Permits and Approvals.** A variety of other permits and approvals from federal, state, and regional agencies may be needed for future projects, or for implementation of project mitigation. These may include encroachment permits and approvals for infrastructure providers for service and extension of facilities to the campus.

### 1.6 EIR REVIEW PROCESS

#### 1.6.1 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW

The University of California prepared an Initial Study for the proposed 2004 LRDP in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 and a Notice of Preparation (NOP) in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082. On August 1, 2003, the NOP and Initial Study were mailed to a distribution list consisting of the State Clearinghouse, responsible, trustee, and other relevant local, state, and federal agencies, and interested individuals. The NOP was also published in the San Diego Union-Tribune newspaper and the NOP and Initial Study were made available on the UCSD Physical Planning website. A 30-day comment period on the NOP commenced on August 4, 2003. A scoping meeting was held on August 27, 2003 to solicit input from interested agencies, individuals, and organizations.

After completion of the NOP comment period it was determined that the 2004 LRDP EIR would also address three specific projects: the Rady School of Management, San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion, and Hopkins Parking Structure. Therefore, a second NOP that addressed the three specific projects and 2004 LRDP, and provided a discussion explaining why a second NOP was issued, was mailed to the State Clearinghouse and the rest of the distribution list on December 5, 2003. A 30-day comment period on the second NOP commenced on December 8, 2003. A second scoping meeting was also held on December 18, 2003. A copy of both NOPs, the 2004 LRDP Initial Study, comments received on the NOPs, and transcripts of the scoping meetings are included in Appendix A of this EIR.

The Draft EIR was available for review and comment by the public and public agencies from May 26, 2004 to July 9, 2004. Public review of the Draft EIR began as a 45-day period but was extended to July 23, 2004 at the request of several commentors. Comments on the Draft EIR could be mailed to UCSD. Additionally, comments could be submitted through the UCSD 2004 LRDP EIR website. Comments were also presented verbally during a public hearing that was held on June 14, 2004 at the UCSD University Center Conference Room 111A.
A hardcopy of the Draft EIR was available for review during normal operating hours for the duration of the public review period at the following locations:

- UCSD Physical Planning Office at 10280 North Torrey Pines Road, Suite 340, La Jolla, CA 92037
- UCSD Geisel Library – Social Sciences and Humanities Library Reference Desk
- San Diego Public Library, La Jolla Branch, 7555 Draper Avenue, La Jolla, CA 92038
- San Diego Public Library, University Community Branch, 4155 Governor Drive, San Diego, CA 92122
- San Diego Public Library, Central Library, 820 E Street, San Diego, CA 92101

An electronic version of the Draft EIR was available on compact disk (CD) upon request from the UCSD Physical Planning office. The Draft EIR was also available for review or downloading on the UCSD 2004 LRDP EIR website during the public review period.

During public review of the Draft EIR, 52 written comment letters or emails were received by UCSD. Numerous comments were also received verbally during the public hearing on June 14, 2004, which were transcribed by a recorder for the record. Following the close of the public comment period, responses to all formally submitted comments that raised environmental issues regarding the project were prepared. Comments and responses are provided in Volume IV of the Final EIR. Volume IV also describes revisions that were made to the Draft EIR. None of the changes to the Draft EIR constitute significant new information requiring recirculation pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

1.6.2 PROJECT APPROVALS

The Final EIR will be considered by The Regents in a public meeting on September 21, 2004, and certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. After or concurrent with certification of the EIR, The Regents will consider the 2004 LRDP for approval. The three specific projects analyzed in Volume III of this document will be considered independently of the LRDP for approval by The Regents, the President of the University, or the Chancellor, as appropriate under the authority delegated by The Regents.

1.6.3 CEQA FINDINGS AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

When a public agency approves a project for which an EIR has been certified, which identified one or more significant environmental effects, CEQA requires that the agency make one or more written findings for each of those significant effects accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Because significant environmental effects have been identified in this EIR, findings will be required for the 2004 LRDP and three specific projects at the time of their approval.

CEQA requires that when a public agency makes findings based on an EIR, the public agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for those measures that it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program must be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. Mitigation Monitoring Programs for the 2004 LRDP and the three specific projects have been prepared and are included in Volume IV of the Final EIR.

1.7 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This EIR is organized into four volumes. Volume I addresses the impacts of the physical development of the proposed 2004 LRDP. Associated technical appendices are contained in Volume II. Volume III addresses the
project level impacts of the proposed Rady School of Management, San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion, and Hopkins Parking Structure projects. Volume IV contains Draft EIR comments, responses, and revisions, as well as the mitigation monitoring programs for the 2004 LRDP and three specific projects.

Volume I of the 2004 LRDP EIR includes the following:

- **Chapter 1, Introduction.** Provides an introduction and overview describing the background of the proposed 2004 LRDP, the purpose and intended use of the EIR, and the review and certification process.

- **Chapter 2, Executive Summary.** Summarizes the proposed 2004 LRDP, environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the 2004 LRDP, proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce impacts, and the level of significance of impacts both before and after mitigation.

- **Chapter 3, Project Description.** Provides a detailed description of the proposed 2004 LRDP, including its location, background information, major objectives, and structural and technical characteristics, and addresses sustainable development.

- **Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation.** Contains project and cumulative analysis for various issues under several environmental topics. The subsection for each environmental topic contains an introduction and description of the existing setting, issues to be analyzed, standards of significance, methodology used to evaluate impacts, and impacts and appropriate mitigation measures.

- **Chapter 5, Other CEQA Considerations.** Provides discussions required by CEQA regarding unavoidable significant impacts, growth inducing impacts, and environmental effects found not to be significant.

- **Chapter 6, Alternatives.** Describes alternatives to the proposed 2004 LRDP that could avoid or substantially lessen significant effects and evaluates their environmental effects in comparison to the LRDP.

- **Chapter 7, Preparers and Persons Contacted.** Identifies the persons who prepared this EIR and those who were consulted during its preparation.

Volume II of the 2004 LRDP EIR consists of supporting materials and technical appendices and includes the following:

- **Appendix A.** 2004 LRDP Initial Study, Notices of Preparation and Responses, and Scoping Meetings and Comments

- **Appendix B.** Air Quality Technical Report and Health Risk Assessment

- **Appendix C.** Biology Technical Report

- **Appendix D.** Geological Technical Report

- **Appendix E.** Hazardous Materials File Review

- **Appendix F.** Hydrology Report

- **Appendix G.** Noise Technical Report

- **Appendix H.** Population and Housing Technical Report

- **Appendix I.** Traffic Analysis Report

- **Appendix J.** Water Supply Assessment Report
A Cultural Resources Technical Report appendix was also prepared for this EIR. It contains sensitive information regarding the location and nature of cultural resources and, pursuant to federal law, is not made available to the general public. Qualified individuals may view the report by appointment at the UCSD Physical Planning office.

Volume III of the 2004 LRDP EIR includes the following:

- **Introduction.** Provides an introduction and overview describing the impact analyses for three specific projects and their relationship to the LRDP EIR.
- **Rady School of Management.**
- **San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion.**
- **Hopkins Parking Structure.**

For each project, the following information is presented in the EIR: project location, a detailed project description, a discussion of impacts adequately analyzed at the LRDP level, an analysis of project-level impacts and mitigation measures, alternatives, and references.

Volume IV of the 2004 LRDP EIR includes the following:

- Comments received on the Draft EIR.
- Responses to comments received on the Draft EIR.
- Revisions made in response to comments received on the Draft EIR.
- Mitigation Monitoring Programs for the 2004 LRDP and three specific projects.
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